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question (x) before the schism of Donatus did so move men of great note, and Fathers and Bishops endued with great Charity, to debate and doubt without breach of peace; that for a long time in several regions there were diverse and doubtful decrees, till that which was truly believed was undoubtedly esta-
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Authorities of Scriptures, Councils, and Fathers proves it also by reason itself, in regard that Marriage is a great impediment to Ecclesiastical functions; and beginning with the action

Page 184:
if we were indeed guilty of Manichaeism, and such absurd impieties, as those whereof you talk. Abstinence from flesh, is meritorious,

Page 185:
and plagues, come by reason of such crimes. In the (u) Canon Law, Blasphemers, beside other punishments, are to stand as Penitents at the Church
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MERCY & TRUTH.
OR
CHARITY
MAINTAYNED
by Catholiques.

By way of Reply upon an Answer lately framed by 
D. POTTER to a Treatise which had formerly proved, That CHARITY was MIS TAKEN
by Protestants: With the want whereof Catholiques are unjuistly charged for affirming, That Pro-
testancy unrepented destroys SALVATION.

Divided into two Parts.

Mercy and Truth have met together. Psalm. 24. v. 11.
Better are the wounds of him that loveth, than the fraudulent kisses
of him that hateth. Prov. cap. 27. v. 6.

We love you Brethren, and desire the same things for you,
which we doe for ourselves. S. Aug. Ep. 166.

Permissu Superiorum, M. DC. XXXIII.
TO THE
MOST HIGH
Mighty, Just, and Clement Prince,
CHARLES
King of Great-Britaine, France,
and Ireland, &c.

These Titles (most gracious Soueraigne) partly flowing from your Royall Authority, and partly appropriated to your Sacred Person, have by their happy conjunction emboldened me to lay at your Princely Feet,
The Epistle

with most humble respects, and profound submission, this reply of mine to a Booke, lately written in obedience, as the Author therof affirmes, to your Maiesties particular Command.

For, though your Regal Authority may seeme to be an Object of only Dread and Awe; yet doth it not so much avert, as invite men to a confident approach, when it appeares so sweetly tempered, and adorned with such rare Personall Qualities as your Maiesties are; Justice to all; Clemency to every one of your meanest Subjects; Wisdom to discern with quicknes & depth, and to determine with great maturity of Judgment, betwene right and wrong; A Princely disdain, and just indignation against the
Dedatory.

the least dissimulation, which may be repugnant to the secret testimony of Conscience; An heroicall Affection, and even as it were a natural kind of sympathy with all Sincerity, and Truth.

So that, when your Majesty thought fit to impose a Commandement of writing upon one; I could not but conceive it to be also your gracious Pleasure and Will, that in Vertue of the same Royal Command, others who are of contrary Judgment, were suffered at least, if not obliged, to answer for themselves; but yet with all due respect, and Christian moderation: Which, I have as carefully endeavoured to observe, as if I had written by the express Command, & spoken in the Hearing, and acted
The Epistle

the part of Truth, in the presence of
so Great, so Modest, and so Judicious
a Monarch, as your Majesty is.

I was therefore supported by con-
templation of these your rare En-
dowments of Mind: which, as
they are the Happines of all your
Subiects; so were they no lesse a
Hope to me, that your Majesty
would not disdain to cast an eye of
Grace upon this Reply, not accor-
ding to the face of present times,
but with regard to the Plea's of
Truth, appearing in times more
ancient, and in places more diffu-
sed, by the allegation of one, who
doeth so cordially profess himselfe
your Maiesties most humble sub-
ject, as that from the depth of a sin-
cere hart, and with all the powvers
of his soule, he vvishes that God be
no
Dedicatory.
no longer mercifull, and good to
him, and all your other Catholi-
ques Subjects, then they, and he
shall both in desire, and deed, ap-
prove themselves upon all occa-
sions, sincerely Loyall to the most
Excellent Person, and thrice hope-
full Issue of your Sacred Maiesty.

This our Catholique Religion
teaches vs to professe and perfor-
me: and heerewith I lay this poore
Worke, and prostrate the Author
thereof, at the Throne of your
Royall Feet.

Your Maiesties most humble
and most loyall Subject.

I. H.
Advertisement of the Printer.

This REPL Y, Good Reader, was indeed long since finished by the Author; but by reason of some impediment, it could not be commodiously transported, so soon as he wished, and desired it should.
TO THE READER.

I have leave (good Reader) to inform thee, by way of Preface, of three points. The first concerns D. Potter's Answer to Charity Mistaken. The second relates to this Reply of mine. And the third contains some Premonitions, or Prescriptions in case D. Potter, or any in his behalf, think fit to rejoin.

2. For the first point concerning D. Potter's Answer, I lay in general, referring particulars to their proper places, that in his whole Booke he hath not so much as once truly and really fallen upon the point in question, which was, Whether both Catholiques and Protestants can be saved in their seuerall professions. And therefore Charity Mistaken judiciously pres-
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Sing those particulars, wherein the difficulties doth precisely consist, proves in generall, that there is but one true Church; that all Christiâ's are obliged to hearken to her; that she must be ever visible, and inallible; that to separate ones selfe from her Communion is Schisme, and to dissent from her doctrine is Heresie, though it be in points never so few, or never so small in their own nature; and therefore that the distinction of points fundamentall, and not fundamentall is wholly vain, as it is applied by Protestants. These (I say) and some other generall grounds Charity Mistaken handles, and out of them doth cleerely evince, that any least difference in faith cannot stand with salvation on both sides: and therefore since it is apparent, that Catholiques and Protestants disagree in very many points of faith, they both cannot hope to be sau'd without repentance: and consequently, as we hold, that Protestant vnrepentanted destroying Salvation; so must they also believe that we canot be sau'd, if they indige their own Religion to be true, and ours to be false. And whosoever disguizeth this truth, is an enemy to soules, which he deceives with ungrounded false hopes of salvation, indifferent Faiths, and Religions. And this, Charity Mistaken performed exactly, according to that which appears to have been his designe, which was not to descend to particular disputes, as D. Potter affectedly does, namely, Whether or no the Roman
To the Reader.

má Church be the only true Church of Christ; and much lesse whether Generall Councils be infallible; whether the Pope may erre in his Decrees common to the whole Church; whether he be aboue a Generall Councell; whether all points of fayth be contained in Scripture; whether Fayth be resolued into the authority of the Church, as into his last formall Object, and Motive; and last of all did he discourse of Images, Communion vnder both kinds, publique Service in an vknowne Tongue, Seauen Sacraments, Sacrifice of the Maffe, Indulgences, and Index Expurgatorius; all which and divers other articles D. Potter (as I said) drawes by violence into his Booke: & he might as well have brought in Pope loane, or Antichrist, or the Jewes who are permitted to live in Rome, which are common Themes for men that want better matter, as D. Potter was forced to fetch in the aforesayd Controversies, that so he might dazzle the验收, & distract the mynd of the Reader, and hinder him from perceiving that in his whole Answer he vtted nothing to the purpose, & point in question: which if he had followed closely, I dare well say, he might have dispatched his whole Booke in two or three sheetes of paper. But the truth is, he was loath to affirm plainly, that generally both Catholiques and Protestants may be faued: and yet seeing it to be most evident that Protestants cannot pretend to haue any true Church be-
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fore Luther except the Roman, and such as agreed with her, and consequently that they cannot hope for salvation, if they deny it to vs; he thought best to avoid this difficulty by confusion of language, & to fill vp his Booke with points which make nothing to the purpose. Wherein he is less excusable, because he must graunt, that those very particulers to which he digresseth, are not fundamentall errors, though it should be granted that they be errors, which indeed are Catholique verities. For since they be not fundamentall, nor destructive of salvation, what imports it whether we hold them or no, for as much as concerns our possibility to be faueld?

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

4. And as for D. Potters manner of handling those very points, which are utterly beside the purpose, it consists, only in bringing vulgar meane objections, which have been answered a thousand tymes, yea, and some of them are cleerely answered even in Charity Mistaken; but he takes no knowledge at all of any such answers, and much lesse doth he apply himselfe to confute them. He alledged also Authors with so great corruption and fraud, as I would not have believed, if I had not found it by cleere, and frequent experience. In his second Edition, he hath indeed left out one or two grosse cor-

B3 rupti-
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ruptions, amongst many others no less notorious, having as it seems been warned by some friends, that they could not stand with his credit: but even in this his second Edition he retracts them not at all, nor declares that he was mistaken in the First, and so his Reader of the first Edition shall ever be deceived by him, though withall he reads the Second. For preventing of which inconvenience, I have thought it necessary to take notice of them, and to discover them in my Reply.

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

6. For the second, touching my Reply: if you wonder at the Bulke thereof, compared
To the Reader.

Concerring my Reply.

eyther with Charity Mistaken, or D. Potters Answer, I desire you to consider well of what now I am about to say, and then I hope you will see, that I was cast upon a meere necessity of not being so short, as otherwise might peradventure be desired. Charity Mistaken is short I grant, and yet very full, and large for as much as concerned his designe, which you see was not to treate of particular Controversies in Religion, no not so much as to debate, whether or no the Roman Church be the onely true Church of Christ, which indeed would have required a larger Volume, as I haue understood there was one then coming forth, if it had not been prevented by the Treatise of Charity Mistaken, which seemed to make the other inteded worke a little lesse seasonable at that tyme. But Charity Mistaken proves onely in Generall out of some Unuerfall Principles, well backed and made good by choyce and solide authorities, that of two disagreeng in points of Fayth, one onely without repentance can be faued; which ayme exacted no great bulke. And as for D. Potters Answer, even that also is not so short as it may seeme. For if his marginall notes printed in a small letter were transfered into the Text, the Booke would appeare to be of some bulke: though indeed it might have been very short, if he had kept himself to the point treated by Charity Mistaken, as shall be declared anon. But contrarily, because the question debated betwixt
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betwixt Charity Mistaken & D. Potter, is a point of the highest consequence that can be imagined, & in regard that there is not a more pernicious Heresy, or rather indeed ground of Atheism, then a persuasion that men of different Religions may be saued, if otherwise forsooth they lead a kind of ciuill and morall life: I conceived, that my chief endeavoure was not to be employed in answering D. Potter, but that it was necessary to handle the Question it selfe somewhat at large, and not only to prove in generall, that both Protestants and Catholikes cannot be saued; but to shew also, that Salvation cannot be hoped for out of the Catholique Roman Church; and yet withall, not to omit to answer all the particules of D. Potter's Booke which may any way import. To this end I thought it fit, to divide my Reply into two Parts: in the former whereof, the maine question is handled by a continued discourse without stepping aside to confute the particulers of D. Potter's Answer, though yet so as that even in this first Part, I omit not to answer such passages of his, as I find directly in my way, and naturally belong to the points whereof I treat: & in the second Part I answer D. Potter's Treatise, Section by Section, as they lie in order I hear therefore intreate the Reader, that if hartenly he desire satisfaction in this so important question, he do not content himselfe with that which I lay to Doctor Potter in my second Part.
To the Reader.

Part, but that he take the First before him, yther all, or at least so much as may serve most to his purpose of being satisfied in those doubts which press him most. For which purpose I have caused a Table of the Chapters of the first Part, together with their Titles & Arguments, to be prefixed before my Reply.

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

And for as much as concernes the manner of my Reply, I have procured to do it without all bitterness, or gall of inveceue words, both for as much as may import either Protestants in generall, or D. Potters person in particular, vnles, for example, he will call it bitterness for me to terme a grosse impertinency, a sleight, or a corruption, by those very names, without which I do not know how to express the things: and yet wherein I can truly affirme that
that I have studied how to deliver them in the most moderate way, to the end I might give as little offence as possibly I could, without betraying the Cause. And if any unfit phrase may peradventure have escaped my pen (as I hope none hath) it was beside, and against my intention, though I must needs profess, that *D. Potter* giues so many and so iust occasions of being round with him, as that perhaps some will judge me to have been rather remisse, then moderate. But since in the very Title of my *Reply* I profess to *maintaine Charity*, I conceive that the excess will be more excusable amongst all kinds of men, if it fall to be in mildnes, then if it had appeared in too much zele. And if *D. Potter* have a mind to charge me with ignorance or any thing of that nature, I can, and will ease him of that labour, by acknowledging in myself as many & more personall defects, then he can heape upon me. *Truth only and sincerity* I so much value and profess, as that he shall never be able to prove the contrary in any one least passage or particle against me.

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

9. In the third & last place, I have thought fit to express my selfe thus If *D. Potter*, or any other resolute to answer my *Reply*, I desire that he will observe some things which may tend to his owne reputation, the saving of my unnecessary paines, and especially to the greater advantage of truth. I wish then that he would be
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careful to consider, wherein the point of every difficulty consists, and not impertinently to shoot at Rouers, and affectedly mistake one thing for another. As for example, to what purpose (for as much as concerneth the question between D. Potter and Charity Mistaken) doth he so often and seriously labour to prove, that faith is not resolved into the Authority of the Church, as into the formall Object and Motive thereof? Or that all points of Faith are contained in Scripture? Or that the Church cannot make new Articles of Faith? Or that the Church of Rome, as it signifies that particular Church or diocese, is not all one with the universal Church? Or that the Pope as a private Doctor may err? With many other such points as will easily appeare in their proper places. It will also be necessary for him not to put certaine Doctrines upon us, from which he knowes we disclaime as much as himselfe.

10. I must in like manner intreat him not to recite my reasons & discourses by halves, but to set the down faithfully & entirely, for as much as in very deed concerns the whole Substance of the thing in question; because the want sometime of one word, may chance to make voyd, or lessen the force of the whole argument. And I am the more solicitous about giving this particular caution, because I find how ill he hath complied with the promise which he made in his Preface to the Reader, not to omit without answer any one
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one thing of moment in all the discourse of Charity Mistaken. Neither will this course be a cause that his Rejoynder grow too large, but it will be occasion of brevity to him, and free me also from the pains of setting downe all the words which he omits, and himself of demonstrating that what he omitted was not materiall. Nay I will assure him, that if he keep himselfe to the point of every difficulty, and not weary the Reader, and ouercharge his margent, with unecessary quotations of Authors in Greeke and Latin, and sometime also in Italian and French, together with proverbs, sentences of Poets, and such grammatical stuffe, nor affect to cite a multitude of our Catholique Schoole deuines to no purpose at all; his Booke will not exceed a competent size, nor will any man in reason be offended with that length which is regulated by necessity. Agayne before he come to let downe his answere, or propoe his Arguments, let him consider very wel what may be replied, and whether his owne objections may not be retorted against himselfe, as the Reader will perceive to have hapned often to his disadva-


tage in my Reply against him. But especially I expect, and Truth it selfe exaets at his hand, that he speake clearly and distinctly, and not seeke to walke in darknes, so to delude and deceue his Reader, now laying, and then denying, and alwayes speaking with such ambiguity, as that his greatest care may seeme to consist in
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in a certaine art to find a shift, as his occasions might chance, eyther now, or heereafter to require, and as he might fall out to be urged by diversity of severall arguments. And to the end it may appeare, that I deale plainly, as I would have him alfo do, I desire that he declare himselfe concerning these points.

11. First, whether our Saviour Christ have not alwayes had, and be not euery to have a visible true Church on earth: & whether the contrary doctrine be not a damnable Heresy.

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

13. Thirdly, since he will be forced to grant that there can be assign'd no visible true Church of Christ, distinct from the Church of Rome, and such Churches as agreed with her when Luther first appeared, whether it do not follow, that she hath not err'd fundamentally; because every such errour destroys the nature and being of the Church, and so our Saviour Christ should have had no visible Church on earth.

14. Fourthly, if the Roman Church did not fall into any fundamentall errour, let him tell us how it can be damnable to live in her Communion, or to maintaine errours, which are knowne & confess'd, not to be fundamentall, or damnable.

15. Fiftly, if her Errours were not damnable,
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bie, nor did exclude salvation, how can they be excused from Schisme, who forsook her Communion upon pretence of errors, which were not damnable?

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

17. Seauenthly, whether any one Error maintayned against any one Truth though never so small in itselfe, yet sufficiently propounded as testified or revealed by almighty God, do not destroy the Nature and Unity of Faith, or at least is not a grievous offence excluding Salvation.

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

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

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

21. These are the questions which for the present I find it fit and necessary for me to ask of D. Potter, or any other who will defend his cause, or impugne ours. And it will be in vaine to speake vainely, and to tell me, that a Foure may ask more questions in an houre, then a wise man can answere in a yeare; with such idle Proverbs as that. For I ask but such questions
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as for which he giues occasion in his Booke, and where he declares not himselfe but after so ambiguous and confused a manner, as that Truth it selfe can scarce tell how to conclude him so, but that with ignorant and ill-judging men he wil seeme to have somewhat left to lay for himselfe, though Papists (as he calls them) and Puritans shoulde presse him contrary wayes at the same tyme: and these questions conserne things also of high importance, as wherevpon the knowledge of Gods Church, & true Religion, and consequently Salvation of the soule depends. And now because he shall not taxe me with being like those men in the Gol-pell whom our blessed Lord and Saviour charg'd with laying heavy burdens vpon other mens shoulders, who yet would not touch them with their finger: I oblige my selfe to answere vpon any demand of his, both to all these Questions, if he find that I haue not done it already, and to any other concerning matter of faith that he shall aske. And I will tell him very plainly, what is Catholique doctrine, and what is not, that is, what is defined or what is not defined, and rests but in discusion among De- uines.

22. And it will be heere expected, that he performe these things, as a man who professeth learning should doe, not flying from questions which conserne things as they are con sidered in their owne nature, to accidentall, or
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rare circumstances of ignorance, incapacity, want of means to be instructed, erroneous conscience, and the like, which being very various and different, cannot be well comprehended under any generall Rule. But in delivering generall doctrines we must consider things as they be ex natura rei, or per se loquendo (as Deuines speake) that is, according to their natures, if all circumstances concur proportionable thereunto. As for example some may for a time have invincible ignorance, even of some fundamentall article of fayth, through want of capacity, instruction, or the like, and so not offend either in such ignorance or error; and yet we must absolutely say, that error in any one fundamentall point is damnable, because so it is if we consider things in themselves, abstracting from accidentall circumstances in particular persons: as contrarily if some man judge some act of vertue, or some indifferent action to be a sinne, in him it is a sinne indeed, by reason of his erroneous conscience; and yet we ought not to say absolutely, that vertuous, or indifferent actions are sinnes: and in all sciences we must distinguish the generall Rules from their particulier Exceptions. And therefore when, for example, he answers to our demand, whether he hold that Catholiques may be saued, or whether their pretended errors be fundamentall and damnable, he is not to change the state of the question, and have re-
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course to Ignorance, and the like, but to answere concerning the errors being considered what they are apt to be in themselves, and as they are neyther increased nor diminished, by accidentall circumstancies.

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

The State of the Question; with a Summary of the reasons for which amongst men of different Religions, one side onely can be saued.

CHAP. I.

Ever is Malice more indiscreet, then when it chargeth others with imputation of that, to which it selfe becomes more liable, even by that very act of accusing others. For, though guiltines be the effect of some errour, yet virtuall it begetts a kind of Moderation, so far forth, as not to let men cast such aspersions vpon others, as must apparently reflect vpon themselves. Thus cannot the
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Poet endure, that Gracchus, who was a factious and vnoquiet man, should be inveighing against Sedition: and the Roman Orator rebukes Philosophers, who, to wax glorious, superscribed their Names upon those very Books which they entitled, Of the contempt of glory. What then shall we say of D. Potter, who in the Title, and Text of his whole Booke doth so tragically charge Want of Charity on all such Romanists, as dare affirme, that Protestant destroyeth Salvation; while he himselfe is in act of pronouncing the like heavy doome against Roman Catholiques? For, not satisfied with much vncivil language, in affirming the Roman Church many (a) wayes to have played the Harlot, and in that regard deserued a bill of divorcement from Christ, and detestation of Christians; in stiling her, that proud (b) and curs Dame of Rome, which takes upon her to renew in the House of God; in talking of an Idol (c) to be worshipped at Rome; he comes at length to thunder out this fearfull sentence against her: For that (d) Mische of Errors (faith he) in judgment and pratiſfe, which is proper to her, and wherein she differs from us, we judge a reconciliation impossible, and to vs (who are convinced in conscience of her corruptions) damnable. And in another place he (e) faith: For vs who are convinced in conscience, that sheers in many things, a necessity lies upon vs, even under paine of damnation, to forsake her in those Errors. By the acerbity of which Censur, he doth not only make himselfe guilty of that, whic
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which he judgeth to be a haynous offence in others, but freeth vs also from all colour of crime by this his vnaduised reccrimination. For, if Roman Catholikes be likewise convicted in conscience of the Errors of Protestants; they may, and must, in conformity to the Doctours owenr rule, judge a reconciliation with them to be also damnable. And thus, all the Want of Charity so deeply charged on vs, dissolves it selfe into this poore wonder, Roman Catholiques believe in their conscience, that the Religion which they professe is true, and the contrary false.

2. Neuerthelesse, we earnestly desire, and take care, that our doctrine may not be defamed by misinterpretation. Far be it from vs, by way of insultation, to apply it against Protestants, otherwise then as they are comprehended under the generality of those who are divided from the only one true Church of Christ our Lord, within the Communion whereof he hath confined salvation. Neither do we understand why our most dear Countrymen should be offended, if the Universality be particularized under the Name of Protestants, first given (g) to certaine Lutherans, who professing that they would stand out against the Impertall de. l.6. fol.84: crees, in defence of the Confession exhibited at Auseurige, were termed Protestants, in regard of such their professing: which Confessio Augstana displauming from, and being displaumed by Calvinists, and Zvinglians, our na-

E 2
Part I. Charity maintained

ming or exemplifying a general doctrine under the particular name of Protestantism, ought not in any particular manner to be odious in England.

Moreover, our meaning is not, as misrepresented persons may conceive, that we give Protestants over to reprobation; that we offer no prayers in hope of their salvation; that we hold their case desperate. God forbid! We hope, we pray for their conversion; and sometimes we find happy effects of our charitable desires. Neither is our Censure immediately directed to particular persons. The Tribunall of particular judgment is God alone. When any man esteemed a Protestant, leaveth to live in this world, we do not instantly with precipitation auouch, that he is lodged in Hell. For we are not always acquainted with what sufficiency or means he was furnished for instruction; we do not penetrate his capacity to understand his Catechism; we have no revelation what light might have cleared his errors, or Contrition retracted his sins, in the last moment before his death. In such particular cases, we wish more apparent signs of salvation, but do not give any dogmatical sentence of perdition. How grievous sins, Disobedience, Schism, and Heresy are, is well knowne. But to discern how far the natural malignity of those great offences might be checked by Ignorance, or by some such lessening circumstance, is the
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office, rather of Prudence, than of Faith.

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

5. But yet lest any man should flatter himselfe with our charitable Mitigations, and thereby wake cares in search of the true Church, we desire him to reade the Conclusion of the Second Part, where this matter is more explyned.

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

7. Now, this is our gradation of reasons. Almighty God, having ordained Mankind to a supernatural end of eternal felicity; hath in his holy Providence placed competent and convenient means, whereby that end may be attained. The universal grand Origin of all such means, is the Incarnation and Death of our Blessed Saviour, whereby he merited internal grace for us; and founded an external visible Church, provided and stocked with all those helps which might be necessary for Salvation. From hence it followeth, that in this Church amongst other advantages, there must become effectual means to beget, and continue faith, to maintain Unity, to discover and condemn Heresies, to appease and reduce Schisms, and to determine all Controversies in Religion. For without such means, the Church should not be furnished with helps sufficient to salvation, nor God afford sufficient means to attain that End, to which him, hee ordained Mankind,
kind. This means to decide Controversies in faith and Religion (whether it should be the holy Scripture, or whatsoever else) must be indicated with an Universal Infallibility, in whatsoever it propoundeth for a divine truth, that is, as revealed, spoken, or testified by Almighty God, whether the matter of its nature, be great or small. For if it were subject to error in any one thing, we could not in any other yield it infallible assent; because we might with good reason doubt, whether it chanced not to err in that particular.

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

9. Ne-
Part I. Charity maintained

9. Neuerthelesse, to the end that men may know in particular what is the saide infallible meanes vpon which we are to rely in all things concerning Fayth, and accordingly may be able to judge in what safety or danger, more or lesse they live; and because D. Potter descrenteth to divers particulars about Scriptures and the Church &c. we will go forward, & prowe, that although Scripture be in it selfe most sacred, infallible, & divine; yet it alone cannot be to vs a Rule, or Judge, fit and able to end all doubts and debates emergent in matters of Religion; but that there must be some externall, visible, publique, living Judge, to whome all sorts of persons both learned & unlearned, may without danger of error, have recourse; and in whose Judgment they may rest, for the interpreting and propounding of Gods Word or Revelation. And this living Judge, we will most evidently prowe to be no other, but that Holy, Catholique, Apostolique, and Visible Church, which our Saviour purchased with the effusion of his most precious bloud.

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

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

12. Out of these grounds, we will shew, that although the distinction of points fundamental, and not fundamental, be good and usefull, as it is delivered and applied by Catholique Deuines, to teach what principal Articles of faith, Christians are obliged explicitly to believe; yet that it is impertinent to the present purpose of excusing any man from grievous sinne, who knowingly disbelieves, that is, believes the contrary of that which God’s Church proposeth as divine Truth. For it is one thing not to know explicitly some thing testified by God, & another positively to oppose what we know he hath testified. The former may often be excused from sinne, but never the latter, which only is the case in Question.
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13. In the same manner shall be demonstrated, that to allledge the Creed, as containing all Articles of faith necessary to be explicitly believed, is not pertinent to free from sinne the voluntary denial of any other point known to be defined by God's Church. And this were sufficient to overthrow all that D. Potter allleadgeth, concerning the Creed: though yet by way of Supererogation, we will prove, that there are divers important matters of faith which are not mentioned at all in the Creed.

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

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

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

17. Only I will heere observe, that it seemeth very strange, that Protestants should charge so deeply with Want of Charity, for only teaching that both they, and we cannot be saued, seeing themselves must affirme the like of whosoever opposeth any least point delivered in Scripture, which they hold to be the sole Rule of Faith. Out of which ground they must be enforced to let all our former Inferences passe for good. For, is it not a grievous sinne, to deny any one truth contained in holy Writ? Is there in such denial, any distinction betwixt points fundamental and not fundamental?
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fundamental, and not fundamental, sufficient
to excuse from hereby? Is it not impertinent, to
alledge the Creed containing all fundamental points of faith, as if believing it alone, we
were at liberty to deny all other points of Scrip-
ture? In a word: According to Protestants;
Oppose not Scripture, there is no Error a-
gainst faith. Oppose it in any least point, the er-
ror (if Scripture be sufficiently proposed, which
proposition is also required before a man can
be obliged to believe even fundamental points)
must be damnable. What is this, but to lay with
us, Of persons contrary in what several point of belief,
one party only can be saved? And D. Potter must
not take it ill, if Catholiques believe they may
be saved in that Religion for which they suffer.
And if by occasion of this doctrine, men will
still be charging us with Want of Charity, and
be resolved to take scandal where none is given;
we must comfort our felies with that grave,
and true saying of S. Gregory: If scandal, (1) be
taken from declaring a truth, it is better to permit
scandal, then forsake the truth. But the solid
grounds of our Assertion, and the sincerity of
intention in uttering what we thinke, yield us
confidence, that all will hold for most reasonable
the laying of Pope Gelasius to Anastasius the
Emperor: Prerobe it from the Roman Emperor
that he should hold it for a wrong to have truth de-
clared to him. Let us therefore begin with the
point which is the first that can be controver-

ded

(1) S. Greg.
Hom. 7. in
Ex. 6.
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CHAP. II.

What is that means, whereby the reavealed Truthes of God are conveyed to our Vnderstanding, and which must determine Controversies in Faith and Religion.

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

2. That the Scripture alone cannot be Judge in Controversies of faith, we gather very cleerly. From the quality of a writing in generall: From the nature of holy Writ in particul
By Catholiques. Chap. II.

euler, which must be believed as true, and infallible: From the Editions, & Translations of it: From the difficulty to understand it without hazard of Error: From the inconveniences that must follow upon the ascribing of sole Jurisdiction to it: & finally from the Confessions of our Adversaries. And on the other side, all these difficulties ceasing, and all other qualities requisite to a Judge concurring in the visible Church of Christ our Lord, we must conclude, that he it is, to whom in doubts concerning Faith and Religion, all Christians ought to have recourse.

3. The name, notion, nature, and properties of a Judge cannot in common reason agree to any mere writing, which, be it otherwise in its kind, never so highly qualified with sanctity and infallibility; yet it must ever be, as all writings are, dead, dumb, and inanimate. By a Judge, all wise men understand a Person endowed with life, and reason, able to hear, to examine, to declare his mind to the disagreeing parties, in such sort as that each one may know whether the sentence be in favour of his cause, or against his presence; and he must be appliable, and able to do all this, as the diversity of Controversies, persons, occasions, and circumstances may require. There is a great & plain distinction betwixt a Judge and a Rule. For as in a kingdom, the Judge hath his Rule to follow which are the received Lawes and customs;
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so are not they fit or able to declare, or be Judges to themselves, but that office must belong to a living Judge. The holy Scripture may be, and is a Rule, but cannot be a Judge, because it being always the same, cannot declare it selfe any one time, or upon any one occasion more particularly than upon any other; and let it be read over an hundred times, it will be still the same, and no more fit alone to terminate controversies in faith, then the Law would be to end suits, if it were given over to the phanly, & glosses of every single man.

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

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

6. And suppose it could defend itselfe from corruption, how could it assure vs that it selle were Canonical, and of infallible Verity? By saying so? Of this very affirmation, there will remaine the same Question still; how it can prove it selfe to be infallibly true? Neither can there ever be an end of the like multiplied demands, till we rest in the externall Authority of some person or persons bearing witnesses to the world, that such or such a booke is Scripture: and yet upon this point according to Proteftars.
42 Part. 1. Charity maintained all other Controversies in faith depend.

7. That Scripture cannot assure us, that it selfe is Canonickall Scripture, is acknowledged by some Protestants in express words, and by all of them in deeds. M. Hooker, whome D. Potter ranketh among men of great learning and judgement, saith: Of things necessary, the very chiefest is to know what books we are to esteem holy; which point is confessed impossible for the Scripture itself to teach. And this he poureth by the same argument, which weshantly vsed, saying thus: It is not the word of God which doth, or possibly can, assure us, that we doe well to thinke it his word. For if any Booke of Scripture did give testimony of all, yet still that Scripture which giveth testimony to the rest, would require another Scripture to give credit unto it. Neither could we come to any pause whereon to rest, unless besides Scripture, there were something which might assure us &c. And this he acknowledgeth to be the Church. By the way. If of things necessary the very chiefest cannot possibly be taught by Scripture, as this may of so great learning and judgment affirme, and demonstratively poureth; how can the Protestant Clergy of England subscribe to their faith Article? Wherein it is sayd of the Scripture: Whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation; and concerning their belief and profession of this Article
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Article, they are particularly examined when they be ordain'd Priests and Bishops. With Hooker, his defendant Covelldoeth puniishly agree. Whitaker likewise confesseth, that the question about Canonickall Scriptures, is defined to vs, not by testimony of the private spirit, which (sayth he) being private and secret, is (c) unfit to teach and refer others; but (as he acknowledgeth) by the (c) Ecclesiastick Tradition: An argument (sayth he) whereby may be argued, and convinced what booke be Canonickall, and what be not. Luther sayth: This (g) indeed the Church hath, that she can discern the Word of God, from the Word of men: as Augustine confesseth, that he believ'd the Gospel, being mov'd by the authority of the Church, which did preach this to be the Gospel. Fulke teacheth, that the Church (h) hath judgment to discern true writings from counterfeit, and the Word of God from the writing of men, and that this judgment she hath not of herself, but of the Holy Ghost. And to the end that you may not be ignorant, from what Church you must receive Scriptures, heare your first Patriarch Luther speaking against the, who (as he faith) brought in Anabaptisme, that so they might delpiight the Pope. Verily (faith he) these (1) men build upon a weake foundation. For by this means they ought to deny the whole Scripture, and the Office of Preaching. For, all these we have from the Pope: otherwise we must goe make a new Scripture.

8. But now in deedes, they all make good.
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That without the Churches authority, no certain can be had what Scripture is Canonical, while they cannot agree in assigning the Canon of holy Scripture. Of the Epistle of S. James, Luther hath these words: The Epistle of James is contentious, swellings, airy, strawy, and unworthy of an Apostolical Spirit. Which censure of Luther, Illyricus acknowledgeth and maintaineth. Kemnitz teacheth, that the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, the Epistle to the Hebrewes, the Epistle of James, the Epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypses of John are Apocryphall, as not having sufficient Testimony of their authority, and therefore that nothing in controversy can be proved out of these Bookes. The same is taught by divers other Lutherans: and if some other amongst them, be of a contrary opinion since Luthers time, I wonder what new infallible ground they can allege, why they leave their Master, and so many of his prime Scholars? I know no better ground, then because they may with as much freedom abandon him, as he was bold to alter that Canon of Scripture, which he found received in Gods Church.

9. What Bookes of Scripture the Protestants of England hold for Canonical, is not easy to affirme. In their first Article they lay: In the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those Canonical Bookes of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.
Church. What mean they by these words? That by the Churches consent they are assured what Scriptures be Canonick? This were to make the Church Judge, and not Scriptures alone. Do they only understand the agreement of the Church to be a probable inducement? Probability is no sufficient ground for an infallible assent of faith. By this rule (of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church,) the whole booke of Esther must quit the Canon, because some in the Church have excluded it from the Canon, as (o) Melito Asianus, (p) Athanasius, and (q) Gregory Nazianzen. And Luther (if Protestant wills be content that he be in the Church) faith: The Jews (r) place the booke of Esther in the Canon, which yet, if I might be Judge, doth rather deserve to be put out of the Canon. And of Ecclesiastes he faith: This (s) booke is not full; there are in it many abrupt things: he wants boots and spurs, that is, he hath no perfect sentence, he rides upon a long reed like me when I was in the Monastery. And much more is to be read in him: who (t) faith further, that the said booke was not written by Salomon, but by Syrach in the tyme of the Maccabees, and that it is like to the Talmud (the Jewes bible) out of many bookes heaped into one worke, perhaps out of the Library of king Ptolomæus. And further he faith, that (u) he doth not believe all to have been done as there is set downe. And he teacheth the (w) booke of Job to be as it were an argument for a fable (or Come dy.)
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dy) to set before us an example of Patience. And he
(x) delivers this general censure of the Pro-
phets Bookes: The Sermons of no Prophet, were
written whole, and perfect, but their disciples, and
Auditors snatched, now one sentence, and then an-
other, and so put them all into one booke, and by this
means the Bible was confirmed. If this were so, the
Bookes of the Prophets, being not written by
themselves, but promiscuously, and casually, by
their Disciples, will soon be called in question.
Are not these errors of Luther, fundamental?
and yet if Protestants deny the infallibility of
the Church, upon what certaine ground do they disprove these Lutheran, and Luciferian
blasphemies? A godly Reformer of the Roman
Church! But to returne to our English Canon
of Scripture. In the New Testament, by the abo-
mentioned rule (of whose authority was ne-
ever any doubt in the Church,) divers Bookes of the
New Testament must be dis canonical, to wit,
all those of which some Ancients have doubted,
and those which divers Lutherans have of
late denied. It is worth the observation how
the before mentioned sixth Article, doth specify
by name all the Bookes of the Old Testament which
they hold for Canonicall; but those of the New
without naming any one, they shuffle over
with this generality: All the Bookes of the New
Testament, as they are commonly received, we do re-
ceive, and account them Canonicall. The mystery
is easily to be unfolded. If they had descended
to
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to particulers, they must haue contradicted
some of their chiefest Brethren. As they are com-
monly receiued &c. I ask: By whom? By the
Church of Rom?: Then, by the same reason they
must receive divers Bookes of the Old Testa-
ment, which they reiece. By Lutherans? Then
with Lutherans they may deny some Bookes of
the New Testament. If it be the greater, or
lesse number of voyces, that must cry vp, or
downe, the Canon of Scripture, our Roman
Canon will preaile: and among Protestants
the Certainty of their Faith must be reduced to
an Uncertaine Controversy of Fact, whether the
number of those who reiece, or of those others
who receive such and such Scriptures, be grea-
ter. Their faith must alter according to yeares,
and dayes. When Luther first appeared, he, and
his Disciples were the greater number of that
new Church; and so this claime (Of being com-
monly receiued) stood for them, till Zwinglius
& Calvin grew to some equall, or greater num-
ber then that of the Lutherans, and then this
rule of (Commonly receiued) will canonize their
Canon against the Lutherans. I would gladly
know, why in the former part of their Article,
ye say both of the Old and New Testament: In
the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand
those Canonical Bookes of the Old and New Testa-
ment, of whose authority was never any doubt in the
Church: and in the latter part, speaking againe
of the New Testament, they give a far different
rule,
Part 1. Charity mainayned rule, saying: All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical. This I say is a rule much different from the former (of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.) For some Books might be said to be commonly received, although they were sometime doubted of by some. If to be commonly received, pass for a good rule to know the Canon of the New Testament; why not of the Old? Above all we desire to know upon what infallible ground, in some Books they agree with us against Luther, and divers principal Lutheran, and in others jump with Luther against us? But seeing they disagree among themselves, it is evident that they have no certain rule to know the Canon of Scripture, in assigning what of some of them must of necessity eft, because of contradictory propositions both cannot be true.

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

11. And here we appeal to any man of Judgement, whether it be not a vain brag of some Protestants to tell vs, that they wot full well what is Scripture, by the light of Scripture itself, or (as D. Potter words it) by (y) that glorious beame of divine light which shines therein; even as our eye distinguisheth light from darkness, without any other help then to itself; and as our ears knowes a voyce, by the voyce

H 11
Part. 1. Charity maintayned it selfe alone. But this vanity is refuted, by what we sayde even now; that the externall Scripture hath no apparent or necessary connexion with divine inspiration, or revelation. Will D. Potter hold all his Brethren for blind men, for not seeing that glorious beam of divine light which shines in Scripture, about which they cannot agree? Corporall light may be discerned by it selfe alone, as being evident, proportionate, &c con. natural to our faculty of seeing. That Scripture is divine, and inspired by God, is a truth exceeding the natural capacity and compass of mas understanding, to vs obscure, and to be belie. ed by divine fayth, which according to the A.

Heb. v. 1 posse is; argumentum (z) non apparentium; an argument, or connexion, of things not evident: and therefore no wonder if Scripture doe not man.ifest it selfe by it selfe alone, but must require some other means for applying it to our un. derstanding. Neuertheles their owne similitudes and instances, make against themselves. For suppose a man had never read, or heard of Sunne, Moone, Fire, Candle &c. and should be brought to behold a light, yet in such sort as that the Agent, or Caule Efficient from which it proceeded, were kept hidden from him; could such an one, by only beholding the light, certainly know, whether it were produced by the sunne, or Moone &c? Or if one heare a voyce, and had never known the speaker, could he know from whome in particular that
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That voyce proceeded? They who looke upon Scripture, may well see, that some one wrote it, but that it was written by divine inspiration, how shall they know? Nay, they cannot so much as know who wrote it, unless they first know the writer, and what hand he writes: as likewise I cannot know whose voice it is which I heare, unless I first both know the person who speaks, & with what voice he speaketh to speak; and yea even all this supposed, I may perhaps be deceived. For there may be voyces so like, and hands so counterfaieted, that men may be deceived by them, as birds were by the grapes of that skillful Painter. Now since Protestants affirm knowledge concerning God as our supernatual end, must be taken from Scripture, they cannot in Scripture alone discerne that it is his voyce, or writing, because they cannot know from whom a writing, or voyce proceeds, unless first they know the person who speaketh, or writeth. Nay I lay more: By Scripture alone, they cannot so much as know, that any person doth in it, or by it, speake anything at all: because one may write without intent to signify, or affirm anything, but only to set downe, or as it were paint, such characters, syllables, and words, as men are wont to set copies, not caring what the signification of the words imports: or as one transcribes a writing which himselfe understandes not; or when one writes what another dictates, and
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in other such cases, wherein it is cleere, that
the writer speaks, or signifies nothing in such
his writing; & therefore by it we cannot hear,
or understand his voyce. With what certainty
then can any man affirme, that by Scripture it
self they can see, that the writers did inted to si-
gnify any thing at all; that they were Apostles,
or other Canonical Authors; that they wrote
their owne sense, and not what was dictated by
some other man; and finally, & especially, that
they wrote by the infallible direction of the
Holy Ghost?

12. But let vs be liberall, and for the pre-
sent suppose (not grant) that Scripture is, like
to corporall light, by it selfe alone able to de-
termine, & move our understanding to assent;
yet the limititude provis against these elues. For
light is not visible, except to such as have eyes,
which are not made by the light, but must be
presupposed as produced by some other cause.
And therefore, to hold the limititude, Scrip-
ture can be cleere only to those who are en-
dewed with the eye of fayth; or, as D. Potter a-
boue cited fayth, to all that have (a) eyes to dis-
cern the shining beams thereof; that is, to the be-
lieuer, as immediatly after he speakeith fayth
then must not originally proceed from Scrip-
ture, but is to be presupposed, before we can see
the light thereof; and consequently there must
be some other means precedent to Scripture, to
beget fayth, which can be no other then the
Church.
Church.

13. Others affirm, that they know Canonical Scriptures to be such, by the Title of the Books. But how shall we know such Inscriptions, or Titles to be infallibly true? From this their Answer our argument is strengthened, because divers Apocryphal writings have appeared, under the Titles, and Names of sacred Authors, as the Gospels of Thomas mentioned by S (b) Augustinus: the Gospel of Peter, which the Nazareni did use as (c) Theodoret witnesseth, with which Scrophius a Catholic Bishop, was for sometyme deceived, as may be read in (d) Eusibius, who also speaketh of the Apocalypse of (e) Peter. The like may be said of the Gospels of Barnabas, Bartholomew, and other such writings specified by Pope (f) Gelasius. Protestants reject likewise some part of Esther and Daniel, which beare the same Titles with the rest of those Books, as also both were, and they hold for Apocryphall the third and fourth Books which go under the name of Esdras, and yet both of vs receive his first and second booke. Wherefore Titles are not sufficient assurances what booke be Canonical: which (h) D. Covel acknowledges in these words: It is not the Word of God, which doth, or possibly can assure us, that we doth well to think it is the word of God: the first outward motion leading men so to esteem of the Scripture, is the Authority of Gods Church, which teacheth us to receive Marks Gospell, who was not

(b) Cont. Adumatum c. 17.
(c) l. 2. Heres. Sab.
(d) lib. 6. cap. 10.
(e) lib. 6. cap. 11.
(g) In his de- defenceart. 4o. Pag. 31.
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an Apostle, and to refuse the Gospell of Thomas who was an Apostle: and to retaine Lukes Gospell who saw not Christ, and to reject the Gospell of Nicodemus who saw him.

14. Another Answere, or rather Objection they are wont to bring: That the Scripture being a principle needs no proofe among Christians. So D. (i) Potter. But this is either a plaine begging of the question, or manifestly untrue, and is directly against their owne doctrine, and practice. If they meane, that Scripture is one of those principles, which being the first, and the most knowne in all Sciences, cannot be demonstrated by other Principles, they suppose that which is in question, whether there be not some principle (for example, the Church) whereby we may come to the knowledge of Scripture. If they intend, that Scripture is a Principle, but not the first, and most knowne in Christianity, then Scripture may be proved. For principles, that are not the first, nor knowne of themselves, may, & ought to be proved, before we can yield assent, either to them, or to other verities depending on them. It is repugnant to their owne doctrine, and practice, in as much as they are wont to affirm, that one part of Scripture may be knowne to be Canonick, and may be interpreted by another. And since every Scripture is a principle sufficient, upon which to ground divine faith, they must grant, that one Principle may, and sometime must be proved by
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by another. Yea this their Answer, upon due ponderation, falls out to prove, what we affirm. For since all Principles cannot be proved, we must (that our labour may not be endless) come at length to rest in some principle, which may not require any other proofe. Such is Tradition, which involves an evidence of fact, and from hand to hand, and age to age, bringing vs vp to the times, and persons of the Apostles, and our Saviour himselfe cometh to be confirmed by all those miracles, and other arguments, whereby they convinced their doctrine to be true. Wherefore the ancient Fathers avouch that we must receive the sacred Canon upon the credit of God's Church. S. (k) In sy-Cypher. Athanasius faith, that only four Gospels are to be received, because the Canons of the Holy, and Catholique Church have so determined. The third Council of Carthage having set downe the 4th Can. 47. Bookes of holy Scripture, gives the reason, because, We have received from our Fathers that these are to be read in the Church. S. Augustine (m) Speaking of the Acts of the Apostles, faith: To which Fundam. c. 5, booke I must give credit, if I give credit to the Gospel, because the Catholique Church doth a like recommend to me both these Bookes. And in the same place he hath also these words: I would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Catholique Church did move me. A saying to plaine, that Zwinglius, (n) Tom. x. is forced to cry out: Here I (n) implore your e-sol. 135. equity to speake freely, whether this saying of Augustine
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gustine seems not overbold, or els unadvisedly to
have fallen from him.
15. But suppose they were assured what
Bookes were Canonical, this will little availe
them, vnles they be likewise certaine in what
language they remaine uncorrupted, or what
Translations be true. Calvin (o) acknowledgeth
corruption in the Hebrew Text; which if it be
taken without points, is so ambiguous, that
scarcely any one Chapter, yea period, can be
securely understood without the help of some
Translation. If with points: These were after
S. Hierom's time, invcnted by the persidious
Iewes, who either by ignorance might mistake,
or vpon malice force the Text, to favour their
impieties. And that the Hebrew Text still re-
tains much ambiguity, is apparent by the disa-
agreeing Translations of Nouellists; which also
prove the Greeke, for the New Testament, not
to be void of doubtfulnes, as Calvin (p) confes-
feth it to be corrupted. And although both the
Hebrew and Greeke were pure, what doth this
help, if only Scripture be the rule of faith, and
so very few be able to examine the Text in these
languages. All then must be reduced to the cer-
tainty of Translations into other tongues, wher-
in no priuate man hauing any promise, or assu-
rance of infallibility, Protestants who rely v-
on Scripture alone, will find no certaine
ground for their faith; as accordingly Whitaker
(q) affirmeth: Those who understand not the He-
brew
By Catholiques. Chap. II.

brev and Grecen do erre often, and unanoydably.

16. Now concerning the Translations of
Protestants, it will be sufficient to set downe
what the laborious, exact, and judicious Au-
thor of the Prote∑ants Apo∑ogy &c. dedicated to
our late King James of famous memory, hath
to this (r) purpose. To omit (faith he) partic-
ulars, who recitall would be infinite, &c. to touch
this point but generally only, the Translation
of the New Testament by Luther is condemned
by Andreas, Osiander, Heckermannus, and Zwin-
glius, who sayth hereof to Luther. Thou dost cor-
r upt the word of God, thou art scene to be a manifest
and common corrupter of the holy Scriptures: how
much are we ashamed of thee who hast hitherto estee-
med thee beyond all measure, and now prove thee to be
such a man? And in like maner doth Luther reiect
the Translation of the Zwinglians terming them
in matter of divinity, fooles, Asses, Antichristis,
deceavers, and of Asse-like understandning. In
so much that when Proscheuerus the Zwinglian
Printer of Zurich sent him a Bible translated by
the diuines there, Luther would not recuyue the
same, but sending it backe reiected it, as the
Protestant Writers Hospinians, and Lauatherus
witness. The translation set forth by Ccelolam-
padus, and the Deuines of Basil, is reproved by
Beza, who affirmeth that the Basil Translation is
in many places wicked, and altogether differing from
the mynd of the Holy Ghost. The translation of Ca-
Stalio is condemned by Beza, as being sacrilegi-
ous.
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ous, wicked, and Ethnicall. As concerning Calvin's translation, that learned Protestant Writer Carolus Molinas faith thereof: Calvin in his Harmony maketh the Text of the Gospell to leape up and downe: he useth violence to the letter of the Gospell; and besides this addeth to the Text. As touching Beza's translation (to omit the dislike had thereof by Seluccerus the German Protestant of the University of Iena, the foresaid Molinas faith of him, de facto mutat textum; he actually changeth the text; and giueth further sundry instances of his corruptions: as also Castalio that learned Calvinist, and most learned in the tongues, reprehendeth Beza in a whole booke of this matter, and faith; that to note all his errors in translation, would require a great volume. And M. Parkes faith:
As for the Geneva Bibles, it is to be wished that either they may be purged from those manifold errors, which are both in the text, and in the margent, or els utterly prohibited. All which confirmeth your Majesties graue and learned Censure, in your thinking the Geneva translation to be worst of all; and that in the Marginal notes annexed to the Geneva translation, some are very partiall, untrue, seditious, &c. Lastly concerning the English Translations, the Puritans lay: Our translation of the Psalms compriz'd in our Booke of Common Prayer, both in addition, substraction, and alteration, differ from the Truth of the H brev in two hundred places at the least. In so much as they do therefore profess to reit doubtfull, whether a man with a safe
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Safe conscience may subscribe thereto. And M. Caer-
kle faith of the English Translators, that they
haue depraue the sense, obscured the truth, and de-
ceived the ignorunt; that in many places they do detort
the Scriptures from the right sense. And that, they
shew themselves to lose darknes more then light, fal-
shood more then truth. And the Ministers of Lin-
colne Diocesse gie their publike testimony,
terming the English Translation: A Translation
that taketh away from the Text; that addeth to the
Text; and that, sometime to the changing, or obscu-
ring of the meaning of the Holy Ghost. Not with-
out cause therefore did your Maiestie affirme,
that you could never yet see a Bible well translated
into English. Thus far the Author of the Protes-
tants Apology &c. And I cannot forbear to
mention in particular that famous corruption
of Luther, who in the Text where it is said (Rom.
3. v. 28.) We acconpt a man to be justified by faith,
without the works of the Law, in fauour of Justifi-
cation by faith alone, translates (Justified by
faith A LO N E.) As likewise the falsification
of Zuinglius is no lesse notorious, who in the
Gospel of S. Mathew, Mark, and Luke, and in S.
Paul, in place of, This is my Body; This is my blood;
translates, This signifieth my Body; This signifieth my
blood. And heere let Protestants consider duely
of these points. Salvation cannot be hoped for
without true faith: Faith according to them reli-
es vpon Scripture alone: Scripture must be
delivered to most of them by the Translations:

1 2  Transla-
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Translations depend on the skill and honesty of men, in whom nothing is more certaine than a most certaine possibility to erre, and no greater evidence of Truth, then that it is evident some of them imbrace falsity, by reason of their contrary translations. What then remaineth, but that truth, faith, salvation, & all, must in them rely upon a fallible, and uncertaine ground? How many poore soules are lamentably seduced, while from preaching Ministers, they admire a multitude of Texts of divine Scripture, but are indeed the false translations, and corruptions of erring men? Let them therefore, if they will be assuaged of true Scriptures, fly to the always visible Catholique Church, against which the gates of hell can never so far preuail, as that she shall be permitted to deceive the Christian world with false Scriptures. And Luther himselfe, by unfortunate experience, was at length forced to confess thus much, saying: If the world last longer, it will be againe necessary to receive the Decrees of Councils, to have recourse to them, by reason of divers interpretations of Scripture which now reign. On the contrary side, the Translation approved by the Roman Church, is commended even by our Adversaries: and D. Council in particular sayeth, that it was used in the Church, one thousand three hundred years agoe, and doubteth not to prefer that Translation before others. In so much, that whereas the English translations be many, and
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among themselves disagreeing, he concludeth, that of all those the approved translation authorized by the Church of England, is that which cometh nearest to the vulgar, and is commonly called the Bishops Bible. So that the truth of that translation which we use, must be the rule to judge of the goodness of their Bibles; and therefore they are obliged to maintain our Translation if it were but for their own sake.

17. But doth indeed the source of their manifold uncertainties stop here? No! The chiefest difficulty remains, concerning the true meaning of Scripture: for attaining whereof, if Protestants had any certainty, they could not disagree so hugely as they do. Hence, Mr. Hooker saith: We are (w) right sure of this, that Nature, Scripture, and Experience have all taught the world to seek for the ending of contentions, by submitting it itself unto some judicial and definitive sentence, whereby neither part that contendeth may, under any pretence, refuse to stand. D. Field's words are remarkable to this purpose: Seeing (faith he) the controversies (x) of Religion in our times are grown in number so many, and in nature so intricate, that few have time and leisure, fewer strength of understanding to examine them; what remaineth for men disirsous of satisfaction in things of such consequence, but diligently to search out which among all the societies in the world, is that blessed Company of holy Ones, that hold, oived of Faith, that Spouse of Christ, and Church of the living God, which is the Pillar and Ground
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ground of Truth, that so they may embrace her communion, follow her directions, and rest in her judgment.

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

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

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

21. This Tenet also of Protestants, by ta-
ting the office of Judicature from the Church,
comes to conferre it upon every particulier ma\n, who being driven from submission to the
Church, cannot be blamed if he trust himselfe
as farre as any other, his conscience dictating,
that wittingly he means not to cozen himself,
as others maliciously may do. Which inference
is so manifest, that it hath extorted from divers
Protestants the open Confession of so vast an
absurdity. Hear Luther: The Governours (a) of
Churches
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Churches and Pastours of Christ's sheep have indeed power to teach, but the sheep ought to give judgment whether they propound the voice of Christ, or of Aliens. Lubbertus sayth: As we have demonstrated principis that all publike Judges may be deceived in interpreting; so we affirm, that they may err in judging. Cap. 13.

All faithful men are private Judges, and they also have power to judge of doctrines and interpretations. Whitaker, even of the unlearned, sayth: They (c) ought to have recourse unto the more learned, but in the mean time we must be careful not to attribute Scripture to them over-much, but so, that still we retain our own freedom. Bilsom affirneth; that, The people (d) must be discerners, and Judges of that which is taught. This same pernicious doctrine is delivered by Brentius, Zanchius, Cartwright, and others exactly cited by (e) Breckley; & nothing (e) Traité 2. is more common in every Protestant's mouth, cap. 1. Sc. then that he admits of Fathers, Councils, Church &c. as far as they agree with Scripture; which upon the matter is himselfe. Thus Heresy ever falls upon extremes: It pretends to have Scripture alone for Judge of Controversies, and in the mean time sets vp as many Judges, as there are men, and women in the Christian world. What good Statesmen would they be, who should judge, or fancy such a Common wealth, as these men have framed to themselves a Church? They verify what S. Augustine objected against certaine Heretiques. (f) lib. 32.

You see (f) that you goe about to overthrow all authority.
Part. b. Charity maintain'd

And that every man's mind may be to himselfe a Rule, what he is to allow, or disallow in every Scripture.

Moreover what confusion to the Church, what danger to the Common wealth, this deniall of the authority of the Church, may bring, I leave to the consideration of any judicious, indifferent man. I will only set downe some words of D. Potter, who speaking of the Proposition of revealed Truths, sufficient to prove him that gain'd faith them to be an Heretique, saith thus: This Proposition (g) of revealed truths, is not by the infallible determination of Pope, or Church; (Pope, and Church being excluded, let vs heare what more secure rule he will prescribe; but by what soever means a man may be convinc'd in conscience of divine revelation. If a Preacher declare any point of faith to his Heavers; if a private Christian do make it appeare to his Neighbour, that any conclusion, or point of faith is delivered by divine revelation of Gods word; if a man himselfe (without any Teacher) by reading the Scriptures, or hearing them read, be convinc'd of the truth of any such conclusion: this is a sufficient proposition to prove him that gain'd faith any such proofe, to be an Heretique, and obstinate opposer of the faith. Behold what goodly base Propounders of faith arise in place of Gods untierfull visible Church, which must yield to a single Preacher, a Neighbour, a man himselfe, if he can read, or at least have cares to heare Scripture read. Verily I do not see, but that
that every well-governed Civill Commonwealth, ought to concur towards the exterminating of this doctrine, whereby the Interpretation of Scripture is taken from the Church, and conferred upon every man, who, whatsoever is pretended to the contrary, may be a passionate seditions creature.

23. Moreover, there was no Scripture, or written word for about two thousand yeares from Adam to Moses, whom all acknowledge to have been the first Author of Canonick Scripture: And againe for about two thousand yeares more, from Moses to Christ our Lord, holy Scripture was only among the people of Israel; and yet there were Gentiles endued in those dayes with divine Faith, as appeareth in Job, and his friends. Wherefore during so many ages, the Church alone was the decider of Controversies, and Instructer of the faithfull. Neither did the Word written by Moses, deprive that Church of her former Infallibility, or other qualities requisite for a Judge: yea D. Potter acknowledgeth, that besides the Law, there was a living Judge in the Jewishe Church, endewed with an absolutely infallible direction in cases of moment; as all points belonging to divine Faith are. Now, the Church of Christ our Lord, was before the Scriptures of the New Testament, which were not written instantly, nor all at one time, but successiuely upon several occasions; and some after the decease of...
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most of the Apostles: & after they were writ-
ten, they were not presently knowne to all
Churches: and of some there was doubt in the
Church for some Ages after our Saviour. Shall
we then say, that according as the Church by
little and little received holy Scripture, she was
by the like degrees deueseted of her possedled In-
fallibility, and power to decide Controversies
in Religion? That some Churches had one Judi-
ge of Controversies, and others another? That
with moneths, or yeares, as new Canoncall
Scripture grew to be publishd, the Church al-
ter'd her whole Rule of faith, or Judge of Con-
troversies? After the Apostles time, and after
the writing of Scriptures, Heretikes would be
sure to rise requiring in Gods Church for their
discovery and condemnation, Infallibility, ei-
ther to write new Canoncall Scripture as was
done in the Apostles time by occasion of emer-
gent heretikes; or Infallibility to interpret Scrip-
tures, already written, or, without Scripture,
by divine vntwritten Traditions, and affittance
of the holy Ghost to determine all Controver-
sies, as Tertullian faith: The soule is (h) before
the letter; and speech before Bookes; and sense before site.
Certainly such addition of Scripture, with de-
rogation, or subtraction from the former power
and infallibility of the Church, would have
brought to the world division in matters of
faith, and the Church had rather lost, than gau-
ned by holy Scripture, (which ought to be far
from
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from our tongues and thoughts,) it being man-
ifest, that for decision of Controvercies, infal-
limity settled in a lying Judge, is incomparably
more vilefull and fit, then if it were conceived,
as inherent in some inanimate writing. Is there
such repugnance betwixt Infallibility in the
Church, and Existence of Scripture, that the
production of the one, must be the destruction of
the other? Must the Church wax dry, by gi-
ing to her Children the milk of sacred Writ?
No, No. Her Infallibility was, and is derived
from an inexhausted fountain. If Protestants
will have the Scripture alone for their Judge, let
them first produce some Scripture affirming, that
by the entering thereof, Infallibility went out of
the Church. D. Potter may remember what him-
self teacheth; That the Church is stiil endowed
with infallibility in points fundamentall, and
consequently, that infallibility in the Church
doeth will agree with the truth, the sanctity, yea
with the sufficiency of Scripture, for all mat-
ters necessary to salvation. I would therefore
gladly know, out of what Text he imagineth
that the Church by the comming of Scripture,
was deprived of infallibility in some points, &
not in others? He affirmeth that the Jewish Syn-
agouge retained infallibility in herself, not-
withstanding the writing of the Old Testament:
and will he so unworthy and unjuistly deprive the
Church of Christ of infallibility by reason of the New Testament? Especially

K 3
70 Part. I. Charity maindtayned of we consider, that in the Old Testament, Lawes, Ceremonies, Rites, Punishments, judgments, Sacraments, Sacrifices &c. were more particularly, and minutely deliver'd to the Iewes, then in the New Testament is done; our Saviour leaving the determination, or declaration of particulars to his Spoule the Church, which therefore stands in need of Infallibility more then the Iewish Synagogue. D. Potter, (1) against this argument drawne from the power and infallibility of the Synagogue, objects, that we might as well infer, that Christians must have one soueraigne Prince over all, because the Iewes had one chiefe Judge. But the disparity is very cleare. The Synagogue was a type, and figure of the Church of Christ, not so their civil governmët of Christian Common-wealths, or kingdomes. The Church succeede to the Synagogue, but not Christian Princes to Iewish Magistrate:

And the Church is compared to a howse, or family; to an (l) Army, to a (m) body; to a (n) kingdome &c. all which require one Masters, one Generall, one head, one Magistrate, one spiritual King; as our blessed Saviour with siet Vnum onse, (o) ioynd Vnum Pastor: One sheepe-fold, one Pastor. But all distinct kingdomes, or Common-wealths, are not one Army, Family, &c. And finally, it is necessary to salvation, that all haue recourse to one Church; but for temporall weale, there is no need, that all submit, or depend upon one temporall Prince, kingdome,
By Catholiques. Chap. 11.

dome, or Common-wealth: and therefore our Saviour hath left to his whole Church, as being one Law, one Scripture, the same Sacraments &c. Whereas kingdoms have their several Lawes, different gouernments, diversitie of Powers, Magistracy &c. And so this objection returneth upon Dr.oster. For as in the one Community of the Lewes, there was one Power and Judge, to end debates, and resolve difficulties: so in the Church of Christ, which is one, there must be some one Authority to decide all Controversies in Religion.

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

25. Besides all this, the doctrine of Protestants is destructive of it else. For either they have certaine, and infallible means, not to erre
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in interpreting Scripture; or they have not. If
not; then the Scripture (to them) cannot be a
sufficient ground for infallible faith, nor a meet
Judge of Controversies. If they have certain
infallible meanes, and so cannot erre in their inter-
pretations of Scriptures; then they are able
with infallibility to heare, examine, and deter-
mine all controversies of faith, and so they may
be, and are Judges of Controversies, although
they use the Scripture as a Rule. And thus, ag-
ainst their owne doctrine, they constitute an
other Judge of Controversies, besides Scripture
alone.

26. Lastly, I aske D. Potter, whether this
Assertion, (Scripture alone is Judge of all Con-
troversies in faith,) be a fundamental point of
faith, or no? He must be well advised, before he
say, that it is a fundamental point. For he will
haue against him, as many Protestants as teach
that by Scripture alone, it is impossible to know
what Bookes be Scripture, which yet to Pro-
estants is the most necessary and chief point of
all other. D. Cowell expressly saith: Doubtles (q)
it is an tolerable opinion in the Church of Rome, if they
go no farther, as some of them do not (he should
have said as none of them doe) to assume, that
the Scriptures are holy and divine in themselves, but
so esteemed by us, for the authority of the Church. He
will likewise oppose himselfe to those his Bre-
thren, who grant that Controversies cannot be
ended, without some external living authori-
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ty, as we noted before. Besides, how can it be in
vs a fundamentall errour to say, the Scripture
alone is not Judge of Controverisies, seing (not-
withstanding this our believe) we use for inter-
preting of Scripture, all the means which they
prescribe, as Prayer, Conferring of places, Con-
sulting the Originals &c., and to these add the
Instruction, and Authority of God's Church,
which even by his Confession cannot errone-
ously, and may afford vs more help, then can
be expected from the industry, learning, or wit
of any private person: & finally D. Potter grants,
that the Church of Rome doth not maintaine
any fundamentall error against faith; and con-
sequently, he cannot affirme that our doctrine
in this present Controvery is damnable. If he
answere, that their Tenet, about the Scriptures
being the only Judge of Controverisies, is not a fun-
damentall point of faith: then, as he teacheth
that the vniversal Church may err in points
not fundamentall: so I hope he will not deny,
but particular Churches, and private men, are
much more obnoxious to error in such points;
and in particular in this, that Scripture alone is
Judge of Controverisies: And so, the very principle
upon which their whole faith is grounded, re-
maines to them uncertain; and on the other
side, for the selfe same reason, they are not cer-
taine, but that the Church is Judge of Con-
troverisies, which if she be, then their case is lamen-
table, who in generall deny her this authority, &
Part 1. Charity maintained in particular Controversies oppose her definitions. Besides among publick Conclusions defended in Oxford the yeare 1633. to the questions, Whether the Church have authority to determine Controversies in faith; And, To interpret holy Scripture? The answer to both is Affirmative.

27. Since then, the Visible Church of Christ our Lord is that infallible Means whereby the revealed Truths of Almighty God are conveyed to our Understanding; it followeth that to oppose her definitions is to resist God himselfe; which blessed S. Augustine plainly affirmeth, when speaking of the Controversy about Rebaptization of such as were baptized by Heretics, he faith. This (r) is neither openly, nor evidently read, Eccles. p. 22, neither by you nor by me; yet if there were any wise man of whom our Saviour had given testimony, and that he should be consulted in this question, we should make no doubt to performe what he should say, lest we might seeme to gainsay not him so much as Christ, by whose testimony he was recommended. Now Christ beareth witness to his Church. And a little after: Whosoever refuseth to follow the practice of the Church, doth resist our Saviour himselfe, who by his testimony recommends the Church. I conclude therefore with this argument. Whosoever refuseth that means which infallibly proposeth to vs God’s Word or Reuelation, commits a sinne, which, unrepented, excludes salvation. But whosoever refuseth Christ’s visible Church, doth resist that means, which infallibly proposeth God’s
God's word or revelation to us: Therefore whoever rebelleth Christ's visible Church, committeth a sin, which unrepented, excludes salvation. Now, what visible Church was extant, when Luther began his pretended Reformation, whether it were the Roman, or Protestant Church; & whether he, and other Protestants do not oppose that visible Church, which was spread over the world, before, and in Luther's time, is easy to be determined, and importeth every one most seriously to ponder, as a thing whereon eternal salvation dependeth. And because our Adversaries do here most insist upon the distinction of points fundamental, and not fundamental, and in particular teach, that the Church may err in points not fundamental, it will be necessary to examine the truth, and weight of this evasion, which shall be done in the next Chapter.
That the distinction of points fundamental and not fundamental, is neither pertinent, nor true in our present Controversy. And that the Catholique Visible Church cannot err, in either kind of the said points.

His distinction is abused by Protestants to many purposes of theirs, and therefore if it be either untrue or impertinent (as they understand, & apply it) the whole edifice built thereon, must be ruinous and fall. For if you object their bitter and continued discords in matters of faith, without any means of agreement; they instantly tell you (as Charity Mistaken plainly shewes) that they differ only in points not fundamental. If you convince them, even by their own Confessions, that the ancient Fathers taught divers points held by the Roman Church against Protestants; they reply, that
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those Fathers may nevertheless be saued, because those errors were not fundamentall. If you will them to remember, that Christ must alwayes haue a visible Church on earth, with administration of Sacraments, and succession of Pastors, and that when Luther appeared there was no Church distinct from the Roman, whose Communion and Doctrine, Luther then forlooke, and for that cauall must be guilty of Schisme and Herefy; they haue an Anwere (such as it is) that the Catholique Church cannot perish, yet may err in points not fundamentall, and therefore Luther and other Protestants were obliged to forfake her for such errors, vnder paine of Damnation; as if (forsooth) it were Damnable, to hold an error not Fundamentall, nor Damnagle. If you wonder how they can teach, that both Catholiques, and Protestants may be saued in their severall profession; they value this contradiction, by saying, that we both agreen in all fundamentall points of faith, which is enoue for saluation. And yet, which is prodigiously strange, they could never be induced to give a Catalogue what points in particular be fundamentall, but only by some generall description or by referring vs to the Apostles Creed, without determining, what points therein be fundamentall, or not fundamentall for the matter; and in what sense, they be, or be not such: and yet concerning the meaning of divers points contained, or reduced to the Creed,
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they differ both from vs and among themselves. And indeed, it being impossible for them to exhibit any such catalogue, the said distinction of points, although it were pertinent, and true, cannot serve them to any purpose, but still they must remain uncertain, whether or not they disagree from one another, from the ancient Fathers; and from the Catholique Church, in points fundamental; which is to say, they have no certainty, whether they enjoy the substance of Christian Faith, without which they cannot hope to be lauded. But of this more hereafter.

2. And to the end, that what shall be sayd concerning this distinction, may be better understood, we are to observe; that there be two precepts, which concern the virtue of faith, or our obligation to believe divine truths. The one is by Deunnes called Affirmative, whereby we are obliged to have a positive, explicit belief of some chief Articles of Christian faith. The other is termed Negative, which strictly binds vs not to disbelieve, that is, not to believe the contrary of any one point sufficiently represented to our understanding, as revealed, or spoken by Almighty God. The said Affirmative Precept (according to the nature of such commands) jointhesome act to be performed, but not at all times, nor doth it equally bind all sorts of persons, in respect of all obieets to be believed. For obieets; we grant that some are more necessary
fary to be explicitly, and severall behu[ed then
other: cyther because they are in themselues
more great, and weighty; or else in regard they
instruct vs in some necessary Christian duty to-
wards God, ourselves, or our Neighbour. For
persons: no doubt but some are obliged to know
distinctly more then others, by reason of their
office, vocation, capacity or the like. For tyme;
we are not obliged to be still in act of exerci-
sing acts of sayth, but according as severall oc-
casions permit, or require. The second kind of
precept called Negative, doth ( according to
the nature of all such commands ) oblige uni-
versally, all persons, in respect of all objects; & at
all tyme; semper & pro semper, as Deuines spea-
ke. This general doctrine will be more cleere
by examples. I am not obliged to be alwaies
helping my Neighbour, because the Affirma-
tive precept of Charity, bindeth onely in some
particular cases: But I am alwaies bound by a
Negative precept, never to doe him any hurt, or
wrong. I am not alwaies bound to vitter what
I know to be true: yet I am obliged, never to
speake any one leaft vntruth, against my know-
ledge. And ( to come to our present purpose )
there is no Affirmative precept, commanding
vs to be at all times actually believing any one, or
all Articles of faith: But we are obliged, never to
exercise any act against any one truth, knowne
to be revealed. All sorts of persons are not bound
explicitly, and distinctly to know all things te-
stitfied
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...God either in Scripture, or otherwise: but every one is obliged, not to believe the contrary of any one point, known to be testified by God. For that were in fact to affirm, that God could be deceived, or would deceive; which were to overthrow the whole certainty of our faith, wherein the thing most principall, is not the point which we believe, which Deuines call the Materiall Object, but the chiefe Object is the Motive for which we believe, to wit, Almighty God's infallible revelation, or authority, which they terme the Formall Object of our faith. In two senses therefore, and with a double relation, points of faith may be called fundamentall, and necessary to saluation. The one is taken with reference to the Affirmative Precept, when the points are of such quality that there is obligation to know and believe them explicitly and seperately. In this sense we grant that there is difference betwixt points of faith, which D. Potter (a) to no purpose laboureth to prove against his Adversary, who in express words doth grant and explicate (b) it. But the Doctor thought good to dissemble the matter, & not say one pertinent word in defense of his distinction, as it was impugned by Charity Mistaken, and as it is wont to be applied by Protestants. The other sense, according to which, points of faith may be called Fundamentall, and necessary to saluation, with reference to the Negative precept of faith, is such, that we can-
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not without gruous sime, and forfeiture of saluation, disbelieue any one point, sufficiently propounded, as revealed by Almighty God. And in this senfe we auspouch, that there is no distinution in points of faith, as if to reiect some must be damnable, and to reiect others, equally proposed as God's word, might stand with saluation. Yea the obligation of the Negative precept is far more strict, then is that of the Affirmative, which God freely imposed, & may freely release. But it is impossible, that he can dispense, or giue leave to disbelieue, or deny what he affirmeth: and in this senfe, sinne & damnation are more inseparable from error in points not fundamentall, then from ignorance in Articles fundamentall. All this I shew by an Example, which I wish to be particularly noted for the present, and for divers other occasions hereafter. The Creed of the Apostles contains divers fundamentall points of faith, as the Deity, Trinity of Perisons, Incarnation, Passion, and Resurrection of our Saviour Christ &c. It contains also some points, for their matter, and nature in themselves not fundamentall, as under what Judge our Saviour suffered, that he was buried, the circumstance of the time of his Resurrection the third day &c. But yet neuertheless, whosoever once knowes, that these points are contained in the Apostles Creed, the deniall of them is damnable, and is in that senfe a fundamentall error: & this is the preicle point
82 Part. I. Charity maintained of the present question.

3. And all that hitherto hath been said, is so manifestly true, that no Protestant or Christian, if he do but understand the terms, and state of the Question, can possibly deny it: In so much as I am amazed, that men who otherwise are endued with excellent wits, should so enslave themselves to their Predecessors in Protestantisme, as still to harp on this distinction, & never regard how impertinently, and untruly it was applied by them at first, to make all Protestants seem to be of one sayth, because forsooth they agree in fundamental points. For the difference among Protestants, consists not in that some believe some points, of which others are ignorant, or not bound expressly to know (as the distinction ought to be applied;) but that some of them disbelieve, and directly, wittingly, and willingly oppose what others do believe to be testified by the word of God, wherein there is no difference betwixt points fundamental, and not fundamental; Because till points fundamental be sufficiently proposed as revealed by God, it is not against faith to reject them, or rather without sufficient proposition it is not possible prudently to believe them; and the like is of points not fundamental, which soone as they come to be sufficiently propounded as divine Truths, they can no more be denied, than points fundamental propounded after the same manner. Neither wil it
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it auayle them to their other end, that for pres-
ervation of the Church in being, it is sufficient
that she do not err in points fundamentall. For
if in the meane time she maintaine any one Er-
roure against Gods revelacion, be the thing in it
selfe, neuer so small, her Errour is damnable,
and destructive of saluation.

4. But D. Potter forgetting to what pur-
pole Protestants make vle of their distinction,
doeth finally overthrow it, & yields to as much
as we can desire. For, speaking of that measure
(c) and quantity of faith without which none can be
saued, he sayth: It is enough to believe some things
by a vertuall faith, or by a generall, and as it were, a
magnific faith, whereby they are not denied or contra-
dicted. Now our question is in case that divine
truths, although not fundamentall, be denied
and contradicted; and therefore, euen accord-
ing to him, all such deniall excludes saluation.
After, he speakes more plainly. It is true (faith
he) whatsoever (d) is revealed in Scripture, or pro-
pounded by the Church out of Scripture, is in some
sense fundamentall, in regard of the divine authority
of God, and his word, by which it is recommended:
that is, such as may not be denied, or contradicted
without Insidelity: such as every Christian is bound
with humility, and reverence to believe, whatsoever
the knowledge thereof is offered to him. And further:
Where (e) the revealed will or word of God is suffi-
ciently propounded, there be that opposeth, is convin-
ced of error, and he who is thus convinced is an Heres-
tique.
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tique, and Heresie is a work of the flteb which exclu-
deth from heaven. (Gal. 5. 20. 21.) And hence it
followeth, that it is FUNDAMENTAL to
a Christians FAITH, and necessary for his salva-
tion, that he believe all revealed Truths of God,
whereof he may be convinced that they are from God.
Can anything be spoken more clearly or di-
rectly for vs, that it is a FUNDAMENTAL error to
deny any one point, though neuer so small, if
once it be sufficiently propounded, as a divine
truth, and that there is, in this sense, no distinct-
tion betwixt points fundamental, and not
fundamental? And if any should chance to i-
agine, that it is against the foundation of
faith, not to believe points FUNDAMENTAL, al-
though they be not sufficiently propounded, D.
Potter doth not admit of this (f) difference bet-
wixt points fundamental, and not fundamen-
tal. For he teacheth, that sufficient proposition of
revealed truth is required before a man can be convi-
enced, and for want of sufficient conviction he ex-
cuseth the Disciples from herey, although they
believed not our Saviours Resurrection, (g) which is a very fundamental point of faith.
Thus then I argue out of D. Potters owne con-
feccion: No error is damnable vnles the contra-
ry truth be sufficiently propounded as revealed by God: Every error is damnable, if the contra-
ry truth be sufficiently propounded as revealed by God: Therefore all errors are alike for the
general effect of damnation, if the difference
arisen not from the manner of being propounded. And what now is become of their distinction?

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

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

7. It hath beene shewed in the precedent
Chapter, that the Church is Judge of Contro-
versies in Religion; which she could not be, if
she could erre in any one point, as Doctor Potter
would not deny, if he were once persuaded that
she is Judge. Because if she could erre in some
points, we could not rely upon her Authority
and Judgment in any one thing.

8. This same is proved by the reason we al-
leged before, that seeing the Church was in-
fallible in all her definitions ere Scripture was
written (unless we will take away all certainty
of faith for that tyme) we cannot with any
shew of reason affirme, that she hath been de-
prived thereof by the adjoined comfort, & help
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of sacred Writ.

9. Moreover to say, that the Catholique Church may propose any false doctrine, maketh her lyable to damnable sinne and error; & yet D. Potter teacheth that the Church cannot err damnable. For if in that kind of Oath, which Deuines call Assertorium, wherein God is called to witnesse every falshood is a deadly sinne in any private person whatsoever, although the thing be of itselfe neither materiall, nor prejudiciall to any; because the quantity, or greatness of that sinne is not measured so much by the thing which is affirmed, as by the manner, & authority whereby it is auouched, and by the injury that is offered to Almighty God in applying his testimony to a falshood: in which respect it is the unanimous consent of all Deuines, that in such kind of Oaths, no leuitas materie, that is, smallnes of matter, can excuse from a mortall sacrifice, against the morall virtue of Religio which respects worship due to God: If, I say, every least falshood be deadly sinne in the forelayd kind of Oath, much more pernicious a sinne must it be in the publique person of the Catholique Church to propound vntrue Articles of fayth, whereby fastning Gods prime Verity to falshood, and inducing and obliging the world to doe the same. Besides, according to the doctrine of all Deuines, it is not only injurious to Gods Eternall Verity, to disbelieve things by him revealed, but also to propose as reuea-
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reuealed truths, thinges not revealed: as in commonwealths it is a haynous offence to coyne eyther by counterfeyting the mettall or the stamp, or to apply the Kings scale to a writing counterfeyt, although the contents were supposd to be true. And whereas, to shew the detestable sinne of such perricious fictions, the Church doth most exemplarily punish all broachers of fayngned reuclations, visions, miracles, prophecies & c. as in particular appeareth in the Councell of (h) Lateran, excommunicating such persons; if the Church her selfe could proposs fasse reuclations, she her selfe should have beene the first, and chiefest deseruer to have beene cenfured, and as it were excommunicated by her selfe. For (as they holy Ghost sayth in (1) Job doth God need your ye, that for him you may speake deceptes? And that of the Apocalyps is most truly verified in ficitious reuclations: If any (k) shall add to these things, God will add unto him the plagues which are written in this Booke: & D. Potter layth, To add (l) to it (speaking of the Creed) is high presumpsion, almost as great as to detract fro it. And threfore to lay the Church may add fasse Reuclations, is to accuse her of high presumption, and of perricious error excluding saluation.

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

11. But it is easily demonstrated that this excuse cannot serve. For if the Church be attested only for points fundametall, she cannot but know, that she may err in points not fundametall, at least she cannot be certaine that she cannot erre, & thersore cannot be excused from headlong & pernicious temerity, in proposing points not fundametall, to be believed by Chris-

rians, as matters of faith, wherein she can have no certainty, yea which always imply a fals-

hood. For although the thing might chance to be true, and perhaps also revealed; yet for the matter she, for her part, doth alwaies expose her-

selfe to danger of falshood & error; and in fact doth alwaies erre in the manner in which she doth propound any matter not fundametall; because she propofeth it as a point of faith certai-

nly true, which yet is always vnecertaine, if she in such things may be deceived.

12. Besides, if the Church may erre in points not fundametall, she may erre in pro-

posing some Scripture for Canonickall, which is not such: or els erre in keeping and conferuing from corruptions such Scriptures as are already believed to be Canonickall. For I will sup-

pose, that in such Apocryphall Scripture as the deliuerers, there is no fundametall error against faith, or that there is no falshood at all but only want of divine testification; in which case D. Potter must either grant, that it is a funda-

men-
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mentall error, to apply divine revelation to any point not revealed, or else must yield, that the Church may err in her proposition, or custody of the Canon of Scripture: And so we cannot be sure whether she have not been deceived already, in Books recommended by her, and accepted by Christians. And thus we shall have no certainty of Scripture, if the Church want certainty in all her definitions. And it is worthy to be obserued, that some Books of Scripture which were not always knowne to be Canonick, have been afterward received for such; but never any one Book, or syllable defined by the Church to be Canonick, was afterward questioned, or rejected for Apocryphall. A signe, that God's Church is infallibly assisted by the holy Ghost, never to propole as divine truth, any thing not revealed by God: & that, Omission to define points not sufficiently discussed is laudable, but Commission in propounding things not revealed, inexcusable; into which precipitation our Saviour Christ never hath, nor never will permit his Church to fall.

13. Nay, to limit the general promises of our Saviour Christ made to his Church to points only fundamentall, namely, that the oates (m) of hell shall not prevaile against her: and that, the holy Ghost (n) shall lead her into all truth &c. is to destroy all Faith. For we may by that doctrine, and manner of interpreting the Scripture, limit the Infallibility of the Apostles words,

(m) Matt. 16. 18.
(n) Ioan. 16. 13.
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words, & preaching, only to points fundamentall: and whatsoever general Texts of Scripture shall be alleaged for their Infallibility, they may, by D. Potters example be explicated, & restrained to points fundamentall. By the same reason it may be further affirmed, that the Apostles, and other Writers of Canonickall Scripture, were endued with infallibility, only in setting downe points fundamentall. For if it be urged, that all Scripture is divinely inspired; that it is the word of God &c. D. Potter hath afforded you a ready answer to say, that Scripture is inspired &c. only in those parts, or parcels, wherein it delivereth fundamentall points. In this manner D. Fotherby saith: The Apostle (o) twice in one Chapter professed, that this he speaketh, & not the Lord; He is very well content that where he lacks the warrant of the express word of God, that part of his writings should be esteemed as the word of man. D. Potter also speakes very dangerously towards this purpose, Sect. 5. where he endeavoureth to prove, that the infallibility of the Church is limited to points fundamentall, because as Nature, so God is neither defect in (p) necessaries, nor lavish in superfluities. Which reason doth likewise prove that the infallibility of Scripture, and of the Apostles must be restrained to points necessary to salvation, that so God be not accused, as defect in necessaries, or lavish in superfluities. In the same place he hath a discourse much tending to this purpose, where speaking of these

(o) In his Sermo. 2. pag. 50.

(p) pag. 150.
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words: The Spirit shall lead you into all truth, and shall abide with (q) you for ever, he sayth: Though that promise was (r) directly, and primarily made to the Apostles (who had the Spirit's guidance in a more high and absolute manner, than any since them) yet it was made to them for the behoof of the Church, and is verified in the Church universal. But all truth is not simply all, but all of some kind. To be led into all truths, is to know, and believe them. And who is so simple as to be ignorant, that there are many millions of truths (in Nature, History, Divinity) whereof the Church is simply ignorant. How many truths lie unrevealed in the infinite treasury of God's wisdom, whereof the Church is not acquainted &c. So then, the truth itself enforces us to understand by (all truths) not simply all, not all which God can possibly reveal, but all pertaining to the substance of faith, all truth absolutely necessary to salvation. Mark what he sayth. That promise (The Spirit shall lead you into all truth,) was made directly to the Apostles, & is verified in the universal Church, but by all truth is not understood simply all, but all pertaining to the substance of faith, and absolutely necessary to salvation. Doth it not hence follow, that the promise made to the Apostles of being led into all truth, is to be understood only of all truth absolutely necessary to salvation? & consequently their preaching, and writing, were not infallible in points not fundamental? or if the Apostles were infallible in all things in which they proposed divine truth, the like must be affirmed?
By Catholiques. Chap. III. affirmed of the Church, because D. Potter teacheth, the sayd promise to be verified in the Church. And as he limits the aforesayd wordes to points fundamentall; so may he restrayne what other text heuer that can be brought for the universall infallibility of the Apostles or Scriptures. So he may; and so he must, leaft otherwise he receive this answere of his owne from himselfe, How many truths he unervealed in the infinite treasury of God's wisdome, wherewith the Church is not acquainted? And therefore to verify such generall sayings, they must be understood of truths absolutely necessary to Salvation. Are not these fearedull consequences? And yet D. Potter will never be able to auoyd them, till he come to acknowledge the Infallibility of the Church in all points by her proposed as divine truths; & thus it is universfally true that she is lead into al truth, in regard that our Saviour never permits her to define, or teach any falshood.

14. All, that with any colour may be replied to this argument is; That if once we call any one Booke, or parcell of Scripture in question; although for the matter it containe no fundamentall error, yet it is of great importance, and fundamentall, by reason of the consequence; because if once we doubt of one Booke received for Canonickall, the whole Canon is made doubtfull and vncestayne, and therefore the Infallibility of Scripture must be univerfall, and not confined within compass of

\[ N_3 \] points
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points fundamentall.

15. I answere: For the thing it selfe it is very true, that if I doubt of any one parcel of Scripture receaued for such, I may doubt of all: And thence by the same parity Inferre, that if we did doubt of the Churches Infallibility in some points, we could not believe her in any one, and consequently not in propounding Canonicall Bookes, or any other points fundamentall, or not fundamentall; which thing being most absurd, and withall most impious, we must take away the ground thereof, & believe that she cannot erre in any point great or small: and so this reply doth much more strenthen what we intended to prove. Yet I add, that Protestants cannot make use of this reply, with any good coherence to this their distinction, and some other doctrines which they defend. For if D. Potter can tell what points in particular be fundamentall; (as in his 7. Sect. he pretendeth) then he may be sure, that whencesoeuer he meets with such points in Scripture, in them it is infallibly true, although it might erre in others: & not only true, but cleere, because Protestants teach, that in matters necessary to Salvation, the Scripture is so cleere, that all such necessary Truths are eyther manifestly contained therein, or may be cleerely deduced from it. Which doctrines being put togetheter, to wit: That Scriptures cannot erre in points fundamentall; that they cleerely containe all such points; and that
By Catholiques.  Chap. III.  95

that they can tell what points in particular be such, I mean fundamental; it is manifest, that it is sufficient for salvation, that Scripture be infallible only in points fundamental. For supposing these doctrines of theirs to be true, they may be sure to find in Scripture all points necessary to salvation, although it were fallible in other points of lesser moment. Neither will they be able to excuse this impiety against holy Scripture, till they renounce their other doctrines: and in particular, till they believe that Christ's promises to his Church, are not limited to points fundamental.

16. Besides, from the fallibility of Christ's Catholique Church in some points, it followeth, that no true Protestant learned, or unlearned, doth or can with assurance believe the universal Church in any one point of doctrine. Not in points of lesser moment, which they call not fundamental; because they believe that in such points she may err. Not in fundamentals; because they must know what points be fundamental, before they go to learn of her, least otherwise they be rather deluded, then instructed; in regard that her certain, and infallible direction extends only to points fundamental. Now, if before they address themselves to the Church, they must know what points are fundamental, they learn not of her, but will be as fit to teach, as to be taught by her: How then are all Christians so often, so seriously, upon
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upon so dreadfull menaces, by Fathers, Scriptures, and our blessed Saviour himselfe, counselled and commanded to seek, to hear, to obey the Church? S. Augustine was of a very different mind from Protestants: if (sayth he) the (s) Church through the whole world practive any of these things, to dispute whether that ought to be so done, is a most insolent madness. And in another place he sayth. That which (t) the whole Church holds, and is not ordained by Councils, but hath always beene kept, is most rightly believed to be delivered by Apostolical authority. The same holy Father teacheth, that the custome of baptizing children cannot be proued by Scripture alone, and yet that it is to be beleuied, as derived from the Apostles. The custome of our Mother the (u) Church (faith he) in baptizing infants is in no wise to be comemned, nor to be accounted superfluous, nor is it at all to be beleuied, unless it were an Apostolical Tradition. And elsewhere. Christ (w) is of profit to children baptized; is he therefore of profit to persons not believing? But God forbid, that I should say infants do not believe. I have already sayd, he believe in another, who sinned in another. It is sayd, he believes, & it is of force, and he is reckoned among the faithfull that are baptized. This the authority of our Mother the Church hath, against this (s) & (t) th, against this inanible wall, whosoever ruffeth, shal be crushed in pieces. To this argument the Protestants in the Conference at Ratishon gave this round answere: Nos ab Augustino (x) hab in parte libri dissentimus.
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In this we plainly disagree from Augustine. Now if this doctrine of baptizing Infants be not fundamentall in D. Potter's sense, then according to S. Augustine, the infallibility of the Church extends to points not fundamentall. But if on the other side it be a fundamentall point; then according to the same holy Doctor, we must rely on the authority of the Church, for some fundamentall point, not contained in Scripture, but delivered by Tradition. The like argument I frame out of the same Father about the not rebaptizing of those who were baptized by Heretics, whereof he excellently to our present purpose speaketh in this manner. We follow (y) indeed in this matter even the most certaine authority of Canonick Scriptures. But how? Consider his (y) lib. 17 words: Although verily there be brought no example for this point out of the Canonick Scriptures yet even in this point the truth of the same Scriptures is held by us, while we do that, which the authority of Scriptures doth recommend, that so, because the holy Scripture cannot deceive us, whosoever is afraid to be deceived by the obscurity of this question, must have recourse to the same Church concerning it, which without any ambiguity the holy Scripture doth demonstrate to us. Among many other points in the aforesaid words, we are to obserue, that according to this holy Father, when we prove some points not particulcarly contained in Scripture, by the authority of the Church, even in that case we ought not to be said to believe such points.
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points without Scripture, because Scripture it

telse recommends the Church; and therefore re-

dlying on her we rely on Scripture, without
danger of being deceived by the obscurity of
any question defined by the Church. And else

(2) Dr. W. where he saith: Seing this is (2)Written in no Scri-

pture, we must beleive the testimony of the Church,

which Christ declareth to speake the truth. But it

seemes Dr. Poter is of opinion that this doctrine

about not rebaptizing such as were baptized by

Heretiques, is no necessary point of faith, nor

the contrary an heresy: wherein he contradicteth

S. Augustine, from whom we have now heard,

that what the Church teacheth, is truly saide to
be taught by Scripture; and consequently to
deny this particular point, delivered by the
Church, is to oppose Scripture it selfe. Yet if he
will needs hold, that this point is not funda-
mentall, we must conclude out of S. Augustine,

( as we did concerning the baptizing of Chil-
dren ) that the infallibility of the Church rea-
cheth to points not fundamentall. The same Fa-
ther in another place, concerning this very

question of the validity of Baptisme conferred

(a) De Bapt. by Heretiques, saith: The (a) Apostiles indeed have

cons. Donat. prescribed nothing of this, but this Custome ought to

be beleived to be originally taken from their tradition,
as there are many things that the universal Church

observeth which are therefore with good reason belie-
ved to have been commanded by the Apostiles, al-
though they be not written. No lesse cleere is S. Chry-

sostrate
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Se some for the infallibility of the Traditions of the Church. For treating these words (2 Thess. 2. Stand, and hold the Traditions which you have learned whether by speech or by our Epistle) faith: Hence it is (b) manifest that they delivered not all things by letter, but many things also without writing, and these also are worthy of beliefe. Let us therefore account the tradition of the Church to be worthy of beliefe. It is a Tradition: Seek no more. Which words are so plaine against Protestants, that Whitaker is as plaine with S. Chrysostome, laying: I answer (c) that this is an inconsiderate speech, and unworthy so great a Father. But let us conclude with S. Augustine, that the Church cannot approve any error against faith, or good manners. The Church (faith he) being (d) placed between much chaffe & cockle, doth tolerate many things; but yet she doth not approve, nor dissemble, nor do those things which are against faith, or good life.

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

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

(c) Institut. 4. cap. 2.

19. Calvin holds the (e) Popes Primacy, Inuocation of Saints, Freewill, and such like, to be fundamentall errors overthrowing the Gospell. Others are not of his mind, as Melan.
(f) Cens. Ep. Ephon who sayth, in (f) the opinion of himselfe, and other his Brethren, That the Monarchy of the Bishop of Rome is of use, or profit to this end, that Consent of Doctrine may be retained. An agreement therefore may easily be established in this Article of the Papes Primacy, if other Articles could be agreed upon. If the Papes Primacy be a means, that consent of Doctrine may be retained, first submit to it, and other articles wilbe easily agreed upon. Lusber allo layth of the Papes Pri-
nacy, it may be borne (g) withal. And why then, O Luther, did you not bear with it? And how can you, and your followers be excused from

damnable Schisme, who chose rather to de-

duce God's Church, then to bear with that,

which you confesse may be borne withall? But

let us go forward. That the doctrine of fre-

will, Prayer for the dead, worshipping of Im-

ages, Worship and Invocation of Saints,

Real presence, Transubstantiation, Receive-

ing under one kind, Satisfaction, and Me-

rit of workes, and the Mass, be not funda-

mental Errors, is taught (respective) by di-

uers Protestants, carefully allledged in the Pro-


tants (h) Apology &c., as namely by Perkins,

Cartwright, Frish, Funke, Henry Spark, Goade, Lu-

ther, Reynolds, Whitaker, Tindall, Francis John-

son, with others. Contrary to this, is the Con-

fession of the Christian faith, so called by Prote-

(i) Cap. i. n.

in we are dammed unto unquenchable fire, for (k) Chark,

the doctrine of Mass, Prayer to Saints, and for disputation

the dead, Freewill, Presence at Idol-service.,

Mans merit, with such like. Justification by faith

alone is by some Protestants affirmed to be the

soul of the (k) Church: The only principall origin 402.

of (l) Salvation: of all other points of (m) doctrine (m) The Con-

the chiefest and weightiest. Which yet, as we have

been, is contrary to other Protestants, who teach

that merit of good works is not a fundamen-

tal Errore; yea, divers Protestants defend me-

O 3

rit
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rit of good works, as may be seen in (n) Brayley. One would thinke that the Kings Supremacy, for which some blessed men lost their lives was once among Protestants held for a Capital point; but now D. Andrewes late of Winchester in his booke against Bellarmine tells vs, that it is sufficient to reckon it among true doctrines. And Watton denies that Protestants (o) Hold the Kings Supremacy to be an essential point of faith. O freedome of the new Ghoespell? Hold with Catholiques, the Pope; or with Protestants, the King; or with Puritaines, neyer Pope, nor King, to be Head of the Church, all is one, you may be saued. Some, as Castalio, (p) and the whole Sect of the Academicall Protestants, hold, that doctrines about the Supper, Baptisme, the state and office of Christ, how he is one with his Father, the Trinity, Predestinacon, and divers other such questions are not necessary to Saluatio. And (that you may observe how ungrounded, and partiall their Assertions be) Perkins teacheth, that the Real presence of our Sauiors Body in the Sacramet, as it is beleued by Catholiques, is a fundamentall error; and yet affirmeth the Consubstantiation of Lutherans not to be such, notwithstanding that divers chiefe Lutherans, to their Consubstantiation joyne the prodigious Heresy of Vbiquitation. D. Uphber in his Sermon of the Unity of the Catholique fayth, grants Saluatio to the Ethiopeans, who yet with Christian Baptisme joyne Circumcision.

(n) Traff. 3; Self. 7. under n. 15.

(o) In his answer to a Popish pamphlet, p. 68.
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cision D. Potter (q) cites the doctrine of some whom he termeth men of great learning and judgement: that, all who profess to love and honour Jesus Christ are in the visible Christian Church, and by Catholiques to be reputed Brethren. One of these men of great learning and judgement, is Thomas Morton by D. Potter cited in his Margent, whose love & honour to Jesus Christ, you may perceive, by his saying, that the Churches of Arians (who denied our Saviour Christ to be God) are to be accounted the Church of God, because they do hold the foundation of the Gospel, which is Faith in Jesus Christ the Sonne of God, and Saviour of the world. And, which is more, it seemeth by these charitable men, that for being a member of the Church it is not necessary to believe one only God. For D. Potter (r) among the arguments to prove Hookers, & Mortons opinion, brings this: The people of the ten Tribes after their defection, notwithstanding their grosse corruptions, and Idolatry, remained still a true Church. We may also, as it seemeth by these mens reasoning, deny the Resurrection, and yet be members of the true Church. For a learned man (sayth D. Potter (s) in behalfe of Hookers, and Mortons opinion) was anciently made a Bishop of the Catholique Church, though he did professedly doubt of the last Resurrection of our bodies. Deere Saviour! What tymes doe we behold? If one may be a member of the true Church, and yet deny the Trinity of Persons, the

Morton in his Treatise of the Kingdome of Israel. pag: 94.

(q) Pag. 113.

(r) Pag. 121.

(s) Pag. 122.
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the Godhead of our Saviour, the necessity of
Baptism, if we may the Circumcision, and
with the worship of God ioyne Idolatry, where-
din doe we differ from Turks, and Iewes? or ra-
ther are we not worse, then eyther of them? If
they who deny our Saviours divinity might be
accounted the Church of God, how will they
deny that Saviour to those ancient Heretiques,
who denied our Saviours true humanity? and
so the totall denyall of Christ will not exclude
one from being a member of the true Church.

(t) Commit. S. Hilary (t) maketh it of equall necessity for
in Matt. c. Salvation, that we believe our Saviour to be
true God, and true Man, saying: This manner
of Confession we are to hold, that we remember him
tobe the Sonne of God, and the Sonne of Man, be-
cause the one without the other, can give no hope of
Salvation. And yet D. Potter sayth of the afo-
sayd doctrine of Hooker and Morton: The
(u) pag. 123. Reader may be pleased to approve, or reiect it, as he
(w) pag. 353. shall find cause. And in another place, (w) he shew-
eth so much good liking of this doctrine, that
he explicateth and proueth the Churches per-
petuall Visibility by it. And in the second Edition
of his booke, he is carefull to declare, and
illustrate it more at large, then he had done be-
fore: howsoever, this sufficiently sheweth, that
they have no certainty, what points be funda-
mentall. As for the Arians in particular, the
Author whome D. Potter cites for a moderate
Catholike, but is indeed a plaine Heretique, or
rather Atheist, Lucian-like resting at all Religion, placeth Arianisme among fundamentall errors: But (x) contrarily an English Protestant Deuine masked under the name of Ire- (x) A modest rate examination &c.; nus Philalethes, in a little Booke in Latin enti- tiuled, Dissertatio de pace & concordia Ecclesiae, en- deavoureth to prove, that even the deniall of the blessed Trinity may stand with saluation. Diuers Protestants haue taught, that the Ro- man Church, erreth in fundamentall points: But D. Potter, and others teach the contrary, which could not happen if they could agree what be fundamentall points. You brand the Donatists with the note of an Error, in the matter (y) and nature of it properly heretical; because (y) pag. 126 they taught that the Church remained only with them, in the part of Donatus; And yet ma- ny Protestants are so far from holding that Doctrine to be a fundamentall error, that them- selves goe further, and say; that for diuers ages before Luther there was no true visible Church at all. It is then too too apparent, that you haue no agreement in specifying, what be fundamentall points; neither haue you any means to determine what they be; for if you haue any such means, why do you not agree? You tell vs, the Creed contains all points fundament- tall, which although it were true, yet you see it serveth not to bring you to a particuluer know- ledge, and agreement in such points. And no wonder. For besides what I haue said already
in the beginning of this Chapter, & am to deli-
ner more at large in the next ) after so much la-
bour and paper spent to prove that the Creed co-
taynes all fundamental points, you conclude:

It remains (a) very probable, that the Creed is the
perfect Summary of those fundamental truths, wher-
of consists the Unity of faith, and of the Catholique
Church. Very probable? Then, according to all
good Logick, the contrary may remaine very
probable, and so all remaine as full of uncertain-
ty, as before. The whole Rule, say you, & the
sole Judge of your faith, must be Scripture. Scrip-
ture doth indeed deliver divine Truths, but
doth not qualify them, or declare whether
they be, or be not, absolutely necessary to salua-
tion. You fall (b) heavy upon Charity Mistaken,
because he demands a particular Catalogue of
fundamental points, which yet you are obli-
ged in conscience to doe, if you be able. For
without such a Catalogue, no man can be as-
sured whether or no, he haue faith sufficient to
Salvation. And therefore take it not in all part,
if we agayne and agayne demand such a Cata-
logue. And that you may see we proceed faire-
ly, I will performe, on our behalfe, what we
request of you, & do heer deliver a Catalogue,
wherein are comprized all points by vs taught
to be necessary to Salvation, in these wordes:

We are obliged, under paine of damnation, to believe
whatsoever the Catholique visible Church of Christ
propaseth, as revealed by Almighty God. If any be of
of another mind, all Catholiques denounce him to be no Catholique. But enough of this. And I go forward with the Infallibility of the Church in all points.

10. For, even out of your own doctrine that the Church cannot err in points necessary to salvation, any wise man will infer, that it behoves all, who have care of their souls, not to forsake her in any one point. Because they are assured, that although her doctrine proved not to be true in some point, yet even according to D. Potter, the error cannot be fundamental, nor destructive of faith, and salvation: neither can they be accused of any least imprudence in erring (if it were possible) with the universal Church. Secondly, since she is, under pain of eternall damnation, to be believed, and obeyed in some things, wherein confessedly she is endowed with infallibility, I cannot in wisdom suspect her credit in matters of lese moment. For who would trust another in matters of highest consequence, and be afraid to rely on him in things of lese moment? Thirdly, since (as I laid) we are undoubtedly obliged not to forsake her in the chiefest, or fundamental points, and that there is no rule to know precisely what, and how many those fundamental points be; I cannot without hazard of my soule, leave her in any one point, lest perhaps that point or points wherein I forsake her, prove indeed to be fundamental, and necessary to sal-
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ulation. Fourthly, that visible Church which cannot err in points fundamental, doth without distinction, propound all her Definitions concerning matters of faith to be believed under Anathema's or Curses, esteeming all those who resift, to be desperately cast out of her Communion, and holding it as a point necessary to salvation, that we believe she cannot err: wherein if she speake true, then to deny any one point in particular, which she defineth, or to affirme in general, that she may err, puts a man into state of damnation. Whereas to believe her in such points as are not necessary to salvation, cannot endanger salvation; as likewise to remaine in her Communion, can bring no great harme, because she cannot maintain any damnable error, or practise: but to be deuided from her (she being Christ's Catholique Church) is most certainly damnable. Fifthly, the true Church, being in lawfull, and certaine possession of Superiority and Power, to command & require Obedience, from all Christians in some things; I cannot without grievous shame withdraw my obedience in any one, vnles I evidently know, that the thing commanded comes not within the compasse of those things to which her Power extendeth. And who can better informe me, how far God's Church can proceed, then God's Church herselvse? Or to what Doctor can the Children, and Schollers, with greater reason, and more security, fly for direction, then
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then to the Mother, and appointed Teacher of all Christians? In following her, I shall sooner be excused, then in cleaving to any particular Sect, or Person, teaching, or applying Scriptures against her doctrine, or interpretation. Sixtly, the searesfull examples of innumerous persons who forlaking the Church upon pretence of her errors, have failed, even in fundamental points, and suffered shipwracke of their Salvation ought to deter all Christians, from opposing her in any one doctrine, or practise: as (to omit other, both ancient and moderne heresies) we see that divers chief Protestants, pretending to reforme the corruptions of the Church, are come to affirme, that for many Ages, she erred to death, and wholly perished; which D. Potter, cannot deny to be a fundamentall Error against that Article of our Creed, I believe the Catholike Church, as he affirmeth it of the Donists, because they confined the universal Church, within Africa, or some other small tract of soile. Least therefore I may fall into some fundamentall error, it is most safe for me to believe all the Decrees of that Church, which cannot be fundamentally, especially if we add; That according to the Doctrine of Catholique Deuines, one error in fayth, whether it be for the matter if selfe, great or small, destroys fayth, as is shewed in Charity Mistaken; and consequently to accuse the Church of any one Error, is to affirme, that the lost all fayth, and

P 3 erred
Part I. Charity maintained

Err'd damnably; which very saying is damnable, because it leues Christ no visible Church on earth.

21. To all these arguments I add this demonstration: D. Potter teacheth, that there neither was (c) pag. 75. nor can be any just cause to depart fro the Church of Christ, no more then from Christ himselfe. But if the Church of Christ can erre in some points of fayth, men not only may, but must forlak her in those, (whyles D. Potter will haue them to beleue one thing, and profess another;) and if such errors, and corruptions should fall out to be about the Churches Liturgy, publique Service, administration of Sacraments, & the like; they who perceive such errors, must of necessity leave her external Communio. And therefore if once we grant the Church may erre, it followeth that men may, and ought to forlak her (which is against D. Potters owne wordes,) or else they are inexecusable who lefte the Communion of the Roman Church, vnder pretence of Errors, which they grant, not to be fundamentall. And if D. Potter thinkes good to answere this argument, he must remember his owne doctrine to be, that evne the Catholique Church may erre in points not fundamentall.

22. An other argument for the vniversal infallibility of the Church, I take out of D. Potters owne words. If (sayth he) we (d) did not (d) pag. 97. dissent in some opinions, from the present Roman Church, we could not agree with the Church truly Catho-
Catholique. These words cannot be true, unless he presuppose that the Church truly Catholique, cannot err in points not fundamentall. For if she may err in such points, the Roman Church which he affirmeth to err only in points not fundamentall, may agree with the Church truly Catholique, if she likewise may err in points not fundamentall. Therefore either he must acknowledge a plaine contradiction in his owne words, or else must grant, that the Church truly Catholique cannot err in points not fundamentall, which is what we intended to prove.

23. If words cannot persuade you, that in all Controversies you must rely upon the infallibility of the Church; at least yield your assent to Deeds. Hitherto I have produced Arguments drawnne, as it were, ex naturali rei, from the Wisdome, and Goodnes of God, who cannot faile to have left some infallible means to determine Controversies, which, as we have proved, can be no other, except a Visible Church, infallible in all her Definitions. But because both Catholiques and Protestants, receive holy Scripture, we may thence also prove the infallibility of the Church in all matters which concern Faith and Religion. Our Saviour speaketh clearely: The gates of Hell (e) shall not prevail against her. And, I will ask my (f) Father, and he will give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of truth. And, But when he, the Spirit of (g) truth cometh, he shall (g) teach
Part I. Charity maintained teach you all truth. The Apostle saith, that the Church is, the Pillar, and ground of Truth. And He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and other some Evangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors, to the consummation of the Saints, unto the work of the Ministry, unto the edifying of the body of Christ: until we meete all into the unity of faith, and knowledge of the Sonne of God, into a perfect man, into the measure of the age of the fulnes of Christ: that now we be not Children wauncing, and carried about with every wind of doctrine in the wickednes of men, in crestinities, to the circumvicion of Error. All which wordes seeme cleerely ingough to proue, that the Church is univer-fally infallible, without which, Unity of faith could not be confered agaynst every wind of Doctrine: And yet Doctor Potter limits these promises & priuileges to fundamental points, in which he grants the Church cannot erre. I urge the wordes of Scripture, which are univerfall, and doe not mention any such restraint. I alleagde that most reasonable, and receaved Rule, that Scripture is to be understood literally, as it soundeth, vnielss some manifest absurdity force vs to the contrary. But all will not serve, to accord our different interpretations. In the meane tyme divers of Doctor Potters Brethren stepe in, and reicat his limitation, as ouer large, and semewhat tafting of Papisty: And therefore they restraine the mentioned Texts, either to the Infallibility which
which the Apostles, and other sacred Writers had in penning of Scripture: or else to the invisible Church of the Eled, and to them, not absolutely, but with a double restriction, that they shall not fall damnable, & finally; and other men have as much right as these, to interpose their opinion, & interpretation. Behold we are three at debate about the selfe same words of Scripture: We confer divers places and Text: We consult the Originals: We examine Translations: We endeavour to pray heartily: We profess to speake sincerely; To seeke nothing but truth and salvation of our owne soules, & that of our Neighbours; and finally we see all those means, which by Protestants themselves are prescribed for finding out the true meaning of Scripture: Neuertheles we neither do, or have any possible means to agree, as long as we are left to ourselues; and when we should chance to be agreed, the doubt would still remaine whether the thing it selfe be a fundamentall point or no: And yet it were great impiety to imagine that God, the Louer of soules, hath left no certaine infallible means, to decide both this, and all other differences arising about the interpretation of Scripture, or upon any other occasion. Our remedy therfore in these contentions must be, to consult, and heare God's Visible Church, with submissive acknowledg-ment of her Power, and Infallibility in whatsoever she propoundeth as a revealed truth: accor-
Part. I. Charity maintained according to that divine advice of S. Augustine in these words. If at length (1) thou seem to be sufficiently tossed, and hast a desire to put an end to thy pains, follow the way of the Catholique Discipline, which from Christ himself by the Apostles hath come downe even to us, and from us shall descend to all posterity. And though I conceive that the distinction of points fundamentall, and not fundamentall hath now beene sufficiently confused; yet that no shadow of difficulty may remaine, I will particularly refell a common saying of Protestants, that it is sufficient for salvation, to believe the Apostles Creed, which they hold to be a Summary of all fundamentall points of Fayth.

(1) De vil. cred. cap. 8.
To say, that the Creed containes all points necessarily to be believed, is neyther pertinent to the Question in hand, nor in itselfe true.

SAY, neyther pertinent, nor true. Not pertinent: Because our Question is not, what points are necessary to be explictely believed: but what points may be lawfully disbelieved, or rejected after sufficient Propohtio that they are divine Truths. You say, the Creed containes all points necessary to be believed. Be it so. But doth it likewise containe all points not to be disbelieved? Certainly it doth nor. For how many truths are there in holy Scripture not contained in the Creed, which we are not obliged distinctly, and particularly to know & believe, but are bound vnder paine of damnation not to reject, as loone as we come to know that they are found in holy Scripture? And we having already shewed, that whatsoever is pro-
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posed by Gods Church as a point of fayth, is
infallibly a truth revealed by God; it followeth
that whosoever denyeth any such point, oppos-
seth Gods sacred testimony, whether that point
be contained in the Creed, or no. In vain then
was your care imploied to prove that all points
of fayth necessary to be explicitly believed, are
contained in the Creed. Neither was that the
Catalogue which Charity Mistaken demanded.
His demand was (and it was most reasonable)
that you would once giue vs a list of all funda-
mentals, the denyall whereof destroys Salua-
tion; whereas the denyall of other points not
fundamentall, may stand with salvation, al-
though both these kinds of points be equally
proposed as revealed by God. For if they be not
equally proposed, the difference will arise from
diversity of the Proposal, and not of the Matter
fundamentall, or the Professor. This Ca-
talogue only, can shew how farre Protestants
may disagree without breach of Unity in fayth;
and upon this many other matters depend,
according to the ground of Protestants. But
you will never adventure to publish such a Ca-
talogue. I say more: You cannot assigne any
one point so great, or fundamentall, that the
denyall thereof will make a man an Hereti-
que, if it be not sufficiently propounded, as a
divine Truth: Nor can you assigne any one
point so small, that it can without hereby be re-
spected, if once it be sufficiently represented as
revealed by God.

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

3. Moreover you cannot ground any certainty upon the Creed itselfe, vnlesse first you presuppose that the authority of the Church is univerally infallible, and consequently that it is damnable to oppose her declarations, whether they concerne matters great or small, contained, or not contained in the Creed. This is cleere. Because we must receive the Creed itselfe upon the credit of the Church, without which we could not know that there was any such thing as that which we call the Apostles Creed: and yet the arguments whereby you endeavour to prove, that the Creed containes all fundamental points, are grounded upon supposition, that the Creed was made euer by the Apostles themselves, or by the (b) Church of their times from them: which thing we could not certainly know, if the succeeding and full continued Church, may erre in her Traditions: neyther can we be assured, whether all fundamental Articles which you say were out of
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the Scriptures, summed, and contracted into the Apostles Creed were faithfully summed and contracted, and not one pretermitted, altered, or mistaken, unless we undoubtedly know that the Apostles composed the Creed; and that they intended to contract all fundamental points of faith into it; or at least that the Church of their times (for it seemeth you doubt whether indeed it were composed by the Apostles themselves) did understand the Apostles aright; & that the Church of their times, did intend that the Creed should contain all fundamental points. For if the Church may err in points not fundamental, may she not also err in the particular which I have specified? Can you shew it to be a fundamental point of faith, that the Apostles intended to comprise all points of faith necessary to Salvation in the Creed? Your selfe say no more then that it is very (d) probable; which is farre from reaching to a fundamental point of faith. Your probability is grounded upon the Judgment of Antiquity, and even of the Roman Doctors, as you say in the same place. But if the Catholique Church may err, what certainty can you expect from Antiquity, or Doctors? Scripture is your total Rule of faith. Cite therefore some Text of Scripture, to prove that the Apostles, or the Church of their times composed the Creed, and composed it with a purpose that it should contain all fundamental points of faith. Which being
By Catholiques. Chap. III. 119
being impossible to be done, you must for the Creed itself rely upon the infallibility of the Church.

4. Moreover, the Creed consisteth not so much in the words, as in their sense and meaning. All such as pretend to the name of Christians, recite the Creed, & yet many have erred fundamentally, as well against the Articles of the Creed, as other points of faith. It is then very frivolous to lay, the Creed contains all fundamental points, without specifying, both in what sense the Articles of the Creed be true, and also in what true sense, they be fundamental. For both these tasks, you are to performe, who teach that all truth is not fundamental: & you do but delude the ignorant, when you say, that the Creed, taken in a Catholique (e) sense, comprehendeth all points fundamental; because with you, all Catholique sense is not fundamental: for so it were necessary to salvation that all Christians should know the whole Scripture, wherein every least point hath a Catholique sense. Or if by Catholique sense, you understand that sense which is universally to be known, and believed by all, that, whosoever failes therin cannot be faued, you trifle and say no more then this: All points of the Creed in a sense necessary to salvation, are necessary to salvation. Or: All points fundamental, are fundamental. After this manner it were an easy thing to make many true Prognostications, by saying it will certainly rain.
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You say the Creed was opened and explained, in some parts in the Creeds of Nice &c. but how shall we understand the other parts, not explained in those Creeds?

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

6. But to what end should we use many arguments? Euen your selfe are forced to limit your owne Doctrine, and come to say, that the Creed is a perfect Catalogue of fundamentall points, taken as it was further opened and explained in some parts (by occasion of emergent Heresies) in the other Catholique Creeds of Nice, Constantinople, (g) Ephesus, Chalcedon, and Athanasius. But this (g) pag. 216.
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explication, or restriction overthrown with your
Affection. For as the Apostles Creed was not to
vs a sufficient Catalogue, till it was explained
by the first Councell, nor then till it was decla-
red by another &c. So now also, as new Here-
sies may arise, it will need particular explana-
tion against such emergent errors; and so it
is not yet, nor ever will be of itself alone, a par-
ticular Catalogue, sufficient to distinguish be-
twixt fundamental, and not fundamental
points.

7. I come to the second part: That the Creed
doth not containe all mane and principall points of
faith. And to the end we may not strive about
things either granted by vs both, or nothing
concerning the point in question, I must pre-
mise these obseruations.

8. First: That it cannot be denied, but that
the Creed is most full and complete, to that
purpose for which the holy Apostles, inspir’d
by God, meant that it should serve, and in that
manner as they did intend it, which was, not to
comprehend all particular points of faith, but
such generall heads, as were most befitting, and
requisite for preaching the faith of Christ to
Iewes, and Gentiles, and might be briefly, and
compendiously set downe, and easily learned,
and remembred. And therefore, in respect of
Gentiles, the Creed doth mention God, as Cre-
tor of all things; and for both Iewes and Gen-
tiles, the Trinity, the Messias, and Sauior, his
birth,
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Birth, life, death, resurrection, and glory, from whom they were to hope remission of sins, & life everlasting, and by whose sacred Name they were to be distinguished from all other professions, by being called Christians. According to which purpose S. Thomas of Aquine (h) doth distinguish all the Articles of the Creed into these generall heads: That some belong to the Majesty of the Godhead; others to the Mystery of our Saviour Christ's Humane nature: Which two generall objects of faith, the holy Ghost doth express, and coniogyne Ionan. 17. Hae est vita aeterna Go. This is life everlasting, that they know thee true GOD, and whom thou hast sent I E S V S C R I S T. But it was not their meaning to give us as it were a course of Divinity, or a Catechisme, or a particular Expression of all points of Faith, leaving those things to be performed, as occasion should require, by their owne word or writing, for their time, and afterwards by their Successours in the Catholique Church. Our question then is not, whether the Creed be perfect, as far as the end for which it was compos'd, did require; For we believe & are ready to give our lives for this: but only we deny, that the Apostles did intend to comprize therein all particular points of believe, necessary to salvation, as even by D. Potter's owne (i) confession, it doth not comprehend agenda, or things belonging to practice, as Sacraments, Commandements, the Acts of Hope, and duties of
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of Charity, which we are obliged not only to practice, but also to believe by divine infallible faith. Will he therefore inferre that the Creed is not perfect, because it containes not all those necessary, and fundamentall Obiects of faith? He will answer: No: because the Apostles intended only to express credenda, thinges to be believed, not practised. Let him therefore giue vs leave to say, that the Creed is perfect, because it wanteth none of those Obiects of belief which were intended to be set downe, as we explicated before.

9. The second observation is, that to satisfy our question what points in particular be fundamentall, it will not be sufficient to alledge the Creed, unless it containe all such points eyther expressly & immediately; or else in such manner, that by evident, and necessary consequence they may be deduced from Articles both cleerely, and particularly contained therein. For if the deduction be doubtful, we shall not be sure, that such Conclusions be fundamentall; or if the Articles themselves which are sayd to be fundamentall, be not distinctly, and particularly expressed, they will not serue vs to know, and distinguish all points fundamentall, from those which they call, not fundamentall. We doe not deny, but that all points of faith, both fundamentall, and not fundamentall, may be said to be contained in the Creed in some sense; as for example, implicitly, generally.
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ally, or in some such involved manner. For when we explicitly believe the Catholique Church, we do implicitly believe whatsoever the prophet saith belonging to faith. Or else by way of reduction, that is, when we are once instructed in the belief of particular points of faith, not expressed, nor by necessary consequence deducible from the Creed, we may afterward, by some analogy, or proportion, and resemblance, reduce it to one, or more of those Articles which are explicitly contained in the Symbole. Thus S. Thomas the Cherubim among Deutines teacheth (1) that the miraculous existence of our Blessed Saviour's body in the Eucharist, as likewise all his other miracles, are reduced to God's omnipotency, expressed in the Creed. And Doctor Potter saith: The Eucharist (2) being a seal of that holy union which we have with Christ our head, by his Spirit and faith, and with the saints his members by charity, is evidently included in the Communion of Saints. But this reducetive way, is farre from being sufficient to inferre out of the Articles of God's omnipotency, or of the Communion of Saints, that our Saviour's body is in the Eucharist, and much lesse whether it be only in figure, or els in reality; by Transubstantiation, or Consubstantiation &c. and leaft of all, whether or no these points be fundamentall. And you hyperbolize, in laying, the Eucharist is evidently included in the Communion of Saints, as if there could not have been, or
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Charity maintained was not a Communion of Saints, before the Blessed Sacrament was instituted. Yet it is true, that after we know, and believe, there is such a Sacrament, we may referre it to some of those heads expressed in the Creed, and yet so, as S. Thomas refers it to one Article, and D. Potter to another; and in respect of different analogies or effects, it may be referred to seve-
rall Articles. The like I lay of other points of faith, which may in some fort be reduced to the Creed, but nothing to D. Potters purpose: But contrarily it sheweth, that your affirming such and such points to be fundamentall or not fundamentall, is meerely arbitrary, to serue your turne, as necessity, and your occasions may require. Which was an old custome amongst He-
((n) De pec- cer. Orig.
tiques, as we read in (n) S. August. Pelagius 
and Celestius, defining fraudulently to avoyde the 
batesfull name of Heresies, affirmed that the question 
of Original Sinne may be disputed without danger of 
faith. But this holy Father affirmes that it be-
longs to the foundation of faith. We may (faith 
he) endure a disputant who erre in other questions 
not yet diligently examined, not yet diligently esta-
blished by the whole authority of the Church, their 
error may be borne with: but it must not passe so far 
as to attempt to shake the foundation of the Church. 
We see S. Augustine places the being of a point 
fundamentall or not fundamentall, in that it 
hath beene examined, and established by the 
Church, although the point of which he spea- 

keth
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keth, namely Original Sinne, be not contain-

ned in the Creed.

10. Out of that which hath beene sayd, I
inferre, that Doctor Potters paines in alledging
Catholique Doctours, the ancient Fathers,
and the Counsell of Trent, to prove that the
Creed containes all points of faith, was need-
lesse, since we grant it in manner aforesayd. But
Doctor Potter, can not in his conscience be-
lieue, that Catholique Deuines, or the Coun-
scell of Trent, and the holy Fathers did intend,
that all points in particular which we are obli-
ged to believe, are contained explicitely in the
Creed; he knowing well enough, that all Ca-
tholiques hold themselues obliged, to believe
all those points which the sayd Counsell defi-
nes to be believed vnder an Anathema, and
that all Christians believe the commandments,
Sacraments &c. which are not expressd in the
Creed.

11. Neither must this seeme strange. For
who is ignorant, that Summaries, Epitomes, &
the like briefe Abstracfts, are not intended to
specify all particulars of that Science, or Sub-
ject to which they belong. For as the Creed is
said to containe all points of Faith; so the De-
calogue comprehends all Articles, (as I may
terme them) which concerneth Charity, and good
life; and yet this cannot be so understood, as if
we were disobligeed from performance of any
duty, or the eschewing of any vice, vnlesse it be
ex.
128 Part. I. Charity maintayned expressed in the ten Commandments. For, (to omit the precepts of receaung Sacraments, which belong to practice or manners, and yet are not contained in the Decalogue;) there are many finnes, even against the Law of nature, and light of reason, which are not contained in the ten Commandements, except only by similitude, analogy, reduction or some such way. For example, we find not expressed in the Decalogue, either divers finnes, as Gluttony, Drunkenesse, Pride, Sloth, Coetoutnes in desiring either things superfluous, or with too much greediness; or divers of our chiefest obligations, as Obedience to Princes, and all Superiors, not only Ecclesiasticall but also Civill, whole Lawes Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, and some other Protestants do dangerously affirm not to oblige in conscience, and yet these men thinke they know the ten Commandments: as likewise divers Protestants defend V fury, to be lawfull; and the many Treatises of Civilians, Canonists, and Casuists, are witnesses, that divers finnes against the light of reason, and Law of nature, are not distinctly expressed in the ten Commandements; although when by other diligences they are found to be unlawful, they may be reduced to some of the Commandments, and yet not so evidently, and particularly, but that divers doe it in divers manners.

12. My third Observation is: That our present
sent question being, whether or not the Creed containe so fully all fundamentall points of faith, that who soever do not agree in all, and every one of those fundamentall Articles, cannot have the same substance of faith, nor hope of Salvation; if I can produce one, or more points, not contained in the Creed, in which if two do not agree, both of them cannot expect to be saved, I shall have performed as much as I intend; and D. Potter must seek out some other Catalogue for points fundamentall, then the Creed. Neither is it materiall to the said purpose, whether such fundamentall points rest only in knowledge, and speculation or belief, or else be further referred to work and practice. For the Habit, or Virtue of Faith, which inclineth, and enableth vs to believe both speculative, and practicall verities, is of one and the selfe same nature, and essence. For example, by the same Faith, whereby I speculatively believe there is a God, I likewise believe, that he is to be adored, feared, and loved, which belong to practice. The reason is, because the Formall Object, or motive, for which I yield assent to those different sorts of materiall objects, is the same in both, to wit, the revelation, or word of God. Where, by the way I note, that if the Unity, or Distinction, and nature of Faith, were to be taken from the diversity of things revealed, by one Faith I should believe speculative verities, and by another such as tend to practice, which
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I doubt whether Dr. Potter himself will admit

13. Hence it followeth, that who soever denieth any one maine practically revealed truth, is no less an Heretique, than if he should deny a point resting in belief alone. So that when Dr. Potter, (to avoid our argument, that all fundamentall points are not contained in the Creed, because in it, there is no mention of the Sacraments, which yet are points of so maine importance, that Protestants make the due administratio of them to be necessary & essentiall to constitute a Church) answereth, that the Sacraments are to be reckoned, rather among the Agenda of the Church, than the Credenda; they are rather divine rites & ceremonies, then Doctrines, he either grants what we affirm, or in effect sayes; Of two kinds of revealed truths, which are necessary to be belieued, the Creed contains one sort only, ergo, it contains all kind of revealed truths necessary to be belieued. Our question is not, de nemoine but re; not what be called points of Fayth, or of practisle, but what points indeed be necessarly to be belieued, whether they be termed Agenda, or Credenda: especially the chiefest part of Christian perfection consisting more in Action, then in barren Speculation; in good workes, then bare believe; in doing, then.. knowing. And there are no less contentions concerning practicall, then speculative truths: as Sacraments, obtaining remission of sinne, Invocation of Saints, Prayers for dead, Adora-
tion of Christ in the Sacrament, & many others all which do so much the more import, as on them, beside right belief, doth also depend our practice, and the ordering of our life. Though D. Potter could therefore give us (as he will never be able to do) a minute, and exact Catalogue of all truths to be believed; that would not make me able enough to know, whether or no I have faith sufficient for salvation; till he also did bring in a particular List of all believed truths, which tend to practice, declaring which of them be fundamentall, which not, that so every man might know whether he be not in some Damnable Error, or some Article of Fayth, which further might give influence into Damnable works.

14. These Observations being premised, I come to prove, that the Creed doth not containe all points of Fayth necessary to be knowne, & believed. And, to omit that in general it doth not tell vs what points be fundamentall, or not fundamentall, which in the way of Protestants, is most necessary to be knowne; in particular, there is no mention of the greatest Evils, from which mans calamity proceeded, I mean, the sinne of the Angels, of Adam, and of Original sinne in vs; nor of the greatest good from which we expect all good, to wit, the necessity of Grace for all works tending to priety. Nay, there is no mention of Angels, good, or bad. The meaning of that most ge-
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generall head (Oportet accedentem &c. It behooves...
(q) him that comes to God, to believe that he is, and is...is questioned, by the denial of
Merit, which makes God, a Giver, but not a Re-
warder. It is not expressed whether the Article
of Remission of sins be understood by fayth a-
lone, or else may admit the efficiency of Sacra-
ments. There is no mention of Ecclesiasticall,
Apostolical, Divine Traditions, one way or oth-
er; or of holy Scriptures in generall, and
much lesse of every booke in particular; nor
of the Name Nature, Number, Effects, Matter,
Forme, Minister, Intention, Necessity of Sacra-
ments, and yet the due administration of Sacra-
ments, is with Protestants an essentiaall Note of
the Church. There is nothing for Baptisme of
Children, nor against Rebaptization. There is
no mention in sauour, or against the Sacrifice of
the Musse, of Power in the Church to institute
Rites, Holy dayes &c. and to inflict Excommu-
nication, or other Censures: of Priesthood,
Bishops, and the whole Ecclesiasticall Hie-
archy, which are very fundamentall points;
of S. Peters Primacy, which to Caluin seemeth a
fundamentall error; nor of the possibility, or
impossibility to keep Gods commandments; of
the procession of the holy Ghost from the Fa-
thar and the Sonne; of Purgatory, or Prayer for
the dead, in any sense: And yet D. Potter doth
not deny, but that Aetius was esteemed an He-
retique, for denying (r) all sort of Commemo-
ration
ration for the dead. Nothing of the Churches Visibility or Invisibleness, Falsibility or Infallibility; nor of other points controverted betwixt Protestants themselves, and betwenee Protestants and Catholiques, which to D. Potter seeme so haynous corruptions, that they cannot without damnation soyne with vs in profession thereof. There is no mention of the Cessation of the Old Law, which yet is a very maine point of faith. And many other might be also added.

15. But what need we labour to specify particulars? There are as many important points of faith not expressed in the Creed, as since the worlds beginning, now, & for all future times, there have been, are, and may be innumerable, grosse, damnable, Heresies, whose contrary truths are not contained in the Creed. For, every fundamental Error must have a contrary fundamental truth; because of two contradictory propositions, in the same degree, the one is false, the other must be true. As for example, if it be a damnable error to deny the Bl. Trinity, or the God-head of our Saviour, the belief of them must be a truth necessary to salvation; or rather, if we will speake properly, the Error is damnable, because the opposite Truth is necessary, as death is frightfull, because life is sweet; and according to Philosophy, the Priuation is measured by the Forme to which it is repugnant. If therefore the Creed containe in particular
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And here I cannot omit to signify how you(s) applaud the laying of D. Vpher. That is, those Propositions which without all controversy are universally received in the whole Christian world, so much Truth is contained, as being joyned with holy Obedience may be sufficient to bring a man to everlasting salvation; Neither have we cause to doubt, but that as many as walk according to this Rule, (neither overthrowing that which they have builded, by superinducing any damnable heresies therupon, nor otherwise vitiating their holy faith with a lewd and wicked conversation) peace shall be upon them, and upon the Israel of God. Now, D. Potter knowes, that the Mystery of the B. Trinity is not universally received in the whole Christian world, as appeares in very many Herenques, in Poland, Hungary, and Transilvania, and therefore according to this Rule of D. Vpher, approved by D. Potter, the denial of the B. Trinity, shall not exclude salvation.

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

18. According to this Modell of D. Potter's foundation, consisting in the agreement of scarcely one point of faith; what a strange Church would he make of men concurring in some one of few Articles of belief, who yet for the rest should be holding conceits plainly contradictory: so patching up a Religion of me who agree only in the Article, that Christ is our Saviour, but for the rest, are like to the parts of a Chimera, having the head of a man, the neck of a horse, the shoulders of an Oxe, the foote of a Lion &c. I wrong them not herein. For in good Philosophy there is greater repugnancy betweene assent and dissent, affirmation and negation, est est, non non (especially when all these contradictions pretend to rely upon one and the selfe same Motive, the infallible Truth of Almighty God) then betweene the integrall parts, as head, necke,
Part. I. Charity maintayned

&c. Of a mā, horse, lion, &c. And thus Protestants are farre more bold to disagree even in matters of fayth, then Catholique Deuines in questions meerely Philosophicall, or not determined by the Church. And while thus they stand only vpon fundamentall Articles, they do by their owne confession destroy the Church, which is the house of God. For the foundation alone of a house, is not a house, nor can they in such an imaginary Church any more expect Salvation, then the foundation alone of a house is fit to afford a man habitation.

19. Moreover, it is most evident that Protestants by this Chaos rather then Church, doe giue vnauoydable occasion of desperation to poor soules. Let some one who is desirous to saue his soule repaire to D. Potter, who maintaynes these grounds, to know vpon whom he may rely, in a matter of so great consequence; I suppose the Doctours anfwere will be: Vpon the truly Catholique Church. She cannot erre danably. What understand you by the Catholike Church? Cannot generall Counsell's, which are the Church representative, erre? Yes,

(t) pag. 167. they may weakely, or (t) willfully misapply, or mis-understand, or neglect Scripture, and so erre danably. To whome then shall I goe for my particular instructio? I cannot confer with the vnited body of the whole Church about my particular difficulties, as your selfe affirms, that the Catholique Church cannot be told (u) of private
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injuries. Must I then consult with every particular person of the Catholique Church? So it seemes, by what you write in these wordes: The whole (w) militant Church (that is all the members of it) cannot possibly erre, eithers in the whole (w) pag.150 fayth, or any necessary Article of it. You say, M. Doctor, I cannot for my instruction acquaint the vniverall Church with my particular scruples: You say, the Prelates of Gods Church meeting in a lawfull generall Council may erre damnably: It remaynes then, that for my necessary instruction, I must repaire to every particular member of the vniverall Church spread over the face of the earth: & yet you teach that the promises (x) which our Lord hath made unto his Church for his assistance, are intended not to any particular persons or Churches, but only to the Church Catholike, with which (as I sayd) it is impossi-ble for me to confer. Alas, O most vncomfor table Ghostly Father, you drive me to despera- tion. How shall I confer with every Christian soule, man and woman, by sea and by land, close prisoner, or at liberty &c.? Yet vpon sup-posefull of this miraculous Pilgrimage for Fayth, before I haue the fayth of Miracles, how shall I proceed at our meeting? Or how shall I know the man on whom I may securely relye? Procure (will you say) to know whether he believe all fundamentall points of fayth. For if he doe, his fayth, for point of believe, is suffi-cient for salvation, though he erre in a hundred things.
Part 1. Charity maintayned

things of lesse moment. But how shall I know whether he hold all fundamentall points or no? For til you tel me thus, I cannot know whether or no his believe be found in all fundamentall points. Can you say the Creed? Yes. And so can many damnable Heretikes. But why doe you aske me this question? Because the Creed containes all fundamentall points of fayth. Are you sure of that? not sure: I should it very probable (y). Shall I hazard my soule on probabilities, or even wagers? This yields a new cause of despaire. But what? doth the Creed containe all points necessary to be believed, whether they rest in the understanding, or else do further extend to practive? No. It was composed to deliuer Credenda, not Agenda to vs; Fayth, not Practise. How then shall I know what points of believe, which direct my practive, be necessary to salvation? Still you chalke out new pathes for Desperation. Well, are all Articles of the Creed, for their nature and matter, fundamentall? I cannot say so. How then, shall I know which in particular be, and which be not fundamentall? Read my Answere to a late Popish Pamphlet intituled Charity Mistaken &c. there you shall find, that fundamentall doctrines are such Catholique Verities, as principally, and essentially pertain (2) to the Faith, such as properly constitute a Church, and are necessary (in ordinary course) to be distinctly believed by every Christian that will be saued. They are these grand, and capitall doctrines Which
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which make up our Faith in Christ; that is, that common faith which is alike precious in all, being one & the same in the highest Apostle, & the meanest believer, which the Apostle elsewhere calls the first principles of the oracles of God, and the forme of sound words. But how shall I apply these general definitions, or descriptions, or (to lay the truth) these only varied words, and phrases (for I understand the word, fundamental, as well as the words, principal, essential, grand, and capital doctrines &c.) to the particular Articles of the Creed, in such sort, as that I may be able precisely, exactly, particularly to distinguish fundamental Articles, from points of lesser moment? You labour to tell us what fundamental points be, but not which they be: and yet unless you do this, your Doctrine serves only, either to make men despair, or else to have recourse to those whom you call Papists, and who give one certain Rule, that all points defined by Christ's visible Church belong to the foundation of Faith, in such sense, as that to deny any one cannot stand with salvation. And being your selfe acknowledges that these men do not err in points fundamental, I cannot but hold it most safe for me to joyn with them, for the securing of my soule, and the avoiding of desperation, into which this your doctrine must cast all them who understand, and believe it. For the whole discourse, and inferences which heer I have made, are either your owne direct &
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tions, or evident consequences clearly deduced from them.

20. But now let us answere some few Objections of D. Potter's, against that which we have said before, to avoid our argument, That the Scripture is not so much as mentioned in the Creed, he sayth: The Creed is an abstract of such (a) necessary Doctrines as are delivered in Scripture, or collected out of it; and therefore needs not express the authority of that which it supposes.

21. This answere makes for us. For by giving a reason why it was needless that Scripture should be expressed in the Creed, you grant as much as we desire, namely, that the Apostles judged it needless to express all necessary points of faith in their Creed. Neither doth the Creed suppose, or depend on Scripture, in such sort as that we can by any probable consequence, infer from the Articles of the Creed, that there is any Canoncall Scripture at all; and much lesse that such Bookes in particular be Canonical: Yea the Creed might have been the same although holy Scripture had neuer been written; and, which is more, the Creed euie in priority of time, was before all the Scripture of the new Testament, except the Gospell of S. Mathew. And so according to this reason of his the Scripture should not mention Articles conteined in the Creed. And I note in a word, how little connexion D. Potter's arguments have, while he tells
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tells vs, that the Creed (b) is an Abstract of such (b) pag. 234. necessary doctrines as are delivered in Scripture, or collected out of it, and therefore needs not expresse the authority of that which it supposes; it doth not follow: The Articles of the Creed are delivered in Scripture: therefore the Creed supposes the Scripture. For two distinct writings may well deliver the same truths, and yet one of them not suppose the other, unless D. Potter be of opinion that two Doctours cannot, at one time, speake the same truth.

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

23. But, how can it be necessary (sayth D. Potter) for any Christian, to have more in his Creed then the Apostles had, and the Church of their times? I answer; You trifle, not distinguishing between the Apostles believe, and that abridgement of some Articles of faith, which we call the Apostles Creed; and with all you beg the question, by supposing that the Apostles believed no more, then is contained in their Creed, which every unlearned person knows and believes: and I hope you will not deny but the Apostles were endued with greater knowledge then ordinary persons.

24. Your pretended proof out of the Acts, that the Apostles revealed to the Church the whole Counsel of God, keeping back nothing, with your gloss (needfull for our salvation) is no proofe unlesse you still beg the question, and doe suppose, that whatsoever the Apostles revealed to the Church, is contained in the Creed. And I wonder you do not reflect that those words were by S. Paul particularly directed to Pastors, and Governors of the Church, as is cleare by the other wordes; He called the Ancients of the Church. And afterward: Take heed to your selves, and to the whole flocke wherein the holy Ghost
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That hath placed you Bishops, to rule the Church. And yourself say, that more knowledge is necessary in Bishops, and Priests, to whom is committed the government of the Church, and the care of souls, than in vulgar Laicks. Do you think that the Apostles taught Christians nothing but their Creed? Said they nothing of the Sacraments, Commandments, Duties of Hope, Charity &c?

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

26. To your demand, why amongst many things of equal necessity to be believed, the Apostles shoul not (g) so distinctly set downe some, and be altogether silent of others? I answer: That you must answer your own demand. For in the Creed there be divers points in their nature, not fundamentall, or necessary to be explicitely and distinctly believed, as above we shewed; why are these points which are not fundamentall expressed, rather then other of the same quali-
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quality? Why our Saviour's descent to Hell, &
Buriall expressed, and not his Circumcision, his
manifestation to the three Kings, working of
Miracles &c? Why did they not express Scriptures, Sacraments, and all fundamental points
of Faith tending to practice, as well as those
which rest in belief? Their intention was, par-
ticularly to deliver such Articles as were fittest
for those times, concerning the Deity, Trinity,
and Messiah (as heretofore I have declared) leav-
ing many things to be taught by the Catholique
Church, which in the Creed we all professe to
believe. Neither doth it follow, as you infer,
That as well, nay better, they might have given no
Article, but that (of the Church) and sent us to the
Church for all the rest. For in setting downe others
besides that, and not all, they make us believe we have
all, when (h) we have not all. For by this kind of
arguing, what may not be deduced? One might,
quite contrary to your inference, say: If the
Apostles Creed containe all points necessary
to salvation, what need we any Church to
teach vs? and consequently what need of the
Article concerning the Church? What need we
the Creeds of Nice, Constantinople &c. Super-
fluous are your Catechisms, wherein beside the
Articles of the Creed, you add divers other par-
ticulars. These would be poore consequences,
and so is yours. But shall I tell you newes? For
so you are pleased to esteeme it. We grant your
inference, thus far: That our Saviour Christ re-
ferred,
ferred vs to his Church, by her to be taught, & by her alone. For, she was before the Creed, and Scriptures; And she to discharge this imposed office of instructing vs, hath delivered vs the Creed, but not it alone, as if nothing els were to be believed. We have besides it, holy Scripture; we have unwritten, divine, Apostolical Ecclesiasticall Traditions. It were a childish argument: The Creed contains not all things which are necessary to be believed: Ergo, it is not profitable. Or; The Church alone is sufficient to teach vs by some convenient means: Ergo, she must teach vs without all means, without Creeds, without Councils, without Scripture &c. If the Apostles had expressed no Article, but that of the Catholique Church, she must have taught vs the other Articles in particular, by Creeds, or other means, as in fact we have even the Apostles Creed from the Tradition of the Church. If you will believe you have all in the Creed, when you have not all, it is not the Apostles, or the Church, that makes you so believe, but it is your own error, whereby you will needs believe, that the Creed must contain all! For neither the Apostles, nor the Church, nor the Creed itself else tell you any such matter; and what necessity is there, that one means of instruction, must involve whatsoever is contained in all the rest? We are not to recite the Creed with anticipated persuasion, that it must contain what we imagine it ought, for better
maintayning some opinions of our owne; but we ought to say, and believe that it contains what we find in it; of which one Article is to believe the Catholique Church; surely to be taught by her, which presupposeth that we need other instruction beside the Creed: and in particular we may learne of her, what points be contained in the Creed, what otherwise; and so we shall not be deceived, by believing we have all in the Creed, when we have not all: and you may in the same manner say: As well may better, the Apostles might have given us no Articles at all, as have left out Articles tending to practice. For in setting down one sort of articles, & not the other, they make us believe we have all, where we have not all.

27. To our argument, that Baptisme is not containned in the Creed; D. Potter, besides his answer, that Sacraments belong rather to practice then faith, (which I have already confuted, and which indeed maketh agaynst himselfe, and serveth only to shew that the Apostles intended not to comprize all points in the Creed which we are bound to believe) adds, that the Creed of (i) Nice expressed Baptisme by name: he confesse one Baptisme for the remissio of Sinne. Which answer is directly against himselfe, and manifestly proves that Baptisme is an Article of faith, and yet is not contained in the Apostles Creed, neither explicitely, nor by any necessary consequence from other Articles expressed therein. If to make it an Article

(i) Pag. 237.
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cle of sayne that it is contayned in
in the Nicene Councell, he will find that Pro-
testants maintayne many errors against faith,
as being repugnant to definitions of Generall
Councells: as in particular, that the very Coun-
cell of Nice (which layth M. Whitgift, (k) is of defence pag;
all wise and learned men reverence, esteemed & im-
braced, next unto the Scriptures themselves) decreed
that, so those who were chosen to the Ministry un-
married, it was not lawfull to take any wife afterward,
is affirmed by Protestants. And your grand Re-
former Luther (lib. de Concilij part. prima) sayth,
that he understands not the Holy Ghost in that
Councell. For in one Canon it layth that those
who have gelded themselves are not fit to be
made Priests; in another it forbid them to have
wives. Hath (sayth he) the Holy Ghost nothing to
due in Counsellis, but so binde, and loose his Mini-
sters which impossible, dangerous, and unnece-
sary lames? I forbear to shew that this very Article
I confesse one Baptisme for the remission of sinnes,
will be understood by Protestants in a farre dif-
f'rent sense from Catholiques, yea Protestants
among themselves do not agree, how Baptis-
tme forgives sinnes, nor what grace it confers.
Only concerning the Unity of Baptisme against
re-baptization of such as were once baptized
(which I noted as a poinc not contained in the
Apostles Creed) I cannot omit an excellent
place of S. Augustine, where speaking of the
Donatists he hath these words. They are so bold
Charity maintained as (m) to rebaptize Catholiques, wherein they shew themselves to be the greater Heretiques, since it hath pleased the universal Catholique Church not to make Baptisme void even in the very Heretiques themselves. In which few words this holy Father deluereareth against the Donatists these points which do also make against Protestants; That to make an Heresy, or an Heretique, knowne for such, it is sufficient, to oppose the definition of Gods Church; That a proposition may be Hereticall though it be not repugnant to any Texts of Scripture. For S. Augustine teacheth that the doctrine of rebaptization, is hereticall, and yet acknowledgeth it cannot be convinced for such out of Scripture. And that neyther the Heresy of rebaptization of those who were baptized by Heretiques, nor the contrary Catholique truth being expressed in the Apostles Creed, it followeth that it doth not containe all points of fayth necessary to salvation. And so we must conclude that to believe the Creed is not sufficient for Unity of fayth, and Spirit in the same Church, vnles there be also a totall agreement both in belief of other points of fayth, and in externall profession, and Communion also (wherof we are to speake in the next Chapter) according to the saying of S. Augustine: You are (n) with us in Baptisme, and in the Creed; but in the Spirit of Unity, and bond of peace, and lastly in the Catholique Church you are not with us.
That Luther, Calvin, their associates, and all who began, or continue the separation from the external Communion of the Roman Church, are guilty of the proper, and formal sinne of Schisme.

HE Searcher of all Hearts, is witness with how unwilling mindes, we Catholiques are drawne to fasten the denomination of Schismaticques, or Heretiques, on them, for whose soules, if they employed their best blood, they would judge that it could not be better spent. If we rejoynce, that they are constrained at such titles, our joy riseth not from their trouble or griefe, but, as that of the Apostles did, from the fountaine of Charity, because they are constrained to repentance; that so after unpartiall examination, they finding themselves to be what we say, may by Gods holy grace,
Part. I. Charity mainayned beginne to dislike, what thenmleues are. For our part, we must remember that our obligation is, to keep within the meane, betwixt uncharitab- le bitternes, & pernicious flattery; not yielding to worldly respects, nor offending Christian Modesty, but uttering the substance of truth in so Caritablc manner, that not so much we, as Truth, and Charity may seeme to speake, ac- cording to the wholesome advise of S. Gregory Nazianzen in these divine words: We doe not af- fect peace with (a) prejudice of the true doctrine, that so we may get a name of being gentle, and milde: & yet we seeke to conserve peace, fighting in a lawfull manner, and containing our selves within our com- passe, and the rule of Spirit. And of these things my judgement is: and for my part I prescribe the same Law to all that deal with soules, and treate of true doctrine, that neyther they exasperate mens minds by harshnes, nor make the haughty or insolent, by submission; but that in the cause of faith they behave themselves prudently, and advisedly, and doe not in nyther of these things exceed the meane. With whome agreeeth S. Leo laying: It be houeth vs in such causes to be (b) most careful, that without noise of contentions, both Charity be conserved, and Truth mainayned.

2. For better Methode, we will handle these points in order. First we will fet downe the nature, and essence, or as I may call it, the Quality of Schisme. In the second place, the greatnes & grievousnes, or (so to terme it) the
Quantity thereof. For the Nature, or Quality will tell vs, who may without injury be judged Schismatiques; and by the greatness, or quantity, such as find themselves guilty thereof, will remaine acquainted with the true state of their soule, and whether they may conceive any hope of salvation or no. And because Schisme will be found to be a division from the Church, which could not happen, vnles there were alwayes a visible Church; we will, Thirdly proue, or rather take it as a point to be granted by all Christians, that in all ages there hath been such a Visible Congregation of Faythfull People. Fourthly, we will demonstrate, that Luther, Calvin, and the rest, did separate themselves from the Communion of that always visible Church of Christ, and therefore were guilty of Schisme. And fifthly we will make it euydent, that the visible true Church of Christ, out of which Luther and his followers departed, was no other but the Roman Church, & consequently that both they, and all others who persist in the same division, are Schismatiques by reason of their separation from the Church of Rome.

3. For the first point touching the Nature, or Quality of Schisme: as the natural perfection of man consists in his being the image of God his Creator, by the powers of his soule; so his supernatural perfection is placed in similitude The nature with God, as his last End and Felicity; and by of Schisme, having the said spirituall faculties, his Understanding.
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Standing and Will linked to him. His understanding is united to God by Faith; his Will, by Charity. The former relies upon his infallible Truth: The latter carrieth vs to his infinite Goodness. Faith hath a deadly opposite, Heresy. Contrary to the Union, or Unity of Charity, is Separation and Division. Charity is twofold. As it respects God, his Opposite Vice is Hatred against God: as it uniteth vs to our Neighbour, his contrary is Separation or division of affections, and will from our Neighbour. Our Neighbour may be considered, either as one private person hath a single relation to another, or as all concur to make one Company or Congregation, which we call the Church; and this is the most principall reference and Union of one man with another: because the chiefest Unity is that of the Whole, to which the particular Unity of Parts is subordinate. This Unity, or Oneness (if so I may call it) is effected by Charity uniting all the members of the Church in one Mystical Body; contrary to which, is Schisme, from the Greek word signifying Scission, or Division. Wherefore upon the whole matter, we find that Schisme, as the Angelicall Doctor S. Thomas defines it, is; A voluntary separation (c) from the Unity of that Charity, whereby all the members of the Church are united. From hence he deduceth, that Schisme is a speciall and particular vice, distinct from Heresy, because they are opposite to two different Vertues: Heresy, to Faith; Schisme, to
Charity. To which purpose be ful alleadgeth S. Hierome upon thele words, (Tit. 3.) A man that is an Heretique after the first and second admonition awoide, saying: I conceive that there is this difference betwixt Schisme and Heresy, that Heresy involves some perversé assertion: Schisme for Episcopal dissention doth separate men from the Church. The same doctrine is delivered by S. Augustine in these words: Heretiques, and Schismatiques call their Congregations Churches: but Heretiques corrupt the Faith by believing of God false things: but Schismatiques by wicked divisions break from fraternal Charity, although they believe what we believe. Therefore the Heretique belongs not to the Church, because she loves God: nor the Schismatique, because she loves her Neighbour. And in another place he sayth, It is wont to be demanded: (e) How Schismatiques be distinguished from Heretiques: and this difference is found, that not a divers faith, but the devided Society of Communion doth make Schismatiques. It is then evident that Schisme is different from Heresy. Neuerthelesse (fayth Saint Thomas (f)) as he who is deprised of faith must needs want Charity: so every Heretique is a Schismatique, but not conversely. every Schismatique is an Heretique; though because want of Charity disposes and makes way to the destruction of faith (according to those wordes of the Apostle, Which (a good conscience) some casting of, have suffered shipwrack in their faith) Schisme speedily degenerates to Heresy,
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Hereby, as S. Hierome after the rehearsed words teacheth, sayeth: Though Schism in the beginning may in some sort be understood different from Heresy; yet there is no Schism which doth not faigne some heresy to it selfe, that so it may seeme to have departed from the Church upon good reason. Nevertheles when Schisme proceeds originally from Heresy, Heresy as being in that case the predominant quality in these two peccant humours, giueth the denomination of an Heretique; as on the other side we are wont, especially in the beginning, or for a while, to call Schismaticques, those men who first began with only Schisme, though in process of time they fell into some Heresy, and by that meanes are indeed both Schismaticques and Heretiques.

4. The reason why both Heresy and Schisme are repugnant to the being of a good Catholique, is: Because the Catholique, or Universall Church signifies One Congregation, or Company of Faithfull people, and therfore implies not only Faith, to make them Faithfull believers, but also Communion, or Common Union, to make them One in Charity, which excludes Separation, and Divison: and therfore in the Apostles Creed, Communion of Saints is immediately ioyned to the Catholique Church.

5. From this definition of Schisme may be inferred, that the guilt thereof is contracted, not only by division from the Univercell Church; but also, by a Separation from a particular Church.
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Church or Diocese which agrees with the Vniuersall. In this manner Meletius was a Schismatique, but not an Heretique, because as we read in S. Epiphanius, (h) he was of the right Faith: (h) Herefor his faith was not altered at anytime from the holy Catholique Church &c. He made a Sect, but departed not from Faith. Yet because he made to himself a particular Congregation against S. Peter Archbishop of Alexandria his lawfull Superior, and by that means brought in a diuision in that particular Church, we was a Schismatique. And it is well worth the noting, that the Meletians building new Churches put this title vpon them, The Church of Martyrs: and vpon the ancient Churches of those who succeeded Peter, was inscrib’d, The Catholique Church. For so it is. A new Sect must have a new name which though it be neuer to gay and specious, as the Church of Martyrs: the Reformed Church &c. yet the Nouelty sheweth that it is not the Catholique, nor is the true Church. And that Schisme may be committed by diuision from a particular Church, we read in Optatus Milevitanus (i) these remarkable words, (which do well declare who be Schismatiques) brought by him to prove that not Caecilianus but Parmenianus was a Schismatique: For Caecilianus went not out from Maiorinus thy Grand-Father (he means his next predecessour but one, in the Bishopricke,) but Maiorinus from Caecilianus: neither did Caecilianus depart from the Chair of Peter, or of Cyprian, (who was

(i) Lib. r. cont. Parmen.
156 Part. 1. Charity maintayned was but a particular Bishop, but Maiorinus, in whose Chaire thou sittest which had no beginning before Maiorinus himselfe. Seing it is manifestly knowne, that these things were so done, it evidently appeareth, that you are heires both of traditors (that is, of those who deliuered vp the holy Bible to be burned) and of Schismatiques. And it seemeth that this kind of Schisme must principally be admitted by Protestants, who acknowledge no one visible Head of the whole Church, but hold that every particular Diocesse, Church, or Countrey is governed by itselfe independantly of any one Person, or Generall Councell, to which all Christians have obligation to submit their judgments, and wills.

2. Point: 6. As for the grievousnes or quantity of Schisme (which was the second point proposed) S. Thomas teacheth, that amongst sines against our Neighbour, Schisme (1) is the most grievous; because it is against the spirituall good of the multitude, or Community. And therefore as in a Kingdom or Common-Wealth, there is as great difference betwixt the crime of rebellion or sedition, and debates among private men, as there is inequality betwixt one man, & a whole kingdom; so in the Church, Schisme is as much more grievous then Sedition in a Kingdom, as the spirituall good of soules surpaseth the civil and politicaill weale. And S. Thomas adds further, that they loose the spirituall Power of Jurisdiction; and if they goe about to absolve from
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from sinnes, or to excommunicate, their actions are inuaid; which he proues out of the Canon Nona.-B. unus. Causa 7. quaest. I. which sayth: He that keepeth neither the vnity of spirit, nor the peace of agreement, and separates him selfe from the bond of the Church, and the College of Priests, can neither have the Power, nor dignity of a Bishop. The Power also of Order (for example to consecrate the Eucharist, to ordaine Priests &c.) they cannot lawfully exercise.

7. In the judgment of the holy Fathers, Schisme is a most grievous offence. Chrysostome (m) compares these Schismaticall deuiders of Christ's mystical body, to those who sacrilegiously pierced his natural body, saying: Nothing doth so much incense God, as that the Church should be deuided. Although we should do innumerable good works, if we deuide the full Ecclesiastical Congregation, we shall be punished no lesse then they who tore his (natural) body. For that was done to the gaine of the whole world, although not with that intention: but this hath no profit at all, but there ariseth from it most great harme. These things are spoken, not only to those who bear of office, but also to those who are governed by them. Behold how neither a morall good life (which conceipt deceiteth many) nor authority of Magistrates, nor any necessity of Obeying Superiours can excuse Schisme from being a most haynous offence. Optatus Milevitanus (o) calls Schisme, In gens flagitium: a huge crime. And speaking to the
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Donatists, sayth; that Schisme is evil in the highest degree, even you are not able to deny. No less patheticcall is S. Augustine upon this subject. He reckons Schismatiques among Pagans, Heretiques, and Jews, saying: Religion is to be sought, neither in the confusion of Pagans, nor in the fish of heretiques, nor in the languishing of schismatiques, nor in the age of the Jews; but among those alone who are called Christian Catholiques, or orthodox, that is, lovers of Unity in the whole body, and followers of truth. Nay he esteems them worse than Infidels and Idolaters, saying: Those whom the Donatists (q) heale from the wound of idolatry and idolatry, they hurt more grievously with the wound of Schisme. Let these men who are pleased untruthly to call vs Idolaters, reflect upon themselves, and consider, that this holy Father judgeth Schismatiques (as they are) to be worse than Idolaters, which they absurdly call vs.: and this he prooveth by the example of Core, Dathan, and Abiron and other rebellious Schismatiques of the Old Testament, who were conveyed alive downe into Hell, and punished more openly then Idolaters. No doubt (sayth this holy Father) but (r) that was committed most wickedly, which was punished most severely. In another place he yoketh Schisme with Herefly, saying upon the Eight Beatitude: Many (s) Heretiques, under the name of Christians, deceiving mens soules, do suffer many such things; but therefore they are excluded from this reward, because it is not only

(p) lib. de vera Relig. cap. 6.
(q) Cont. Donatist. 1. cap. 8.
(r) ibid. lib. 2. cap. 6.
(s) De cern. Dom. in monte c. 5.
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ly laid, Happy are they who suffer persecution, but there is added, forjustice. But where there is not soundfayth, there cannot be justice. Neither can Schismatiques promise to themselves any part of this reward, because likewile where there is no Charity, there cannot be justice.

And in another place, yet more effectually he faith: Being out of (t) the Church, and divided from the beape of Unity, and the bond of Charity, thou shouldst be punished with eternall death, though thou shouldst be burned alive for the name of Christ. And in another place, he hath these words: If he hear not the Church let him be to (v) thee, as an Heathen or Publican; which is more grievous then if he were smitten with the sword, consumed with flames, or cast to wild beasts. And else where: Out of the Catholique Church sayth he) one (w) may have Fayth, Sacraments, Orders, and in summe, all things except Salvation. With S. Augustine, his Countreyman and second selfe in sympathy of spirite, S. Fulgentius agreeith, saying: Believe this (x) steadfastly without doubting, that every Heretiique, or Schismati
tique, baptized in the name of the Father, the Sonne, and the Holy Ghost, if before the end of his life, he be not reconciled to the Catholique Church, what Almes sooner he give, yea though he should shed his blood for the name of Christ, he cannot obtaine Salvation.

Marke againe how no morall honesty of life, no good deeds, no Martyrdome, can without repentance auaile any Schismatique for Salvation. Let vs also add that D. Potter sayth: Schisme
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me is no lesse (y) damnable, then Heresy.

8. But you Holy, Learned, Zealous Fathers, and Doctours of God's Church; out of these premises, of the grievousnes of Schisme, & of the certaine damnation which it bringeth (if unrepented) what conclusion draw you for the instruction of Christians? S. Augustine maketh this wholesome inference. There is (2) no inst necessity to dividc Unity. S. Irenæus conclueth: They cannot (a) make any so important reformation, as the euiil of the Schisme is pernicious. S. Denis of Alexandria sayth: Certainly (b) all things should rather be indulg'd, then to consent to the disunion of the Church of God: those Martyrs being no lesse glorious, that expre themselves to hinder the dismembering of the Church, then those that suffer rather than they will offer sacrifice to Idols. Would to God all those who divided themselves from that visible Church of Christ, which was upon earth when Luther appeared, would rightly consider of these things! And thus much of the second Point.

9. We have iust and necessary occasion, e-ternally to bless Almighty God, who hath vouchsafed to make vs members of the Catho-lique Roman Church, from which while men fall, they precipitate themselves into so vast absurdities, or rather sacrilegious blasphemies, as is implied in the doctrine of the totali deficieny of the visible Church, which yet is main-tayned by divers chiefe Protestants, as may at

large
large be scene in Breeley, and others; out of whom I will here name Jowell saying: The truth was unknown at that time, and unheard of, when Martin Luther, and Velderick Zuinglius first came unto the knowledge and preaching of the Gospell. Perkins saith: We say, that (d) before the days of Luther for the space of many hundred years an universal Apostasy overspread the whole face of the earth, and that our (Protestant) Church was not then visible to the world. Napier upon the Revelations teacheth, that from the year of (e) Christ three hundred and sixeene, the Antichristian and Creed pagi: papisticall reign began, reigning universally, and without any debatable contradiction, one thousand two hundred sixty yeares (that is, till Luther's time.) And that, from the yeare of (f) Christ three hundred and sixteen, God hath withdrawn his visible Church from open Assemblies, to the hearts of particular godly men &c. during the space of one thousand two hundred threescore yeares: And that, the (g) Pope and Clergy have possessed the outward (h) Ibid. in visible Church of Christians, even one thousand two hundred threescore yeares. And that, the (h) true Church abroad latent, and invisible. And Brocard (i) upon the Revelations, professest to ioyne in opinion with Napier. Fulke affirmeth, that in the (k) time of Boniface the third, which was the yeare 637, the Church was invisible, and fled into faith Cath. the wilderness, there to remaine a long season. Luther pag. 16. saith: Primo flosius eram: At the first (l) I was alone. Jacob Haibroncocus one of the Disputants for the
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the Protestant party in the Conference at Ratibone, affirmeth (m) that the true Church was interrupted by Apostasy from the true Fayth. Calvin sayth: It is absurd in the very (n) beginning to breake one from another, after we have beene forced to make a separation from the whole world. It were ouerlong to allledge the wordes of Ioannes Regius, Daniel Chamiers, Beza, Ochimus, Castalia, and others to the same purpose. The reason which caft them vpon this wicked doctrine, was a desperate voluntary necessity: because they being resolued not to acknowledge the Rom. Church to be Christis true Church, & yet being convinced by all manner of evidence, for that divers Ages before Luther there was no other Congregation of Christians, which could be the Church of Christ; there was no remedy but to affirme, that vpon earth Christ had no visible Church: which they would never have auouched, if they had known how to avoide the foresaid inconuenience (as they apprehended it) of submitting themselues to the Roman Church.

10. Agaynst these exterminating spirits, Dr. Potter, and other more moderate Protestants, professe, that Christ alwayes had, and alwayes will haue vpon earth a visible Church: other-

(m) in no Acacatholigmovolum. a.

(n) Ep.141.

(o) pug. 154

(p) Matt. 16

Mr.
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reaptions, and acknowledging her still to be a member of Christ's body, he seeketh to cleare himselfe and others from Schisme, because (faith he) 'the property (q) of Schisme is (witness the Donatsists and Lucifcrians) to cut off from the Body of Christ, & the hope of salvation, the Church from which it separates. And if any Zelotes amongst vs have proceeded to beauer censures, their zeale may be excused, but their Charity and wisedome cannot be justified. And elsewhere he acknowledgeth, that the Roman Church hath those maine, and (r) essentiall truths, which give her the name and essence of a Church.

11. It being therefore granted by D. Potter, and the chiefe and best learned English Protestants, that Christ's visible Church cannot perish, it will be needles for me in this occasion to prove it. S. Augustine doubted not to say: The Prophets (s) spoke more obscurely of Christ, than (t) in Psalm of the Church, because, as I thinke, they did forsee 30. Com. 2, in spirit, that men were to make parties against the Church, and that they were not to have so great Strife concerning Christ: therefore that was more plainly foretold & more openly prophecyd about which greater contentions were to rise, that it might turne to the condemnation of them who have seen it, and yet gone forth. And in another place he sayth: How doe we confide (r) to have receaue manifeestly Christ himselfe from Holy Scriptures, if we have also manifeestly receaue the Church from them? And indeed to what Congregatio shall a man haue recourse for
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for the affaires of his soule, if vpon earth there
be no visible Church of Christ? Besides, to ima-
gine a company of men belieuynge one thing in
their hart, and with their mouth professing
the contrary, (as they must be supposed to doe;
for if they had professedy what they belieuued,
they would have become visible) is to droma
of a damned crew of dissembling Sycophants,
but not to conceiue a right notion of the Church
of Christ our Lord. And therefore S. Augustine
sayth: We cannot be saued, vntes labouring also for
the (u) salvation of others, we profess with our
mouths, the same fayth which we heare in our harts.
And if any man hold it lawfull to dissemble, &
deny matters of fayth, we cannot be assured,
but that they actually dissemble, and hide A-
nabaptisme, Ariasisme, yea Turcisme, & eu en
Atheisme, or any other false beliefe, vnder the
outward profession of Caluinisme. Doe not
Protestants teach that, preaching of the word,
and administration of Sacraments (which ca-
not but make a Church visible) are insepaparble
notes of the true Church? And therefore they
must eyther grant a visible Church, or none at
all. No wonder then if S. Augustine account
this Heresy so grosse, that he sayth against those
who in his tyme defended the like errour: But
this Church which (w) hath beene of all Nations is
no more, the hath perished; so say they that are not
in her. O impudent speach! And afterward. This
voiece so abominable, so destable, so full of presump-
tion
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tion and fallhood, which is sustained with no truth, enlightened with no wisdom, seasoned with no salt, vain, rash, heady, pernicious, the Holy Ghost foresaw &c. And, Peradventure some (x) one may say, there (x) Deonib, are other Sheep I know not where, in which I am not acquainted, yet God hath care of them. But he is too absurd in humane sense, that can imagine such things. And these men do not consider, that while they deny the perpetuity of a visible Church, they destroy their own present Church, according to the argument which S. Augustine urged against the Donatists in these words: If the Church were lost in Cyprians (we (y) De Bapt. may say in Gregories) time, from whence did Donatus (Luther) appear? From what earth did he spring? From what sea is he come? From what heavens did he drop? And in another place: How can they want (z) to have any Church, if he be ceased ever since those times? And all Deuines by defining (z) Lib. 3. Schisme to be a division from the true Church, suppose, that there must be a knowne Church, from which it is possible for men depart. But enough of this in these few words.

13. Let us now come to the fourth, and chiefest Point, which was, to examine whether Luther, Calvin, and the rest did not depart from the externall Communion of Christs visible Church, and by that separation became guilty of Schisme. And that they are properly Schismatiques clearely followeth from the grounds which we have layed, concerning the nature of Schisme.
Schism, which consists in leaving the external Communion of the visible Church of Christ our Lord: and it is clear by evidence of fact, that Luther and his followers forsooke the Communion of that Ancient Church. For they did not so much as pretend to joyn with any Congregation which had a being before their time; for they would needs conceive that no visible Company was free from errors in doctrine, and corruption in practice: And therefore they opposed the doctrine; they withdrew their obedience from the Prelates; they left participation in Sacraments; they changed the Liturgy of publique SERVICE of whatsoever Church then extant. And these things they pretended to do out of a persuasion, that they were bound ( forsooth ) in conscience so to do, unless they would participate with errors, corruptions, & superstitions. We dare not ( sayth D. Potter ) communicate (a) with Rome either in her publique Liturgy, which is manifestly polluted with grosse superstition &c. or in those corrupt and ungrounded opinions, which she hath added to the Faith of Catholiques. But now let D. Potter tell me with what visible Church extant before Luther, he would have adventured to communicate in her publique Liturgy and Doctrine, since he durst not communicate with Rome? He will not be able to assigne any, even with any little colour of common sense. If then they departed from all visible Communities professing Christ, it followeth
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Loweth that they also left the Communion of the true visible Church, which longest it was, whether that of Rome, or any other; of which Point I do not for the present dispute. Yea this the Lutherans do not only acknowledge, but praise, and brag of. If (sayth a learned Lutheran) there had been right (b) believers which went before (b) Georgius Luther in his office, there had been no need of a Milan in Lutheran Reformation. Another affirmeth it to be Augustian. ridiculous, to thinke that in the time (c) before Luther, any had the purity of Doctrine; and that Luther should receive it from them, and not they from Luther. Another speaketh roundly, and sayth it is Morgetern. impudence to say, that many learned men (d) in Germany before Luther, did hold the Doctrine of the Gospell. And I add: That far greater impudence, it were to affirme that Germany did not agree with the rest of Europe, and other Christian Catholic Nations, and consequently, that it is the greatest impudence to deny, that he departed from the Communion of the visible Catholic Church, spread over the whole world. We have heard Calvin saying of Protestants in general: We were, even, forced (e) to make a separation from the whole world. And, Luther of himself in particular: In the beginning (f) I was alone. If in press. Ergo (say I, by your good leave) you were at least a Schismatique, deuided from the Ancient Church, and a member of no new Church. For no soleman can constitute a Church; & though he could, yet such a Church could not be that g.c.
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glorious company, of whose number, great-
ness, and amplitude, so much hath been spo-
ken both in the Old Testament, & in the New.

13. D. Potter endeavours to auido this eu-
dent Argument by divers equations; but by the
confutation thereof I will (with God's holy
assistance) take occasion, even out of his owne
Answers and grounds, to bring unanswerable
reasons to convince them of Schism.

14. His chiefe Answer is: That they have
not left the Church, but her Corruptions.

15. I reply. This answer may be giuen ey-
ther by those furious people, who teach that
theses abuses, and corruptions in the Church
were so enormous, that they could not stand
with the nature, or being of a true Church of
Christ: Or else by those other more calme Pro-
teants, who affirm that those errors did not
destroy the being, but only deform the beauty
of the Church. Against both these sorts of men,
I may fitly vse that unanswerable Dilemma,
which S. Augustine brings against the Dona-
tists in these concluding words: Tell me whether
the (g) Church at that tyme when you say she enter-
tayned those who were guilty of all crimes, by th'
contagion of those sinnefull persons, perished, or perished
not? Answere; whether the Church perished, or per-
ished not? Make choice of what you think: if then
she perished, what Church brought forth Donatus?
(we may say Luther.) But if she could not perish,
because so many were incorporated into her (without
Bap-
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Baptisme (that is, without a secon baptism, or rebaptization, & I may say, without Luther's reformation) answer me I pray you, what madness did move the Sect of Donatus to separate themselves from her? To pretend to avoid the Communion of bad men? I beseech the Reader to ponder every one of S. Augustine's words: & to consider whether anything could have been spoken more directly against Luther, & his followers at what time ever.

16. And now to answer more in particular; I say to those who teach, that the visible Church of Christ perished for many ages, that I can easily afford them the courtesy, to free them from mere Schisme: but all men touched with any spark of zeal to vindicate the Wisedome, and Goodness of our Saviour from blaspemous injury, cannot choose but believe and proclaim them to be Superlative Arch-heretiques. Nevertheless, if they will needs have the Honours of Singularity, and desire to be both formal Heretiques, & properly Schismatiques, I will tell them, that while they dream of an invisible Church of men, which agreed with them in Faith, they will upon due reflection find themselves to be Schismatiques, from those corporeal Angels, or invisible men, because they held external Communion with the visible Church of those times, the outward Communion of which visible Church those moderne hot-spurs forsaking, were thereby divided from the outward Communion of their hidden Brethren, & so are Separatists.
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tills from the external Communion of them, with whom they agree in faith, which is Schism in the most formal, and proper signification thereof. Moreover according to D. Potter, these boisterous Creatures are properly Schismatiques. For, the reason why he thinks himselfe, and such as he is, to be cleared from Schisme, notwithstanding their division from the Roman Church, is because (according to his Divinity) the property of (h) Schisme, is (witness the Donatists and Luciferians) to cut off from the Body of Christ, and the hope of Salvation, the Church from which it separates: But those Protestants of whom we now speake, cut off from the Body of Christ, and the hope of Salvation, the Church from which they separated themselves; and they do it directly as the Donatists (in whom you exemplify it by affirming that the true Church had perished: and therefore they cannot be cleared from Schisme, if you may be their Judge. Consider, I pray you, how many prime Protestants both domestical and forraine, you have at one blow strucke off from hope of Salvation, and condemned to the lowest pit, for the grievous sinne of Schisme. And withall it importes you to consider, that you also involve your selfe, and other moderate Protestants in the selfe same crime and punishment, while you communicate with those, who, according to your owne principles, are properly, and formally Schismatiques. For if you held your selfe obli-
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obliged under paine of damnation to forsake the Communion of the Roman Church, by reason of her Errors and Corruptions, which you confesse were not fundamentall; shall it not be much more damnable for you, to live in Communion and Confraternity, with those who defend an errour of the salling of the Church, which in the Donatists you confesse (i) to have been properly heretical against the Article of our Creed; I believe the Church? And I desire the Reader, hear to apply an authority of S. Cyprian (ep. 76.) which he shall find alleged in the next number. And this may suffice for confutation of the aforesaid Answer, as it might have relation to the rigid Calvinists.

17. For Confutation of those Protestants, who hold that the Church of Christ had always a being, and cannot err in points fundamentall, and yet teach, that she may err in matters of lesse moment, wherein if they forsake her, they would be accounted not to leave the Church, but only her corruptions; I must say, that they change the state of our present Question, not distinguishing between internal Fayth, and external Communion, nor between Schisme, and Heresy. This I demonstrate out of D. Potter himselfe, who in expresss words teacheth, that the promises which our Lord hath made (k) unto his Church for his assistance, are intended, not to any particular Persons or Churches, but only to the Church Catholique, and they are to be ex-

(i) pag. 120.

(k) pa. 151; tended, not to any particular Persons or Churches, but only to the Church Catholique, and they are to be ex-

Z 2 tended
Charity maintayned tended not to every parcel, or particularity of truth, but only to points of Faith, or fundamental. And afterwards (speaking of the Universal Church,) he (1) pag. 155, saith: 'It's comfort (1) insomuch for the Church, that the Lord in mercy will secure her from all capital dangers, and conserve her on earth against all enemies; but she may not hope to triumph over all sinne and errore, till she be in heaven. Out of which words I observe, that, according to D. Potter, the selfe same Church, which is the Universal Church, remaining the universal true Church of Christ, may fall into errors and corruptions: from whence it cleerely followeth that it is impossible to leave the Externall communio of the Church so corrupted, and retain externall communion with the Catholique Church; since the Church Catholique, and the Church so corrupted is the selfe same one Church, or company of men. And the contrary imagination talks in a dreame, as if the errors and infestions of the Catholique Church were not inherent in her, but were separate from her, like to Accidents without any Subiect, or rather indeed, as if they were not Accidents, but Hypotheses, or Persons subsisting by themselves. For men cannot be said to live in, or out of the Communion of any dead creature, but with Pertons, endured with life and reason; and much lesse can men be said to live in the Communion of Accidents, as errors and corruptions are, and therefore it is an absurd thing to affirm, that Protestants diuided them-
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theselues from the corruptions of the Church, but not from the Church herselfe, being the corruptions of the Church were inherent in the Church. All this is made more cleere, if we consider, that when Luther appeared, there were not two distinct visible true Catholique Churches, holding contrary Doctrines, and divided in externall Communion; one of the which two Churches did triumph over all error, and corruption in doctrine and practice; but the other was stained with both. For to faigne this diversitie of two Churches cannot stand with record of histories, which are silent of any such matter. It is against D. Potters owne grounds, that the Church may erre in points not fundamentall, which were not true, if you will imagine a certaine visible Catholique Church free from error euyn in points not fundamentall. It contradiceth the words in which he said, the Church may not hope to triumph over all error, till she be in heaven. It euacuateth the brag of Protestants, that Luther reformed the whole Church: and lastly it maketh Luther a Schismatique, for leaving the C moltion of all visible Churches, seeing (upon this supposition) there was a visible Church of Christ free from all corruption, which therefore could not be forsaken without just imputation of Schisme. We must therefore truly affirm, that since there was but one visible Church of Christ, which was truly Catholique, and yet was (according to Protestants)
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stained with corruption; when Luther left the
external Communion of that corrupted Church,
he could not remain in the Communion of
the Catholique Church, no more then it is pos-
sible to keep company with Christopher Potter,
and not keep company with the Provost of
Queenes Colledge in Oxford, if D. Potter and
the Provost be one, and the selfe same man: For
so one should be, and not be with him at the
same time. This very argument drawne from
the Unity of God's Church, S. Cyprian urgeth
to convince, that Nouatianus was cut off from
the Church in these words: *The Church is one,*
which being one cannot be both within and with-
out. If she be with Nouatianus, she was not with Cor-
nelius. But if she were with Cornelius, who succeeded
Fabianus, by lawful ordination, Nouatianus is not in
the Church. I purposely here speak only of ex-
ternal Communion with the Catholique Church.
For in this point there is great difference be-
tween internal acts of our Understanding, and
will; and of external deeds. Our Understanding
and Will are faculties (as Philosophers speake)
abstractiue, and able to distinguish, and as it
were, to part things, though in themthes they
be really conioyned. But reall externall deeds do
take things in grosse as they find them, not se-
parating things which in reality are tioyned to-
gether. Thus, one may consider and loue a sinner
as he is a man, fried, benefactor, or the like;
and at the same time not consider him, nor loue
him.
him as he is a sinner; because these are acts of our
Understanding, and Will, which may respect
their objects under some one formality, or con-
consideration, without reference to other things
contained in the selfe same objects. But if one
should strike, or kill a sinnefull man, he will not
be excused, by alledging, that he killed him, not
as a man, but as a sinner; because the selfe same
person being a man, and the sinner, the externall
act of murder fell jointly upon the man, & the
sinner. And for the same reason one cannot
avoyde the company of a sinner, and at the
same time be really present with that man who
is a sinner. And this is our case: and in this our
Aduersaries are egregiously, and many of them
affectedly, mistaken. For one may in some
points believe as the Church belieueth, and dis-
agree from her in other. One may love the truth
which she holds, and detest her, (pretended) cor-
rupctions. But it is impossible that a man should
really separate himselfe from her externall
Communion, as she is corrupted, and be really
within the same externall Communion as she
is found; because she is the selfe same Church
which is supposed to be found in some things,
and to err in others. Now, our question for the
present doth concern only this point of exter-
nal Communion: because Schisme, as it is distin-
guished from Heresy, is committed when one di-
untes himselfe from the Externall Communion
of that Church with which he agrees in Fayth;
Wheras
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Whereas Herety doth necessarily imply a difference in matter of Fayth, and believe: and therefore to say, that they left not the visible Church, but her errors, can only excuse them from Heresy (which shall be tried in the next Chapter) but not from Schisme, as long as they are really diviued from the External Communion of the selfsame visible Church; which, notwithstanding those errors wherein they do in judgment dilet from her, doth still remaine the true Catholique Church of Christ; and therefore while they fortake the corrupted Church, they forfake the Catholique Church. Thus then it remaineth cleere, that their chiefest Anwer changeth the very state of the Question; confoundeth internall acts of the Understanding with external Deeds; doth not distinguish between Schisme and Heresy; and leaueth this demonstrated against them: That they divided themselves from the Communion of the visible Catholique Church, because they conceaued that she needed Reformation. But whether this pretence of Reformation will acquit them of Schisme, I refer to the vnpartial Judges here-

(n) Num. 8. tofore (n) alledged; as to S. Irenæus who plainly sayth: They cannot make any so important RE-
FORMATION, as the Euiil of the Schisme is penurious. To S. Denis of Alexandria, laying:
Certainly all things should be endured rather then to consent to the division of the Church of God: those Martyrs being no lisse gloriouns that expose themselues
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... to hinder the dismembering of the Church, then those that suffer rather than they will offer sacrifice to Idols. To S. Augustine, who tells vs: That not to heare the Church, is a more grievous thing then if he were striken with the sword, consumed with flames, exposed to wildbeasts. And to conclude all in few words, he giueth this generall prescription: There is no just necessity, to divide Unity. And D. Potter may remember his owne words: There neither was (s) nor can be any just cause to depart from the Church of Christ, no more then from Christ himselfe. But I haue shewed that Luther, and the rest departed from the Church of Christ (if Christ had any Church vpon earth:) Therefore there could be no just caual of Reformacion, or what else soeuer to do as they did, and therefore they must be contented to be held for Schismatics.

Moreover; I demand whether those corruptions which moved them to forsake the Communion of the visible Church, were in manners, or doctrine? Corruption in manners yields no sufficient cause to leave the Church, otherwise men must go not onely out of the Church, but out of the world, as the Apostle (t) layth. Our blessed Saviour foretold that (t) 1 Cor. 5: there would be in the Church tares with to, choice corn, & sinners with just men. If then Protestants waxe zealous, with the Servants to pluck up the weeds, let them first harken to the word of the Master: Let both grow up.

And
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And they ought to imitate them, who as S. Augustine faileth: tolerate for the good of Unity, that which they desist for the good of Equity. And to whome the more frequent, and foule such scandals are, by so much the more is the merit of their perseverance in the Communion of the Church, and the Martyrdome of their patience, as the same Saint calls it. If they were offended with the life of some Ecclesiastical persons, must they therefore deny obedience to their Pastours, and finally breake with Gods Church? The Pastour of Pastours, teacheth vs (w) another lesson: Upon the Chaire of Moses have sitten the Scribes & Pharises. All things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you, observe yee, & doe yee: but according to their workes do yee not. Must people except agaynst lawes, and reuolt from Magistrates, because some are negligent, or corrupt in the execution of the same lawes, and performance of their office? If they intended Reformation of manners, they vied a strange means for the achieving of such an end, by denying the necessity of Confession, laughing at austerity of penance, condemning the vows of Chastity, pouerty, obedience, breaking faits, &c. And no lesse vsfit were the Men, then the Meanes. I loue not recrimination. But it is well knowne to how great crimes, Luther, Calvin, Zwinglius, Beza, and other of the prime Reformers were notoriously obnoxious; as might be easily demonstrated by the only transcribing of what
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what others have delivered upon that subject; whereby it would appeare, that they were very farre from being any such Apostolical men as God is wont to vse in so great a worke. And whereas they were wont, maliciously to exaggerate the faults of some Clergy men, Erasmus said well (Epist ad fratres inferioris Germaniae,) Let the riot, lust, ambition, avarice of Priests, and whatsoever other crimes be gathered together. Hereby alone doth exceed all this filthy lake of vices. Besides, nothing at all was omitted by the sacred Counsell of Trent which might tend to reformation of manners. And finally the vices of others are not hurtfull to any but such as imitate, and consent to them; according to the saying of S. Augustine: We conserve (y) innocency, not by knowing the ill deeds of men, but by not yielding consent to such as we know, and by not judging rashly of such faults as we know not. If you anwere, that, not corruption in manners, but the approbation of them, doth yield sufficient cause to leave the Church; I reply with S. Augustine; That the Church doth (as the pretended Reformers ought to haue done) tolerate or beare with scandals and corruptions, but neither doth, nor can approve them. The Church (sayth he) being placed (z) be- twixt much chaffe and cockle, doth beare with many things; but doth not approve, nor dissemble, nor acd those things which are against faith, and good life. But because to approve corruption in manners

\( \text{Aa}^2 \)
Part. I. Charity maintained as lawfull, were an error against Fayth, it belongs to corruption in doctrine, which was the second part of my demand.

19. Now then, that corruptions in doctrine (I still speake upon the vntrue supposition of our Aduersaries) could not afford any sufficient cause, or colourable necessity to depart from that visible Church, which was extant when Luther rofe, I demonstrate out of D. Potters own confession; that the Catholique Church neither hath, nor can err in points fundamentall, as we shewed out of his owne expresse words, which he also of set purpose deliuereth in divers other places; and all they are obliged to maintain the same who teach that Christ had alwayes a visible Church vpon earth: because any one fundamentall error overthrowes the being of a true Church. Now (as Schoolemen speake) it is, implicatio in terminis (a contradiction to plaine, that one word destroyeth the other, as if one should say, a living dead man) to affirme that the Church doth not err in points necessary to salvation, or damnably; & yet that it is damnable to remaine in her Communion because she teacheth errors which are confessed not to be damnable. For if the error be not damnable, nor against any fundamentall Article of Fayth, the believe therof cannot be damnable. But D. Potter teacheth, that the Catholique Church cannot, and that the Roman Church hath not erred against any fundamentall Article of Fayth:
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Fayth: Therefore, it cannot be damnable to remaine in her Communion; and so the pretended corruptions in her doctrine could not induce any obligation to depart from her Communion, nor could excuse them from Schisme, who upon pretence of necessity in point of conscience, forsooke her. And D. Potter will never be able to value a manifest contradiction in these his words: To depart from the Church (a) of Rome (a) Tit. 75: in some Doctrines, and practices, there might be necessary cause, though she wanted nothing necessary to salvation. For if, notwithstanding these doctrines and practices, she wanted nothing necessary to salvation; how could it be necessary to salvation to fortake her? And therefore we must still conclude that to fortake her, was properly an act of Schisme.

20. From the same ground of the in-fallibility of the Church in all fundamentall points, I argue after this manner. The visible Church cannot be forfaken, without damna-
tion, upon pretence that it is damnable to remaine in her Communion, by reason of corrup-
tion in doctrine; as long as, for the truth of her Fayth and believe, she performeth the duty which she oweth to God, and her Neighbour: as long as she performeth what our Saviour exacts at her hands: as long as she doth, as much as lies in her power to do. But (even according to D. Potter's Assertions) the Church performeth all these things, as long as she eth not in points
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points fundamentall, although they were supposed to err in other points not fundamentall. Therefore, the Communion of the Visible Church cannot be forsaken without damnation upon pretence that it is damnable to remaine in her Communion, by reason of corruption in doctrine. The Major, or first Proposition of it selfe is evident. The Minor, or second Proposition doth necessarily follow out of D. Potter's owne doctrine aboue rehearsed, That the promises of our Lord made to his Church for his assistance, are to be (b) extended only to points of Fayth, or fundamentall: (Let me note herewith by the way that by his (Or,) he seemes to exclude from Fayth all points which are not fundamentall, & so we may deny innumerable Texts of Scripture:) That, It is (c) comforit enough for the Church, that the Lord in mercy will secure her from all capital dangers &c. but she may not hope to triumph over all sinne and error, till she be in heaven. For it is evident, that the Church (for as much as concerns the truth of her doctrines and believe) owes no more duty to God and her Neighbour; neither doth our Saviour exact more at her hands, nor is it in her power to do more then God doth assist her to doe; which assitance is promised only for points fundamentall; and consequently as long as she reacheth no fundamentall error, her Communion cannot without damnation be forsaken: And we may fitly apply against D. Potter a Concionatory declamation which
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which he makes against vs, where he sayth: May (d) pag. 221.

the Church of after-Ages make the narrow way to
heaven, narrower then our Saviour left it &c? since
he himselfe obligeth men vnder paine of dam-
nation to forsaie the Church, by reason of er-
rors against which our Saviour thought it
needles to promise his assistance, and for which
he neither denieth his grace in this life, or glory
in the next. Will D. Potter oblige the Church to
do more then she may euen hope for? or to per-
ferme on earth that which is proper to heaven
alone?

21. And as from your owne doctrine
concerning the infallibility of the Church in
fundamentall points, we have proued that it
was a grieuous sinne to forsaie her: so doe
we take a strong argument from the fallibili-
ty of any who dare pretend to reforme the
Church, which any man in his wits will
believe to be induced with at laef as much infa-
llibility as proueate men can challenge: and D.
Potter expressly affirme that Christ's promis-
es of his assistance are not intende(e) to any par-
ticuler persons or Churches: and therefore to leaue
the Church by reason of errors, was at the best
hand but to flit from one erring company to
another, without any new -ope of triumphing
over errors, and without necessity, or vtility
to forsaie that Communion of which S. Augu-

(f) Ep. conz.

(d) Parmen. lib.

2. cap. ii.

Stine sayth, There is (f) no inst necessity to divisive V-

uity. Which will appeare to be much more cui-
dent
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dent if we consider that though the Church had
maintained some false doctrines, yet to leave
her Communion to remedy the old, were but
to add a new increase of errors, arising from
the innumerable disagreements of Sectaries,
which must needs bring with it a mighty malfe
of falsehoods, because the truth is but one, & in-
dissoluble. And this reason is yet stronger, if we
still remember that even according to D. Potter
the visible Church hath a blessing not to err in
points fundamental, in which any private Re-
former may faile: and therefore they could not
pretend any necessity to forsaake that Church,
out of whole Communion they were exposed
to danger of falling into many more, and even
into damnable errors. Remember I pray you,
what your selfe affirmes (Pag. 6,) where speak-
ing of our Church and yours, you say: All the
difference is from the seeds, which remaine there, and
here are taken away; Yet neither here perfectly, nor
everywhere alike. Behold a faire cession of cor-
ruptions, still remayning in your Church, which
you can only excuse by saying they are not fun-
damental, as likewise those in the Roman Church
are confessed to be not fundamental. What
man of judgment wilbe a Protestant, since that
Church is confessedly a corrupt One?

22. I still proceed to impugne you expressly
upon your grounds. You say: that it is comfor-
t enough for the Church, that the Lord in mercy will
secure her from all capital dangers: but she may not
hope
By Catholiques. Chap. v.  185

hope to triumph over all sinne, and error till she be in heaven. Now if it be comfort enough to be secured from all capital dagers, which can arise only from error in fundamental points: why were not your first Reformers content with enough, but would needs dismeber the Church, out of a pernicious greedines of more then enough? For, this enough, which according to you is attained by not erring in points not fundamental was enjoyed before Luther's reformation, unless ye will now against your selfe affirm, that long before Luther there was no Church free from error in fundamental points. Moreover if (as you say,) no Church may hope to triumph over all error till she be in heaven; You must either grant that errors not fundamental cannot yield sufficient caule to forsake the Church, or els you must affirm that all Communities may, & ought to be forsaken, & so there wilbe no end of Schisme: or rather indeed there can be no such thing as Schisme, because according to you, all Communities are subject to errors not fundamental, for which if they may be lawfully forsaken, it followeth cleereely that it is not Schisme to forsake them. Lastly, since it is not lawfull to leave the Communion of the Church for abuses in life and manners, because such misteries cannot be avoided in this world of temptation: and since according to your Assertion no Church may hope to triumph over all sinne and error; You must grant, that as

B b    the
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The ought not to be left by reason of sinne; so
neither by reason of errors not fundamental,
because both sinne, & error are (according to
you) impossible to be avoided til she be in heane.

23. Furthermore, I ask whether it be the
Quantity or Number; or Quality, and Greatnes
of doctrinal errors that may yield sufficient
cause to relinquish the Churches Communion?
I prove that neither. Not the Quality, which is
supposed to be beneath the degree of points
fundamentall, or necessary to salvation. Not the
Quantity or Number: For the foundation is
strong enough to support all such unnecessary additions, as you term them. And if they once
weighed so heavily as to overthrow the founda-
tion, they should grow to fundamentall er-
rors, into which your selfe teach the Church
cannot fall. Hay and stubble (say you;) and such
profitable stuff, laid on the roofe, destroys not
the house, whilest the maine pillars are standing on
the foundation. And tell vs, I pray you, the pre-
cise number of errors which cannot be toler-
ated? I know you cannot do it; and therefore be-
ing uncertaine, whether or no you have cause to
leave the Church, you are certainly obliged not
to forfaile her. Our blessed Saviour hath decla-
red his will, that we forgive a private offender
even sevene sevenen times, that is, without limita-
tion of quantity of time, or quality of trespasses;
and why then dare you allege his command,
that you must not pardon his Church for er-
rors,
errors, acknowledged to be not fundamentall? What excuse can you faigne to yourselves, who for points not necessary to salvation, have been occasions, causes, and authors of so many mischieves, as could not but unavoidably accompany so huge a breach in kingdoms, in Common wealths, in private persons, in publique Magistrates, in body, in soul, in goods, in life, in Church, in the state, by Schisms, by rebellions, by war, by famine, by plague, by bloodshed, by all sorts of imaginable calamities upon the whole face of the Earth, wherein as in a map of Delolation, the heauness of your crime appears, under which the world doth pant?

24. To say for your excuse, that you left not the Church, but her errors, doth not extenuate, but aggravate your sinne. For by this devise you sow seeds of endless Schisms, & put into the mouth of all Separatists, a ready answer how to awoide the note of Schisme from your Protestant Church of England, or from any other Church whatsoever. They will, I say, answer, as you do prompt, that your Church may be forsaken, if she fall into errors, though they be not fundamentall: And further, that no Church must hope to be free from such errors; which two grounds being once laid, it will not be hard to infer the consequence, that she may be forsaken.

25. From some other words of D. Potter I likewise prove, that for Errors not fundamentall,
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tall, the Church ought not to be ouitaken. There
neither was (layth he) nor can be (h) any just cause
to depart from the Church of Christ, no more then
from Christ himselfe. To depart from a particular
Church, & namely from the Church of Rome, in some
doctrines & prachises, there might be just and neces-
sary cause, though the Church of Rome wanted no-
thing necessary to salvation. Marke his doctrine,
that there can be no just cause to depart from the
Church of Christ; and yet he teacheth that the
Church of Christ may erre in points not funda-
mentall; Therefore (say I ) we cannot forsake
the Roman Church for points not fundamental,
for then we might also forsake the Church of
Christ, which your selfe deny: and I pray you
consider whether you do not plainely contra-
dict your selfe, while in the words above reci-
ted, you say there can be no just cause to forsake
the Catholique Church; and yet that there may
be necessary cause to depart from the Church
of Rome, since you grant that the Church of
Christ may erre in points not fundamentall; &
that the Roman Church hathered only in such
points; is by and by we shall see more in parti-
cular. And thus much be said to disprove their
chiselft Answeres, that they left not the Church,
but her Corruptions.

26. Another euasion D. Potter bringeth, to
avoid the imputation of Schisme, and it is be-
dause they still acknowledge the Church of
Rome to be a Member of the body of Christ, and
not
not cut off from the hope of salvation. And this (sayth he) clears us from (1) the imputation of Schism, whose property it is, to cut off from the Body of Christ, and the hope of salvation, the Church from which it separates.

27. This is an Answer which perhaps you may get some one to approve, if first you can put him out of his wits. For what prodigious doctrines are these? Those Protestants who believe that the Church erred in points necessary to salvation, and for that cause left her, cannot be excused from damnable Schism: But others who believed that she had no damnable errors, did very well, yea were obliged to forake her: and (which is more miraculous, or rather monstrous) they did well to forake her formally and precisely, because they judged, that she retained all means necessary to salvation. I say, because they so judged. For the very reason for which he acquiteth himself, and condemneth those others as Schismatiques, is because he holdeth that the Church which both of them forsooke, is not cut off from the Body of Christ, and the hope of salvation; whereas those other Zealots deny her to be a member of Christ's Body, or capable of salvation, wherein alone they disagree from D. Potter: for in the effect of separation they agree, only they do it upon a different motive or reason. Were it not a strange excuse if a man would think to cloake his rebellion, by alleging that he held the person against whom he
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he rebelled to be his lawful Soueraygne? And D. Potter thinkes himselfe free from Schisme, because he forsooke the Church of Rome, but yet so, as that till he held her to be the true Church, and to have all necessary means to Salvation. But I will no further urge this most solemn folly, and doe much more willingly put all Catholiques in mind, what an unspakeable comfort it is, that our Adversaries are forced to confess, that they cannot cleare themselves from Schisme, otherwise then by acknowledging that they do not, nor cannot cut off from the Hope of salvation our Church. Which is as much as if they should in plain terms say: They must be damned, vnlesse we may be sa-
ued. Moreover this evasion doth indeed con-
demne your zealous Brethren of Heresy, for de-
nying the Churches perpetuity, but doth not cleare your selfe from Schisme, which consists in being divided from that true Church, with which a man agreeeth in all points of fauth, as you must profess your selfe to agree with the Church of Rome in all fundamentall Articles. For otherwise you should cut her off from the hope of salvation, and so condemn your selfe of Schisme. And lastly even according to this your owne definition of Schisme, you cannot cleare your selfe from that crime, vnlesse you be content to acknowledge a manifest contradic-
tion in your owne Assertions. For if you do not cut vs off from the Body of Christ, and the Hope of
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of salvation; how come you to lay in another place that you judge a reconciliation with vs to be (k) damnable? That to depart from the church of Rome, there might be just and necessary (l) caus: ? That, they that have the understanding and means to discover their error, and neglect to use them (m) we dare not flatter them (say you) with so easy a censure, of hope of salvation? If then it be (as you lay) a property of Schisme, to cut off from the hope of salvation the Church from which it separates: how will you cleere your selfe from Schisme, who dare nor flatter vs with so easy a censure? and who affirm that a reconciliation with vs is damnable? But the truth is, there is no constancy in your Assertions, by reason of difficulties which press you on all sides. For, you are loath to affirm cleerly that we may be fau- ced, least such a grant might be occasion (as in all reason it ought to be) of the conversion of Protestants to the Roman Church: And on the other side, if you affirm that our Church erred in points fundamentall, or necessary to salvation, you know not how, nor where, nor among what Company of men, to find a perpetuall visible Church of Christ before Luther. And therefore your best shift is to lay, and unsay as your occasions command. I do not examine your Assertion that it is the property of Schisme to cut of from the Body of Christ, and the hope of salvation, the Church from which it separates; wherefore you are mightily mistaken, as appears by your
your owne example of the Donatists, who were most formal and proper Heretiques, and not Schismatiques, as Schisme is a vice distinct from Heresy. Besides although the Donatists, & Luciferians (whom you also alleag) had byn meere Schismatiques, yet it were against all good Logick, from a particular to inter a generall Rule, to determine what is the property of Schisme.

28. A third deute I find in D. Peter to cleere his Brethren from Schisme. There is (sayth he) great difference betweene, a Schisme from them, and a Reformation of our selves.

29. This I confesse is a quarrant subtiltitty, by which all Schisme, and Sinne may be as well excuted. For what dwell incarnate could meere by pretend a separation, and not rather some other motinge of vertue, truth, profit, or pleasure? But now since their pretended Reformation consisted, as they gave out, in forsaking the corruptions of the Church, the Reformation of themselves, and their division from vs, falls out to be one, and the selfe same thing. Nay, we see that although they infintly disagree in the particulars of their reformation, yet they symbolize, and consent in the generall point of forsaking our pretended corruptions: An evident signe, that the thinge, upon which their thoughts first pitched, was not any particulars, Modell, or Idea of Religion, but a settled resolution to forsake the Church of Rome. Wherefore this Metaphysicall Speculation, that they inten-
intended only to reforme themselves, cannot possibly excuse them from Schism, vnlesse first they be able to prove, that they were obliged to depart from vs. Yet for as much as concerns the fact itselfe; it is cleere, that Luthers revolt did not proceed from any zeale of Reformation: The motions which put him upon so wretched, and unfortunate a worke, were Courtousnes, Ambition, Lust, Pride, Enuy, and grudging that the promulgation of Indulgences was not committed to himselfe, or such as he desired. He himselfe taketh God to witnessse, that he fell into these troubles casually, and against his will (not upon any intention of Reformation) not so much as dreaming or suspecting any change which might happen. And he began to preach (against Indulgences) when he knew not what the matter meant. For (layth he) I scarce understood then what the name of Indulgences meant. In so much as afterwards Luther did much mislike of his owne undertaken course, oftentimes (layth he) wishing that I had never begunne that busines. And Fox layth: It is apparent that Luther promised Cardinal Cajetan to keepe silence, provided also his adversaries would co-oper. M. Cooper reporteth further, that Luther by his letter submitted himselfe to the Pope, so that he might not be compelled to recant. With much more, which may be leene in. But this is sufficient to shew, that Luther was far enough from intending any Reformation. And
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If he judged a Reformation to be necessary, what a huge wickedness was it in him, to promote silence if his adversaries would do the like? Or to submit himselfe to the Pope, so that he might not be compelled to recant? Or if the Reformation were not indeed intended by him, nor judged to be necessary, how can he be excused from damnable Schisme? And this is the true manner of Luther's reason, taken from his owne acknowledgments, and the words of the more ancient Protestants themselves, whereby D. Potter's faltering, & mincing the matter is clearly discovered, and confuted. Upon what motiues our Countrey was divorced from the Roman Church by king Henry the Eight, and how the Schisme was continued by Queene Elizabeth, I have no harte to rip vp. The world knoweth, it was not upon any zeale of Reformation.

But you will prove your former euasion by a couple of humilitudes: If a Monastery should reforme itselfe, and should reduce into prattise ancient good Discipline, when others would not; in this case could it in reason be charged with Schisme from others, or with Apostacy from its rule and order? Or as in a society of men universally infected with some disease, they that should free themselves from the common disease, could not be therefore said to separate from the society: so neither can the reformed Church. So truly accused for making a Schisme from the Church, seeing all they did was to reforme themselves.
I was very glad to find you in a Monastery, but sorry when I perceived that you were inuencating wayes how to forfake your Vocation, and to maintaine the lawfulness of Schisme from the Church, and Apostasy from a Religious Order. Yet before you make your finall resolution here a word of advice. Put those that a Monastery did confessedly obserue their substantiall vows, and all principal Statutes, or Constitutions of the Order, though with some neglect of lesser Monasticall Obeuances: And that a Reformation were undertaken, not by authority of lawfull Superiours, but by some One, or very few in comparison of the rest: And those few knowne to be led, not with any Spirit of Reformation, but by some other finaster intention: And that the Statutes of the howse were even by those busy-fellowes confessed, to have been time out of mind understood, and practised as now they were: And further that the pretended Reformers acknowledged that themselves as soone as they were gone out of their Monastery, must not hope to be free from those or the like errors and corruptions, for which they left their Brethren: And (which is more) that they might fall into more enormous crimes than they did, or could do in their Monastery, which we suppose to be secur'd from all substantiall corruptions, for the annoyding of which they have an infallible assistance. Put (I say) together all these my And's, and
and then come with your If's, if a Monastery should reform it selfe &c. and tell me, if you could excuse such Reformers from Schisme, Sedition, Rebellion, Apostasy, &c? What would you say of such Reformers in your Colledge? or tumultuous persons in a kingdom? Remember now your owne Tenets, and then relect how fit a similitude you have picked out, to prove your selfe a Schismatique. You teach that the Church may err in points not fundamentall, but that for all fundamentall points she is secured from error. You teach that no particular person, or Church hath any promise of assistance in points fundamentall. You, and the whole world can witness that when Luther began, he being but only one, opposed himselfe to All, as well subjects as superiours; and that euen then, when he himselfe confessd that he had no intention of Reformation: You cannot be ignorant but that many chiefe learned Protestants are forced to confess the Antiquity of our doctrine and practice, and doe in feuerall, and many Controversies, acknowledge that the Ancient Fathers stood on our side: Consider I say these points, and see whether your similitude do not condemn your Progenitors of Schisme from God's visible Church, yea and of Apostasy also from their Religious Orders, if they were vowed Regulars, as Luther, and diuers of them were.

32. From the Monastery you are fled into an Hospitall of persons universally infected with some
some disease, where you find to be true what I supposed, that after your departure from your Brethren you might fall into greater inconveniences, and more infectious diseases, then those for which you left them. But you are also upon the point to abandon these miserable needy persons, in whole behalfe for Charities sake, let me set before you these considerations. If the disease nether were, nor could be mortall, because in that Company of men God had placed a Tree of life: If going thence, the sick man might by curious tasting the Tree of Knowledge eat poisonous under pretence of bettering his health: If he could not hope thereby to avoid other diseases like those for which he had quitted the company of the first infected men: If by his departure innumerable mischiefs were to ensue; could such a man without senselessness be excused by saying, that he sought to free himself from the common disease, but not forfooth to separate from the society? Now your selfe compare the Church to a man deformed with superfluous fingers and toes, but yet who hath not lost any vital part: you acknowledge that out of her society no man is secured from damnable error, and the world can beare witnesse what unpeakeable mischiefs and calamities ensued Luther's revolt from the Church. Pronounce then concerning the, the same sentence which even now I haue shewed them to deserve who in the manner aforefayd should separate from
Part. I. Charity maintained by persons universally infected with some disease.

33. But alas, to what pass hath Hereby brought men, who term themselves Christians, & yet blush not to compare the beloved Spouse of our Lord, the one Dove, the purchase of our Saviour's most precious blood, the holy Catholique Church, I mean that visible Church of Christ which Luther found spread over the whole world; to a Monastery so disordered that it must be forsaken; to the cryans in Gath much deformed with superfluous fingers and toes; to a society of men universally infected with some disease? And yet all these comparisons, & much worse, are neither injurious, nor undervalued, if once it be granted, or can be proved, that the visible Church of Christ may err in any one point of Faith, although not fundamental.

34. Before I part from these similitudes, one thing I must observe against the censure of D. Potter, that they left not the Church, but her corruptions. For as those Reformers of the Monastery, or those other who left the company of men universally infected with some disease, would deny themselves to be Schismatiques, or any way blame-worthy, but could not deny, but that they left the said Communities: So Luther and the rest cannot so much as pretend, not to have left the visible Church, which according to them was infected with many diseases, but can only pretend that they did not sinne in leaving her. And you speake very strangely when
when you lay: In a Society of men universally infected with some disease, they that should free themselves from the Common disease, could not be therefore said to separate from the Society. For if they do not separate themselves from the Society of the infected persons; how do they free themselves & depart from the common disease? Do they at the same time remain in the company, and yet depart from those infected creatures? We must then lay, that they separate themselves from the persons, though it be by occasion of the disease: Or if you lay, they free their own persons from the common disease, yet so, that they remain still in the Company infected, subject to the Superiors and Gouernours thereof, eating & drinking & keeping publique Assemblies with them; you cannot but know, that Luther and your Reformers the first pretended free persons from the supposed common infection of the Roman Church, did not so: for they endeavoured to force the Society whereof they were parts, to be healed and reformed as they were: and if it refused, they did, when they had forces, drive them away, even their Superiors both spiritual and temporall, as is notorious. Or if they had not power to expell that supposed infected Community, or Church of that place, they departed from them corporally, whence mentally they had forsaken before. So that you cannot deny, but Luther forsook the external Co-munion, and Company of the Catholique Church,
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Church, for which as your selfe (z) confesse, there neither was nor can be any just cause, no more then to depart from Christ himselfe. We do therefore inferre, that Luther and the rest who forsooke that visible Church which they found upon earth, were truly, and properly Schismatiques.

35. Moreover, it is evident that there was a diuision betwenee Luther and that Church which was Visible when he arose: but that Church cannot be said to have deuised her selfe from him, before whose tyme she was, & in comparison of whom she was a Whole, and he but a part: therefore we must say, that he deuised himselfe & went out of her; which is to be a Schismatique, or Heretique, or both. By this argument, Optatus Melititanus poueth, that not Cacilianus, but Parmenianus was a Schismatique, saying: For, Cacilianus went (z) not out of Maiorinus thy Grandfather, but Maiorinus from Cacilianus: neither did Cacilianus depart from the Chayre of Peter, or Cyprian, but Maiorinus, in whose Chayre thou sittest, which had no beginning before Maiorinus. Since it manifestly appeareth that these things were acted in this maner, it is cleare that you are heires both of the delinuerers vp (of the holy Bible to be burned) and also of Schismatiques. The whole argument of this holy Father makes directly both against Luther, and all those who continue the diuision which he began; and proues: That, going out, convinceth those who
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who go out to be Schismatiques; but not those from whom they depart: That to forsake the Chaire of Peter is Schisme; yea, that it is Schisme to erect a Chaire which had no origin, or as it were predeceasour, before it selfe: That to continue in a division begun by others, is to be Heires of Schismatiques: and lastly; that to depart from the Communion of a particular Church (as that of S. Cyprian was) is sufficient to make a man incurre the guilt of Schisme, and consequently, that although Protestants, who deny the Pope to be supreme Head of the Church, do thinke by that Heresie to cleere Luther frō Schismes, in disobeying the Pope: Yet that will not ferue to free him from Schisme, as it importeth a division from the obedience, or Communion of the particular Bishop, Diocesse, Church, & Countrey, where he liued.

36. But it is not the heresy of Protestants, or any other Sectaries, that can deprive S. Peter, and his Successours, of the authority which Christ our Lord conferred upon them over his whole militant Church: which is a point confessed by learned Protestants to be of great Antiquity, and for which the judgement of divers most ancient holy Fathers is reproved by them, as may be seen at large in Breuerley (b) exactly citing the places of such chiefe Protestants. And we must say with S. Cyprian: Heresies (c) have sprung, and Schismes been bred from no other cause. (c) Epist. 59: then for that the Priest of God is not obeyed, nor one D d
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Priest and judge is considered to be for the time in the Church of God. Which words do plainly condemn Luther, whether he will understand them as spoken of the Universal, or of every particular Church. For he withdrew himself both from the obedience of the Pope, and of all particular Bishops, and Churches. And no less clearly is the Idyd Optatus Melitutanus, saying: Thou canst not deny (d) but that thou knowest, that in the City of Rome, there was first an Episcopal Chaire placed for Peter, wherein Peter the head of all the Apostles sat, whereof also he was called Cephas; in which one Chaire Unity was to be kept by all, least the other Apostles might attribute to themselves, each one his particular Chaire; and that he should be a Schismatic and sinner, who against that one single Chaire should erect another. Many other Authorities of Fathers might be alluded to this purpose, which I omit, my intention being not to handle particular controversies.

37. Now, the arguments which hitherto I have brought, prove that Luther, and his followers were Schismatiques, without examining (for as much as belongs to this point) whether or no the Church can err in any one thing great or small, because it is universally true, that there can be no just cause to forsake the Communion of the Visible Church of Christ, according to S. Augustine, saying: It is not possible (e) that any may have just cause to separate their Communion, from the Communion of the Whole

(d) Lib 2. Cont. Parm.

(e) Ep. 48.
Whole world, and call themselves the Church of Christ, as if they had separated themselves from the Communion of all Nations upon just cause. But since indeed the Church cannot erre in any one point of doctrine, nor can approve any corruption in manners; they cannot with any colour avoid the just imputation of eminent Schisme, according to the verdict of the same holy Father in these words: The most manifest (§) Sacrilege of Schisme is eminent, when there was no cause of separation.

38. Lastly, I prove that Protestants cannot avoid the note of Schisme, at least by reason of their mutual separation from one another. For most certain it is that there is very great difference, for the outward face of a Church, and profession of a different faith, between the Lutherans, the rigid Calvinists, and the Protestants of England. So that if Luther were in the right, those other Protestants who invented Doctrines far different from his, and divided themselves from him, must be reputed Schismatiques: and the like argument may proportionably be applied to their further divisions, and subdivisions. Which reason I yet urge more strongly out of D. Potter, (3) who affirms, that to him & to such as are convicted in conscience of the errors of the Roman Church, a reconciliation is impossible, and damnable: And yet he teacheth, that their difference from the Roman Church, is not in fundamental points. Now, since 2-
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among Protestants there is such diversity of belief, that one denieth what the other affirmeth, they must be convicted in conscience that one part is in error (at least not fundamentall) and, if D. Potter will speake consequently, that a reconciliation between them is impossible: and what greater diuision, or Schisme can there be, then when one part must judge a reconciliation with the other to be impossible, and damnable?

39. Out of all which premises, this conclusion followes: That, Luther & his followers were Schismatiques; from the vnseuertail visible Church; from the Pope Christ's Vicar on earth, and Successour to S. Peter; from the particular Diocese in which they receiued Baptisme; from the Countrey or Nation to which they belonged; from the Bishop vnder whom they liued; many of them from the Religious Order in which they were Professed; from one another; And lastly from a mans selfe (as much as is possible) because the selfe same Protestant to day is convicted in conscience, that his yesterday's Opinion was an error (as D. Potter knowes a man in the world who from a Puritan was turned to a moderate Protestant) with whom therefore a reconciliation, according to D. Potter grounds, is both impossible, and damnable.

40. It seemes D. Potter's last refuge to excuse himselfe and his Brethren from Schisme, is because they proceeded according to their conscience, dictating an obligation vnder damnation.
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tion to forfayke the errors maintayned by the Church of Rome. His words are: Although we confess the (b) Church of Rome to be (in some sense) (h) Pag. 81: a true Church, and her errors to some men not damnable: yet for us who are convinced in conscience, that the errors in many things, a necessity lies upon us, each under paine of damnation, to forfayke her in those errors.

41. I answere: It is very strang, that you judge us extremely Uncharitable, in saying, Protestants cannot be faued; while your selfe aouch the name of all learned Catholiques, whom ignorance cannot excuse. If this your pretence of conscience may servye, what Schismatique in the Church, what popular seditious braine in a kingdome, may not alledge the di-aemen of conscience to free themselves from Schisme, or Sedition? No man wishes them to do any thing against their conscience, but we say, that they may, and ought to rectifie, and deposite such a conscience, which is easy for them to do, euen according to your owne affirmation; that we Catholiques want no means necessary to saluation. Ealy to do? Nay not to do so, to any man in his right wits must seme impossible. For how can these two apprehensions stand togethe: In the Roman Church I enjoy all means necessary to saluation, and yet I cannot hope to befaued in that Church? or, who can contoine in one braine (not crack't) these affertions? After due examination I judge the Roman er-

D d 3 ers
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Errors not to be in themselves fundamental, or damnable; and yet I judge that according to true reason, it is damnable to hold them? I say according to true reason. For if you grant your conscience to be erroneous, in judging that you cannot be saved in the Roman Church, by reason of her errors, there is no other remedy, but that you must rectify your erring conscience, by your other judgment, that her errors are not fundamental, nor damnable. And this is no more Charity, than you daily afford to such other Protestants as you term Brethren, whom you cannot deny to be in some errors, unless you will hold, that of contradictory propositions both may be true, & yet you do not judge it damnable to live in their Communion, because you hold their errors not to be fundamental. You ought to know, that according to the doctrine of all Deuines, there is great difference between a speculative persuasion, and a practical dictamen of conscience; and therefore although they had in speculation conceived the visible Church to erre in some doctrines, of themselves not damnable; yet with that speculative judgement they might, & ought to have entertained this practical dictamen, that for points not substantiall to sayth, they neither were bound, nor lawfully could break the bond of Charity, by breaking unity in Gods Church. You say that, bay & stubble (1) and such unprofitable stuffe ( as are Corruptions in points not
By Catholiques. Chap. v. not fundamental flayd on the rooffe, deftruys not the house, whilst the maine pillars are standing on the foundation. And you would thinke him a madman who to be rid of such stuffe, would set his house on fire, that he might walk in the light, as you teach that Luther was obliged to forfiate the house of God, for an unnecessary light, not without a combustion formidable to the whole Christian world; rather then beare with some errors, which did not destroy the foundation of faith. And as for others who entred in at the breach first made by Luther, they might, & ought to have guided their consciences by that most reasonable rule of Vincentius Lyrinensis, delivered in these words. Indeed it is a matter of great moment, and both most profitable to be learned, & necessary to be remembered, & which we ought againe and againe to illustrate, and inculcate with mighty heaps of examples, that almost all Catholiques may know, that they ought to receive the Doctours with the Church, and not forfiate the faith of the Church with the Doctours: And much lesse should they forfiate the faith of the Church to follow Luther, Calvin, and such other Novelists. Moreover though your first Reformers had conceiued their owne opinions to be true; yet they might, and ought to have doubted, whether they were certain: because your selfe affirm me, that infallibility was not promised to any particular Persons, or Churches. And since in cases of uncertainties, we are not to leaue our Superior, nor cast off his.
Part. Charity maintained his obedience, or publicly oppose his decrees; your Reformers might easily have found a safe way to satisfy their zealous conscience, without a public breach: especially if with this their uncertainty, we call to mind the peaceable possession, and prescription which by the confession of your own Brethren, the Church, & Pope of Rome did for many ages enjoy. I wish you would examine the works of your Brethren, by the words your selfe lets downe to free S. Cyprian from Schisme: every syllable of which words convinceth Luther, and his Co-partners to be guilty of that crime, and sheweth in what manner they might with great ease, & quietnes have rectified their conscience about the pretended errors of the Church. S. Cyprian (say you) was a peaceable (1) and modest man; dissented from others in his judgement, but without any breach of Charity; condemned no man (much less any Church) for the contrary opinion. He believed his own opinion to be true, but believed not, that it was necessary, and therefore did not proceed rashly and peremptorily to censure others, but left them to their liberty. Did your Reformers imitate this manner of proceeding? Did they censure no man, much less any Church? S. Cyprian believed his own opinion to be true, but believed not that it was necessary, and therefo therefore did not proceed rashly, and peremptorily to censure others. You believe the points wherein Luther differs from vs not to be fundamental, or necessary; and why do you not thence
therefore infer the like THEREFORE, he should not have proceeded to censure others? In a word, since their disagreement from us concerned only points which were not fundamental, they should have believed that they might have been deceived, as well as the whole visible Church, which you say may err in such points; and therefore their doctrines being not certainly true, and certainly not necessary, they could not give sufficient cause to depart from the Communion of the Church.

42. In other places you write so much, as may prove us to prove that Luther, and his followers ought to have deplored, and rectified their consciences: As for example, when you say: *When the Church (m) hath declared her selfe (m) pag.105, in any matter of opinion, or of Rites, her declaration obliges all her children to peace, and external obedience. Nor is it fit, or lawful for any private man to oppose his judgement to the publick;* (as Luther and his fellows did) *He may offer his opinion to be considered of, so he do it with evidence, or great probability of Scripture, or reason, and very modestly, still containing himself within the dutifull respect which he oweth but if he will factiously advance his own conceits (his owne conceits? and yet grounded upo evidence of Scripture) & despite the Church so farre as to cut of her Communion; he may be suitly branded, and condemned for a Schismatic, yea and an Heretique also in some degree, & in foro exteriori, though his opinion were true, and much more if it be falsi.
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false. Could any man, even for a Fee, have spoken more home to condemn your Predecessors of Schisme, or Heresy? Could they have stronger Motives to oppose the doctrine of the Church, and leave her Communion, than evidence of Scripture? And yet, according to your own words, they should have answered, and justified their conscience, by your doctrine, that though their opinion were true, and grounded upon evidence of Scripture, or reason; yet it was not lawfull for any private man to oppose his judgment to the publique, which obligeth all Christians to peace and external obedience: and if they cast of the communion of the Church for maintaining their own conceits, they may be branded for Schismatiques, and Heretiques in some degree, and in suo exteriori, that is, all other Christians ought to esteem of them, (and why then are we accounted uncharitable for judging so of you?) and they also are obliged to behave themselves in the face of all Christian Churches, as if indeed they were not Reformers, but Schismatiques, and Heretiques, or as Pagans, and Publicans. I thank you for your ingenuous confession, in recompence whereof I will do a deed of Charity by putting you in mind, into what labyrinths you are brought, by teaching that the Church may err in some points of faith, and yet that it is not lawfull for any man to oppose his judgment, or leave her Communion, though he have evidence of Scripture. against
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gainst her. Will you have such a man dissemble against his conscience, or externally deny a truth known to be contained in holy Scripture? How much more coherently do Catholiques proceed, who believe the universal infallibility of the Church, and from thence are assured that there can be no evidence of Scripture, or reason against her definitions, nor any just cause to fortake her Communion? M. Hooker esteemed by many Protestants an incomparable man, yields as much as we have alluded out of you. The will of God is (layth he) to have (n) Preface to them do whatsoever the sentence of judiciaall and fi- his books of small decision shall determine, yet though it seeme in Ecclesiastical their private opinion, to swerve utterly from that which is right. Doth not this man tell Luther what the will of God was, which he transgressing must of necessity be guilty of Schisme? And must not M. Hooker either acknowledge the universal infallibility of the Church, or else drive men into the perplexities and labynaths of dissembling against their conscience, whereof now I spake? Not unlikethis, is your doctrine deluded elsewhere. B. for the Nicene Council (lay you) many (o) good Catholique Bishops were of (o) pag. 131. the same opinion with the Donatists, that the Baptisme of Hieretiques was ineffectual; and with the Novatians, that the Church ought not to absolve some grievous sinners. These errors therefore (if they had gone no further) were not in themselves Hieretical, especially in the proper, and most heayy, or bitter sense.
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sense of that word; neither was it in the Churches intention (or in her power) to make them such by her declaration. Her intention was to silence all disputes, and to settle peace and unity in her government: to which all wise and peaceable men submitted, whatsoever their opinion was. And those factious people, for their unreasonable and uncharitable opposition, were very justly branded for Schismatiques. For us, the Mistaeker will never prove that we oppose any declaration of the Catholique Church &c. and therefore he doth unjustly charge us either with Schisme, or Heresy. These words manifestly condemn your Reformers who opposed the visible Church in many of her declarations, Doctrines, and Commands imposed upon them, for silencing all disputes, and settling peace and unity in the govern-ment, and therefore they still remaining obstinately disobedient, are justly charged with Schisme, and Heresy. And it is to be observed that you grant the Donatisis to have been very justly branded for Schismatiques, although their opposition against the Church did concern (as you hold) a point not fundamentally to the Faih, and which according to S. Augustine cannot be proved out of Scripture alone; and therefore either doth evidently convince that the Church is universally infallible, even in points not fundamentally, or else that it is Schisme to oppose her declarations in those very things wherein she may err; and consequently that Luther, and his fellows were Schismatiques, by opposing the visible
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visible Church for points not fundamentall, thought it were (truly) supposed that the erred in such points. But by the way, how come you on the luddaine to hold the determination of a Generall Councell (of Nice) to be the declaration of the Catholique Church, seeing you teach, That Generall Councels may erre even fundamentally? And do you now say, with vs, that to oppose the declaration of the Church is sufficient that one may be branded with Heresy, which is a point so often impugned by you?

43. It is therefore most evident, that no pretended scruple of conscience could excuse Luther, which he might, and ought to have rectified by means inowse, if Pride, Ambition, Obstinate &c. had given him leave. I grant he was touched with scruple of conscience, but it was because he had forlaken the visible Church of Christ; and I beseech all Protestants for the love they beare to that sacred ransom of their soules, the Blood of our blessed Saviour, attentively to ponder, and unpartially to apply to their owne conscience, what this Man spoke concerning the feelings, and remorse of his. How often (saith he) did my trembling heart (p) beat within me, and reprehending me, objected against me that most strong argument; Art thou only wise? Do so de abroge many worlds erre? Were so many ages ignorant? What if thou errest, and dravest so many into hell to be damned eternally with thee? And in another place he saith: Dost thou who art but One, and of no (q)
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account, take upon thee so great matters? What, if thou, being but one, offendest? If God permit such, so many, and all to err, why may he not permit thee to err? To this belong those arguments, the Church, the Church, the Fathers, the Fathers, the Councils, the Councils, the customs, the multitudes and greatness of wise men. Whom do not these Mountains of arguments, these clouds, yea these seas of Examples overthrow? And these thoughts wrought to deeps in his foule, that he often wished and desired that he had (r) never begun this business: wishing yet further that his Writings were burned, and buried (s) in eternall oblivion. Behold what remorse Luther felt, and how he wanted no strength of malice to Crosse his owne conscience: and therefore it was no scruple, or conceived obligation of conscience, but some other motives which induced him to oppose the Church. And if yet you doubt of his courage to encounter, and strength to master all reluctions of conscience, heare an example or two for that purpose. Of Communion vnder both kinds, thus he sayth: If the Counsell (t) should in any case decree this, least of all would we then use both kinds, yea rather in a spirit of the Counsell, and that Decree, we would use either but one kind only, or neither, and in no case both. Was not Luther perswaded in conscience, that to use neither kind was against our Saviours command? Is this only to offer his opinion to be considered of, as you said all men ought to do? And that you may be sure that he spake from his heart.
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heart, and if occasion had been offered, would have been as good as his word; marke what he saith of the Elevation of the Sacrament: I did know the Elevation of the Sacrament to be idolastrically; yet nevertheless I did retain it in the Church at Wittenberge, so the end I might see the diuell, Caro
dius Was not this a conscience large and capacious enough, that could swallow Idolatry? Why would he not tolerate Idolatry in the Church of Rome (as these men are wont to blaspheme) if he could retain it in his owne Church at Wittenberge? If Caro
dius, Luther of spring, was the Diuell who but him else must be his damme? Is Almighty God wont to send such furies to preach the Ghospell? And yet further (which makes most directly to the point in hand) Luther in his Booke of abroga
ting the Primate Masse, exhorts the Augustines Fears of Wittenberg, who first abrogated the Masse, that euen against their conscience ac
cusing them, they should perf. in what they had begun, acknowledging that in some things he him selfe had done the like. And Ioannes Marhe
ts a Lutheran Preacher sayth. Antonius Majus, the Parish Priest of Roeltz, recounted to me that on a time he heartily warned himselfe to the Do
er (he meanes Luther) that he himselfe could not believe what he preached to others: And that D. Lu
ther answered; praise and thankes be to God, that this happens also to others, for I had thought it had hap
pened only to me. Are not these conscionable, and
Part 1. Charity maintained fit Reformers? And can they be excused from Schisme vnder pretence that they held themselves oblige to forlache the Roman Church? If then it be damnable to proceed against ones conscience, what will become of Luther, who against his conscience persisted in his division from the Roman Church?

44. Some are said to flatter themselves with another pernicious conceit, that they (for tooth) are not guilty of sinne; Because they were not the first Authors, but only are the continuers of the Schisme, which was already begunne.

45. But it is hard to believe, that any man of judgment, can thinke this excuse will subsist, when he shall come to give vp his finall accpt. For according to this reason, no Schisme will be damnable, but only to the Beginners: Whereas contrarily, the longer it continues, the worse it grows to be, and at length degenerates to Heresy as wine by long keeping grows to be Vinegar, but not by continuance returns againe to his former nature of wine. Thus S. Augustine faith, that Her sy is (x) Schisme immeasure. And in another place: We owe to you only the (y) crime of Schisme, which you have also made to become Heresy by cruel persecuting therein. And S. Hieronymayth: Though Schisme (z) in the beginning may be in some sort understood to be different from heresy; yet there is no Schisme which doth not cause to it frise some Heresy, that it may seeme to have departed from the Church.

(x) Lib. 2. cont. Creft.
(y) Ep 164.
(z) Upon these words as fit. 3. Hereticum hominem est.
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Church upon just cause. And lo indeed it falleth out. For men may beginne upon passion, but afterward by instinct of corrupt nature seeking to maintaine their Schisme as lawfull, they fall into some Herely, without which their Separation could not be justified with any colour, as in our present case the very affirming that it is lawfull to continue a Schisme unlawfully begunne, is an error against the maine principle of Christianity, that it is not lawfull for any Christian to live out of God's Church, within which alone Salvation can be had; Or, that it is not damnable to disobey her Decrees, according to the words of our Saviour: If he shall not heare (a) the Church, let him be to thee as a Pagan or Publican. And, He (b) that despiseth you, despiseth me. We heard above Optatus Milevitanus saying to Parmenianus, that both he, and all those other who continued in the Schisme begun by Maiorinus, did inherit their Forefathers Schisme; and yet Parmenianus was the third Bishop after Maiorinus in his Sea, and did not begin but only continue the Schisme. For (sayth this holy Father) Cæcilianus (c) went not out of Maiorinus thy Grand-Father, but Maiorinus from Cæcilianus: neither did Cæcilianus depart from the Chaire of Peter, or Cyprian, but Maiorinus, in whose Chaire thou sittest, which before Maiorinus (Luther) had no beginning. Seeing it is evident that those things passed in this manner (that, for example, Luther departed from the Church, and not the Church from
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Luther) it is cleere that you be HEIR ES both of the givers up of the Bible to be burned: and of SCHISMATIQUES. And the Regall Power, or example of Henry the Eight could not excuse his Subjectes from Schisme according to what we have heard out of CHrysostome laying: Nothing doth so much provoke: (d) the wrath of Almighty God, as that the Church should be diuided. Although we should do innumerable good deeds, if we diuide the full Ecclesiastical Congregation, we shall be punished no lesse, then they who did rend his (naturall) Body; for that was done to the gaine of the whole world, though not with that intention: but this hath no good in it at all, but that the greatest hurt riseth from it. These things are spoken not only to those who be in office, but to such also as are governed by them. Behold therefore, how liable both Subjectes, and Superiours are to the sinne of Schisme, if they breake the unity of God's Church. The words of S. Paul can in no occasion be verified more then in this of which we speake. They who do such things (e) are worthy of death: and not only they that do them, but they also that consent with the doers. In things which are indifferent of their owne nature, Custome may be occasion, that some act not well begun, may in time come to be lawfully continued. But no length of Time, no Quality of Persons, no Circumstance of Necessity can legitimate actions which are of their owne nature vnlawfull: and therefore diuision from Christes mysticall Body, being of the number of those
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those actions, which Deuines teach to be intrinsicum, cuvil of their owne nature and essence, no

difference of Persones or Time can ever make it
lawfull. D. Potter sayth: There neither was, nor
can be any cause to depart from the Church of Christ,
no more then from Christ himselfe. And who dares
say, that it is not damnable to continue a Separa-
tion from Christ? Prescription cannot in con-
sience ruine, when the first beginner, and his
Successors are conscious that the thing to be
prescribed, for example goods or lands, were un-
justly possessed at the first. Christians are not
like strays, that after a certaine time of wan-
dring from their right home, fall from their ow-
er to the Lord of the Soile; but as long as they
retaine the indeleble Character of Baptisme, and
live upon earth, they are obliged to acknowled-
ge submission to God's Church. Human Lawes
may come to nothing by discontinuance of
Time, but the Law of God, commaundying vs
to continue Vnity in his Church, doth still re-
maine. The continued disobedience of Chi-
dren cannot deprive Parents of their paternall
right, nor can the Grand-child be undutiful to
his Grand-Father, because his Father was
unnatural to his owne Parent. The longer
God's Church is disobeyed; the profession of
her Doctrine denied, her Sacraments neglected;
her Liturgie condemned; her Vnity violated; the
more grievous the fault growes to be: as the
longer a man withholds a due debt, or retains

Ft 2

his
Part. I. Charity maintained his Neighbours goods, the greater injustice he commits. Constancy in evil doth not extenuate, but aggravate the same, which by extension of Time, receiveth increase of strength, & addition of greater malice. If these mens conceits were true, the Church might come to be wholly divided by wicked Schismes, and yet after some space of time, none could be accused of Schisme, nor be obliged to returne to the visible Church of Christ: and so there should remaine no one true visible Church. Let therefore these men who pretend to honour, reuerence, & believe the Doctrine, and practise of the visible Church, and to condemn their forefathers who folooke her, and say they would not have done so, if they had liued in the dayes of their Fathers, and yet follow their example in remaining divided from her Communion; consider, how truly these words of our Saviour fall upon them. Woe be to you, because ye build (f) the Prophets sepulchers, and garnish the monuments of just men, and say: If we had been in our Fathers dayes, we had not been their fellows in the blood of the Prophets. Therefore you are a testimony to your owne sences, that you are the sonnes of them that killed the Prophets; and fill up the measure of your Fathers.

46. And thus haung demonstrated that Luther, his Associates, and all that continue in the Schisme by them begunne, are guilty of Schisme, by departing from the visible true Church of Christ; it remaineth that we examine what is
particular was that visible true Church, from which they departed, that so they may know to what Church in particular they ought to returne; and then we shall have performed what was proposed to be handled in the fifth Point.

47. That the Roman Church (I speake not for the present, of the particular Dioces of Rome, but of all visible Churches dispersed throughout the whole world, agreeing in faith with the Chaire of Peter, whether that Sea were supposed to be in the City of Rome or in any other place:) That (I say) the Church of Rome, in this sense, was the visible Catholique Church out of which Luther departed, is proved by your owne Confession, who assigne for notes of the Church, the true Preaching of Gods Church, and due Administration of Sacraments, both which for the substance you cannot deny to the Roman Church, since you confess that the wa-it-ed nothing fundametall, or necessary to Sal-va-tion; and for that very cause you thinke to cleare your selfe from Schisme, whose propery, as you say, is to cut off from the Body of Christ and the Hope of Salvation, the Church from which it se-parates. Now that Luther and his fellowes were borne and baptized in the Roman Church, and that the was the Church out of which they de-parteled, is notoriously knowne: And therefore you cannot either of from the Body of Christ, & Hope of Salvation, unless you will acknowledge your selfe to deserve the just imputation of Schis-
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Nether can you deny her to be truly Catholique by reason of (pretended) corruptions, not fundamentall. For your selfe auouch, and endeavour to prove, that the true Catholique Church may erre in such points. Moreover, I hope you will not so much as go about to prove, that when Luther role, there was any other true visible Church, disagreeing from the Roman, & agreeing with Protestants in their particular doctrines: and you cannot deny but that England in those dayes agreed with Rome, and other Nations with England: And therefore eyther Christ had no visible Church upon Earth, or else you must grant that it was the Church of Rome. A truth to manifest, that those Protestants who affirm the Roman Church to have lost the Nature & being of a true Church, do by inevitable consequence grant, that for divers Ages Christ had no visible Church on Earth: from which error, because D. Potter, doth say meth, he must of necessity maintain, that the Roman Church is free from fundamentall, and damnable error, and that she is not cut off from the Body of Christ, and the Hope of Salvation: And if (faith he) any Zealots amongst us have proceeded (h) to heavier censures, their zeal may be excused, but their Charity and wisdom cannot be justified.

48. And to touch particulars which perhaps some may object. No man is ignorant that the Grecians, even the Schismaticall Grecians, do in most points agree with Roman Catholiques,
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ques, &c. all agree from the Protestant Reformation. They teach Transubstantiation (which
point D. Pater also confesseth;) Invocation
of Saints, and Angels; veneration of Reliques,
and Images; Auricular Confession; enjoyned
Satisfaction; Confirmation with Chrisme;
Extreme-vation; All the seauen Sacraments;
Prayer, Sacrifice, Almes for the dead; Monas-
chisme; That Priests may not marry after their
Ordination. In which points that the Greci-
ans agree with the Roman Church appeareth
by a Treatise published by the Protestant Deur-
nes of Wittenberg, intituled, Acta Theologorum
Wittenbergensium, & Jeremiah Patriarchae Constan-
inop. de Augstana Confessione Sc. Wittenbergae
(k) De statu
anno 1584 by the Protestant (k) Grisinius, & by
Religion of the West. And I wonder with what
coUar of truth, (to say no worse) D. Pater could
affirm that the Doctrines debated between the
Protestants (l) & Rome, are only the partial & particu-
lar fancies of the Roman Church; unless happily the
opinion of Transubstantiation may be excepted, wherein
the latter Grecians seeme to agree with the Romanists.
Beside the Protestant Authors already cited,
Peter Arcadius a Grecian and a learned Catho-
lique Writer, hath published a large Volume,
the Argument and Title whereof is: Of the agree-
ment of the Roman, and Grecian Church in the seauen
Sacraments. As for the Heresy of the Grecians,
that the Holy Ghost proceeds not from the
Sonne
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Sonne, I suppose that Protestants disavow them in that error, as we doe.

49. D. Potter will not (I think) so much wrong his reputation, as to tell vs, that the Waldenses, Wicetiffes, Husses, or the like were Protestants, because in some things they disagreed from Catholiques. For he well knowes that the example of such men is subject to these manifest exceptions. They were not of all Ages, nor in all Countries, but confined to certaine places, and were interrumped in time, against the notion and nature of the word Catholique. They had no Ecclesiasticall Hierarchy, nor Succession of Bishops, Priests, and Pastours. They differed among themselves, and from Protestants also. They agreed in divers things with vs against Protestants. They held doctrines manifestly absurd and damnable heresies.

50. The Waldenses begun not before the yeare 1218. so far were they from Universality of all Ages. For their doctrine: first, they denied all Judgments which extended to the drawing of blood, and the Sabbath, for which cause they were called In-sabbatists. Secondly, they taught that Lay men, and women might conereate the Sacrament, and preach (no doubt but by this means to make their Master, Waldo, a meere lay man, capable of such functions.) Thirdly, that Clergy men ought to have no possessions, or proprieties. Fourthly, that there should be no diuision of Parishes, nor Churches,
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OHES, for a walled Church they reputed as a
barne. Fiftly, that men ought not to take an
oath in any case. Sixtly, that those persons sin-
ned mortally, who accompanied without hope
of issue. Seavenly, they held all things done a-
bove the girdle, by kissing, touching, words,
comprehension of the breasts, &c. to be done in
Charity, and not against Continency. Eightly,
that neither Priest, nor cuill Magistrate, being
guilty of mortal sinne did enjoy their dignity,
or were to be obeyed. Ninthly, they conden-
med Princes, and Judges. Tenthly, they affir-
med singing in the Church to be an hellish cla-
mor. Eleavenly, they taught that men might
dissemble their Religion, and to accordingly
they went to Catholique Churches, dissem-
bling their Fayth, and made Offertories, con-
fessions, and communions after a dissembling
manner. Waldo was so vnlearned, that (sayth (m) Mon. pag.
Fox ) he gaue rewards to certaine learned men 628.
to translate the holy Scripture for him, and be-
ing thus holpen did (as the same Fox there re-
porteth ) confer the forme of religion in his time to
the infallible word of God. A godly example, for
such as must needs haue the Scripture in En-
glish, to be read by every simple body, with such
fruit of godly doctrine, as we have seen in the
foresaid grosse heresies of Waldo. The followers
of Waldo, were like their Master, so vnlearned, (n) Ibi.4.
that some of them (sayth (n) Fox ) expounded the
words, Isai. 1. Sui cum non receperunt : Skynne did
G g
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not receive him. And to conclude, they agreed in
inducing things with Catholiques against Prote-
stants, as may be seen in (o) Beverley.

51. Neither can it be pretended, that these
are flanders, forged by Catholiques. For, be-
des that the same things are testified by Pro-
etant Writers, as Ilyrius, Cowper, &c. others, our
Authors cannot be suspected of partiality in
disfavour of Protestants, unless you will say
perhaps, that they were Prophets, and some
hundred years ago, did both foresee that there
were to be Protestants in the world, and that
such Protestants were to be like the Waldenses.
Besides, from whence, but from our Histories
are Protestants come to know, that there were
any such men as the Waldenses? and that in some
points they agreed with the Protestants, and
disagreed from them in others? And upon what
ground can they believe our Authors for that
part wherein the Waldenses were like to Prote-
stants, and imagine they lyed in the rest?

52. Neither could Wicliffe continue a Church
neuer interrupted from the time of the Walden-
ses, after whom he lived more then one hun-
dred and fifty yeares, to wit, the yeare 1371. He
agreed with Catholiques about the worhip-
ping of Reliques, and Images: and about the In-
tercession of our blessed Lady, the ever Imma-
culate Mother of God, he went so far as to say,

It seems some (p) impossible, that we should be re-
warded without the intercession of the Virgin Mary.

He
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He held saucen Sacraments, Purgatory, and other points. And against both Catholicques and Protestants he maintained sundry damnable doctrines, as divers Protestant Writers relate. As first: If a Bishop or Priest be in deadly sinne, he doth not indeed either giue Orders, Consecrate, or Baptize. Secondly, That Ecclesiastical Ministers ought not to have any temporall possessions, nor propriety in any thing, but should beg; and yet he himselfe brake into herefey because he had beene depruied by the Archbishop of Canterbury of a certaine Benefice; as all Schismes, & herefies begin upon passion, which they seek to couer with the cloake of Reformation. Thirdly, he condemned lawfull Oaths, like the Anabaptists. Fourthly, he taught that all things came to passe by absolute necessity. Firstly, he defended human merits as the wicked Pelagians did, namely, as proceeding from natural forces, without the necessary help of God's grace. Sixtly, that no man is a Civill Magistrate, while he is in mortall sinne: and that the people may at their pleasure correct Princes, when they offend; by which doctrine he prooves himselfe both an Heretique, and a Traytoure.

53. As for Husse, his chiefeft Doctrines were: That Lay people must receive in both hands; and That Civill Lords, Prelates, and Civill Lords, Prelates, and Bishops loose all right, and authority, while they are in mortall sinne: For other things he wholly agreed with Catholicques against Protestants;
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and the Bohemians his followers being demand
ed, in what points they disagreed from the
Church of Rome, propounded only these: The
necessity of Communion under both kinds; That all
iudicial Dominion was forbidden to the Clergy: That
Preaching of the word was free for all men, and in
all places; That open Crimes were in no wise to be per
mitted for avoiding of greater euill. By these particu
larso, it is apparant, that Husse agreed with
Protestants against vs, in one only point of both
Kinds, which according to Luther is a thing in
different; because he teacheth that Christ in this
matter (q) commanded nothing as necessary. And
he fayth further: If thou come to a place (t) where
one only kind is adninistered, use one kind only, as oth
ers do. Melancthon likewise holds it a thing
indifferent: and the same is the opinion of
some other Protestants. All which considered,
it is clear that Protestants cannot challenge the
Waldenses, Wicclife, and Husse for members of
their Church: & although they could, yet that
would aduantage them little towards the finding
out a perpetuall visible Church of theirs, for the reasons aboue (t) specified.

54. If D. Potter, would go so farre off, as to
fetch the Musconites, Armenians, Georgians, Aethiopians, or Abyssines into his Church, they
would proue ouer deare bought: For they eather hold the damnable heresy of Eutiches, or
vre Circumcision, or agree with the Grecke, or Roman Church. And it is most certayne that they
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they have nothing to do with the doctrine of Protestants.

55. It being therefore granted that Christ had a visible Church in all ages, and that there can be none assigned but the Church of Rome; it followeth that she is the true Cath. Church; and that those pretended Corruptions for which they forsooke her, are indeed divine truths, delivered by the visible Catholique Church of Christ: And, that Luther and his followers departed from her, and consequently are guilty of Schisme, by dividying themselves from the Communion of the Roman Church. Which is cleeerely convinced out of D. Potter himselfe, although the Roman Church were but a particular Church. For he saith: Whosoever professes (u) himself to forsake the Communion of any one meber of the body of Christ, must confess himselfe consequently to forsake the whole. Since therefore in the same place he expressly acknowledges the Church of Rome to be a member of the Body of Christ, and that it is cleere they haue forsaken her; it evidently followes, that they haue forsaken the whole, and therefore are most properly Schismatiqnes.

56. And lastly, since the crime of Schisme is so grievous, that according to the doctrine of holy Fathers rehearsed above, no multitude of good works, no morall honesty of life, no cruel death endured even for the profession of some Article of faith can excuse any one who is guil-
Part 1. Charity maintained by of that sinne from damnation; I leave it to be considered, whether it be not true Charity to speake as we believe, and to believe as all Aniquity hath taught vs, That whatsouer eyther begins, or continues a division for the Roman Church, which we haue proued to be Christ's true Militant Church on earth, cannot without effectuall repentance hope to be a membre of his Triumphant Church in heauen. And so I conclude with these words of blessed Saint Augustine: It is common to all Heretiques to be unable to see that thing which in the world is the most manifest, and placed in the light of all Nations; out of whose Unity whatsoever they werke, though they seeme to doe it with great care and diligence, can no more availe them against the wrath of God, then the Spiders web against the extremity of cold. But now it is high tyme that we treat of the other sort of Division from the Church, which is by Heresie.

CHAP.
CHAP. VI.

That Luther, and the rest of Protestants, have added Heresy unto Schisme.

BEC AUSE Vice is best known by the contrary Virtue, we cannot well determine what Heresy is, nor who be Heretiques, but by the opposite vertue of Fayth, whose Nature being once understood as farre as belongs to our present purpose, we shall passe on with ease to the definition of Heresy, and so be able to discerne who be Heretiques. And this I intend to do, not by entring into such particular Questions as are controverted betweene Catholiques and Protestants, but only by applying some generall grounds, eyther already proued, or els yielded to, on all sides.

2. Almighty God having ordayned Man to a supernaturall End of Beatitute by supernaturall means; it was requisite that his Understanding should be enabled to apprehend that End, and
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and Means by a supernatural knowledge. And because if such a knowledge were no more then probable, it could not be able sufficiently to overbear our Will, & encounter with human probabilities, being backed with the strength of flesh and blood; it was further necessary, that this supernatural knowledge should be most certaine and infallible; and that Fayth should believe nothing more certainely then that it selfe is a most certaine Belief, and so be able to beate downe all gay probabilities of humane Opinion. And because the aforelayd Means and End of Beatificall Vision, do farre exceed the reach of naturall wit, the certainty of Fayth could not alwayes be joyned with such evidence of reason, as is wont to be found in the Principles, or conclusions of humane natural Sciences: that so all flesh might not glory in the arme of flesh, but that he, who glories, should glory (a) in our Lord. Moreover, it was expedient that our belief, or assent to divine truths, should not only be vnknowne, or incident by any humane discourse, but that absolutely also it should be obscure in itselfe, and (ordinarily speaking) be void euem of supernatural evidence; that so we might have occasion to actuate, and testify the obedience which we owe to our God, not only by submitting our Will to his Will and Commandes, but by submitting also our Understanding to his Wisdome & Words, captuating (as the Apostle speakes) the same Understanding (b) to the Obedience of Fayth:
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Fayth: Which occasion had been wanting, if Almighty God had made cleere to vs, the truths which now are certainly, but not evidently presented to our minds. For where Truth doth manifestly open it selfe; not obedience, but necessity comands our assent. For this reason, Deuines teach, that the Obiects of Fayth being not euident to humane reason, it is in mans power not only to abstaine from believing, by suspending our Judgement, or exercing no act one way or other; but also to disbelieve, that is, to believe the contrary of that which Fayth proposeth; as the examples of innumerable Arch-heretiques can beare witnes. This obscurity of fayth we learne from holy Scripture, according to those words of the Apostle. Fayth is the (c) substance of things to be hoped for, the argument of things not appearing. And, We see by a glasse (d) in a darke manner: but when face to face. And, accordingly S. Peter layth: Which you do well attending unto, as to (e) a Candle shining in a darke place.

3. Fayth being then obscure (wherby it differeth from naturall Sciences) and yet being most certaine and infallible (wherin it surpasseth humane Opinion) it must rely vpon some motiue and ground, which may be able to give it certainty, and yet not release it from obscuritie. For if this motiue, ground, or formall Obiect of Fayth, were any thing euidently presented to our understanding, and if also we did euidently know,
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know, that it had a necessary connection with
the Articles which we believe, our assent to
such Articles could not be obscure, but evident;
which, as we said, is against the nature of our
Fayth. If likewise the motive or ground of our
fayth were obscurely propounded to us, but were
not in itselfe infallible, it would leave our assent
in obscurity, but could not endue it with
certainty. We must therefore for the ground of
our Fayth, find out a motive obscure to us, but
most certaine in it selfe, that the act of Fayth
may remaine both obscure, and certaine. Such a
motive as this, can be no other but the divine Au-
thority of almighty God, rewealing, or speaking
those truths which our Fayth believes. For it is
manifest, that God's infallible testimony may
transfusse Certainy to our Fayth, and yet not
draw it out of Obscurity; because no humane dis-
course, or demonstration can cuince, that God
rewealeth any supernaturall Truth, since God
had been no lesse perfect then he is, although he
had neuer rewealed any of those objects which
we now believe.

4. Neuertheles,because Almighty God out
of his infinite widsome and sweetnes, doth con-
cur with his Creatures in such sort as may befit
the temper, and exigence of their natures; and
because Man is a Creature endued with reason,

(f) Rom. 13.

God doth not exact of his Will or Understan-
ding any other then,as the Apostle Fayth, rati-
onable (f) Obsewium, an Obedience, sweetened

with
With good reason, which could not so appeare, if our Vnderstanding were sumnowed to beliue with certainty, things no way represended as infallible and certaine. And therefor Almighty God obliging vs Vnder paine of eternal damnation to beliue with greatest certainty divers verities, not knowne by the light of naturall reason, cannot faile to furnish our Vnderstanding with such inducements, motiues, and arguments as may sufficiently persuade any mind which is not partiall or passionate, that the objectes which we believe, proceed from an Authority so Wise, that it cannot be deceived, and so Good that it cannot deceive; according to the words of David: Thy Testimonies are made credible exceedingly. These inducements are by Deuines, called argumenta credibilitatis, arguments of credibility, which though they cannot make vs evidently see what we believe, yet they evidently convince that in true wisdome, and prudence, the objectes of fayth deserue credit, and ought to be accepted as things revealed by God. For without such reasons & inducements our judgment of fayth could not be conceived prudent, holy Scripture telling vs, that, he who sonce believes, is light of hart. By these arguments and inducements our Vnderstanding is both satisfied with evidence of credibility, and the objectes of fayth retaine their obscurity, because it is a different thing to be evidently credible, and evidently true; as those who were present at the
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Miracles wrought by our blessed Saviour, & his Apostles, did not evidently see their doctrine to be true (for then it had not beene Faith but Science, and all had beene necessitated to believe, which we see fell out otherwise) but they were evidently convinced, that the things confirmed by such Miracles, were most credible, and worthy to be imbraced as truths revealed by God.

5. These evident Arguments of Credibility are in great abundance found in the Visible Church of Christ, perpetually existing on earth. For, that there hath been a company of men professing such and such doctrines, we have from our next Predecessors, and these from theirs upward, till we come to the Apostles, & our Blessed Saviour, which gradation is known by evidence of sense, by reading books, or hearing what one man delivers to another. And it is evident that there was neither cause, nor possibility, that men so distant in place, so different in temper, so repugnant in private ends, did, or could agree to tell one and the selfsame thing, if it had been but a fiction inuented by themselves, as ancient Tertullian well saith: How is it likely that so many (i) & so great Churches should err in one faith? Among many events there is not one issue, the error of the Churches must needs have varied. But that which among many is found to be One, is not mistaken, but delivered. Dare then any body say, that they erred who delivered it? With this never interrupted existence of the Church are joyned
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and the many and great miracles wrought by men of that Congregation or Church; the sanitation of the persons; the renowned victories over so many persecutions, both of all sorts of men, and of the infernal spirits; and lastly, the perpetual existence of so holy a Church, being brought up to the Apostles themselves, she comes to partake of the same assurance of truth, which they by so many powerful ways, did communicate to their Doctrine, and to the Church of their times, together with the divine Certainty which they received from our Blessed Saviour himself, revealing to Mankind what he heard from his Father; and so we conclude with Tertullian: We receive it from the Churches, the Churches (k) from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from his Father. And if we once interrupt this line of succession, most certainly made known by means of holy Tradition, we cannot conjoin the present Church, its doctrine, with the Church, and doctrine of the Apostles, but must invent some new means, and arguments sufficient of themselves to find out, and prove a true Church, and faith independently of the preaching, and writing of the Apostles; neither of which can be known but by Tradition, as is truly observed by Tertullian saying: I will prescribe, that there is no means to prove what the Apostles preached, but by the same Churches which they founded.

6. Thus then we are to proceed: By evidence
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of manifest and incorrupt Tradition, I know that there hath alwayes been a neuer interrupted Succession of men from the Apostles tyme, believning, professing, and practising such and such doctrines: By evident arguments of credibility, as Miracles, Sanctity, Unity &c. and by all those wayes whereby the Apostles, and our Blessedd Samour himlifes confirmed their doctrine, we are assured that what the sayd neuer interrupted Church propoeth, doth deserve to be accepted & acknowledged as a divine truth: By evidence of Sense, we see that the same Church propoeth such and such doctrines as divine truths, that is, as revealed and testified by Almighty God. By this divine Testimony we are infallibly assured of what we believe: and to the last period, ground, motive, and formal object of our Fayth, is the infallible testimony of that supreme Verity, which neither can deceyue, nor be deceived.

7. By this orderly deduction our Faith cometh to be endued with these qualities which we said were requisite thereto; namely Certainty, Obscurity, and Prudence. Certainty proceeds from the infallible Testimony of God propounded & conued to our understanding by such a mean, as is infallible in itself, and to us is evidently knowne that it propoeth this point or that, and which can manifestly declare in what sense it propoeth them which means we have proued to be only the visible Church of Christ.

Ob-
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Obscurity from the manner in which God speaks to Mankind, which ordinarily is such, that it doth not manifestly shew the person who speaks, nor the truth of the thing spoken. Prudence is not wanting, because our fayth is accompanied with so many arguments of Credibility, that every well disposed Understanding, may & ought to judge, that the doctrines so confirmed deserve to be believed, as proceeding from Authority.

8. And thus from what hath been said, we may easily gather the particular nature, or definition of Fayth. For, it is a voluntary, or free, infallible obscure ascent to some truth, because it is testified by God, & is sufficiently propounded to us for such: which proposal is ordinarily made by the visible Church of Christ. I say, Sufficiently propo-
sed by the Church; not that I purpose to dispute whether the proposal of the Church enter into the formall Obiect, or motive of Fayth: or whether an error be any hereby, formally and precisely, because it is against the proposition of the Church, as if such proposal were the formall Obiect of fayth, which D. Potter to no purpose at all, labours so very hard to disprove: But I only affirm, that when the Church proposes any Truth, as revealed by God, we are assured that it is such indeed; & so it instantly grows, to be a fit Obiect for Christian fayth, which enclines and enables vs, to believe whatsoever is duly presented, as a thing revealed by Almighty God. And in the same manner we are sure,
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Sure that whosoever opposeth any doctrine propos'd by the Church, doth thereby contradict a truth, which is testified by God: As when any lawfull Superior, notiseth his will, by the meanes, and as it were proposall of some faithfull messenger, the subject of such a Superior in performing, or neglecting what is deliver'd by the messenger, is laid to obey, or disobey his owne lawfull Superior. And therefore because the testimony of God is notified by the Church, we may, and we do most truly say, that not to believe what the Church proposeth, is to deny God's holy word or testimony, signified to us by the Church, according to that saying of S. Irenæus. We need not goe (m) to any other to seake the truth, which we may easily receive from the Church.

9. From this definition of fayth we may also know what Heresy is, by taking the contrary termes, as Heresy is contrary to Fayth, and say'ing: Heresy is a voluntary error against that which God hath revealed, and the Church hath proposed for such. Neither doth it import, whether the error concerne points in themselves great or small, fundamentall or not fundamentall. For more being required to an act of Vertue, then of Vice, if any truth though neuer so small may be believed by Fayth alone as we know it to be testified by divine revelation; much more will it be a formall Heresy to deny any least point sufficiently propos'd as a thing witnessed by God.
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10. This divine Faith is divided into Actual and Habitual. Actual Faith, or Faith actuated is when we are in act of consideration, and believe of some mystery of Faith; for example, that our Saviour Christ is true God, and Man, &c. Habitual Faith, is that from which we are denominated Faithfull, or Believers, as by actual Faith they are stiled Believing. This Habit of Faith is a Quality, enabling us most firmly to believe Objects above human discourse, and it remaineth permanently in our Soul, even when we are sleeping, or not thinking of any Mystery of Faith. This is the first among the three Theological Virtues. For Charity united vs to God, as he is infinitely Good in himself; Hope ties vs to him, as he is unspeakably Good in vs. Faith Joynes vs to him, as he is the Supreme immovable Verity. Charity relies on his Goodness, Hope on his Power; Faith on his divine Wisdom. From hence it followeth, that Faith being one of the Virtues which Deuines terme Infused (that is, which cannot be acquired by human wit, or industry, but are in their Nature & Essence, supernaturall) it hath this property; that it is not destroyed by little and little, (contrarily to the Habits, called acquisiti, that is, gotten by human endeavour, which as they are successively produced, so also are they lost successively, or by little and little) but it must either be consumed entire, or wholly destroyed. And since it cannot stand entire with any one act which is
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is directly contrary, it must be totally overthrown, and as it were demolished, and razed by every such act. Wherefore, as Charity or the Love of God is expelled from our soul by any one act of Hatred, or any other mortal sin against his divine Majesty: and as Hope is destroyed by any one act of voluntary Desperation: so Faith must perish by any one act of Heresy; because every such act is directly, and formally opposite therunto. I know that some sins which (as Deuines speake) are ex genero suo, in in their kind, grievous and mortal, may be much leisened, and fall to be venial, ob lepitatam materia, because they may happen to be exercised in a matter of small consideration; as for example, to steale a penny, is venial, although theft in his kind be a deadly sinne. But it is likewise true, that this Rule is not general for all sorts of sinnes; there being some so inexubably wicked of their owne nature, that no smallnes of matter, nor paucity in number, can defend them from being deadly sinnes. For, to give an instance, what Blasphemy against God, or voluntary false Oath is not a deadly sinne? Certainly, none at all, although the saluation of the whole world should depend vpon swearing such a falshood. The like hapneth in our present case of Heresy, the iniquity whereof reounding to the injury of God's supreme wisdom & Goodnes, is always great, & enormous. They were no precious stones which David (n) pickt out
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out of the water, to encounter Golias; and yet if a man take from the number but one, and say they were but foure, against the Scripture af
firming them to have beene six; he is instantly guilty of a damnable sinne. Why? Because by this substraction of one, he doth deprive God's word and Testimony of all credit and infallibility. For if either he could deceive, or be deceived in any one thing, it were but wieldome to suspect him in all. And seing every Heresy opposeth some Truth revealed by God; it is no wonder that no one can be excused from deadly, and damnable sinne. For if voluntary Blasphemy, and Perjury, which are opposite only to the infused Moral Virtue of Religion, can never be excused from mortall sinne: much lesse can Heresy be excused, which opposeth the Theological Virtue of Fayth.

11. If any object, that Schisme may seeme to be a greater sinne then Heresy; because the Virtue of Charity (to which Schisme is opposite) is greater then Fayth, according to the Apostle, saying: Now there remaine (O) Fayth, Hope, (O) I Cor. Charity; but the greater of these is Charity. S. Tho. 13. 13. was answered in these words: Charity hath two Objects: one principal, to wit, the Divine (P) Goodnes; (P) 2. 2. q. & another secondary, namely the good of our Neigh-39. ar. 2. bour; But Schisme and other sinnes which are committed against our Neighbour, are opposite to Charity in respect of this secondary good, which is lesse, then the object of Fayth, which is God; as he is the Prime

II 2
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Verity, on which Fayth doth rely; and therefore these
sinnes are lesse then Infidelity. He takes Infidelity
after a generall manner, as it comprehends Heresy,
and other vices against Fayth.

12. Having therefore sufficiently declared,
wherin Heresy consists; Let us come to proove
that which we proposed in this Chapter. Where
I desire, it be still remembred: That the visible
Catholique Church cannot erre damnably, as
D.Potter confesseth: And, that when Luther ap-
peared, there was no other visible true Church
of Christ disagreeing from the Roman, as we
have demonstrated in the next precedent
Chapter.

13. Now, that Luther & his followers cannot
not be excused from formall Heresy, I proove by
these reasons. To oppose any truth propounded
by the visible true Church as revealed by God,
is formall Heresy, as we have shewed out of the
definition of Heresy: But Luther, Calvin, and the
rest did oppose diuers truths propounded by
the visible Church as revealed by God; yea they
did therefore oppose her, because she propounded
as divine revealed truths, things which they
judged either to be false, or human inventions:
Therefore they committed formall Heresy.

14. Moreover, every Errour agaynst any
doctrine revealed by God, is damnable Heresy,
whether the matter in it selfe be great or small,
as I prooved before: and therefore cyther the
Protestants, or the Roman Church must be guilt-


ty of formall Heresie, because one of them must erre against the word & testimony of God: but you grant (perforce) that the Roman Church doth not erre damnably; & I add that she cannot erre damnably, because she is the truly Catholic Church, which you confesse cannot erre damnably: Therefore Protestants must be guilty of formall Heresy.

15. Besides, we have shewed that the visible Church, is Judge of Controuersey & therefore must be infallible in all her Proposals; which being once supposed, it manifestly followeth, that to oppose what she delueth as revealed by God, is not so much to oppose her, as God himselfe; and therefore cannot be excused from grievous Heresy.

16. Agayne, If Luther were an Heretique for those points wherein he disagreed from the Roman Church; All they who agree with him in those very points, must likewise be Heretiques. Now, that Luther was a formall Hereticke I demonstrate in this manner. To say, that God's visible true Church is not universal, but confined to one only place or corner of the world, is according to your owne expresse words (q) properly Heresy, agaynst that Article (9) Pag. of the Creed, wherein we profess to believe the holy 126. Catholic Church: And you brand Donatus with heresy, because he limited the universal Church to Africa. But it is manifest, and acknowledged by Luther himselfe, and other chief Protestants

that
It is evident, therefore, that Luther could not, when he
ordered those prayers after the Amy, receive her from us. But
there were other reasons for this: it is evident (Church)
that your places in all nations, which are included in the
measures Universal Church, is to receive your
which be many places for the Catholic Church, just
represented, being, in no part of the earth, except
the places where Luther's Reformation is another place, as far
as much our churches, and durable to the next
to the places which Luther's Reformation, or
not be confined to the City of Jerusalem, or
of holy Scripture; that the Church of Christ is
spread over the whole earth; much more may it be
seen with most admirable testimony and
therefore 1) of body, because it is approved by
these times, and 2) of its
also the Donatists. These are innumerable in places
itself, not in Africa, as these
keeps. If 2), Augustine in those times had
his Reformation cannot be excelled from
for which did contain Luther's body. Therefore
was connected to that complete of ground
not universally, nor spread over the world, but
and much more for divers a few before 26.
that Luther's Reformation when it first began
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he said, At the beginning I was alone, give vs an univercall Church. Therefore happy had he been, if he had then, and his followers would now, receive her from vs. And therefore we must conclude with the same holy Father, saying in another place of the univercall Church: She hath this (ε) most certaine marke, that she cannot be hidden. She is then knowne to all Nations. The See of Donatus is unknown to many Nations; therefore that cannot be she. The See of Luther (at least when he began, and much more before his beginning) was unknowne to many Nations, therefore that cannot be she.

17. And that it may yet further appeare how perfectly Luther agreed with the Donatists: It is to be noted, that they never taught, that the Catholique Church ought not to extend it selfe further then that part of Africa, where their faction raigned, but only that in fact it was so confined, because all the rest of the Church was prophane, by communicating with Caecilianus, whom they falsely affirmed to have beene ordained Bishop by those who were Traditours, or givers vp of the Bible to the Persecutours to be burned: yea at that very time they had some of their See residing in Rome, and sent thither one Victor, a Bishop, under colour to take care of their Brethren in that Citty, but indeed as Baronius(f) obserueth, that the world might (u) Anno account them Catholiques, by communicating with the Bishop of Rome, to communicate with whom
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whom was even taken by the Ancient Fathers as an assured signe of being a true Catholique. They had also, as S. Augustine witnesseth, a pretended Church in the house and territory of a Spanish Lady called Lucilla, who went flying out of the Catholique Church, because she had been justly checked by Caecilianus. And the same Saint speaking of the conference he had with Fortunius the Donatist, saith: Here did he first attempt to affirm that his Communion was spread over the whole Earth &c. but because the thing was evidently false, they got out of this discourse by confusion of language: whereby nevertheless they sufficiently declared, that they did not hold, that the true Church ought necessarily to be confined to one place, but only by mere necessity were forced to yield that it was so in fact, because their Sect which they held to be the only true Church was not spread over the world. In which point Fortunius, and the rest were more modest, then he who should affirm that Luther's reformation in the very beginning was spread over the whole Earth; being at that time by many degrees not so far diffused as the Sect of the Donatists. I have no desire to prosecute the similitude of Protestants with Donatists, by remembering that the Sect of these men was begun and promoted by the passion of Lucilla; and who is ignorant what influence two women, the Mother and Daughter, ministred to Protestantism in England? Nor will I stand to observe their
their very likeness of phrase with the Donatists, who called the Chaise of Rome, the Chaise of pestilence, and the Roman Church an Harlot, which is D. Potter's own phrase, wherein he is lesse excusable then they, because he maintaine
teth her to be a true Church of Christ: & therefore let him duely ponder these words of S. Aug
gustine against the Donatists. If I persecute him in
tilly who detracts (y)from his Neighbour, why should (y)Conc. for
I not persecute him who detracts from the Church perpest ens
of Christ, and sayth, this is not the, but this is an Har. Enerit.
lot? And leaft of all, will I consider, whether
you may not be well compared to one Ticonius
a Donatist, who wrote against Parmenianus like
wise a Donatist, who blasphemed, that the
Church of Christ had perished (as you do e
uen in this your Booke write against some of
your Protestant Brethren, or as you call them
Zelots among you, who hold the very same or
rather a worse Heresy) and yet remained among
them, even after Parmenianus had excommuni
eated him, (as those your Zealous Brethren
would proceed agaynst you if it were in their
power) and yet like Ticonius you remaine in
their Communion, and come not into that
Church which is, hath been, and shall ever be
venerfall. For which very cause S. Augustin
complaines of Ticonius, that although he wrote
against the Donatists, yet he was of an hart (z) De doct. (z)
so extremely absurd, as not to forsake them alto
tgether. And speaking of the same thing in ano-
other
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er place he oblueres, that although Ticonius did manifestly confute them who affirmed that the Church had perished; yet, he saith this holy Father, that which in good consequence (a) he should have scene, that those Christians of Africa belonged to the Church spread over the whole world, who remained united, not with them who were divided from the communion and unity of the same world, but with such as did communicate with the whole world. But Parmeionius, and the rest of the Donatists saw that consequence, and resolved rather to settle their mind in obscurity against the most manifest truth which Ticonius maintained, than by yielding thereto, to be overcome by those Churches in Africa, which enjoyed the communion of that unity which Ticonius defended, from which they had divided themselves. How fitly these words agree to Catholiques in England in respect of the Protestants, I desire the Reader to consider. But these and the like resemblances of Protestants to the Donatistes, I willingly let passe, and only urge the maine point: That since Lutheres Reformed Church was not in being for divers Centuries before Luther, and yet was (because so forsooth they will needs have it) in the Apostles time, they must of necessity affirm heretically with the Donatists, that the true and vnspottered Church of Christ perished; & that she which remained on earth was (O blasphemy!) an Harlot. Moreover the sa-
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Potter, and other Protestants, that the Church may err in points not fundamentally; because we have shewed that every error against any one revealed truth, is heresy and damnable, whether the matter be otherwise of itself, great or small. And how can the Church more truly be said to perish, then when she is permitted to maintain a damnable heresy? Besides, we will hereafter prove, that by any act of heresy all divine faith is lost; & to imagine a true Church of faithfull persons without any faith, is as much as to fancy a living man without life. It is therefore cleer, that Donatist-like they hold that the Church of Christ perished: ye they are worse then the Donatists, who said, that the Church remained at least in Africa; whereas Protestants must of necessity be forced to grant, that for a long space before Luther, she was no where at all. But let us go forward to other reasons.

18. The holy Scripture, and Ancient Fathers do assigne Separation from the Visible Church as a mark of heresy; according to that of S. John: They were ours (b) from us. And, Some who (c) went out from us. And, Our of you shall (d) arise men speaking perverse things. And according Vincentius Lyrinensis saith: Whoever (c) began heresy, who did not first separate himself from the Universality, Antiquity, and Consent of the Catholic Church? But it is manifest, that when Luther appeared, there was no visible Church
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distinct from the Roman, out of which she could
depart, as it is likewise well knowne that Luther, & his followers departed out of her: There-
fore she is no way liable to this Mark of Here-
fy, but Protestants cannot possibly avoid it. To
this purpose S. Prosper hath these pithy words:
A Christian communicating (f) with the uni-
versall Church is a Catholique, and he who is di-
vided from her, is an Heretique, and Antichrist. But
Luther in his first Reformation could not com-
municate with the visible Catholique Church
of those times, because he began his Reforma-
tion by opposing the supposed Errors of the
then visible Church: we must therefore say with
S. Prosper, that he was an Heretique &c. Which
likewise is no lesse clearly proued out of S. Cy-
(g) Lib. de Cyprian, saying: Not we (g) departed from them, but
Unit. Ecies. they from us, and since Heresies and Schismes are
bred afterwards, while they make to themselves divers
Conventicles, they have forsaken the head and origin
of Truth.

19. And that we might not remaine doubt-
full what separation it is, which is the mark of
Heresy, the ancient Fathers tel us more in parti-
cular, that it is from the Church of Rome, as it is
the Sea of Peter. And therefore D. Potter need not
to be lo hot with vs, because we say & write that
the Church of Rome, in that sense as she is the
Mother Church of all others, and with which
all the rest agree, is truly callled the Catholique
Church. S. Hierome writing to Pope Damasus
sayth:
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layth: I am in the Communion (h) of the Church of Peter; I know that the Church is built upon that Rocke. Whosoever shall eat the Lamb out of this house he is profane. If any shall not be in the Ark of Noe, he shall perish in the time of the deluge. Whosoever doth not gather with thee, doth scatter, that is, he that is not of Christ is of Antichrist. And elsewhere Which doth he (i) call his fayth? That of the Roman Church? Or what which is contained in the Bookes of (i) Lib. I. A-\textsuperscript{c} Origen. If he answer, the Roman, then we are Ca-\textsuperscript{h} tolog. tholiques, who have translated nothing of the error of Origen. And yet further: Know thou, that the (k) (k) Ibid. lib. Roman fayth commended by the voice of the Apostile: doth not receive these delusions, though an Angel should denounce otherwise; then it hath once been preached. S. Ambrose recounting how his Brother Satyrus inquiring for a Church wherein to give thanks for his deliverie from Shipwreck, sayth: he called unto him (l) the Bishop, neither did (l) De obit. he esteem any fayth to be true, except that of the Satyris fra-\textsuperscript{t} true fayth, and he asked of him whether he agreed with the Catholique Bishops; that is, with the Roman Church. And having understood that he was a Schismatique, that is, separated from the Roman Church, he abstained from communicating with him. Where we see the priviledge of the Roman Church confirmed both by word and deed, by doctrine and praefice. And the fame (m) lib. I. ep. Saint sayth of the Roman Church: From thence 4. ad Impe-\textsuperscript{r} estores. the Rights (n) of Venerable Communion do grow to (n) Epist. 55. S. Cyprian sayth: They are bold (n) to saile to the ad Cornel. K k 3 Chaire
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Chaire of Peter, and to the principall Church, from whence Priestly Unity hath sprung. Neither do they consider, that they are Romans, whose Fayth was commended by the preaching of the Apostles, to whom falshood cannot have access. Where we see this holy Father joynes together the principall Church, and the Chaire of Peter; and affirmeth that falshood not only hath not had, but cannot have access to that Sea. And else where: Thou protest that I should send (o) a Copy of the same letters to Cornelius our Colleague, that laying aside all solicitude, he might now be assured that thou didst Communicate with him, that is, with the Catholique Church. What thinke you M. Doctor of these words? Is it so strange a thing to take for one and the same thing, to communicate with the Church & Pope of Rome, and to communicate with the Catholique Church? S. Irenæus layth. Because it were long to number the succesions of all Churches, (p) we de-

(o) Epis. 3.

claring the Tradition (and Fayth preached to men, and comming to vs by Tradition) of the most great, most ancient, and most knowne Church, foun-
ded by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul, which Tradition it hath from the Apostles, comming to vs by succesion of Bishops; We confound all those who any way either by cuill complacence of themselves, or vaine glory, or by blindnes, or ill Opinion do gather otherwise then they ought. For to this Church for a more powerfull Principality, it is necessarie that all Churches resort, that is, all Faythfull people of what place soever: in which (Roman Church) the Tra-

(p) Lib. 3.

diction
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dition which is from the Apostles hath always been
conferred from those who are every where. S. August-
Vinay sayth: It giveth us (q) to see so toly cut off.
Numnor the Priest even from the Sea of Peter; and
consider in that order of Fathers who succeeded to
whome. She is the Rock which the proud Gates of Hell
do not ou rrome. And in another place, speaking
of Caciliam. he sayth: He might condemne the con-
spiring (r) multitude of his Enemies, because he
knew himselfe to be united, by Communicatory let-
ters both to the Roman Church in which the Princi-
pality of the Sea Apostolique did always flourish; and
to other Countreys from whence the Gospell came first
into Africa. Ancient Tertullian sayth: If thou be
were Italy, thou hast Rome whose (s) Authority is
were at hand to us: a happy Church, into which the
Apostles have poured all Doctrine, together with their
bloud. S. Basili in a letter to the Bishop of Rome
sayth. In very deed that which was given (t) by our (t) Epist. ad
Lord to thy Piety, is worthy of that most excellent Tont. Rom,
voce which proclaimed thee Blessed, to wit, that thou
must discern betwixt that which is counterfeit, and
that which is lawfull and pure, and without any di-
mination mayst preach the Fayth of our Ancestors.
Maximannus Bishop of Constantinople about
twelue hundred yeares agoe, said: All the bounds
of the earth who have sincerely acknowledged our
Lord, and Catholiques through the whole world pro-
fessing the true Faith, looke upon the power of the Bi-
shop of Rome, as upon the Sunne &c. For the Creator
of the world, amongst all men of the world cledled him
he
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(he speakes of S. Peter) to whom be granted the
Chair of Doctor to be principally possessed by a per-
petual right of Priviledge; that whoseuer is desirous
to know any divine and profound thing, may have re-
course to the Oracle, and Doctrine of this instruction.
John Patriarch of Constantinople, more then elea-
uen hundred yeares agoe in an Epistle to Pope
Hormisda, writeth thus: Because [u] the beginning
of salvation is to conserve the rule of right Faith, &
in no wise to swerve from the tradition of our for-
thers; because the words of our Lord cannot faile, say-
ing: Thou art Peter, and upon this Rocke I will build
my Church; the proofs of deeds have made good those
words, because in the Sea Apostolical the Catholique
Religion is always conserved inviolable. And an-
gaine: We promise hereafter not to recite in the sa-
cred Mysteries the names of them who are excluded
from the Communion of the Catholique Church,
that is to say, who consent not fully with the Sea Apo-
stolique. Many other Authorities of the ancient
Fathers might be produced to this purpose, but
these may shew, that both the Latin, &
Greke Fathers held for a Note of being a Ca-
tholique, or an Heretique, to have been united,
or divided from the Sea of Rome. And I have
pursely alledged only such Authorities of
Fathers, as speake of the priviledges of the Sea
of Rome, as of things permament, and depen-
ding on our Saviours promise to S. Peter, from
which a generall rule, and ground ought to be
taken for all Ages, because Heauen and Earth
shall
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shall (w) passe, but the word of our Lord shall re-
maine for ever. So that I heere conclude, that se-
ing it is manifest that Luther and his followers
divided themselves from the Sea of Rome, they
beare the inseparable Marke of Heresy.

20. And though my meaning be not to
treate the point of Ordination, or Succession
in the Protestants Church, because the Fathers
alleged in the last reason, assigne Succession
as one marke of the true Church; I must not o-
mit to say, that according to the grounds of
Protestants themselves, they can neyther pre-
tend personal Succession of Bishops, nor Successi-
on of doctrine. For whereas Succession of Bishops
signifies a neuer-interrupted line of Persons,
endued with an indelible Quality, which Deu-
nenes call a Character, which cannot be taken away
by deposition, degradation or other means what-
soever; and endued also with Jurisdiction and
Authority to teach, to preach, to govern the
Church by lawes, precepts, cenfures, &c. Prote-
stats cannot pretend Successio in either of these.
For besides that there was neuer Protestant Bi-
shop before Luther, and that there can be no
continuance of Succession, where there was no
beginning to succeed; they commonly acknowledge no Character, & consequently must affirm
that when their pretended Bishops or Priests
are deprived of Jurisdiction, or degraded, they
remaine mere lay Persons as before their Or-
dination; fulfilling what Titusiiap obiectas as a


marte
marke of Heresie: To day a Priest, to morrow (x) a Layman. For if there be no immoueable Character, their power of Order must consist only in Jurisdiction, and authority, or in a kind of morall deputation to some function, which therefore may be taken away by the same power, by which it was gien. Neither can they pretend Succession in Authority, or Jurisdiction. For all the Authority, or Jurisdiction which they had, was conferred by the Church of Rome, that is, by the Pope: Because the whole Church collectively doth not meet to ordayne Bishops or Priests, or to give them Authority. But according to their owne doctrine, they believe that the Pope neyther hath, or ought to have any Jurisdiction, Power, Superiorty, Preheminence, or Authority Ecclesiasticall, or Spirituall within this Realme, which they sweare euyn when they are ordained Bishops, Priests, and Deacons: How then can the Pope giue Jurisdiction where they sweare he neyther hath, nor O V G H T to have any? Or if ye be had, how could they without Schisme withdraw themselves from his obedience? Besides, the Roman Church never gave them Authority, to oppose Her, by whome it was giuen. But grant, their first Bishops had such Authority from the Church of Rome: after the decease of those men, who gae Authority to their pretended Successours? The Primate of England? But from whome had he such Authority? And after his decease, who shall conferre
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The temporall Magistrate? King Henry, neyther a Catholique, nor a Protestant? King Edward, a Child? Queene Elizabeth, a Woman? An Infant of one hours Age, is true King in case of his Predecessours decease: Butshal your Church lie fallow till that Infant-King, and greene Head of the Church come to yeares of discretion? Doe your Bishops, your Hierarchy, your Succession, your Sacraments, your being or not being Heretiques for want of Succession, depend on this new-found Supremacy-doctrine brought in by such a man meereley upon base occasions, and for shamefull ends; impugned by Calvin, and his followers; derided by the Christian world; & even by chiefe Protestants as D. Andrews, Wotton &c. not held for any necessary point of fayth? And from whom I pray you, had Bishops their Authority, when there were no Christian Kings? Mult the Greeke Patriarchs receive spiritual Jurisdiction from the Greeke Turke. Did the Pope, by the Baptisme of Princes, loose the spiritual Power he formerly had of conferring spiritual Jurisdiction upon Bishops? Hath the temporall Magistrate authority to preach, to attoile from sinnes, to inflict excommunications, and other Censures? Why hath he not Power to excommunicate, as well as to dispense in Irregularity, as our late Soueraigne Lord King James, either dispensed with the late Archbishop of Canterbury.
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burth, or else gave commission to some Bishops to do it? and since they were subject to their Primate, and not he to them, it is clear, that they had no power to dispense with him, but that power must proceed from the Prince, as Superior to them all, and head of the Protestant Church in England. If he have no such authority, how can he give to others what himselfe hath not? Your Ordination, or Consecration of Bishops and Priests imprinting no Character, can only consist in giving a Power, Authority, Jurisdiction, or (as I said before) some kind of Deputation to exercise Episcopal, or Priestly functions: If then, the temporal Magistrate confers this power &c. he can, nay he cannot chuse but Ordain, and consecrate Bishops, and Priests, as often as he confers Authority or Jurisdiction: and your Bishops as soon as they are designed and confirmed by the King, must ipso facto be Ordained and Consecrated by him without interuention of Bishops, or Matter and Forme of Ordination: Which absurdities you will be more unwilling to grant, then well able to avoid, if you will be true to your owne doctri-nes. The Pope from whom originally you must beg your Succession of Bishops, never received, nor will, nor can acknowledge to receive any Spirituall Jurisdiction from any Temporall Prince, and therefore if Jurisdiction must be derived from Princes, he hath none at all: and yet either you must acknowledge, that he hath true
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Spiritual Jurisdiction, or that your Selues can receive none from him.

Moreover, this new Reformation, or Reformed Church of Protestants, will by them be pretended to be Catholic, or Universal, and not confined to England alone, as the Sect of the Donatists was to Africa: and therefore it must comprehend all the Reformed Churches in Germany, Holland, Scotland, France &c. In which number, they of Germany, Holland, and France, are not governed by Bishops, nor regard any personal Succession, yules of such fat-benedicted Bishops as Nicolaus Amforius, who was consecrated by Luther, (though Luther himself was never Bishop) as witnesseth (y) Desserus (y) in Milde.

And though Scotland hath of late admitted some Bishops, I much doubt whether they hold them to be necessary, or of divine Institution; and so much enforced admitting of them, doth not so much furnish that kingdom with personal Succession of Bishops, as it doth convince them to want Succession of Doctrine; since in this their neglect of Bishops they disagree both from the milder Protestants of England, and the true Catholic Church: And by this want of a continued personal Succession of Bishops, they retain the note of Schisme, & Heresy. So that the Church of Protestants, must either not be universal, as being confined to England; Or if you will needs comprehend all those Churches which want Succession, you must confess, that
that your Church doth not only communicate with Schismatique and Hereticall Churches, but is also compounded of such Churches; & your felues cannot avoid the note of Schismatiques, or Heretiques, if it were but for participating with such hereticall Churches. For it is impossible to retaine Communion with the true Catholique Church, and yet agree with them who are divided from her by Schisme, or Herety; because that were to affirme, that for the selfe same time, they could be within, and without the Catholique Church, as proportionably I discoursed in the next precedent Chapter, concerning the Communicating of moderate Protestants with those who maintaine that Heresy of the Latency and Inutility of Gods Church, where I brought a place of S. Cyprian to this purpose, which the Reader may be pleased to review in the Fift Chapter, and 17. Number.

22. But besides this defect in the personall Succession of Protestant Bishops, there is another of great moment; which is, that they wait the right Forme of ordaining Bishops, and Priests, because the manner which they use is so much different from that of the Roman Church (at least according to the common opinion of Deunes) that it cannot be sufficient for the Essence of Ordination; as I could demonstrate if this were the proper place of such a Treatise, and will not sayle to doe if D. Potter give me occasion. In the meane time the Reader may be plea-
By Catholiques. Chap. vi. 263

sed to read the Author (z) cited here in the
margent, & then compare the forme of our Or-
dination with that of Protestants; and to reme-
ber that if the forme which they use yeither in
Consecrating Bishops, or in Ordaining Priests
be at least doubtfull, they can neyther haue un-
doubted Priests, nor Bishops. For Priests cannot
be ordaned but by true Bishops, nor can any
be a true Bishop, unless he first be Priest. I say,
their Ordination is at least doubtfull; because
that sufficeth for my present purpose. For Bis-
haps and Priests, whose Ordination is noto-
riously knowne to be but doubtfull, are not to be
esteemed Bishops, or Priests: and no man with-
out Sacramende can receive Sacraments from
them; all which they administer unlawfully:
And (if we except Baptisme, with manifest
danger of inuallity, and with obligation to
be at least conditionallly repeated) so Prote-
stants must remaine doubtfull of Remission
of sinesse of their Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and
may not pretend to be a true Church, which
cannot subsist without undoubted true Bishops,
and Priests, nor without due administration of
Sacraments, which (according to Protestants)
is an essentiaall note of the true Church. And
it is a world to obluerue the proceeding of En-
gh Protestants in this point of their Ordina-
tions. For first, Ann. 3. Edw. 6. cap. 2. when he (a)
was a Child about twelue yeares of age, it was

(z) See A-
damum Tó-
nerum tom.
4. disp. 7.
quest. 2.
sub. 3. & 4.
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crating of Bishops and Priests, as by six Prelates, and
six other to be appointed by the King, should be deu-
sed (marke this word, deuised) and set forth un-
der the great Seale; should be used, and none other.
But after, this Act was repealed 1. Mar. Seff. 2.
in so much as that when afterward An. 6. & 7.
Reg. Eliz. Bishop Bonner being endicted upon
a certificat made by D. Horne a Protestant Bi-
shop of Winchester, for his refusal of the Oath of
Supremacy; and he excepting against the en-
dictment because D. Horne was no Bishop; all
the Judges resolved that his exception was good,
if indeed D. Horne was not Bishop; and they
were all at a stand, till An. 8. Eliz. cap. 1. the Act
of Edw. 6. was renewed and confirmed, with a
particular promise, that no man should be impec-
ched or molested by means of any certificate
by any Bishop or Archbishop made before this
last Act. Whereby it is clear, that they made
some doubt of their own ordination; and that
there is nothing but uncertainty in the whole
busines of their Ordination, which (forsooth)
must depend upon six Prelats, the great Seale,
Acts of Parliaments being contrary one to an-
other, and the like.

23. But though they want Personall Suc-
cession; yet at least they have Succession of do-
ctrine as they say, & pretend to prove, because
they believe as the Apostles believed. This is
to begg the Question, and to take what they
may be true, will never be granted. For if
they
they want Personall Succession, and sleight Ecclesiastical Tradition, how will they per-
swade any man, that they agree with the do-
grine of the Apostles? We have heard Tertullian
saying: I will prescribe (b) against all Heretiques)
that there is no means to prove what the Apostle
preached, but by the same Churches which they foun-
ded. And S. Irenaus tells us that, We may (c) behold (e) L. 3.8
the Tradition of the Apostles in every Church, if
men be desirous to hear the truth; and we can num-
ber them who were made Bishops by the Apostles in
Churches, and their Successors, even to us. And the
same Father in another place sayth: We ought to
obey (d) those Priests who are in the Church, who
have Succession from the Apostles, and who together
with Succession in their Bishoprickes have receivd the
certaine gift of truth. S. Augustin sayth: I am kept
in the Church (c) by the Succession of Priests from
the very Sea of Peter the Apostle, to whom our Sa-
miour after his Resurrection committed his Sheep to
be fed, even to the present Bishop. Origen to this
purpose giveth vs a good and wholesome Rule
(happy, if himselfe had followed the same) in
the excelent words: Since there be many who
think (f) they believe the things which are of Christ, (f)Pref. ad
and some are of different opinion from those who went (lib. Periur-
before them; let the preaching of the Church be kept, then
which is delivered by the Apostles by order of Suc-
cession, and remains in the Church to this very day;
that only is to be believed for truth, which in nothing
disagrees from the Tradition of the Church. In vaine

M m then
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then do these men brag of the doctrine of the
Apostles, unless first they can demonstrate that
they enjoy a continued Succession of Bishops
from the Apostles, and can shew vs a Church
which according to S. Augustin is deduced by
undoubted Succession from the Sea of the
Apostles, even to the present Bishops.

23. But yet notwithstanding, suppose it were
granted, that they agreed with the doctrine of
the Apostles; this were not sufficient to prove a
Succession in Doctrine. For Succession, besides ag-
reement or similitude, doth also require a ne-
ver-interrupted conveyance of such doctrine,
from the time of the Apostles, till the dayes of
those persons who challenge such a Succession.
And so S. Augustin saith: We are to believe
that Gospel which from the time of the Ap-
ostles, the Church hath brought downe to our
dayes by a never-interrupted course of times, and by
undoubted Succession of connection. Now, that the
Reformation begun by Luther, was interrupted
for divers Ages before him, is manifest out of
History, and by his endeavours a Reforma-
tion, which must presuppose abuses. He cannot
therefore pretend a continued Succession of that
Doctrine which he sought to reform, and reduce
to the knowledge, and practice of men. And
they ought not to prove that they have Succes-
sion of doctrine, because they agree with the
doctrine of the Apostles; but contrarily we
must infer, that they agree not with the Apo-
Stles,
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Ales, because they cannot pretend a never-interrupted Succession of doctrine from the times of the Apostles, till Luther. And here it is not amiss to note, that although the Wadens, Wickefe &c. had agreed with Protestants in all points of doctrine; yet they could not brag of Succession from them, because their doctrine hath not beene free from interrupcion, which necessarily croseth Succession.

24. And as Want of Succession of Persons and Doctrine, cannot stand with that Universalitie of Time, which is inseparable from the Catholike Church; so likewise the disagreeing Sects which are dispersed throughout divers Countreys, and Nations, cannot help towards that Universallity of Place, wherwith the true Church must be endowed, but rather such local multiplication, doth more and more lay open their division, and want of Succession in Doctrine. For the excellent Obseruation of S. Augustine doth punctually agree with all moderne Here.

tiques; wherein this holy Father having cited these words out of the Prophet Ebchiel, (1) My vi; Cap. 24. flockes are dispersed upon the whole face of the Earth; he adds the remarkable sentence: Not all Here-

tiques (b) are spred over the face of the Earth, and yet there are Heretiques spred over the whole face of (k) Lib de

the Earth, some here, some there, yet they are wanting Pastorib. in no place, they know not one another. One Sect for 5-8,

example in Africa, another Herein the East, another in Egypt, another in Mesopotamia. In divers

Mm 2 places
Part. I. Charity maintained

places they are divers: one Mother Pride hath begot them all, as our one Mother the Catholicke Church hath brought forth all faithful people dispersed throughout the whole world. No wonder then, if Pride breed Dijfection, and Charity Union. And in another place, applying to Heretiques those words of the Canticles: If thou know not (l) thy selfe, goe forth, and follow after the steps of the flocks, and feed thy kids, he sayth: If thou know not thy selfe, goe (m) thou forth, I do not cast thee out, but goe thou out, that it may be said of thee: They went from us, but they were not of us. Goest thou out in the steps of the flocks; not in my steps, but in the steps of the flocks, nor of one flocke, but of divers and wandring flocks; and feed thy Kids, not as Peter, to whom is said, Feed my sheep: but feed thy Kids in the Tabernacles of the Pastors, not in the Tabernacle of the Pastor, where there is one flock, and one Pastor. In which words this holy Father doth set downe the Markes of Heresy, to wit, going out from the Church, and Want of Unity among them selves, which proceed from not acknowledging one supreme Visible Pastor and Head vnder Christ. And so it being proved that Protestants having neither Succession of Persons, nor Doctrine, nor Universality of Time, or Place, cannot avoid the just note of Heresy.

25. Hitherto we haue brought arguments to prove, that Luther, and all Protestants are guilty of Heresy against the Negative Precept of faith, which obligeth vs vnder paine of damnation,
nation, not to imbrace any one error, contrary to any truth sufficiently propounded, as testified or revealed by Almighty God. Which were enough to make good, that among persons who disagree in any one point of faith, one part only can be said: Yet we will now prove that who soever erreth in any one point, doth also break the Affirmative Precept of Faith, whereby we are obliged positively, to believe some revealed truth with an infallible, and supernatural Faith, which is necessary to salvation, even necessity, or mean, as Divine speaketh; that is, so necessary that not any, after he is come to the use of reason, was or can be sauced without it, according to the words of the Apostle: Without Faith it is impossible to please God. (Heb. xi. 6).

26. In the beginning of this Chapter I shewed, that to Christian Catholique faith there are required Certainty, Obscurity, Prudence, and Supernatural: All which Conditions we will prove to be wanting in the belief of Protestants, even in those points which are true in themselves, and to which they yield assent, as happeneth in all those particulars, wherein they agree with vs; from whence it will follow, that they wanting true Divine Faith, want means absolutely necessary to salvation.

27. And first, that their belief wanteth Certainty, I prove, because they denying the Universal infallibility of the Church, can have no certain ground to know what Objects are.
Part I. Charity maintained revealed, or testified by God. Holy Scripture is in itself most true and infallible; but without the direction & declaration of the Church, we can neither have certain means to know what Scripture is Canonical; nor what Translations be faithful; nor what is the true meaning of Scripture. Every Protestant, as I suppose, is persuaded that his own opinions, be true, and that he hath used such means as are wont to be prescribed for understanding the Scripture, as Prayer, Conferring of divers Texts &c. and yet their disagreements thereof show that some of them are deceived: And therefore it is clear that they have no one certain ground whereon to rely for understanding of Scripture. And seeing they hold all the Articles of Faith, even concerning fundamental points, upon the selfe same ground of Scripture, interpreted, not by the Churches Authority, but according to some other Rules, which as experience of their contradictions teach, do sometimes fail; it is clearer that the ground of their faith is infallible in no point at all. And albeit sometime it chance to hit on the truth, yet it is likewise apt to lead them to error: As all Arch-heretiques believing some truths, and with all divers errors upon the same ground and motive, have indeed no true divine infallible faith, but only a fallible humane opinion, and persuasion. For if the ground upon which they rely were certain, it could never produce any
any error.

28. Another cause of uncertainty in the faith of Protestants, must rise from their disjunction of points fundamental, and not fundamental. For since they acknowledge, that every error in fundamental points destroys the substance of faith and yet cannot determine what points be fundamental; it followeth that they must remaine uncertain whether or no they be not in some fundamental error, & to want the substance of faith, without which there can be no hope of Salvation.

29. And that he who erreth against any one revealed truth (as certainly some Protestants must doe, because contradictory Propositions cannot both be true) doth lose all Divine faith; is a very true doctrine delivered by Catholique Doctores, with so generall a consent, that the contrary is wont to be cenfured as temerarious. The Angelicall Doctour S. Thomas proposeth this Question: Whether he who denyeth articles of faith, may retain faith of other articles? and reduceth that he cannot: which he prooveth, (Argumenta sed contra) because: As every man is opposite to Charity; so to deny one Article of faith is opposite to faith; But Charity doth not remaine with any one deadly sinne; therefore faith doth not remaine after the denyall of any one Article of faith. Whereof he giues this further reason: Because the nature of every habit doth depend upon the formall Motive: & Observe ther-
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of, which Motive being taken away the nature of the
habit cannot remaine. But the formal Obiect of faith
is the supreme truth as it is manifested in Scriptures,
and in the doctrine of the Church, which proceeds fro
the same supreme verity. Whosoever therefore doth
not rely upon the doctrine of the Church (which pro-
ceeds from the supreme Verity manifested in Scrip-
tures) as upon an infallible Rule, he hath not the
habit of faith, but believeth those things which belong
to faith, by some other means then by faith; as is one
should remember some Conclusion, and not know the
reason of that demonstration, it is cleere that he hath
not certaine knowledge, but only Opinion. Now it is
manifest, that he who relies on the doctrine of the
Church, as upon an infallible Rule, will yield his of-
sent to all, that the Church teacheth. For if among
those things, which she teacheth, he hold what he will,
and doth not hold what he will not, he doth not rely up-
on the doctrine of the Church, as upon an infallible
Rule, but only upon his owne will. And so it is cleere
that an Heretique, who with pertinacy denieth one
Article of faith, is not ready to follow the doctrine of
the Church in all things. And therefore it is mani-
fest, that whosoever is an Heretique in any one Ar-
ticle of faith, concerning other Articles, hath not
faith, but a kind of Opinion, or his owne will. Thus
far S. Thomas. And afterward: A man doth believe

(q) Ad 2: (q) all the Articles of faith for one and the selfe same
reason, to wit, for the Prime Verity proposed to us in
the Scripture, understood aright according to the Do-
ctrine of the Church: and therefore whosoever fals
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from this reason or motive, is totally deprived of faith. From this true doctrine we are to infer, that to retain, or want the substance of faith, doth not consist in the matter, or multitude of the Articles, but in the opposition against God's divine Testimony, which is involved in every least error against Faith. And since some Protestants must needs err, and that they have no certaine Rule to know, why rather one then another; it manifestly follows that none of them have any Certainty for the substance of their faith in any one point. Moreover D. Pot-ter, being forced to confesse that the Roman Church wants not the substance of faith; it follows that she doth not err in any one point against faith, because as we have seen out of S. Thomas, every such error destroys the substance of faith. Now if the Roman Church did not err in any one point of faith, it is manifest that Protestants err in all those points wherein they are contrary to her. And this may suffice to prove that the faith of Protestants wants Infal-

libility.

30. And now for the second Condition of faith, I say: If Protestants have Certainty, they want Obscurity, and to have not that faith which, as the Apostle faith, is of things not appearing, or not necessitating our Understanding to an assent. For the whole edifice of the faith of Protestants, is settled on these two Principles: These particular Bookes are Canonicall Scri-

N pture:
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...the sense and meaning of these Canonickl Scriptures, is certaine and evident, at least in all points necessary to Salvation. Now, these Principles being once supposed, it cleerly followeth, that what Protestants believe as necessary to Salvation, is evidently knowne by them to be **true**, by this argument: It is certaine and evident, that whatsoever is contained in the word of God, is true. But it is certaine and evident, that these Bookes in particular are the word of God: Therefore it is certaine and evident, that whatsoever is contained in these Bookes is true. Which Conclusion I take for a *Maioir* in a second Argument, and say thus: It is certaine and evident that whatsoever is contained in these Bookes is true: But it is certaine and evident, that such particular Articles (for example, the Trinity, Incarnation, Original Sinne &c.) are contained in these Bookes: Therefore it is certaine and evident, that these particular Obieets are true. Nayther will it availe you to say, that the sayd Principles are not evident by naturall discource, but only to the eye of reason cleared by grace, as you speake. For supernaturall evidence, no lesse (yea rather more) drawes and excludes obscurity, then naturall evidence doth: Nayther can the party so enlightened be sayd voluntarily to captivate his understanding to that light, but rather his understanding is by a necessity made captive, and forced not to disbelieved, what is presented by...
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foe cleere a light: And therefore your imaginary fayth is not the true fayth defined by the Apostle, but an inuention of your owne.

31. That the fayth of Protestants wanteth their faith the third Condition which was Prudence, is deduced from all that hitherto hath beene layd.

What wifdome was it, to forsake a Church foolishly verry ancient, and belids which, there could be demonstrated no other visible Church of Christ vpon earth? A Church acknowledged to want nothing neceffary to Saluation; endued with Succession of Bishops, with Visibility and Vniversalitie of Tyme and Place; A Church which if it be not the true Church, her enemies cannot pretend to have any Church, Ordina
tion, Scriptures, Succession, &c. and are forced for their owne sake, to maintaine her perpetuall Existence, and Being? To leaue, I lay, such a Church, & frame a Community, without euyther Vnity, or meanes to procure it; a Church which at Luthers first revolt had no larger extent then where his body was; A Church without Vniversalitie of place or Tyme; A Church which can pretend no Visibility, or Being, except only in that former Church which it opposeth; A Church void of Succession of Persons or Doctrine? What wifdome was it to follow such men as Luther, in an opposition again the visible Church of Christ, begun vpon meere passion? What wifdome is it to receive from Vs, a Church, Ordination, Scriptures, Personall
Nu 2 Suc-
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Succession, and not Succession of Doctrine? Is not this to verify the name of Heresy, which signifieth Election or Choyce? Wherby they cannot avoid that note of Imprudency, (or as S. Augustine calls it) Foolishnes, set downe by him against the Manichees, and by me recited before. I would not (sayth he) believe (r) the Gospell, unless the Authority of the Church did move me. Those therefore whom I obeyed, saying, Believe the Gospell, why should I not obey the same men saying to me, Do not believe Manichaus (Luther, Caluin, &c.) Chuse what thou pleasest: If thou say, Believe the Catholiques, they warne me, not to believe thee. Wherefore if I believe them, I cannot believe thee. If thou say, Do not believe the Catholiques; thou shalt not do well, in forcing me to the faith of Manichaus, because by the Preaching of Catholiques, I believed the Gospell it selfe. If thou say, you did well to believe them (Catholiques) commending the Gospell, but you did not well to believe them, discommending Manichaus; dost thou thinke me so very FOOLISH, that without any reason at all, I should believe what thou wilt, and not believe what thou wilt not? Nay this holy Father is not content to call it Foolishnes, but meere Madness, in these words: Why should I not most diligently enquire (s) what Christ commanded of those before all others, by whose Authority I was moved to believe, that Christ commanded any good thing? Canst thou better declare to me, what he said, whom I would not have thought to have been, or to be, if the Belief of therof had been recommended by thee to me?
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me? This therefore I believed by fame, strengthened with Celebrity, Consent, Antiquity. But every one may see that you, so few, so turbulent, so new, can produce nothing which deserves Authority. What MADNESS is this? Believe them (Catholiques) that we ought to believe Christ; but learn of us, what Christ said. Why I beseech thee? Surely if they (Catholiques) were not at all, and could not teach me anything, I would more easily persuade myself, that I were not to believe Christ, then I should learn any thing concerning him from any other than those, by whom I believed him. Lastly, I ask what wildomere it could be to leave all visible Churches, and consequently the true Catholique Church of Christ, which you confess cannot err in points necessary to salvation, and the Roman Church which you grant doth not err in fundamentals, and follow private men who may err even in points necessary to salvation? Especially if we add, that when Luther rose there was no visible true Catholique Church besides that of Rome, and them who agreed with her; in which sense, she was, & is, the only true Church of Christ, and not capable of any Error in saith. Nay, even Luther, who first opposed the Roman Church yet comming to dispute against other Heretiques, he is forced to give the Lyce (r) inepist. cont. Anab. ad duos Ta.

We freely confess (t) that in the Papacy there are rochos to. 2.

many good things, worthy the name of Christian, which have come from them to us. Namely, we con. 130.

Nn 3 
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...that in the Papacy there is true Scripture, true Baptism, the true Sacrament of the Altar, the true keyes for remission of sinnes, the true Office of Preaching, true Catechisme, as our Lords Prayer, Ten Commandments, Articles of fayth &c. And afterward: I auouch, that under the Papacy there is true Christianity, yea the Kernel and Marrow of Christianity, and many pious and great Saints. And againe he affirmeth, that the Church of Rome hath the true Spirit, Gospels, Fayth, Baptisme, Sacraments, the Keyes, the Office of Preaching, Prayer, Holy Scripture, and whatsouer Christianity ought to haue. And a little before: I heare and see that they bring in Anabaptisme only to this end, that they may spight the Pope, as men that wil receiue nothing from Antichrist; no otherwise then the Sacramentaries doe, who therefore believe only Bread and Wine to be in the Sacrament, merely in hatred against the Bishop of Rome; and they thinke that by this meanes they shall overcome the Papacy. Verily these men rely upon a weake ground, for by this meanes they must deny the whole Scripture, and the Office of Preaching. For we haue all these things from the Pope; otherwise we must goe make a new Scripture. O Truth, more forcible (as S. Augustine layes) to wring out (x) Confession, then is any racke, or torment! And so we may truly say with Moses: Inimici nostris sunt Judices: Our very Enemies give (y) sentence for vs.

(x) Contra Donat. post collat. cap. 24. (y) Dent. c. 52. 31.

Lastly, since your fayth wanteth Certainty, and Prudence, it is ealy to inferre that it wants
wants the fourth Condition, *Supernaturality*. Their faith wants Su-
For being but an *Humane persuasion*, or *Opinion*, it is not in nature, or *Essence Supernatur-
And being *imprudent*, and rash, it cannot
proceed from divine Motion and Grace; and
therefore it is neither *supernatural* in itself, or in the *Cause* from which it proceedeth.

33. Since therefore we have proved, that
whosoever erres agaynst any one point of faith, 
looseth all divine fayth, even concerning those
other Articles wherein he doth not erre; and
that although he could still retayne true fayth
for some points, yet any one error in what-
soever other matter concerning fayth, is a grie-
uous sinne; it cleeerely followes, that when two
or more hold different doctrines concerning
fayth and Religion, there can be but one part
sauced. For declaring of which truth, if Catho-
liques be charged with *Want of Charity*, and *Mo-
desty*, and be accused of rashnes, ambitioun, and
fury, as D. Potter is very free in this kind; I de-
sire every one to ponder the words of S. Chry-
*stome*, who teacheth, that every least error o-
erthrows all fayth, and whosoever is guilty
therof, is in the *Church*, like one, who in the
*Common-wealth* forgeth faulse Coyne: *Let them beare* (fayth this holy Father) *what S. Paul sayth:*
*Namely, that they who brought in some small errour* (2) *Galat.*
(2) *had overthrew the Gospell.* For, *to shew how a* 7-
*small thing ill mingled doth corrupt the whole, he*
*fayd, that the Gospell was subverted.* For as he who
clips
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clips a little of the stamp from the King's money, makes
the whole piece of no value: so whosoever takes away
the least particle of sound faith, is wholly corrupted,
always going from that beginning to worse things.

Where then are they, who condemn us as contentious
persons, because we cannot agree with Heretiques,
and do often say, that there is no difference betwixt
us and them, but that our disagreement proceeds from
Ambition to dominion? And thus having shewed
that Protestants want true faith, it remaineth that,
according to my first designe, I examine
whether they do not also want Charity, as it res-
pects a man's selfe.
In regard of the Precept of Charity towards ones selfe, Protestants are in state of Sinne, as long as they remaine separated from the Roman Church.

H A T, due order is to be observed in the Theologicall Vertue of Charity, whereby we are directed to preferre some Obiects before others; is a truth taught by all Deuines, and declared in these words of holy Scripture: He hath ordered (a) Charity in me. The reason whereof is: because the infinite Goodnes of God, which is the formall Object, or Motive of Charity, & for which all other things are loued, is differently participated by different Obiects; and therefore the loue we beare to them for Gods sake, must accordingly be unequall. In the vertue of Faith, the case is harre otherwise; because all the Obiects, or points which we believe, do equally participate the divine
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uine Testimony, or Revelation, for which we believe all things propounded for such. For it is as impossible for God, to speak an untruth, in a small, as in a great matter. And this is the ground for which we have so often affirmed, that any least error against Faith, is injurious to God, and destructive of Salvation.

2. This order in Charity may be considered; Towards God; Our owne soul; The soul of our Neighbour; Our owne life, or Goods; and the life or goods of our Neighbour. God is to be beloved above all things, both oblique (as the Deuine spake) that is, we must with or desire to God, a Good more great, perfect, and noble then to any, or all other things; namely, all that indeed He is, a Nature Infinite, Independent, Immense &c. and also appretiatine, that is, we must sooner loole what good fower, then leave, and abandon Him. In the other Objects of Charity, of which I spake, this order is to be kept. We may, but are not bound, to preferre the life and goods of our Neighbour before our owne: we are bound to prefer the soule of our Neighbour before our owne temporall goods or life, if he happen to be in extremest spiritual necessity, and that we by our assistance can succour him, according to the saying of S. John: In this we have known (b.) the Charity of God, because he hath yielded his life for us: and we ought to yield our life for our Brethren. And S. Augustine likewise sayth: A Christian will
will not doubt (c) to loose his owne temporall life, for the eternall life of his Neighbour.Lastly we are to prefer the spirituall good of our owne soule, before both the spirituall and temporall good of our Neighbour, because as Charity doth of its owne Nature, chiefly encline the person in whom it resieth, to loue God, and to be united with him: to of it selfe it enclines him, to procure those things whereby the said Union with God is effected, rather to himselfe then to others. And from hence it followes, that in things necessary to salvation, no man ought in any case, or in any respect whatsoever, to prefer the spirituall good, either of any particular person, or of the whole world before his owne soule; according to those words of our Blessed Saviour: What doth it (d) avail a man, if he gaine the whole world, and sustaine the damage of his owne soule? And therefore (to come to our present purpose) it is directly against the Order of Charity, or against Charity, as it hath a reference to our seules, which Deuines call Charitas propria, to aduenture either the omitting of any means necessary to salvation, or the committing of any thing repugnant to it, for whatsoever respect, & consequently, if by liuing out of the Roman Church we put our seules in hazard, either to want some thing necessarily required to salvation, or else to performe some act against it, we commit a most grievous sinne, against the vertue of Charity, as it respects our seules.
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beloves, and so cannot hope for salvation, without repentance.

3. Now, of things necessary to salvation, there are two sorts, according to the doctrine of all Divines. Some things (they say) are necessary to salvation, necessitate praecepti, necessary only because they are commanded; For: If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments.

In which kind of things, as probable ignorance of the Law, or of the Commandment doth excuse the party from all fault, breach thereof; so likewise doth it not exclude salvation in case of ignorance. Some other things are said to be necessary to salvation necessitate mediaris, or salutis; because they are Meanes appointed by God to attain our End of eternal salvation, in so strict a manner, that it were presumption to hope for Salvation without them. And as the former meanes are said to be necessary, because they are commanded; so the later are commonly said to be commanded, because they are necessary, that is: Although there were no other particular precept concerning them; yet supposing they be once appointed as means absolutely necessary to salvation, there cannot but rise an obligation of procuring to have them, in virtue of that universal precept of Charity, which obligeth every man to procure the salvation of his owne soule. In this sort divine infallible Faith is necessary to salvation; as likewise repentance of every deadly sinne, and in the doctrine of Catho-
Catholiques, Baptisme in re, that is, in act to
Children, and for those who are come to the
ve of reason, in voto, or hartly desyre, when they
cannot haue it in act. And as Baptisme is necesa-
ary for remissio of Original, and actual sinne
committed before it: so the Sacrament of Con-
fession, or Penance is necessary in re, or in voto,
in act, or desire, for the remissio of mortall
finnes, committed after Baptisme. The Minister
of which Sacrament of Penance being necessa-
riely a true Priest, true Ordination is necessa-
ry in the Church of God for remissio of finnes
by this Sacrament, as also for other ends not
belonging to our present purpose. From hence
it rifieth, that no ignorance, or impossibility can
supply the want of those meanes which are abso-
lutely necessary to saluation. As if, for exam-
ple, a sinner depart his world without repe-
ting him self of all deadly finnes, although he
dye suddenly, or unexpectedly fall out of his
wits, and so committ no new sinne by omission
of repentance; yet he shall be eternally punished
for his former finnes committed, and never repe-
ten. If an Infant dye without Baptisme, he
cannot be saued, not by reason of any actual
sinne committed by him in omitting Baptisme,
but for Original sinne, not forgiven by the
meanes which God hath ordained to that pur-
pose. Which doctrine, all, or most Protestants
will (for ought I know) grant to be true, in
the Children of Insidels, yea not only Luthe-

Oo 3

rans.
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or some other Protestants as Mr. Bilson late of Winchester (f) and others hold it to be true, even in the Children of the faithfull. And if Protestants in generall disagree from Catholiques in this point, it cannot be denied but that our disagreement is in a point very fundamental. And the like I say of the Sacrament of Penance, which they deny to be necessary to salvation, either in act, or in desire; which error is likewise fundamental, because it concerns (as I sayd) a thing necessary to salvation: And for the same reason, if their Priesthood and Ordination be doubtfull, as certainly it is, they are in danger to want a meanes without which they cannot be saved. Neither ought this rigour to seeme strange, or unius: For Almighty God having of his owne Goodnes, without our merit, first ordained Man to a supernatural end of eternall felicity; and then, after our fall in Adam vouchsafed to reduce vs to the attaining of that End, if his blessed Will be pleased to limit the attaining of that End, to some meanes which in his infinite Wisdom he thinkes most fit; who can lay why dost thou so? Or who can hope for that End, without such meanes? Blessed be his divine Majesty, for vouchsafing to ordaine vs, base creatures, to so sublime an End, by any meanes at all.

4. Out of the forelaid difference followeth another, that (generally speaking) in things necessary only, because they are commanded,
it is sufficient for auoydng sin, that we proceed prudently, and by the conduct of some probable opinion, maturely weighed and approved by men of vertue, learning, & wisdom. Neithre are we always obliged to follow the moit strict, and seuere, or secure part, as long as the doctrine which we embrace, proceeds upon such reasons, as may warrant it to be truly probable, and prudent, though the contrary part want not also probable grounds. For in humane affairs, and discourse, evidence and certainty cannot be always expected. But when we treat not precisely of auoyding sin, but moreover of procuring something without which I can not be laued; I am obliged by the Law, & Order of Charity to procure as great certainty as morally I am able; and am not to follow every probable Opinion, or dictamen, but tutiorem partem, the safer part, because if my probability prove false, I shall not probably, but certainty come short of Salvation. Nay in such case, I shall incurre a new sinne against the Verte of Charity towards myselfe, which obligeth every one not to expose his soule to the hazard of eternall perdition, when it is in his power, with the assistance of Gods grace, to make the matter sure. From this very ground it is, that although some Deuines be of opinion, that it is not a sinne to use some Matter, or Forme of Sacraments, onely probable, if we respect precisely the feuerence or respect which is due to Sacraments
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ments, as they belong to the Morall infused Ver-
tue of Religion; yet when they are such Sacra-
ments, as the inualidity therof may endanger
the salvation of soules, all doe with one con-
fect agree, that it is a griuous offence to vse a
doubtfull, or onely probable Matter or Forme,
when it is in our power to procure certainty. If
therefore it may appeare, that though it were
not certaine that Protestancy unrepentent de-
stroyes Salvation (as we have proued to be ve-
ry certaine) yet at least that is probable, & with
all, that there is a way more safe; it will follow
out of the grounds already layd, that they are
obliged by the law of Charity to imbrace that
safe way.

5. Now, that Protestants have reason at least
to doubt in what case they stand, is deduced frō
what we have layd, and proued about the uni-
uersall infallibility of the Church, and of her
being Judge of Controveries, to whome all
Christians ought to submit their Judgment (as
euen some Protestants grant, ) and whome to
oppose in any one of her definitions, is a grieu-
sous sinne: As also from what we have layd
of the Unity, Universality, and Visibility of the
Church, and of Succession of Persons, and Do-
ctrine; Of the Conditions of Divine Fayth, Cer-
ainty, Obscurity, Prudence, and Supernaturali-
ity, which are wanting in the fayth of Prote-
stants; Of the frivolous distinction of points
fundamentall and not fundamentall, (the co-
futation
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futation wherof proueth that Heretiques disa-
greeing among themselves in any least point, cannot have the same fayth, nor be of the same Church: ) Of Schilme; of Herely; of the Pers-
sons who first revolted from Rome, and of their Motiues; of the Nature of Fayth, which is de-
stroyed by any least errour, & it is certaine that some of them must be in errour, and want the
substance of true fayth; and since all pretend the like certainty, it is cleere that none of them have any certainty at all, but that they want true fayth, which is a meanes most absolutely ne-
cessary to Saluation. Moreover, as I sayd heer-
toefore, since it is granted that every Errour in
fundamentall points is damnable, & that they
cannot tell in particular, what points be funda-
mentall; it followes that none of them knowes
whether he, or his Brethren do not erre dan-
ably, it being certayne that amongst so many dis-
agreeing persons some must erre. Vppon the same
ground of not being able to assigne what points
be fundamentall, I say, they cannot be sure
whether the difference among them be funda-
mentall or no, and consequently whether they
agree in the substance of fayth and hope of Sal-
uation. I omit to add that you want the Sacra-
ment of Penance, instituted for remission of
sinnes, or at least you must confesse that you
hold it not necessary; and yet your owne Bre-
thren, for example, the Century Writers doe 

(g) Cont. 3, cap. 6, col.

acknowledge, that in the tymes of Cyprin.
Pp and
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and Tertullian, Primate Confession even of Thoughts was used; and that, it was then commanded, and thought necessary. The like, I say, concerning your Ordination, which at least is very doubtfull, & consequently all that depends thereon.

6. On the other side, that the Roman Church is the safer way to Heaven (not to repeat what hath been already said upon divers occasions.) I will againe put you in my mind, that vnles the Roman Church was the true Church, there was no visible true Church upon Earth. A thing so manifest, that Protestants themselves confess that more then one thousand yeares the Roman Church possessed the whole world, as we have shewed heretofore, out of their own words: from whence it followes, that vnlesse Ours be the true Church, you cannot pretend to any perpetual visible Church of your Own; but Ours doth not depend on yours, before which it was. And here I wish you to consider with feare and trembling, how all Roman Catholiques, not one excepted; that is, those very men whom you must hold not to erre damnably in their belief, vnlesse you wil destroy your owne Church, and salvation, do with vnamous consent believe, and professe that Protestantity vnrepentent, destroys Salvation; and then tell me, as you will answer at the last day, whether it be not more safe, to live & die in that Church, which euens your felles are forced to acknowledge not to be cut off from hope of salvation (which are
are your owne words) then to live in a Church, which the sayd confessedly true Church doth firmly believe, and constantly profess not to be capable of salvation. And therefore I conclude that by the most strict obligation of charity towards your owne soule, you are bound to place it in safety, by returning to that Church, from which your progenitors Schismatically departed; least too late you find that saying of the holy Ghost verified in your selues: He that lones (1) the danger, shall perish therein. (i) Eccles. 3.

7. Against this last argument of the greater security of the Roman Church drawn from your owne confession, you bring an Objection; which in the end will be found to make for vs, against your selve. It is taken from the words of the Donatists, speaking to Catholiques in this manner: Your selues confesse (k) our Baptisme, Sacraments, and Fayth (heer you put an Explication of your owne, and say, 'for the most part, as if any small error in fayth did not destroy all Faith') to be good, and anyhake. We deny yours to be so, and say there is no Church, no salvation amongst you. Therefore it is safest for all to joyn with vs.

8. By your leave our Argument is not (as you say) for simple people alone, but for all them who have care to save their soules. Neither is it grounded upon your Charitable Indulgence (as you, l) ipeake, but upon an incevable (l) Pag. 81. necessity for you, either to grant salvation, to
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our Church, or to entaile certaine damnation upon your owne: because yours can haue no being till Luther, vnles ours be supposed to haue been the true Church of Christ. And since you termeth this Argument a Charme, take heed you be none of those, who according to the Prophet David, do not heare the voysce of him (m) who charmeth wisely. But to come to the purpose: Catholiques never granted that the Donatists had a true Church, or might be saued: And therfore you having cited out of S. Augustin, the words of the Catholiques, that the Donatists had true Baptisme, when you come to the contrary words of the Donatists, you add, No Church, No Salvation; making the Argument to haue quinque terminos; without which Addition you did see, it made nothing against vs: For, as I said, the Catholiques never yielded, that among the Donatists there was a true Church, or hope of salua­tion. And your selfe a few leaves after acknowledge that the Donatists maintaine an errour, which was in the Matter and Nature of it properly heretical, against that Article of the Creed, wherein we profess to believe the holy (n) Catholique Church: and consequently, you cannot allow salvation to them, as you do, and must do to vs. And therefore the Donatists could not make the like argument against Catholiques, as Catholiques make against you, who grant vs Salvation, which we deny to you. But at least (you will lay) this Argument for the Certainty of their Bap-
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Baptisme was like to Ours touching the Security and Certainty of our salvation; & therefore that Catholiques should have esteemed the Baptisme of the Donatists, more certaine then their owne, and so have allowed Rebaptization of such as were baptized by Heretiques, or sinners, as the Donatists esteemed all Catholiques to be. I answeare, no. Because it being a matter of fayth, that Baptisme administr'd by Heretiques, obseruing due Matter, forme &c. is valide; to rebaptize any to baptized, had bee ne both a sacriledge in reitering a Sacrament not reiterable, and a profession also of a damnable Heresy, and therfore had not been more safe, but certainly damnable. But you confesse that in the doctrine or practise of the Roman Church, there is no beliefe, or profession of any damnable error, which if there were, even your Church should certainly be no Church. To believe therfore and professe as we do, cannot exclude Salvation, as Rebaptization must have done. But if the Donatists could have affirmed with truth, that in the opinion both of Catholiques and themselves, their Baptisme was good, yea and good in such sort as that vnles theirs was good, that of the Catholiques could not be such; but theirs might be good, though that of the Catholiques were not: and further that it was no damnable error to believe, that Baptisme administr'd by the Catholiques was not good, nor that it was any Sacriledge to reiter-
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rate the same Baptisme of Catholiques: If, I say, they could have truly affirmed these things, they had said somewhat, which at least had seemed to the purpose. But these things they could not say with any colour of truth, and therefore their argument was fond, and impious. But we with truth say to Protestants: You cannot but confesse that our doctrine contains no damnable error, and that our Church is of certainely a true Church, that unless ours be true, you cannot pretend any; Yea you grant, that you should be guilty of Schism, if you did cut off our Church from the Body of Christ, and the hope of salvation: But we neither do, nor can grant that yours is a true Church, or that within it there is hope of salvation: Therefore it is safest for you, to joyn with us. And now against whom hath your Obiection greatest force?

9. But I wonder not a little, and so I thinke will every body else, what the reason may be, that you do not so much as goe about to answer the argument of the Donatists, which you say is all one with Ours, but refer vs to S. Augustin there to read it; as if every one caried with him a Library, or were able to examine the places in S. Augustine: and yet you might be sure your Reader would be greedy to see some solid answer to an Argument so often urged by vs, and which indeed, unless you can confute it, ought alone to move every one who hath care of his soule, to take the safest way, by incorpora-
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fating himselfe in our Church. But we may easily imagine the true reason of your silence. For the answer which S. Augustin gives to the Donatists, is directly against your selfe, and the same which I have given: Namely, that Catholiques (o) approve the Baptisme of Donatists, but abhor their heresy of Rebaptization. And that as gold is good (which is the similitude v
ted by (p) S. Augustin) yet not to be sought in company of theues; so though Baptisme be good, yet it must not be sought for in the Congregation of Donatists. But you free vs from damnable heresy, and yield vs salvation, which I hope is to be imbraced in whatsoever Company it is found, or rather that Company is to be imbraced before all other, in which all sides agree, that salvation may be found. We therefore must infer, that it is safest for you to seek salvation among vs. You had good reason to conceal S. Augustins answer to the Donatists.

10. You frame another argument in our behalfe, & make vs speake thus: If Protestants believe the (q) Religion of Catholiques, to be a safe way to Heaven, why do they not follow it? Which (q) pag. 79. wise argument of your owne, you answere at large, and confirme your answere by this instance: The Jesuits and Dominicans hold different Opinions touching Predetermination, and the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin: Yet so, that the Jesuits hold the Dominicans way safe, that is, his answer not damnable, and the Dominicans hold the same

(o) Ad lit. Petil. lib. 2. cap. 108.
(p) Contra Cresce lib. 1. cap. 21.
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same of the Jesuits. Yet neither of them with good
Consequence can presse the other to believe his opi-
nion, because by his owne Confeffion it is no damna-
blesse error.

11. But what Catholique maketh such a
wise demaund, as you put into our mouths? If
our Religion be a safe way to heauen, that is,
not damnable; why do you not follow it? As if
every thing that is good, must be of necessity
embraced by every body. But what thinke you
of the Argument framed thus? Our Religion is
safe, even by your Confeffion, therefore you
ought to grant that all may embrace it. And yet
further, thus: Among different Religions and
contrary wyes to heauen, one only can be safe:
But Ours, by your owne Confeffion, is safe,
wheres we hold that in yours there is no hope
of faluation: Therefore you may, and ought to
imbrace ours. This is our Argument. And if
the Dominicans and Jesuits did say one to an-
other as we say to you; then one of them might
with good Confequence presse the other to be true
his opinion. You haue still the hard fortune to
be beaten with your owne weapon.

12. It remaineth then, that both in regard
of Faith, and Charity, Protestants are obliged
to unite themselves with the Church of Rome.
And I may add also, in regard of the Theological
Vertue of Hope, without which none can hope
to be saved, and which you want, either by ex-
cellence of Confidence, or defect by Despair, not
unlike
Unlike to your Faith, which I shewed to be either deficient in Certainty, or excessive in Evidence; as likewise according to the rigid Calvinists, it is either so strong, that once had, it can never be lost; or so more then weak, and so much nothing, that it can never be gotten. For the true Theological Hope of Christians, is a Hope which keeps a mean between Presumption, and Desperation; which moves us to work our salvation with fear, and trembling; which conducts us to make sure our salvation by good works, as holy Scripture adjureth. But contrariwise, Protestants do either exclude Hope by Despaise, with the Doctrine that our Saviour died not for all, and that such want grace insufficient to salvation; or else by vain Presumption grounded upon a fantastical persuasion, that they are Predestinate; which Faith must exclude all fear, and trembling. Neither can they make their Calling certain by good works, who do certainly believe that before any good works they are justified, and justified even by Faith alone, and by that Faith whereby they certainly believe that they are justified. Which points some Protestants do expressly afferme to be the soul of the Church; the principal Origin of Salvation; of all other points of Doctrine the chiefest and weightiest; as already I have noted Chap. 3 n. 19. And if some Protestants do now relent from the rigour of the aforesaid doctrine, we must afferme, that at least some of them want the Theological
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call Virtue of Hope; yea that none of them can
have true Hope, while they hope to be saued in
the Communion of those, who defend such
doctrines, as doe directly overthrow all true
Christian Hope. And for as much as concerns
Fayth, we must also infer, that they want Unity
therein; and consequently have none at all; by
their disagreement about the Soule of the Church;
the principal Origen of Salvation; of all other points
of Doctrine, the chiefest and weightiest. And if you
want true Fayth, you must by consequence
want Hope; or if you hold that this point is not to
be so indivisible on either side, but that it hath
latitude sufficient to imbrace all parties, with-
out prejudice to their Salvation; notwithstanding
that your Brethren hold it to be the Soule of
the Church &c. I must repeate what I have said
hertofoore, that, even by this Example, it is
cleere, you cannot agree what points be funda-
mentall: And so ( to whatsoever answere you
fly) I presse you in the same manner, and say,
that you have no Certainty whether you agree
in fundamentall points, or Unity and Substance
of Fayth, which cannot stand with difference
in fundamentall. And so upon the whole mat-
ter, I leaue it to be considered, whether, Want
of Charity can be justly charged on vs, because we
affirme, that they cannot (without repentance)
be saued, who want of all other the most nec-

cessary meanes to salvation, which are, the three
Theological Vertues, Faith, Hope, and
Char-
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CHARITY.

13. And now I end this first Part, having as I conceiue, complyed with my first designe (in that measure, which Tyme, Commodity, scarcity of Bookes, and my owne small Abilities could afford) which was to shew, that Amongst men of different Religions, one side onely can be saued. For since there must be some infallible Means to decide all Controversies concerning Religion, and to propound truth reveale by Almighty God; and this Means can be no other, but the Visible Church of Christ, which at the tyme of Luthers appearance was only the Church of Rome, and such as agreed with her: We must conclude, that whosoever opposeth himself to her definitions, or forsaaketh her Communion, doth resift God himselfe, whose spouse she is, and whose divine truth she propounds; and therefore becomes guilty of Schisme, and Heresy, which since Luther, his Associates, and Protestants, haue done, and still continue to doe; it is not Want of Charity, but abundance of evident cause, that forceth vs to declare this necessary Truth, PROTESTANCY UNREPEIENT DESTROYES SALVATION.
The End of the first Part.
THE SECOND PART.

THE PREAMBLE.

SINCE I have handled the substance of our present Controversy, & answered the chiefe grounds of D. Potter in the First Part; I may vvell in this Second be more briefe, referring the Reader to those several places, wther in his reasons are confuted, and his ob-

Qq 3 secti-
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jections answered. And because in
every Section, he handleth so many
different points, that they cannot be
ranged under one Title, or Argu-
ment; my Chapters must accordingly have no particular Title as they had
in the First Part; but the Reader may
be pleased to conceive, and yet do me
no more then Justice therein, that the
Argument of every one of my Seaven
Chapters, is an Answer to his Seau-
en Sections, as they lie in order. 
But let vs now address our Speech
to D. Potter.

CHAP.
O V pretend, and profess in your Preface to the Reader, that you have not omitted without Answer any one thing of moment in all the Discourse of Charity Mistaken: and yet you omit that, which very much import to the Question in hand, namely the moderate Explication of our doctrine, that Protestant unrepented destroys Salvation; and that you must say the same of vs, if you believe your owne Religion to be true, and Ours to be false: which points are prudently delievered in Charity Mistaken in his second Chapter, which together with his First, you undertake to answer in this your First Section. And whereas he shewed by divers arguments that it is improbable that the Church should want Charity, your Answer is that point is superficial, and untrue in some things, and none at all in others, as will easily appeare to any that shall read Charity Mistaken in his first Chapter.

2. You tell vs in very confident manner, that hardly (a) any Age in former times may compare (a) Pag. 33.
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with this of Ours (since this Church was happily purged from Popery) for publike expressions of Charity; but you doe it in so generall termes, as if you were afraied of being confuted. For I beseech you, D. Potter, are the Churches which Protestants haue built, any thing comparable to the which haue been erected by Catholiques? Doe your Hospitalls so much deserve as to be named? Haue you any thing of that kind in effect of particular note, saving the few meane Nurseries of idle beggars and debauched people, except perhaps Sutton's Hospital, which (as I haue beene informed) was to take no profit at all till he was dead? He who (as I haue also understood) dyed to without any Children, or Brothers, or Sisters, or knowne kindred, as that peraduenture it might haue escheted to the King? He who liued a wretched and penurious life, and drew that malle of wealth together by V fury, in which case according to good conscience, his estate without asking him leave, was by the Law of God obnoxious to restitution, and ought to have been applied to pious uses? Whereas both anciently in this Countrey, and at all tymes, and specially in this last age, men see abundanse of heroicall actions of this kind performed in forrayne parts. And if it were not for feare of noting many other great Citties, as if there were any want of moit munificent Hospitalls in them, wherein they abound; I could tell you of one cal-
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called the Annunziata in the City of Naples, which spends three hundred thousand Crownes per annum, which comes to about four-score thousand pounds sterling by the yeare, which ever feeds, and cures a thousand sicke persons, and payes for the nurling and enter-tayning of three thousand fucking children of poore people, and hath fourteene other distinct Hospitals vnder it, where the persons of those poore creatures are kept, and where they are defrayed of all their necessary charges every weeke. I could also tell you of an Hospitall in Rome called S. Spirito of huge reuencewes, but it is not my meaning to enter into particulars, which would prove endles. In the meane time it is pretie entertainment for you to believe no more then you see, which is not much, and to talke in generall termes, by comparing that which comes in your way, with those which are in other Countries, wherof you seeme to know very little. And where I pray you can you verify that which Charity Mislaken sayth of our Church in these words. (pag. 7.) Persons sicke of all abuses are served and attended (after the example of Christ our Lord) by the owne hands of great Princes and Prelates, and of choyce and delicate Ladies and Queens, in the Communion of the holy Catholique Church? Would to God the first Head of your Church had not destroyed those innumerable glorious monuments of Charity which he found! But because our present question a-

R r
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bout the Saueablenenes of Protestants belongeth rather to Faith then Charity, out of your owne hyperbolicall affirmation. I will infer: That see-
ing the Monuments of Charitable workes per-
formed by Catholiques, do incomparably ex-
ceed those of yours; and yet, that time for time
your Charity (as you affirmest) surpassest ours;
it followes very cleerly, that our Fayth and
Church is far more ancient then yours, and
consequently that yours cannot be Catholique
for all Ages. So that by exaggeration of your
Charity, you have overthrowne your Fayth and
Charity also, which cannot subsist without true
Catholique Fayth.

3. But yet you are so ingenuous, that you
donot so much as pretend to compare your
Charity in converting soules, to that of the Ca-
tholiques: nor do you so much as once venture
to intinuate that the Protestant Ministers leave
their Countrey and Commodities, and the
howses of rich and louing friends, to transport
themselfes into barbarous Nations, with the
sufferance of all cruell inconueniences, and ve-
ry many times of death it selfe, for the conver-
tion of soules to Christ our Lord. For of this
you were expresslye toold, and consequently
how improbable it was, that Catholiques should
fear the daungerous state of Protestants,
through meere want of Charity; wheras yet for
the only exercize of that vertue, they were con-
sent with so much courage and joy to cast away
their
their lines; & that thence when we made that judgment of you, it was rather through our zeal and cordiall desire of your good, and fear of your losse, then for want of charity, or compassion. But of this, as I was saying, you were so wise as not to speake a word. For that glorious marke of the Dilatation and Amplitude of Gods Church, by the Conversion of Nations, Kings, and Kingdomes, so manifestly foretold by the holy Prophets, and ordained in the Gospell, when our Saviour bid the Apostles preach to all Nations, and yet never performed by Protestants, by evidence of fact, and by the confession of our Adversaries, doth shine most bright in the Church of Rome.

4. But I cannot say, that you omitted to raile against the Jesuites, whom I will not dishonour so much, as to defend them against that which you offer so impertinently, vulgarly, and meanely against them, and particularly because in defence of a common cause I will not be diverted by the consideration of particular persons, though by reason of the Eminency of the person of Cardinal M'offat, I cannot forbear to tell you, that you falsify him, when you make him lay in his eight Epistle, that he collected from their wicked doctrine and practises, that they believe neither in Jesus Christ, nor the Pope. For the Cardinal speakes not those words of any doctrine or practises of the Jesuites: And in the funerall Oration which was pronounced at the
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Exeqyes of the said Cardinall, and is prefixed before the Booke which you alledge, it is af-
firmed, that he of his owne accord, and with-
out being dealt with to that purpose, did nego-
ciate the readmission of the Iesuites into France.
So far was he from collecting from their doctrine & practises, that they believe neither in Jesu Christ, nor in the Pope. And as for our doctrine, which concerns the incompatibility of Protestanty with salvation, as proper to the Iesuites, it is an idle speak, void of all colour of truth. For it is so far from being proper to them, that it is com-
mon to all Roman Catholiques in the world, and you shall never be able to shew me any one of an entire fame, who holds the contrary.

5. And whereas you aske: Why may not a Protestant be saued since he believes entirely the Scriptures, the Catholique Creeds, and whatsoever the Catholique Church in all ages hath believed as neces-
sary to salvation? You may take the answere out of my First Part, where I haue shewed, that he neither keepes the Commandments, nor be-
lieves all things necessary to salvation, yea and believes not any one point with divine and su-
pernatuall fayth, who disobeyes, and disagrees from the visible Church of Christ, in any one
ting, propounded by her as a Divine truth.

6. You tell vs, that you are no further depar-
ted from the present Roman Church, then she is de-
parted from herself. But no wise man will be-
lieue this, till you can informe him, what visi-
ble
ble Church at, or before Luther's appearance remained pure, out of which the Roman Church had formerly departed; or else you must confess that the whole Church of Christ was corrupted. Which because you will never be able to doe, with truth you must be forced to confess, that she still kept her integrity, without any spot of erroneous doctrine, and therefore that your departure out of her, cannot be excused from Schisme, and Heresy.

7. You say truly, That it is meerly impossible (b) the Catholique Church should want Charity, because the good spirit of Truth and Love ever assists and animates that great Body. But you speake not consequently to your owne Assertion, that the Catholique Church may err in points of faith not fundamentally. For if the good spirit of Truth, may fail to assist her faith: why may not the good spirit of Love, fail to direct her Charity? Nay if we observe it well, the Want of Charity which you impute to vs, is resolved into this doctinall point, Protestancy unrepented destroyes salvation: Which Doctrine and Assertion, if you hold to be a fundamental error, you deprive vs of salvation, and become as uncharitble to vs as you lay we are to you. If it be not a fundamental point, then (according to your principles) the Church may err therein, and so want Charity, by judging that Protestants cannot be fauored.

8. What we understand by the Roman Cat-
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tholique Church, I have explained heeretofore, to wit, all Christians united with the Church of Rome, as it is the Sea of Peter. In which sense it is not a part, but comprehendeth all the Catholique Church (which heeretofore I proved out of the Fathers;) as, in some proportion, we do not understand the Tribe of Iuda alone by the Jewish Church, though the other Tribes were called by the name of the Jewish People and Church, from that principal Tribe of Iuda. So that your marginall quotations to prove that the Church of Rome is a particular Church, are employed to prove that which no man denies, if we speake of the particular Diocesse of Rome, and not as it is the Sea of Peter, to which all Christian Catholiques dispersed throughout the whole world are united: Which Sea of Peter settled in Rome, being the Root, the Center, the Fountaine, the Idea of all Ecclesiastical Union in all Christian Churches, giueth them the denomination of Roman Catholiques; which doth no more limit the whole Catholique Church, then the name of Jewish Church, did limit the whole Sinagogue to the Tribe of Iuda alone. And therefore your thred-bare Objection, that

(c) Pag. 11. Catholique Roman (c) are terms repugnant, signifying universal particular, vanisheth utterly away by this different conception of the Roman Church, and serveth only to convince by your own oblication, that D Potter, or the Church of England cannot rule themselves Catholique, because
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causae Catholique signifieth Universal, and D. Porter and the Church of England, are things particular. And I would gladly know what your Brethren mean, when they affirm the Roman Church, for divers Ages to have possessed the whole world? Do they thinke that the particular Dioces of Rome was lifted over the Alpes? Or when your Prelates deaund, whether we be Roman Catholiques, do they deaund whether we dwell in the City, or Dioces of Rome? And heer I note in a word, what now cometh to my mind, that I wonder D. Andrewes, a man so highly esteemed among Protestants, would tell vs that the Roman Church is indiv. (d) as the Logicians call it, and that Catholique is Genus, or a generall kind. For to omit that the thing it selfe is ridiculous, it makest directly for vs, because every individuum contains in it selfe the Genus, as Peter (for example) is a substance, a sensible creature &c. and so if the Roman Church be individuum, it must containe Catholique in it selfe; and so the Roman Church must of necessitie be affirmed to be a Catholique Church. Before I leave this point I must tell you, that you corrupt Innocentius Tertius, to proue (e) that the Roman Church was anciently esteemed a Topical, or particuler Church (e) Pag. 12: distinct from others, and is called the Universall, in these words: It is called the Universall Church which consists of all Churches: where you put an &c. and then add, Ecclesia Romana sic non est universalis.
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versalis Ecclesia, sed pars univer-salis Ecclesia: The
Roman Church is not thus the universal Church, but
part of the universal Church, where you breake
off. But Innocentius his words are these: The V-
universal Church is said to be that which consists of all
Churches, which of the Greke word is called Catho-
lique: and according to this acception of the Word, the
Roman Church is not the Vuniversal Church, but part
of the Vuniversal Church: Yet the first and chiefe
part, as the head in the body; because in her, fulnes of
power doth exist, but only a part of fulnes is derived
to others. And that One Church, which contains un-
der it seife all Churches, is said to be the Vuniversal
Church. And according to this signification of the
Word, only the Roman Church is called the Vuniversal
Church, because she alone is preferred before the
rest by pruileedge of singular dignity. As God is called
the Vuniversal Lord, not because he is divided into
species &c. but because all things are contained under
his Dominion: For there is One general Church of
which Truth it seife said to Peter; Thou art Peter and
upon this Rocke &c. And the many particular Chur-
ches, of which the Apostle sayth, Instantia mea &c.
One doth consist of all, as the general of particulars,
& One hath the preeminence before all, because seing
there is one Body of the Church, of which the Apostle
sayth; We are all one Body in Christ: she excels the
rest, as the Head excels the other members of the body.
Thus far Innocentius; who as you see teacheth
that the Roman Church is the Head of all oth-
ers: That although the Roman Church in one
sense
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sense be a particular Church, yet in another sense it both is, and ought to be called the Universal Church; and finally that your Objection about the repugnance betwixt the terms Universal and particular is frivolous, as he expatiates very well by the example of Almighty God, who is said to be an Universal Cause, and yet had neither genus, nor species, and besides whom there are other particular Causes. Is this to affirm, as you say, that the Roman Church is a topickall, or particular Church in, and under the Universal? Or that he is only Topickall, or particular, as you would make the Reader believe?

9. Your preaching, rather then proving the Charity of your Church, Administration of Sacraments &c. must rely upon a voluntary begging of the Question, that your Religion is true; otherwise the good deeds you mention are not expressions of Charity, but professions of Heresy; The learned Cardinal Hosius saying: Whosoever believes (f) the Article of the Catholique Church, believes all things necessary to Salvation, lays no more then you will say, that whosoever believes the whole Canon of Scripture, believes all things necessary to Salvation. And you cannot but speake against your owne conscience, when you say of the Roman Church, (pag 18.) She tells them it is creed enough for them to believe only in the Catholike Church: For your selfe (pag. 198.) affirm, that the best advised of Catholique Devines yield there are some points necessarily
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cessary to be knowne of all sorts, necessitate medijs, in
which points implicite fayth doth not suffice, & you
cite some of our Authors to this purpose (chap.
71. & 141.) and referre vs to a great many
more. What conscionable dealing is this? I
will not stand to note, that Hosius even as he is
cited by you in Latin, doth not say, that we be-
lieue in the Church, as you make him speake in
your text, but that, we believe the Church. But
enough of this.

10. In your First Edition, I find these wor-
des: Never did (g) any Church afford more plen-
tfully the means of grace, nor more abound with all
helps and advantages of Piety, then this of ours. But
in your second Edition you say: No Church of this
Age doth afford &c. Whereby you acknowledge
that at first you did overlash, & so do you now.
But it comes to you by kind. Beza makes bold
to say: When I compare, even the tymes which were
next to the Apostles (h) with ours, I am wont to
say, and in my opinion not without cause, that they
had more conscience and lesse knowledge; and con-
trarily we have more knowledge and lesse conscience.
And M. Whitgift your once Archbishop of Can-
terbury sayth: The doctrine taught and profess
(i) by our Bishops at this day, is more perfect and
founder than commonly was in any Age after the A-
postles &c. How greatly were almost all the Bishops
and learned Writers of the Grecke Church, and Lat-
tins also for the most part, spotted with doctrines of
Freeswill, of Merits, of Invocation of Saints, and
such
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such like. Surely you are not able to reckon in any Age, since the Apostles times, any Company of Bishops, that taught and held so sound and perfect doctrine in all points, as the Bishops of England do at this day. And will not the Puritans say, that they are more pure than Protestants, and Anabaptists account themselves more vainly potted then Puritans &c? In the meane time your own Archbishop grants that, Almost all the Bishops & learned Writers of the Greeke Church, and Latins also, were for the most part spottet with doctrines, which now you call Popish Superstitions.

11. The rest of this Section contaynes nothing but rayling, and vntruths, continually vtered by euerie Minister, and often anwered by our Writers. In Catholique Countreys there may be good reason for not mentioning the needles praiies of condemned Heretiques, lest the estimation of their morall parts, which they abuse against Gods Church, breed a liking, and add authority to their pestiferous errors. If D. Stapleton, or any other speaking of Heretiques in generall, compare them to: Magicians &c (as Tertullian also doth) what is that to you, vnles you be resolued to proclaime your selfe an Heretique? Such layings are not directed to their Persons, which we loue; but fall upon their fame: which considered in it selfe, cannot, I hope, be ouerwronged by ill language. S. Policarpe called an Heretique the first begotten of the Diuell. S. Paul gives them the name of (k) (k) Philip.
Dogs. S. Iohn termes them Antichristes, as your Ministers are wont to call the Pope. Charity Mistaken compares you not with Iewes, or Turkes for impossibility to be fauned. Every deadly sinne excludes salvation; yet some are more grievous, and further from pardon then others.

12. I hope the Mistaker(1) would not wish vs converted from our Creed. No: But we wish you converted, from Erroneous Interpretations thereof, to the Catholique Church, which we profess in our Creed. In the mean time these are learned arguments which may serve both sides. Protestants believe the Creed, Ergo, they need not be converted. Catholiques believe the Creed, Ergo they need not be converted. You tell us of a Censure of the Creed, written by some Catholique. And in your first Edition you put, Censura Symboli Apostolici, ad instar Censura Parisiensis. But in your second Edition, being as it seemes, sory for your former sinceritie, you say absolutely, Censura Symboli Apostolici, with an &c. which helps you in divers occasions, both to deceive the Reader, and yet to saue your selfe when you shall be told of corrupting the sentence by leaving out words, as in this particular the Reader will conceive, that it was an absolute Censure of the Apostiles Creed; whereas contrarily, it supposeth that the Creed, as a thing most sacred, cannot be censured, and out of that supposition, taxeth a certaine Censure framed, as he thinkes, in such manner that the Creed it selfe
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Selfe could not be free from mens Censure, if such a forme of Censure might passe for current. This I lay, is the drift of that Censure, and not to censure the Creed: which thing I touch, but to answere you, who infer that some Catholiques seeme very meanely to esleeme the Creed. But my intention is not to medle any way with that Censure of the Creed, ( whose Author in very deed is unknowne to me ) or with any Bookes, or Censures in that kind, wholly leaving those affairs to the Vicar of Christ, the Successour of S. Peter, which is a great happines proper to Catholiques, who though they may disagree as men, yet as Catholiques, they haue meanes to end all Controversies, by recourse and submission to one supreme Authority.

Chap. II.

Our Second Section treats principally of two points: The Unity of the Church, where in it consists; and; The Communion of the Church, how farre necessary. Both these points have been handled in the first Part; where I proved that Difference in any one

313 point
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point of faith destroyeth the being and unity of faith, and of the Church. And that, Communion with the true Visible Church is so far necessary, that all voluntary error against her definitions, as Heresy is, and all division from her outward Society, which is Schism, excludes salvation. By these Rules, we can certainly know what is damnable Schism, and Heresy; whereas you, placing the Unity of Faith, and truth of a Church in the belief of points, which you call fundamental, although it be joined with difference in a thousand other points, and yet not knowing what Articles in particular be fundamental, must give this final resolution: The Unity of faith, and of the Church consists in, We know not what. Moreover, if you measure the Nature, and Unity of faith, not by the formal motive, for which we believe, to wit, the Word, or Revelation of God, but by the weight of the particular objects which are believed, you will not be able to shew, that he who erreth in some one, or more fundamental points, doth loose divine infallible faith in respect of those other truths which he believes: and by this means, Persons disagreeing, even in Fundamental points, may retain the same substance or essence of faith, and be of the selfe same true Church; which is most absurd, & makes a faire way to affirm, that Jews, and Turks are of the same Church with Christians, because they all agree in the belief of one God. And thus we have
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have answered the substance of your Section. Yet because you interpose many other unnecessary points we must follow your wadings, lest else you may be thought to have laid something to vs which is vnanwerable.

2. After an vnpnforitable ostentation of Erudition (which yet required no deeper learning, then to read some of our Catholique Interpreters) about the place Deut. 17. you come in the end to grant, that the High Priest in cases of moment had an absolutely infallible direction &c. And will you give greater priviledge of infallibility to the Type, then to the Thing signified, to wit, the true Church of Christ, of which the Synagogue was but a figure? You cite some Catholique Authours, as affirming that by the Judge is meant the Civill Magistrate, and by the Priest, not the High Priest alone. Of which Catholique Authours, I have at the present only the Dauid's (as you are pleased to call them) in their Marginall Note on the 2. Chro. 19. Vers. 1. whom I find you to falsify. For their words are only these: A most plaine distinction of spiritual and temporeall authority and offices, not instituted by Iosaphat, nor any other King, but by God himselfe. And upon the words of Deut. 17. Vers. 9. Thou shalt come to the Priest of the Leuiticall Stocke, and to the Judge that shall be at that time; they say: In the Councell of Priests one supreme Judge, which was the High Priest. Vers. 12. And further they say: There were not many Presidents at once, but in Succession.
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cession, one after another. Is this to affirm, that
by the Priest, is meant not the high Priest alone?
Do they not say the quite contrary? And as for
your Objections against our Argument drawn
from the Synagogue, to prove the infallibility
of the Church, I have answered them (m) here-
tofore.

3. That Core, Dathan, and Abiron, with all
their Company descended alive into the pit of Hell;
you say, is rashly, and (n) uncharitably said by Cha-
rry Mislaken. But you falsify his words which
are: The ground (o) opened itself and swallowed
them alive, with all their goods into the profound pit
of Hell. Are (goods) and (company) two words
of one significan? And yet in your second Ed-
dition, you cite (with all their company &c.) in a
different letter, as the words of your Auerfane.
But suppose he had said, as you allege him
(with all their company &c.) what great crime
had he committed? The holy Scripture lays of
them, and their Complices, without limitation
or distinction: The Earth (p) brake in sunder under
their feet; and opening her mouth, devoured them
with their Tabernacles, and all their substance, and
they went downe into Hell quicke, covered with the
ground, and perished out of the midst of the multi-
tude. You see the Scripture speakes indefinitely,
and so doth Charity Mislaken, without adding
any Vniversal particle, as (All, Every one, or the
like), except when he layth, with all their Goods,
which are the very words of Scripture. Nay

Since
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since the Scripture layth: They went downe into Hell quicke, and perished out of the midst of the multitude; by what authority will you affirm, that all perished out of the midst of the multitude, but not all went downe into Hell quicke?

4. Though it were granted that those wordes Math. 18. 17. If thy Brother offend thee, tell the Church, are meant of private wrongs: yet it is cleere, that from thence is inferred a fortiori, that all Christians are obliged to obey the Catholique Church in her decrees. And no man is so ignorant as not to know, that the holy Fathers do every where apply those words against Schismatiques and Heretiques, as appeareth by S. Augustine whom he herefofe (p) I cited, and S. Cyprian (q) and others. And I pray you, if one utter some Heresy, in presence of his brother; doth he not in a very high degree offend his Brother? and consequently, is he not comprehended in those words of our Sauiour, If thy Brother offend thee &c.? Now, if the Church were fallible, how could we be obliged under paine of being reckoned Pagans and Publicans, to obey her Decrees and Declarations concerning matters of fayth, which is a Vertue, that necessarily inuolues infallibility? But when did you ever heare any Catholique say what you impose upon Charity Mistaken, that absolute obedience is due unto the Church, no appeale being allowed, no nor (r) to Scriptures though expounded in a Catholike sense, and consonantly to the judgment of (r) pag. 28.

T t
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the most ancient and famous members of the Church?
With what face can you utter such stuffe?
You know we believe, that the Church cannot oppose Scripture.

5. As for those corruptions of the Text of S. Cyprian in his Booke de uniate Ecclesia, which you charge Pamellus to have committed in favour of S. Peter's Primacy; it is but an old objection borrowed of others, and purposely answered by Pamellus in his notes upon that Booke, where, for his justification he cites divers ancient Copies, and one more then nine hundred yeares old. And as for the phrase & maine point itselfe, that Christ built the Church upon Peter, it is expressly affirmed by S. Cyprian in many other places, which I quote in the (s) Margent: whereby it manifestly appeareth what S. Cyprian believed about the Authority of Saint Peter: and how much his Booke de Uniate Ecclesia maketh for the Roman Church: neyther can you in all S. Cyprians workes, or in this place in particular, shew anything to the contrary, as you are pleased to (t) affirme. To prove that our vnworthy fashion is, to alter & raze many records and Monuments of Antiquity, you cite a moderne English Writer, & Sixtus Seneculis. But both of them are alledged after your fashion: for the first speaks only of Bookes written in favour of the Popes Power in temporall things, wherein neuertheles we can in no wise allow of his saying, nor is he in this
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this point a competent witness; and the second directly falsified. For you say, he highly commendst (u) Pope Pius the fifth for the care which (u) Epist.de he had to extinguish all dangerous Books; and, to die.ad Pium purge the writings of all Catholique Authors, es. especially of the Ancient Fathers, from the filth and poison of Heresy; & there you end the sentence. But Sixtus Sevenstis hath factus hereticorum atatis nostra: from the dregs of the Heretiques of our times, understanding nothing else, but that the said holy Pope caused the false Annotations Glosses, Marginall notes &c. of Erasmus, and moderne Heretiques to be blotted, or taken out of the Bookes of the holy Fathers. Is not this playne falsification? And so much lesse excusable, because it could not be done but willingly, and willingly; for that in the Margent you cite the Latin, & when you come to those words, especially of the ancient Fathers, you breake off with an &c. leaving out that which did directly overthrow the purpose for which you alledged those words. For want of better matter, you tell vs of an Edition of Isidorus Pelusio[s] his Greeke Epistles approved, because they contained nothing contrary to the Catholique Roman Religion: wherein what great harme is there? If the Approbator had left out Roman, would you have made this objection? To vs, Catholique and Roman are all one, as heretofore I explicated. But it seemes (say you) that they had not passed, but upon that Condition.
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This is but a poore Consequence in Logicke: For, one effect may be produced by some cause, yet in such manner, as that the effect would follow, though that cause were taken away; & accordingly you grant that the aforesayd clause of Approbation is left out in another Edition. Neyther can you be ignorant that Catholicques do print, and reprint the writings of ancient Authours, although they contayne Heresies, as the workes of Tertullian, Origen &c. And therefore you are lesse excusable both for making this Objection in generall, and also for fallifying Sixtus Senensis in particular.

6. The places alledged by you out of S. Augustin against the Donatists, come far short of proving, that (u) Scripture alone is the Judge, or rather (as you correct your selfe) Rule of Controversies; & your bringing the to that purpose is directly against S. Augustins words & meaning, as will appeare by what now I am about to say. Two Questions were debated between the Catholicques, & Donatists. the one concerning the Church, whether or no she were confined to that corner of the world, where the faction of Donatus did reside. The other, whether such as were baptized by Heretiques ought to be rebaptized. We grant that S. Augustine in the former Question, prelled the Donatist, with manifest Scripture to prove the externall apparent Notes, or Markes of the Church, as Viability, perpetuity, Amplitude, Universality &c. And no wonder
wonder that he appealed to Scripture. For that very Questiō being, whether the Catholiques, or Donatists, were the true Church; to suppose the Catholiques to be the true Church, and upon that supposition to allege their Authority against the Donatists, had been but to beg the Question: as if there were Controversy, whether some particular Booke were Canonical Scripture, or no, it were an idle thing to allege that very writing in question, to prove it self, Canonical: and on the other side, both the Catholikes and Donatists did acknowledge & believe the same Scriptures, which as S. Augustine is wont to lay, speake more clearly of the Church, then of Christ himselfe: and therefore he had good reason to try that Question concerning the Church by clear, & not doubtfull Testimonies of holy Writ; whereas the Donatists had recourse eyther to obscure Texts, as that of the Canticles, Show me where thou feedest, where thou liest in the midday, to prove that the Church was confined to Africa; or els to humane Testimonies as Acts of Notaries or Scriveners, to prove that the Catholiques had been Traditors, that is had gue vp the holy Bible to be burned. Or that they had sacrificed to Idols. Or had been cause of persecution against Christians: and that either for these crimes, or for communicating with such as had committed them, the Church had perished from among Catholiques: Or els they produced their owne bare affirmation or
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mock-Miracles, & false Counsels of THE I R
OWNE: All which provokes being very par-
tially, insufficient, and impertinent, S. Augustin
had reason to say: Let these fictions (w) of lying
men, or fantastical wonders of deceitfull Spirits, be
removed. And: Let us (x) not heare; These things I
say; These things thou saist; but let us heare; These
things our Lord sayth. And: What are our words (y)
wherein we must not seeke her & c. All that we object
each against another of the giving up of the holy
Bookes, of the Sacrificing to Idols, and of the persecu-
tion, are our words. (these words you fraudulently
conceale, although you cite other in the selfe
fame Chapter, because they plainly shew what
S. Augustin understands by Humane Testimo-
nes, & they ans were all your Objections:) And:
The question betweene vs (z) is, where the Body of
Christ, that is, the Church is? What then are we to do?
Shall we seeke her in our words, or in the words of our
Lord Jesus-Christ her head? Surely we ought rather
to seeke her in his words who is Truth, and best knows
his owne Body. And: Let this Head (a) of which we
agree, shew vs his Body, of which we disagree, that
our discensions may by his words be ended. Which
words plainly declare the reason why he appeal-
ed to Scriptures, because both parts agreed
about them, but disagreed concerning the
Church. And: That we are in the (b) true Church
of Christ, and that this Church is univerally spread
over the earth, we prove not by O V R Doctours, or
Counsels, or Miracles, but by the divine Scriptures.
The
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The Scriptures are the only (this word only put by you in a different letter, as if it were S. Augustines, is your owne addition:) Document, and foundation of our cause. These are the places by you alleaged to unfaithfully. And will you in good earnest infer from them, that we must reject all Councils, never so lawfull; all Doctors, never so Orthodox; all Miracles, never so authentical, even those which were wrought in the Primitive Church, & particularly in S. Augustines time, which he himselfe published (c) De cist. approved, and admired? And above all, will you infer, that after we have found out the true Church by Markes set downe in Scripture, her voyce for other particular points of doctrine is not to be heard, but to be esteemed a mere humane testimony of Notaries &c. as S. Augustine understood humane Testimony when he writ against the Donatists? Or will you infer that we must leare from Scripture all that which we are obliged to believe? This you pretend, but with such success as you are wont; that is, to plead for your Adversary against your selfe. Which is manifestly proued by the other Question of Rebaptization, controverted with the Donatists, for which they were properly and formally Heretiques: and yet S. Augustine confesseth that for this point of believe, he could not produce Scripture, as appeares by his words, which I cited in the first (d) Part, and desire the Reader to saue me the labour of repeating them heere.
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here: and then he will easily fee, that there is
great difference betwixt the general question of
the Church, and Questions concerning particular Doctrines delivered by the Church; in
which this holy Father sayth not we must have
recourse to Scripture alone, but that we ought
to believe the Church, which is recommended
to us by Scripture. And this he teacheth in that
very booke De unitate Ecclesiae, out of which
you brought the aforesaid places, to prove that
all Controversies must be decided by Scripture.
With what modesty then do you lay, The Mistak-
er was ill advised to send us to this (e) Treatise,
which both in the general ayme, and in the quality of
the Arguments and proofs is so contrary to his pre-
tensions?

7. You leave (f) a passage taken out of S.
Augustine to Charity Mistaken to ruminate v-
on: Whosoever (g) will believe a right in Christ the
Head, but yet doth so dissent from his Body the
Church, that their Communion is not with the whole
whosoever diffused, but with themselves severall in
some part; it is manifest that such are not in the Cath-
olique Church. Well; suppose all were done as
you desire; what other thing could be conclu-
ded, then this? But when Luther appeared,
Protestantism was not with the whole wher-
soever diffused, but with himselfe alone: What
will follow from hence, you have so much Logick
that you cannot Mistake. Wherefore at this day,
and for ever, we must say of the Catholique
Church,

(e) pag. 33.
(f) pag. 33.
(g) S. Aug. de unit. Ec-
sle. cap. 4.
Church, as Saint Augustine sayd: Every one of those (he speakes of Heretiques) is not (g) to be found; where she is to be found, but she who is, is not (h) to be found in the selfe same places, where the others are.

8. You made an ill choyce of S. Epiphanius, to prove by his example that the Fathers were wont to confute Heresies by the only Evidence of Scripture. For he not only approves Traditions as necessary, but also proves them out of Scripture. We ought (sayth he) to use also (h) Tradition, for all things cannot be taken from the holy Scripture: the holy Apostles therefore delivered some things in writing, and some things by Tradition, as the holy Apostle sayth: As I delivered to you. And in another place: So I teach, and so I delivered in the Churches. And the same Father, as we shall see anon, doth most cleerly approve Traditions, yea and confutes Aërius by Tradition alone, without any Scripture. It is then no wonder, if you corrupt S. Epiphanius to make men believe that he speakes of Heresies in generall, whereas his words concern some few in particular, as the Samosatenians, Arians &c. His words as you translate them are these: The Divine (k) Godnes hath forewarned vs agaynst Heresies by his Truth, for God foreseeing the Citadnes, Impiety, & Fraude of the Samosatenians, Arians, Manichees, and other Heretiques, hath securd us by his divine Word against all their subtilities. But the true Translation of S. Epiphanius is this: Therefore the
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holy Scripture doth make vs secure of every word: That is, hath secured vs how we are to speake, or what words to use against the decepts of the Samosatenians, Ariani, and of other Heresies concerning the blessed Trinity, as it is cleere by these words immediatly following (which you thought fittest to conceale:) For he doth not say the Father is the Only-begotten. For how can he be the Only-begotten, who is not Begotten? But he calls the Sonne the only begotten, that the Sonne may not be thought to be the Father &c. Where you see he speaks of words, or manner of speaking, and concerning particular Heresies, which yet is made more cleere by the words immediatly precedent to the sentence by you cited, which words you also thought good to leave out. For he first proves out of Scripture that the Word is begotten of the Father, but that the Father is not Begotten, and therefore the Only-Begotten is the Sonne. And then he comes to the words by you cited, and teacheth, that holy Scripture hath warned vs, what words and manner of speach, or phrase we ought to use in speaking of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity, which Schoole Deuines call Proprietes Personarum. Yet that your Corruption might not be void of art (or rather a double fraud) in your Margent, you put in Grecke S. Enphaianus his words, that lo to such as understood not Grecke, nor perceive your mistranslation, your fraud might passe for honest dealing, and deceive your Reader; and
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9. These words of Charity Mistaken (I must needs observe, that (m) he (that is, S. Augustin) recounts divers Heresies, which are held by the Protestant Church at this day, and particularly that of denying Prayers, and Sacrifices for the dead) you corruptly compendiate when you say: The Mistaken must needs observe, that the Protestants hold divers ancient Heresies, and particularly (n) that of denying Prayers for the dead. Where you omit the words (S. Augustine recounts divers Heresies, and in particular, that &c. (to make men believe that it was but a bare affirmation of Charity Mistaken, and not collected out of S. Augustine: As likewise you conceal) Sacrifices) left the world might believe S. Augustine was a Papist; who nevertheless both in this Treatise de baresibus ad Quod-vult-Deum, bar. 35. cited by Charity Mistaken, and elsewhere, teacheth that the dead are holpen by the holy (o) Sacrifice. After this you say: He is very much (p) mistaken in his Observation. The Commemoration of the deceased in the ancient Church, which Aërius without reason disallowed, was a thing much differing from those Prayers for the dead, which are now in use in the Church of Rome. Thus having substituted Commemoration of the deceased, instead of Prayers and Sacrifices for the dead, you add, with your wonted sincerity: Our Roman Catholiques believe (at least they say so)
Charity maintayned that some soules of the faithful after their departure hence, are detained in a certaine fire bordering upon Hell till they be throughly purged; and their Prayers for them are, that they may be released, or easen of these torments. But you are full like your selfe. You may read in (q) Bellarmine, that concerning the Question, \textit{Ad Purgatorium}, \textit{Where Purgatory is}, the Church hath defined nothing. And to the other point: Whether in Purgatory there be true corporall fire, he answers; (r) That it is the common Opinion of Deuines that properly there is true fire, & of the same nature with our fire. Which Doctrine is not indeed a matter of fayth, because it is nowhere defined by the Church, yea in the Counsell of Florence the Grecians openly profess't, that they did not hold there was fire in Purgatory; nevertheless in the definition which was made in the last Sess. it was defined that there is a Purgatory, without making any mention of fire: Nevertheless it is an most probable Opinion, by reason of the agreement of the Schoole-Deuines, which cannot be rejected without rashnes. Thus Bellarmine.

10. Now for the maine point: That \textit{A\-e\-rius} was put in the list of \textit{Heretiques}, for denying Prayers for the Dead, which are offered to releue, or ease them of their paine, I prove out of \textit{A\-e\-rius} his owne words; Out of S. Epiphanius whom you seeme to alledge in your behalfe; Out of the ancient Fathers, Greeke, and Latine; & out of Protestants themselves; both in regard that they confesse the Doctrine of Purgatory
By Catholiques. Chap. II.

gatory and Prayer for the dead, even as Catholiques believe them, to have been believed by
the Ancient Fathers; and also in regard, they
directly acknowledge, that Aërius was con-
demned by the Fathers for denying Prayer for
the Dead, as we believe, and practive it.

11. Therefore your Progenitor Aërius tes-
tifying with his owne mouth the practive of
Catholiques in those ancient dayes. How (faith
he to Catholiques) do you (*) after Death name,
the names of the dead? For if the living pray &c. what
will it profit the dead? Or if the prayers of them who
are heere, be for those who are there, then let no man
be vertuous, nor let him doe any good worke, but let
him get friends by what means he will, either by mo-
cy, or having that charge to his friends at his death,
& let them pray for him that he may not S V E F E R
anything there, and that, irremediable sinnes com-
mittted by him may not be laid to his charge. Is it not
cleere enough by these worde, that this Here-
tique taereth Prayers offered for the dead, to re-
lease or leilien their paynes after this lie, & not
only for a bare Commoration, or Thanksgiving,
or the like? And that any man may yet further
confirme, especially if he continue to be of as
Puritanical a spirit, as he was who most re-
sembles the spirit of this Aërius; let vs, by the
way, add these words of his: Neither ought (s)
the croue any appointed fast, for these things are
Industriall, and under the yoke of servitude. For there
is no law appointed for the lust man, but for Murr-

(*) Apud
Epiph. be.
ref. 75.

V u 3

therere
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there is of their Fathers and Mothers, and such
like. But if I be resolued to fast, I will choose myself
any day, and I will fast with freedom.

12. Let vs now see what S. Epiphanius in
the same place sayth for your Commemoration of
the deceased: As for pronouncing the names of the
Dead (sayth he) What can be more profitable, good,
and admirable? Because the living believe that the deceas
dead live, and are not extinct, but have a being, and
live with our Lord: And, that I may utter a most
pious doctrine, that there is hope in those who pray
for their Brethren, as for those who are transmigrated
to another Country. These words you recite out of
S. Epiphanius, but leave out those words which
immediately follow, and are directly against the
doctrine which you will prove out of him in
that very place. For thus he saith: But the Prayers
which are made for them do profit them, although they
do not release the whole sin; in regard as long as we
are in this world, we faile, and erre both voluntarily
and against our will, to the end that, that also may be
mentioned which is more perfect, we remember both
the lust and Sinners: For Sinners, imploring the mer-
cy of God: But for the Lust, Fathers, Patriarches,Pro-
phets, Apostles, Evangelists, Martyres, Confessors,
Bishops, and Anchorites &c. that we may put a diffe-
rence betwixt our Lord Jesus Christ, and all Orders of
men, by that honour which we give to him, and that
to him we may give adoration. You see that S. Epi-
phanius speakes of forguienes of sinnes, & that
he makes a difference between Prayers offered
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for deceased Sinners, and the Commemoration of Saints, who by way of Thankes-giving, are remembered as holy men; whereas to our Saviour Christ highest adoration is exhibited as to God; Or (as Bellarmine tayth,) we distinguish the Saints from Christ, because we offer Sacrifice of Thankes-giving for Saints, but we do not offer Sacrifice for Christ, but to him, together with the Father, and the holy Ghost. You likewise falsify S. Epiphanius, while you lay out of him; That the living have hope for the deceased, as for those which be from home in another Countrey, and that, at length they shall attain the state which is more perfect. Which last words are not in S. Epiphanius, who never taught, that we offer Prayers for Saints, that they may attain a state which is more perfect. And when S. Epiphanius sayth, that those who pray for their Brethren have hope of them, as of those who are in another Countrey; you leave out Praying, and only put in Hope. And that you may be assured how contrary S. Epiphanius is to you; not only in the doctrine of Prayer for the dead, but also in the ground and reason, for which he believes it, namely Tradition; mark his wordes: The Church (sayth he in the same place) doth necessarily practisethis by Tradition received from our Ancestors. And who can breake the Ordination of his Mother, and the Law of his Father? as Salomon sayth: Hear O Son; the words of thy Father, and receive not the Ordination of thy Mother. Shewinge by this, that God
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God the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghost have taught both by writing, and without writing, (behold divine Traditions) and our Mother the Church, hath also in herselfe Ordinances inviolable which cannot be broken: (behold Ecclesiastical Traditions.) Since therefore there be Ordinances set downe in the Church, and that all be right, and admirable, this Seducer (Aeirius) remaines confuted. And together with him all those that follow his heresy. And let vs yet heare S. Epiphanius speaking a little before of another point, thus: But who knowes most of these things? Whether this deluded fellow (Aeirius) who is yet alive &c. or those who before vs have yielded Testimony, and have had the Tradition of the Church, which also was delivered from their Fore-Fathers, as they likewise learned of those who were before them, in which manner the Church doth still conserve the true Faith received from their Fore-Fathers, and also Traditions? Consider now with what reason you alleged S. Epiphanius, as one who saith that all Heresy is to be confuted by evidence of Scripture; whereas he doth cleerly auouch Tradition in general, and doth in particular confute the Heresy of Aeirius, without alleging so much as one Text of Scripture.

13. And though S. Epiphanius alone, might suffice both to assure vs what was the Heresy of Aeirius in whose time he liued; and also to witnes for all the rest of the Greeke Fathers, yea &c for the whole Church, (because he auouched Prayer
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Prayer for the dead to come from the Tradition of the Greek Church; yet I will add some more of the Greek Church, as S. Dionysius Areopagita, who saith: Then a Venerable (u) Bishop doth pray (u) Ecele, over the dead party, that the divine Goodness would Hierarch, pardon all his sins committed by humane frailty, 
and transferre him to light, and the Country of the living. I wonder then how in your Text your could tel vs, that (w) conformably to your Opinion; The ancient Church in her Liturgy remembered (w) Page 37; all those that slept in hope of the Resurrection of everlasting life, and particularly the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs &c. beseeching God to give the rest, and to bring them, you put in a parenthesis at the Resurrection, to the place where the light of his countenance should shine upon them for evermore. And in your Margent, you cite S. Dionysius as favouring you, who nevertheless in the very Chapter with you cite for your Opinion, is directly against you in the words even now alleged. The like sincerity you shew in the very same Margent in citing S. Cyril, who doth clearly affirm, that in the Sacrifice we remember some that they would pray for us, and others that they may be relieved by our Prayers and Sacrifices, in these (x) Catech. words: When we offer this Sacrifice (x) we make motion of those who are deceased, of Patriarchs &c. God would receive our prayers by their intercession. And we pry for all who are deceased, believing that it is an highest help to those for whom the oblation of that holy and dreadful Sacrifice is offered. S. Gregory
In Ora. gory Nyssen faith: He cannot after his departure (y) from the body be made partaker of the Divinity, unless the purging fire shall cleanse the staines of his soule.

14. Among the Latin Fathers, Protestants pretend to esteeme none more then S. Augu-istine, and yet none can speake more plainly against them in this point then he doth, who besides that he rankes Aemius among the Heretiqes, in another place, he sayth: Purge me (z) in this lyfe, in such sort, as that I may not need the correcting, or amending fire. And afterward: It is sayd he shall be sauced as if it were by fire, and because it is sayd, he shall be sauced, that fire growes to be condemnd. But so it is; though he shall be sauced, yet the paine of that fire is more grievous, then whatsocuer a man can suffer in this life. And ellwwhere;

Some suffer (a) temporall punishments, only in this lyfe, others after death, others both now and then. Of which place, Fulke is enforced to say: Augustine concludes very clearly, (b) that some suffer Temporall paines after this lyfe, this may not be denied. And in another place, S. Augustine sayth: We ought not (c) to doubt, but that the dead are holpen by the Prayers of the holy Church, and by the wholesome Sacrifice, and by Almes given for their soules, that our Lord would deal with them more mercifully then their sinnes have deservd. For the whole Church observes this, as delivered from our Fathers. Neither can you avoide these Authorities by flying to the Requests of Gods mercy that they may have their
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De cinit. lib. 21. c. 13.

Confut. of Purg. pag. 110.

De verbis Apost. ferm. 34.

Pag. 32. (d) perfect Consummation in body and soule, in the king.
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kingdom of God at the last Judgment, as you speake. For (besides that all they who depart this life in Gods favour are most assured of a perfect Consummation independantly of our Almes-deeds, Prayers &c.) S. Augustine as you have heard speaks of a Purging fire, of Temporal Punishments, after this life &c. And doth else-where write as if he had purposely intended to prevent this your Evasion, saying: At the Altar (e) we do not remember Martyrs, as we do other deceased who rest in peace, by praying for them; but rather that they would pray for us. Which difference between Martyrs, and other deceased, cannot stand with your mere Commemoration of Thanksgiving, or your Request for a perfect Consummation, both which according to your doctrine concerne Martyrs, no lesse then others. The same difference is expressed by S. Cyprian, saying: It is one thing to be purged, (f) after long torment for ones sinnes, and to be long cleansed with the fire, and another thing to have wiped away all sinnes by suffering. S. Hierome sayth: If Origen affirme that (g) all Creatures endued with reason, are not to be lost, and granteth repentance to the cont. Plea- Druell, what belongs that to vs, who affirme that the giants, Diuell, and all his Officers, and all sinneful and wicked men do eternally perish, and that Christians, if they be taken away in sinne, are to be saved after punishments? More Fathers may be seen in Bellarmine and other Catholique Writers. These may suffice to shew, what was that Belief & Practise of

X x. 2.

the
Part. 2. Charity maintayned
the Church, which Aërius opposed in his time, as you do at this day.

15. Lastly, your owne Brethren beare witnes thus against you. Calvin sayth: More then a thousand three hundred (h) years ago, it was a Custom to pray for the dead: But I confesse they were all driven into Error. Bucer his words are: Because (1) almost from the beginning of the Church, Prayers and Almes-deeds were offered for the dead, that opinion which S. Augustine sets downe in his Enchri-
dio cap. 110. crept in by little & little: Neither ought we to deny, that souls are released by the piety of their living friends, when the Sacrifice of our Mediatour is offered for them &c. Therefore I doubt not, but that from hence arose that duty of Praying, and offering Sacrifice for them. Fulke speaketh plainly: Aërius taught, that Prayer for the dead (k) was unprofitable, as witnesseth both Epiphanius, and Augustine, which they count for an Error. He likewise acknowledges, that Ambrose, Chrysostome, & Augustine allowed Prayer for the dead: That, Tertullian, Augustine, Cyprian, Hierome, and a great many more do witness, that Prayer for the dead is the Tradition of the Apostles. And that Fulke understands these Fathers in the sense of satisfying for Temporal paines after this life, I hope you will not deny. For it is cleere by what we said out of him aboue; Nay, euene in the Communion Booke allowed, and established by Aët of Parliament in the second yeare of Edward the Sixth, and printed in London by Edward Whitchurch Anno 1549.
there is Prayer for the dead: and in the year 1547. the first year of Edward the Sixth his reign, Stow recounts, that on the 19. of June a Dirige was sung in every parish Church in London for the French King late deceased; and a Dirige was also sung in the Church of S. Paul in the same City, & on the next morrow the Archbishop of Canterbury, assisted of eight Bishops, all in rich mitres, & other their Pontificals, did sing a Masse of Requiem. And (to say this by the way) there is in the same Communion Book offering vp of our Prayers by Angels: as likewise in the first year of that King’s reign, Communion in One Kind, in time of Necessity, is approved, as also in the Collection in English of Statutes &c. the reason hereof is added, because at that time the opinion of the Real presence (as the Collector saith) was not removed from us. Which ingenious confession supposes that Communion in one kind cannot be disallowed, if we believe the real presence, because indeed the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ is both under the species of bread, and under the species of wine.

16. You lay, the Ancient Church (n) in her (n)Page 37: Liturgies remembred all those that slept in hope of the Resurrection of everlasting lyfe, and particularly the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles &c. beseeching God to give unto them rest, and to bring them, (at the Resurrection, as you add) to the place where the light of his countenance should shine upon them for evermore.

X x 3

17. But
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(0) De Purg. lib. 1. cap. 9. But read (0) Beilarmine, and you shall find a farre different thing in the Greek Luturgy, of which S. Epiphanius makes mention, whome you also cite in your Margent: *We offer Sacrifice to thee, O Lord, for all the Patriarchs, Apostles, Martyrs, and especially for the most Blessed Mother of God. And that the Sacrifice was offered for those Saints only in Thankes giving,*

the words following doe shew: *By whose Prayers O God, looke upon us.* But for other faithfull deceased, the speach is altered, thus: *And be mindfulfull of all the faithfull deceased who have slept in hope of the Resurrection, and grant them to rest where the light of thy Countenance is seen.* Which last words you vntruly applied to Patriarches &c. and added at the Resurrection; wheras they are referred only to other faithfull people, for whom Sacrifice is offered, that they may come to see the light of Gods Countenance, even before the Resurrection; that is, as soone as they have satisfied for their sinnes. And now how many wayes is the Greekke Liturgy repugnant to you?

It speakes of Sacrifice, which you turne to Remembrance; It speakes of some persons whom we intreate to pray for vs, & others for whom we pray. It teacheth Prayers to Saints: It teacheth that Saints do already enjoy the Beartificall Vision, and therefore that Sacrifice only of Thankes-giving is offered for them. And as for the latter Schismaticall, and Heretickall Greeks, although their Authority weigh not much; yet even
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euen they professe in the Councell of Florence,
that they beleived a Purgatory, &c only dened
that the soules were there tormented by fire;
teaching nevertheless that it was a darke place,
and full of paigne. And your owne (q) Brethren
Sparke, Osander, and Crispinus affirm; that about
Prayer for the dead they conformed themselves
to Rome. And St. Edwin (r) Sands faith; that the
Greeke Church doth concur with Rome in the
opinion of Transubstantiation, in Praying to
Saints, in offering Sacrifices, and Prayer for the
dead, Purgatory, &c. And a Treatise published
by the Protestant Duines of Wittemberge An-
no 1584, intituled Acta Theologorum Wittember-
genium &c. affirmeth that the Greeke Church
at this day beleives Invocation of Saints, and
Prayer for the dead, as heretofore I noted. All
which considered, with what Modesty can you
lay: The generall opinion of (t) the Ancient Do-
tors Greeke and Latin, downe almost to these last
Ages, was (and is the opinion of the Greeke Church
at this day) that all the spirits of the Righteous de-
ceased, are in Abrahams bosome, or in some outward
Court of heauen &c. And to mend the matter you
allege in your Margent, for what you lay ab-
out the Greeke Church at this day, the Coun-
cell of (u) Florence; wheras indeed it is affirmed
in the Councell, that Declaratum fuit &c. It was at in Conc.
length declared, that the Saints have both attained,
Flore ant
Seff. 1, in
Quest. de
Soules as Soules have attained perfect Beatitude, yet Purgat.
that
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that they shall receive some perfection with their bodies, when they shall shine as the sunne. And it is to be noted that before this declaration was made, the Greeke Emperor came into the Council, and so it was done with the common consent of the Grecians.

18. And here let me put you in mind, that if the Heresy of Aërius, (whether you take it in our, or your owne sense) were not fundamental, then you may learn that to make an Heresy, or Heretique it is sufficient that the error consist in any point, though the same be not fundamental. If you hold it to be fundamental; then it follows, that Tradition, and Custom of the Church extends it selfe even to fundamental points, in such sort, as to oppose such Tradition is a fundamental error. For as we haue seene before, S. Epi.phani.us, and S. Augustine prove Prayer for the dead by Tradition, though I grant we want not Scripture for it: but you who both deny the Machabees, and also turne Prayer for the Dead, into a bare Commemoration &c. will find no Scripture, whereby to refuse Aërius. Moreover whereas you are wont to impugne a third place distinct from Heauen and Hell, by those words of Scripture: If the Tree shall fall to the South (w) or the North, in what place soever it shall fall, there shall it be: and such like Arguments; how come you now to admit a third Temporary place, and so be forced to solue your owne objections?

19. Now,
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19. Now, I wish you to consider, that either the Grecians did believe that the Saints enjoy the Beatificall Vision, &c are not (as you teach) in some outward Court; or else they thought that Invocation of Saints may well be defended, though they do not see the face of God; which two points you (x) deny, can stand together. (x)Pag. 302 For you have heard both out of the Greeke Liturgy, and your Protestant Writers, that the Grecians believe Invocation of Saints. True it is, if Saints do not enjoy the Beatificall Vision, they cannot hear, or see our Prayers in verbo, or in the Divine Essence, but yet they may behold vs and our Prayers by particular Revelation, as some Catholique Deuines teach de facto, of the blessed soules, and Angels.

20. Yet if you will needs suppose that Invocation of Saints cannot be defended, unless they enjoy the Beatificall Vision; you should not in true reason deny Invocation because they are not Blessed; but contrarily you ought to believe that they are in Bliss, because it hath always beene the Practice of the Ancient Church to invocate them. Nor ought Protestants in generall, to deny prayers to Saints, because they cannot hear vs; but they ought on the other side to believe that they can hear vs, because the Church both Greeke, and Latine hath alwayes practised, and allowed Prayers to them. Ms. sense of the Whitgift, as I sayd already, confesseth; that al-answer. pag. most all the Bishops and Writers (y) of the Greeke 47b.

(y) In his de...
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Church and Latin also, for the most part, were sposti
ted with the doctrines of Freewill, of Merit, of In-
ocation of Saints, and such like. In particular, the
Saints, Ambrose, Augustine, Hierome, Nazian-
zon, Basil, Nysen, Chrysoflome, are taxed by
your Brethren for holding Inuocation of Saints.
And your Centurists not only charge ancient Or-
igen for praying for himselfe to holy Tob: but
they also lay that there are manifest heirs of In-
uocation of Saints in the Doctors of that ancient
Age. And D. Conel affirmeth that divers both
of the Greeke (a) and Latin Church, were spotted
with errors about Freewill, Merits, Inuocation of
Saints &c. That Vigilantius was condemned as
an Heretike for denying Prayers to Saints, may
be seen in (b) S. Hierome, and is confessed by
(c) Fulke. Thus then we see what the Ancient
Church held concerning Inuocation of Saints,
& consequently they believed that they heare
our Prayers.

21. Your saying, that we inuocate Saints
as Commissioners (d) under God, to whom he hath
deged the power of conferring sundry benedits, de-
posed in their hands, & to be bestowed at their plea-
sure; I let passe as a very vulgar slander, un-
worthy of a particular answer. For (as the la-
cred Councell of Trent speaketh) we implore (e)
their assistance, that they would vouchsafe to pray
for us in heaven, whose memory we keep on earth.
Which wordes are also in the Mass.

22. But how solidly Bellarmine (f) proues
that
that the Saints enjoy the sight of God, may be seen by weighing his Arguments drawn from Scriptures, Councils, Fathers, both Greeke and Latin, and Realons grounded on Scripture. And your affirming, that, It may be (g) thought he spake against his knowledge, & conscience, comes very unreasonably, besides the grosse vntruth, and great folly of it, in a Treatise wherein you tax others for want of Charity. But I remember that S. Thomas among the causes of suspition, putth the first of them to proceed from this: That a man is (h) ill himselfe, and therefore being conscious of his owne sinne, he easily conceiveth ill of others; according to that Eccles. 10. The foolish man walking by the way, he himselfe being foolish, doth account all to be Fools. Did your prime Brethren speake against their conscience, who affirme to many Ancient Fathers to have beene spotted with the Invocation of Saints, which you lay cannot stand with their want of Beatitude?

23. You say; The Roman Writers utterly con-
demne the (i) former doctrine, and practice of Anti-
quity. One of them says not to censur it as absurd
and impious: for which last words you cite in your (k) Margent, Azor. But it is an egregious
vntruth, and falsification. For we do both ad-
mit and practise Thankes-giving for the hap-
pines of Saints. And your further Requestis of cap. 20. lib. 8. § Nequa vera.
Gods mercy that they may have their perfect Consum-
mation both in body and soule in the kingdom of
God at the last Judgment, are wholly needles at left,
Part. 2. Charity maintained

because without any dependance, or reference to our Prayers, they are most assured therof by the immutable decree of God. And you might in the same manner make Requests, that they may not loose their happiness in body & soule, when they shall once have attained it, after the generall Resurrection, which were a Request sa- luxurious of Infidelity, as if the Saints could be deprived of Beatitude once enjoyed. Now as for Azor, he proves in the place cited by you, that the Grecians do not altogether take away some kind of Purging fire, but only seem to deny a certaine determined punishment of corporall fire, Because (saith he) they do truly offer Sacrifice and Prayers to God for the dead, surely not for the Blessed, nor for those which be damned in Hell, which were plainly absurd and impious: it must therefore be for them, who are deceased with faith and Piety, but have not fully satisfied for the temporall punishment due to their sinnes. Is this to condemne the doctrine of Antiquity as absurd, and impious? Did Antiquity offer Sacrifice and Prayers for the damned Ghosts, or for the Saints to satisfy for the paine due to their sinnes, as Azor meanes & speakes, and thencefore doth truly say, it were absurd and impious? Is not this to corrupt Authors?

24. Wherfore upon the whole matter we must conclude, that Aerius was condemned by the Church, and was reckoned among Heretiques, and particularly by S. Epiphanius, and S.
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Augustine, for the selfe same Error which you maintaine. To which Major Proposition, if we adde this Minor, (which Charity Mislaken expressly notes (m) and you conceale:) But S. Augustine layth, Whosoever should hold any one of (m)Pag.27; the Heresies by him recounted, (wherof this of Arianus is one) were not a Christian Catholique; The Conclusion will follow of it selfe.

25. Would to God, your selfe, and all Protestants did seriously consider, what accompt will be exacted at the last day, of those who by their erroneous doctrine, and opposition to the visible Church of Christ, deprive the soules of faythfull people deceased, of the many Prayers, Sacrifices, and other good deeds, which in all rigour of Justice are due to them by Title of founding Colledges, Chanonyes, Chantries, Hospitals &c. Lesse cruelty had it been to rob them of their Temporall goods, or to bereave them of their corporall lives, then to have abandonded them to the Torment of a fier, which although as S. Augustine layth (n) is heighted (n) in Psal. by worldly men, yet indeed is more grievous 37. then whatsoeuer can be endured in this world. Contider I say, whether this manifest Injustice, though it did not proceed (as it doth) from hereticall perdition, were not alone sufficient to exclude salvation. And so much of this point concerning Prayer for the dead.

26. The words of S. Thomas, whom you cite (pag. 40.) to strengthen your distinction of points
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points fundamentall and not fundamentall, do
directly overthrow that lente, and purpose for
which you make vse of them. For as much (sayth
he) as belongs to the prime (o) Object5 of Belief,
which are the Articles of Faith, a man bound expi-
citely to believe them, as he is bound to have Fayth.
But as for other Objects of Fayth, a man is not bound
to believe them explicitly, but only implicitly, or in
readiness of mind, for as much as he is ready to believe
whatsoever the holy Scripture contains: But he is
bound to believe them explicitly, only when it ap-
ppears to him that it is contained in the doctrine of
Fayth. Now our Question is not about nescience,
or ignorance of some points of Fayth, but of dis-
agreeing concerning them, one denying what
another affirms: in which case, according to
the aforesaid doctrine of S. Thomas, there is nei-
ther explicit, nor implicit Belief of such
points, but positive & direct error in them: and
therefore such disagreement cannot stand with
Uni
ty of Fayth. It is strange Di
un
ity, to con-
found, as you do, points secondary or not funda-
mentall, with probable points. For how many
millions of Truths are there contained in Scrip-
ture, which are not of their owne nature prime
Articles? Will you therefore infer that they are
but probable? Primary, and secondary respect the
matter which we believe. Probable, and certaine
are derived from the formall reason, or motive
for which we believe. Let two disagree in some
points even fundamentall, yet not sufficiently
pro-
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propounded as revealed Truths, they still retain the same faith; and contrary, put case that two agree in all fundamental points, if they disagree in any secondary point sufficiently applied to their understanding as a revealed truth, then the one must be an Heretic, and differ from the other, in the very nature, and substance of faith. For as in a Musical Consort (lay you) a discord (p) now and then (so it be in the Descant, and depart not from the ground) swee- tens the Harmony: so say I (retorting your own sweet similitude) because every least error opposing a revealed Truth is not in the Descant, but departs from the ground of faith, which is the attestation of God, it doth not sweeten the Harmony, but destroys the substance of faith. And heerafter it shalbe shewed, that you wroght Stau- picon, no lesse (q) then you do St Thomas.

27. That Variety of Opinions or Rites in parts of the Church doth rather commend then prejudice the Unity of the whole, ye pretend to prove out of (s) Firmilianus in an Epistle to S. Cyprian; which doctrine though it be true in some sense, yet according to your application, it is pernicious: as if it were sufficient to Unity of Faith, that men agree in certain fundamental points, though they vary in other matters concerning faith. And you should have observed, that Firmilianus (who wrote that Epistle in favour of S. Cyprian's error about Rebaptization) speaks in that place of the Custome of kee-
Part. 2. Charity maintained

Ping Easter: which point after it was once defined, remained no more indifferent, but grew to be a necessary Object of Belief, in so much that the Heretiques called Quattuordecimani were for that point condemned, and anathematized by the Universal Church in the Councils of Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus. Wherby it is evident that though some point be not in itselfe fundamental; yet if it be once defined by the Church, the Error degenerates into Heresy. Your Charity is always Mistaken, advantaging your Adversary by your owne Arguments.

28. I said already that to be separate from the Church for Heresy, or Schisme destroys Salvation, because persons lyable to those crimes are in the Church neither in re nor in voto; neither in fact, nor in effectual desire; as Catholica persons are, and as Excommunicati persons may be, if repenting their former Obstynacy, they cannot by reason of some extrinsecall impediment, obtaine Absolution from the Centurie.

29. You extend your Charity so far to Infidels, as to forget seldewry in relating what Catholique Deuines teach concerning them, not telling whether they require some supernaturall faith at lest, for some Object; and quoting Authors with so great affected confusion, that a man would think them to maintain the opinion which they expressly condemn as erroneous, or in the next degree to Heresy. But because it were a vanity to muster a number of Writers
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Writers in a question impertinent to our present designe, which is only against Heresy or Schisme, both which exclude inuincible ignorance; I hold it best to passe them over in silence.

30. Your saying, that A man may be a true visible member of the holy Catholique Church, who is not actually (otherwise then in vow) a member of any true visible Church; destroyes it selfe. For in the same manner and degree, neyther more nor lese, a man is a visible member in act, or in desire of the visible Church, as he is a member of the true Catholique Church, which is visible. And Bellarmine, whom you cite for your selfe, is directly agaynst you. For he teacheth that a man may (u) be in the Church in desire, which is sufficient for Salvation (when he is involuntary hindered from being actually of the Church) and yet not in the Church by external Communion, which properly maketh him to be of the visible Church, which is directly to deny what you affirmed. I might reflect what a pretty connection you make in saying: who is not actually otherwise then in vow &c. you might as well have said, who is not actually, otherwise then not in act &c. But such small matters as these I willingly dissemble. The poore man in the Gospel was cast out of the Synagogue by notorious injustice, and therefore still remayned a member of the Iewish Church, not only in desire, but also in act. You say, Athanasius stood single.
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defense of divine Truth, all his Brethren the other Patriarchs (not be of Rome excepted) having subscribed to Arianism, and cast him out of their Communion. And you referre vs to Baronius cited in your Margent, to what purpose I know not, except to display your owne bad proceeding. For Baronius in the place by you allledged (w) doth (not incidently, or only by the way, but, indultiously, and of set purposecleere Pope Liberius from having ever subscribed to Arianisme. He subscribed indeed to the condemnation of S. Athanasius, which was not for matter of faith but of fact, to wit, for certayne crimes objected
(x) De Rom. agaynft him, as Bellarmine (x) affirmeth, which being falle, S. Athanasius did not therefore cease to be a member of the Catholike Church. If the errors of Tertullian were in themselves formal, as you would make them, it may serue for an example, that not so much the matter, as the manner, and obstinacy is that which makes an Heretique; which over throws your distinction of points fundamental &c.

31. The proofes which you bring from the Africans, and others, that Communion with the Roman Church was not alwayes held necessary to Saluation, have been a thousand tymes answered by Catholique Writers; and they are such as you could not have chosen any more disaduantagious to your cause. Hecrefoere I shewed, that Communion with the Roman Church, was by Antiquity judged to be the
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marke of a true Believer. And indeed saying you speake of those times wherein Rome stood in her purity (as you say) how could any be diuided from her fayth, and yet believe aught? Do not your selfe say: Whosoever professeth himself to forsake (y) the Communion of any one member of the Body of Christ, must confess himselfe consequently (z) Ad Cor- to forsake the whole? How then could any diuide themselfes from the Romane Church while she was in her purity? Euen S. Cyprian, whose example you allege, fayth: They (z) presume to saile to the Roman Church, which is the Chaire of Peter, and to the principall Chaire, from whence Priestly Unity hath sprung. Neither do they consider that they are Romans, whose fayth was commended by the preaching of the Apostle, to whom fullhood cannot have access. Optatus Milevitanus, also an African, fayth: At Rome hath been constituted to Peter (a) the E-Parm, lib. 2. episcopall Chaire, that in this only Chaire, the Unity of all might be preferred. And S. Augustine, likewise an African, affirmeth, that Caecilianus might despise (b) the conspiring multitude of his enemies, (that is, of seauenty Bishops of Africa assembled in Numidia) because he saw himselfe entred by letters Communicatory with the Roman Church, in which the Principality of the Sea Apostolique had al\-
ways flourished. And after Pelagius had been judged in the East by the Bishops of Palestine, and Celestius his Disciple had been excommunicated for the same cause in Africa by the African Bishops; the Milevitan Councell referred them finally
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finally to the Pope, saying: We hope by the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, who vouchsafe to govern thee consulting with him, and to heare thee praying to him, that those who hold these Doctrines superserve and pernicious, will more easily yield to the authority of thy Holynes, drawne out of the holy Scriptures. Behold the Popes prerogative drawne out of the holy Scriptures. And it is very strang that you will allege the Authority of S. Cyprian, and other Bishops of Africa, against Pope Stephen, who opposed himselfe to them in the Question of Re-baptization, wherein they agreed with the Heresie of the Donatists, which was condemned not only by the Pope, but by the whole Church, yea by those very Bishops who once adhered to S. Cyprian, as S. Hierome wittnesmeth, saying: Finally they who had been of the same opinion, set forth a new decree, saying: What shall we do? So hath it been delivered to them by their Ancestors and ours. And Vincentius Lyricensis speaking of Stephen his opposing S. Cyprian, sayth: Then the blessed Stephen resisted, together with, but yet before his Colleagues; judging it as I conceiue to be a thing worthy of him, to excell them as much in Fayth, as he did in the authority of his place.

Neither are you more fortunate in the example of Pope Victor, then in the other of Stephen. For although Eusebius (whom S. Hierome styleth the Enigne-bearer of the Arian Sect, and who was a profest Enemy of the Roman Church) doth relate that S. Irenaeus represent
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hended Victor, for having excommunicated the Churches of Asia, for the question about keeping Easter: yet even he dare not say, that Irenaeus blamed the Pope for want of power, but for misapplying it; which supposeth a Power to do it, if the cause had been sufficient. And the success he showed, that even in the use of his Power, Pope Victor was in the right. For after his death, the Councils of Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus (which you receive as lawful General Councils) excommunicated those who held the same Custode with the Provinces which Victor had excommunicated: and so they came to be ranked among Heretiques under the name of Quattuordecim. You may know what opinion S. Irenaeus had of Popes by these words: Every Church ought to have recourse (h) to Rome, by reason of her more powerful Principality. And even in this your instance, Eusebius doth only say, that Irenaeus did only exhort Pope Victor, that he should not cut off all the Churches of God, which held this ancient Tradition. Which exhortation doth necessarily imply, that Pope Victor had Power to do it, as I said already. And now I pray you, reflect upon your precipitation in laying of Victor and Stephen: Their Censures (i) were much heightened, and their Pride and Schisme in troubling the peace of the Church much condemned. For they did nothing which was not approved by the universally Church of God; and the Doctrines which they condemned were not less than here.

Z 2 3
Part. 2. Charity maintayned hereticall. And therefore (to answere also to what you object pag. 52.) If the British and Scotish Bishops did adhere to the Churches of Asia in their Celebration of Easter, after the matter was knowne to be defined by the Church, their example can only be approv'd by such, as your selfe; nor can it either impeach the Authority, or darken the proceeding of the Pope. You cite Bariinus (1) in the Margent, who direly against you relates out of Bede; that when our Apostle S. Augustine, could neither by Arguments, nor by Miracles wrought in their presence, bow their stinnes, he prophesied that they should perish by the English, as afterwards it hapned. But you are a fit Champion for such men, and they no lesse fit examples to be alleaged against the Authority of the Roman Church.

33. Your other example, that S. Augustine and divers other Bishops of Africa, and their Successours for one hundred yeares together were seuered from the Roman Communion, is manifestly untrue in S. Augustine, and some other chiefe Bishops. For when king Thrasmundus had baniished into Sardinia almost all the Bishops, to wit, two hundred and twenty, Pope Symmachus maintained them at his owne charges, as persons belonging to his Communion. To the Epistle of Boniface the second to Eulalius Bishop of Alexandria, and the Epistle of Eulalius to the same Boniface, recited by you, out of which
which it is gathered, that after the sixt Council of Carthage for the space of one hundred yeares, the Bishops of Carthage were separated from the Communion of the Roman Church, & that in the end they were reconciled to her, Eulalius submitting himselfe to the Apostolique Sea, and anathematizing his Predecessors; Bellarmine (m) answereth, that these Epistles may justly be suspected to be Apochryphall for divers reasons which he alleageth, and it seemeth also by your owne words that you do doubt of them: For you say, If their owne Records (n) be true. Yet if they be authentickall, their meaning cannot be, that all the Predecessors of Eulalius were for so long space divided from the Roman Church; the contrary being most manifest not only in S. Augustine, who kept most strict amity with Zozaemus, Innocentius, and Celestius Popes, but also in S. Fulgentius and others: but it must be understood only of some Bishops of Carthage, and in particular of Eulalius, himselfe, till he being informed of the truth, submitted himselfe to the Roman Church. And you ought rather to have alleged his submission, and condemnation of his Predecessors to prove the Popes Authority over the African Church; then to object against it the example of some of his Predecessors, & of himselfe who afterward repented, and condemned his owne fact. You do well, only to mention the Pretensions and Forgeries of the Sea of Rome in the matter of Appeals. For

(m) de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 25. (n) Tag. 50.
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(o. Ubi sup. you may know that Bellarmine (o) doth so fully
and were that point, as nothing can be more ef-
fectual to prove the Popes Supremacy in Afri-
ca, then the right of Appeals from Africa to
Rome, in causes of greater moment.

34. Your last instance about three Chap-
ters of the Council of Chalcedon, condemned by
the fifth General Council, the Bishop of Rome at
length consenting, for which divers Bishops of Italy,
and also the Bishops of Ireland did resolutely de-
part from the Church of Rome, is like to your for-
mer Objections. For Baronius whom you cite
in yourMargent hath these words as contrary to
your purpose as may be. Hence was it, that the (q)
Bishops of Venice & the adjoining Regions did gather
together a Council at Aquincia against the Fifth Syn-
ods; and the divisions at length went as farre as Ire-
land: for all these relying on the Dicree of Vigilius
Pope, persuaded themselves that they might doe it.
Is this to depart from the Pope, or the Roman
Church, to oppose that which he is thought to
oppose, & formally, because he is thought to op-
pose it? Now, as for the thing it selfe, when Vi-
gilius had afterward condemned the three Chap-
ters, which at the first he refused to doe, and
had confirmed the Fifth Council, which had con-
demned them, who so ever opposed that Con-
demnation, were accounted Schismatiques by
the whole Catholique Church: which plainly
shews the Popes Authority, and therefore
whatsoever Bishops had opposed Vigilius, their
exam-

(q) Ann. 553, num. 14. apud St. tend.
example could prove no more, then the faction
of rebellious persons can prejudice the right of
a lawfull King. And in fine, all this Contro-
versy did nothing concern any matter of faith,
but only in fact; and not doctrine, but persons, as
may be seen at large in Baro.nius: Neither was it
betwixt Catholiques and Heretiques, but am-
ong Catholiques themselves. The rest of your
Section needs no answer at all: Only whereas
you say; Whosoever wilfully opposeth (r) any Ca-
tholique Verity maintayned by the Catholique Visible
Church, as doe Heretiques; or perversely divides him-
selxe from the Catholique Communion, as doe Schis-
matiques; the Condition of both them is damnable.
What understand you by Catholique verities of
the Catholique Church? Are not all Verities
mayntayned by the Catholique Church, Catho-
lique Verities? or how do you now distingui.
Heresy, and Schisme from the Catholique Com-
munion? You tell vs, (pag 76.) that it is the
property of Schisme to cut off from the Body of Christ,
and the hope of Salvation, the Church from which
it separates: and is it not an Heresy to cut off from
the Body of Christ & hope of Salvation, the Ca-
tholike Church? How then can one ( according
to your principles ) be a Schismatique from
the Catholique Church, & not be jointly an He-
retique?
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CHAP. III.

The Protestants (1) never intended to erect a new Church, but to purge the Old: The Reformation did not change the substance of Religion, but only cleansed it from corrupt, and impure qualities. Therefore (say we,) the visible Church existed before those your cleansing dayes, had & still hath the substance of Religion; and to according to your owne ground we are safe, if you can possibly be saued. But we have no such dependance upon you. Nay, the same Conscience which acquits vs, condemns your selves. For while you confesse a Reformation of the Old Church, and neither doe, nor can specify any Visible Church, which in your opinion needed no Reformation; you must affirm, that the Church which you intended to reforme, was indeed the Visible Catholique Church; if so, then you cannot deny but that you departed from the Catholique Church, & are guilty of Schisme, yea and of Heresy. For if the Catholique Church was infected with erroneous doctrine which need
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ded Reformation; it followes, that the errours were Vniuersall, and that the Reformation coming after those errours, must want Vniuersal use of place and Tyme, and therefore be branded with the marke of Herefy. For in true Divinity a new, and no Church are all one. Moreover, the very Nature, & Essence of the Church requiring true faith, it is impossible to alter any left point of faith, without changing the substance of the Church, and Religion; and therefore to reforme the Church in matters of faith, is as if you should reforme a man by depriving him of a reasonable Soule, whereby he is a man; And a Reformed Catholique are termes no less repugnant, then a reasonable unreasonable creature, or a destroied existing thing. Wherefore to say, the Reformation did not change the substance of Religion, but only cleansed it from corrupt and impure qualities, are mere wordes to deceave simple soules. And it is a lamentable case, that you can never be brought from such ridiculous similitudes, as here you bring of Naaman, who was stil the same man before and after he was cured of his leprosy; Of a field ouergrown with weeds, thistles &c. (and your Brethren are full of twenty such childish pretended illustrations; ) whereas every body knowes that leprosy is accidental to a man, and weeds to a field, but Fayth is essentiall to the Church; And that Affirmation, or Negation of any one revealeed Truth whatsoever, are differences.
Charity maintayned reverence no lesse essentiaall in fayth, then reasonable and unreasonable in living Creatures. And Fayth itselfe being an accident and quality consisting in Affirmation, or Negation; to cleanse it from the corrupt and impure quality of affirming, or denying; is to cleanse it from its own Nature, and Essence; which is not to reforme, but to destroy it. Lastly, from this your forced Confession, not to erect a new Church, but to purge the Old, we must inferre that the Roman Church, which you sought to purge, was the Old Church, and the Catholike Church of Christ. For if you found any other Old visible Catholike Church, which needed no Reformation, then you then ther intended to erect a new Church, nor to purge the Old.

2. You say, the things which Protestants believe on their part, and wherein they judge the life and substance of Religion to be comprized, are most, if not all of them, so evidently and indisputably true, that their Adversaries themselves do allow, and receive them as well as they. If this be true, and that the said Verities make up the fayth of Protestants (as you speake) then what needed you a Reformation to teach men the fayth of Protestants, which they believed before Protestants appeared? Or how can you be excused from Schisme, who divided your selves from that visible Church, which believed those verities which make up your fayth? You say, If all other Christians could be content to keepe within these gen-
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generall bounds, the wofull Schismes and ruptures of Christendome might be more easilie healed. O words most powerfull to condemn your selues, who were not content to keep within those generall bounds, which you confesse we believed, but would attempt new Reformations, although with so wofull Schismes and Ruptures of Christendome, as you hold worthy to be lamented with teares of bloud! If our errors were not fundamentall, your Reformation could not be necessary to saluation; as when the wound or disease is knowne not to be deadly, the cure cannot be necessary to the conservation of life.

3. The Reformation which zealous Catholiques did desire, and with whose words you vainely load your Margin, were not in fayth but manners. For which if it be lawfull to forsake a Church, no Church shall remaine unforstaken. But of this I haue spokne in the Fift Part. Luther was justly cut off by Excommunication, as a pernicious member: which yet was not done, till the Pope had vsed all meanes to reclame him. Provinicial or Nationall Synods may seeke to reforme abuses in manners, and endeavour that the fayth already established be conserved: but if they go about to reforme the Catholique Church in any one point, they deserve the name of Conuenticles, and not of Councils.

4. What meane you when you say; that you left the (c) Church of Rome in nothing she holds (e) pag. 67.
Part. 2. Charity maintained of Christ, or of Apostolique Tradition? Do you admit Traditions? Are they fallible or infallible? For if they be infallible, then may they be part of the Rule of faith. If fallible, they are not Apostolique.

5. You goe then about to proove, that our doctrines are, First, doubtfull and perplexed opinions. 2. Doctrines unnecessary, and forraigne to the faith: and 3. Nouelties unknowne to Antiquity.

6. You pretend they are doubtfull, and say: The Roman Doctours do not fully and absolutely agree in any one point among themselves, but only in such points wherein they agree with us. If a manifest vntruth be a good proofe, your Argument convincenth. If you thinke that disagreement in matters not defined by the Church, argues difference in matters of faith, you shew small reading in our Deuines, who euin in all those Articles wherein you agree with us, haue many different, and contrary Opinions concerning points not defined: as about some speculative questions concerning the Deity, the Blessed Trinity, Incarnation; yea there are more disputes about those high Mysteries wherein you agree with us, then in others wherein we disagree: and yet, you grant, that such disputes do not argue those mane points to be doubtfull. And so you must answere your owne instance, by which you might as well proove, that Philosophers do not agree whether there be such things as Time, Motion, Quantitie, Heauens, Elements, &c. because
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causa in many particulars concerning those things, they cannot agree.

7. In the second place you affirm our doctrines to be unnecessary and superfluous: because every small measure of explicit knowledge is of absolute necessity. But this is very clearly nothing at all to the purpose. For our Question is not what every one is obliged explicitly to believe, but whether every one be not obliged, not to disbelieve, or deny any one point sufficiently propounded by the Church, as a divine Truth. Neither do we treat of ignorance of some points, but of plaine opposition, and contradiction both between you and vs, and also among your selves. You cite Bellarmin., saying: The Apostles never used (g) to preach openly to the people, other things, then the Articles of the Apostles Creed, the Ten Commandments, and some of the Sacraments, because these are simply necessary, and profitable for all men: the rest besides, such as a man may be found without them. Here you stop, leaving out the words immediately following, which are directly against you. So that (layth Bellarmin.) he have (h) a will ready to embrace and believe them, whenever they shall be sufficiently propounded to (h) ibid. him by the Church. Besides, you falsifie Bellarmin when you make him say, that the Apostles never used to preach to the people other things then the Articles of the Apostles Creed, the commandments, and some of the Sacraments, because these are simply necessary, and profitable for all men; But he layth direct
Part. 2. Charity maintained

Aly the contrary, namely; that the Apostles preached to all, some things which were not necessary, but only profitable to all (and therefore not superfluous as you say;) whereas yet he expressly affirmes the knowledge of the Creed, commandments, and some sacraments to be necessary to all. I wonder what pleasure you can take in corrupting Authors, to your own discredit? Now since we must have, as Bellarmine rightly teacheth, a will ready to embrace whatsoever is propounded by the Church; it followeth, that notwithstanding your Confidence to the contrary, we cannot but except against your publique Service, or Liturgy. I have neither will nor leisure to examine particulars: but Exceptions inough offer themselves to any mans first Consideration. The very occasion and end for which it was framed, proceeded out of an Hereticall spirit, to oppose the true Visible Church: It was turned into English upon an hereticall perswasion, and a popular insinuation, and a crafty affectation to inveigle the humor of the people, that publique Prayers were vnlawfull in an vnknowne tongue. It leaueth our Prayers both for deceased sinners, and to glorious Saints, blotting divers of them out of their Calendar; and hath abrogated their festiuall dayes: and the like they have done concerning facts, except those few which they vouchsafe to like: It aboliseth all memory of S. Peters Successour: It treateth only of two Sa-
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Oraments, excluding the rest; and in the one it ommitteth most of our Ceremonies, as Superstitions: in the other it professeth not to give anything but the substance of Bread and Wine. It administreth to Lay people both kinds, as necessary by the institution of Christ our Lord: Masse, or Sacrifice it hath none. It readeth and believeth Scripture heretically translated: It mentioneth no Reliques of Saints: And in a word, it is both in the whole Body, and designeth, and in every point a profession of a Church, and taketh contrary to Catholiques, and implies a condemnation of our Liturgy as Superstitions, &c. your teller boldly say: We cannot, we (i) dare not communisate with Rome in her publick Liturgy, which is manifestly polluted with grosse Superstitions; and therefore wee Catholiques also can no more approve your practise and Liturgy, then we can embrace your Doctrine, and sayeth I laid that I had no desire to examine the particulars of your Liturgy, neither is it needfull. For we may judge of the rest by the very first words, or Introit of your Service, beginning with a Text, for which you cite Ezek. 18. At what time soever a sinner doth repent him of his sines from the bottom of his heart, I will put all his wickednes out of my remembrance, saith the Lord. But there is no such sentence in Ezekiel, whose words are these, even in the Bible of the Protestants: But if the wicked will turne from all his sines which he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that...
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which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die: All his Transgressions which he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him: in the righteousness which he hath done, he shall live. Your first Reformers, the soul of whole Church was solidian Justification, were both to heare of possibility to keep all the Commandments, of working Righteousness, or living in the Righteousness which he hath wrought; as also they were unwilling to particularize with the Prophet, what is required to true Repentance, knowing full well, the different opinions of their first Progenitors about this point of Repentance, and therefore they thought best to corrupt this Text. And which is more strange, in your service-Booketranslated into Latin, and printed in London, Per ascriptionem Francisci Flore, the sentence is cited at large as it is in the Prophet, and therefore the corruption still remaining in the English to deceive the Unlearned, is more inexcusable. Neither (in the same Introito) is the allegation of Is. 2. much more truly made: Rent your hearts, & not your garments, and turne to the Lord your God &c. Out of which place, you know men are wont to declaim against our corporall Penance of Fasting, Watching, Hayre-cloth, Disciplines &c. but, even according to your own translation, the words are: Turne you even to me with all your heart, and with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning; And rent your hearts, and not your garments &c.
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where I believe you will confesse, that your omission was not used to no purpose.

8. You speake among other things of Images, & we grant that God may be worshipped without an Image. But we say, that he cannot be truly worshipped by any one, who denieth worship of Images, because true worship of God cannot stand with any one Hereby. It is highly good, & lawfull, and a most holy thing to pray to God; but yet if one should believe, that we may not also pray to living men, your selfe would I thinke condemn him for an Heretique, because all Christians intreate their Brethren to pray for them: By which example all your instances (pag. 72.) may be answered. Your laying out of Bellarmine that the worship, and Invocation of Saints was brought into the Church, rather by custom then any Precept, is answered hereafter n. 12. And I would gladly know by what authority your Church can injoyne secret Confession in some case, as (here pag. 72.) you say she doth, if Christ have left it free? Can a humane law oblige men to reuelse their secret sines, in Confession? especially since they know not whether your Ministers will not thinke themselves obliged to acquaint some Officer therewith, in case the Penitent disclose any crime punishable by the Lawes of the Realme. To which propose I could tell you strange and true stories: as contrarily because Catholikes believe the Sacrament of Confession to have been instituted
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uted by our Saviour Christ, as necessary to Sal-
uation, they consequently teach, that the Seale
and Secret thereof is so sacred and inviolable,
that the Pope himself cannot dispense therein,
though it were to save his own life. And now,
to follow your wanderings, you may know that
we do not hinder, but give free leave to vn-
learned persons to say their prayers in a known
language: but the Church doth celebrate pu-
blique Service in one of the learned Tongues,
for weighty reasons, which have been learned-
ly set downe by our Catholique Writers. And
if nothing must be read but what the People,
yea learned men understand, you must give or-
er reading in publique, even in English, di-
viers Psalms of David, the Prophets, the Apo-
calyps, and other parts of Scriptures, the sense
and meaning whereof the people understand no
more, then if they were read in Hebrew. Nay,
to understand the words, and not the sense, is
not free from danger, because they may by the
conceafe some error, as we daily see by the
example of Sceattaries, &c. in that vngracious crea-
ture, who lately out of Scripture, as he thought,
murthered his Mother, and Brother, for being
cause of his Idolatry in kneeling at the Com-
munion. Happy had it beene both for him,
and a thousand more, if the sacred Scriptures
in English were not so common among
them, but were read with due circumspection,
and not without approbation of such as can
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de consider better of them, then themselves. And in very truth it seems strange, & not only not safe but even shamefull, that, for example, the Bookes of Leviticus, and the Canticles, besides many passages in other Bookes, should he promiscuously made subject to the vulgar eyes of sensual, and unmortified people, who morally will be sure to make no other use thereof, than to hurt themselves, together with the abusing & prophaning so holy a thing, as every word of holy Scripture is in itself.

9. Now, to come to your other particulars; we acknowledge and profess all Merits to be the gift of God, and therefore they cannot withdraw vs from relying on him. You cite Bellarmin, laying: It is safe, not to trust (m) to a mans owne Merits, but wholly and solely to call himselfe (m) Pag. on the mercy of Jesus-Christ. But doth Bellarmin say, that it is safe to relye on Gods Mercy alone, and to deny all Merits, as Protestants do? This indeed were to your purpose. But let vs heare Bellarmin rightly cited: It is (sayth he) most safe to place (m) all our trust in the sole mercy & (n) De Infall. benignity of God. Here you stay. But Bellarmin justifie, lib. 3, goes on, and sayth: I explicate my sayd Proposition: c. 7. 4. Sitterson: for it is not to be so understood as if a man with the proposition all his forces ought not to attend to good works: Or that we ought not to confide in them, as if they were not true Justice, or could not undergo the judgment of God (for no wonder if Gods owne gifts, as all our merits are, may endure his examination.}  
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but we only say, that it is more safe, as if were to for
gest our former merits, and to looke only upon the
mercy of God; Both because no man can without a re
mation certaynely know that he hath true merits, or
that he is to perseuere in them to the end: And also,
because in this place of Temptation nothing is more
easy then to conceyue Pride by the consideration of our
good workes. I leaue it therefore to any mans co
sideration, what sincerity you have vsed in al
dling Bellarmine.

In the last place you affirme, that our

(0) Pag. 73. doctrines are confessed(0) Nouelties, and you go
about to prooue it by a few instances; all which
being either nothing to the purpose, or plainely
mistaken, or manifestly vntrue, do excellently
prooue against yourself, how ancient our Reli
gion is. Your instance about the Popes infall
bility, is not to the purpose of proouing that the
Roman Church teacheth any Noueltie. For Bel
larmine, out of whom you cite a few Authours
who teach that the Popes Decrees without a
Counsell are not infallible, sayth: That, that Do
(p) De Rom. Erine (p) is yet tolerated by the Church, though he
affirme it to be erroneous, and the next degree
to Herety. The same Answere serues for your o
ther example concerning the Popes Authority
above that of a Generall Counsell, of which
(q) De Con-
Bellarmine sayth: They are not properly Heretiques
who holde the contrary; but (q: they cannot be excused
from great temperity. And you are not ignorat, but
that euens those who defend these doctrines do

vrnai-
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Unanimously content against you, that the Pope is Head of the Church. But I pray you, what Consequence is it? Some Authors deny, or doubt of the Popes Infallibility, or his Authority ower a General Council: ergo, these doctrines are Novelties? May not private men be mistaken, even in doctrines which of themselves are most ancient; as is known by experience in many Truths, which both you and we maintain? For how many Bookes of Scripture were once doubted of by some, which now yourselves receive as Canonical? Are you therefore Novelist? You overlash then, when you say: Above a thousand (r) years after Christ, the Popes judgment was not esteemed infallible, nor his authority above that of a general Council: and especially when you cite Bellarmine to make good your sayings. And your affirming out of Bellarmine (de Indulg. 1. 2. c. 17.) that Eugenius the 3, (who began his Papacy 1145.) was (s) the first that (s) says July 12, granted indulgences, is a huge untruth, and falli 

ication of Bellarmine, who in that very place, directly, expressly, purposely, proves that other Popes before Eugenius granted Indulgences, & names them in particular. Whereas you say that the Councils of Constance and Basil, decreed the Council to be above the Pope; you might have seen the Answer in Bellarmine in the same Book which you (t) cite; that these two Councils at that time were not lawfull Councils, or till 1215, sufficient to define any matters of Faith.
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11. You say, Many of them (meaning Catholique Doctours) yield also, that Papall Indulgences are things unknowne to all Antiquity. And to prove this, you allege Bellarmine, (u, who cites Durand, S. Antoninus, and Roffensis. Neither do these three, which you by I know not what figure call many, say as you do, that Indulgences are things unknowne to all Antiquity; but only for the first five hundred yeares, as Bellarmine layth in the place by you cited, & therefore you take to your selfe a strange privilidge to multiply persons, and enlarge tythes: and yet these Authors do not deny Indulgences. And as Bellarmine answeres: We ought not to say, that Indulgences are not indeed Ancient, because two or three Catholiques have not read of them in Ancient Authors. And you may, with greater shew, deny divers Bookes of Scripture, which more then three Writers did not only lay, they were not received by Antiquity; but did expressly reject them. As for the thing itselfe, Bellarmine sheweth, that Indulgences are no lesse ancient than the (y) beginning of the Church of Christ. & that your owne Protestants confesse, that it is hard to know when they began, which is a signe of Antiquity, not of Novelty. But we can tell you, when, and who, first began to oppose Indulgences, namely the Waldenses, who appea Red about the yeare 1170. And therefore the mark of Novelty, & Heresy must fall not upon the defenders, but the impugners of Indulgences.

12. You
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12. You say out of Bellarmine, that Leo the Third was the first that ever Canonized any Saint, as before (pag. 72.) you alleged out of him, that the worship of Saints, was brought into the Church rather by Custom, then by any Precepts; and in your Margent you cite him in Latin saying, Saints began to be (2) worshipped in the universal Church rather by Custom then by Precept. But Bellarmine doth not there treat in general of the worship of Saints, but only handling the Question, Cuius sit &c. To whom doth it belong to Canonize Saints, and proving that it belongs to the Pope to Canonize them for the whole Church, and not for some particular Diocese alone; in answer to an Objection, that there are many worshipped for Saints, who were not Canonized by the Pope, he hath these words: I answered, that the Ancient Saints began to be worshipped in the universal Church, not so much by any Law, as by Custom. Where you brake off. But Bellarmine goeth further, and saith: But as other Customs have the force of a Law by the tacit Consent of the Prince, without which they are of no force &c. So the Worship of any Saint generally introduced by the Custom of the Churches, hath force from the tacit, or express Approbation of the Pope. First then, you conceive the Question of which Bellarmine treated. Secondly, you leave out (Veteres) Ancient Saints, and lay only Saints, and yet (Ancient) thowest he spoke not of all Saints, but of some who were not expressly Canonized.
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ized, or Commanded to be held for Saintes, whereas divers others have been Canonized by direct command to believe that they are happy. Thirdly, in your Translation, you leave out Universal, & only put Church; whereas Bellarmine §. Primo modo, expressly teacheth: That in ancient time every Bishop might Canonize Saints for his particular Diocese, and de facto, they did command some Feasts to be kept, as Bellarmine proves; which shews, that the worship of Saints was held both to be lawful, and was to some particular persons commanded. Fourthly, you leave out Bellarmines words; That the Worship of some Saint generally introduced by the custome of the Churches, growes to haue the force of a Law, or Precept, by the tacite, or expresse Approbation of the Pope; which is contrary to that, which you cited out of Bellarmine; The worship and Invocation of Saints was brought into the Church, rather by Custome, then any Precept. And now to come to your former Objection out of Bellarmine, what is it to your purpose if he affirmeth that Leo the third was the first that ever Canonized any Saint? Dost he affirm that Leo was the first that taught Worship, and Invocation of Saints? Or that such worship was not practised by Custome, yea & by Precept before his Time, as we haue leeme out of his words it was? Bellarmine speaks only of such forme and solemnity of Canonization as afterwards was vied: Which makes nothing for your purpose, to prooue
prove that our doctrine of Worship, or Innuocation of Saints, is a Novelty. If one should affirm that the solemnity of Crowning Kings, was not used in all places, or tymes alike; should he therefore deny the Antiquity of Kings, or that Obedience is due to them? You may see not only the answer, but the danger also of such discourse.

13. When one reads in your booke these words in a different letter; Not any one ancient Writer (b) reckons precisely seven Sacraments; the first Author that mentions that number is Peter Lombard, and the first Council, that of Florence; and in your Margent, the names of Valentina, and Bellasmine; Who would not thinke that in the opinion of these Authors no ancient Writer before Lombard believed that there were seven Sacraments, neither more nor fewer? Which is most untrue, and against their forseall words, \\& expresse intentios. For thus faith Valentina in the very same place which you (c) cite: The same (c) Tom. 4. A. disp s. q. 6. probatur. 

Affirmation, (that there are seven Sacraments) is proved by the Authority of Fathers. For although the more ancient Writers do not number seven Sacraments, all together, in one place; yet it may be easily shewed, especially by the testimony of S. Augustine that they did acknowledge every one of these Ceremonies to be a Sacrament. Thus Valentina in generall, and then he proves every one of the seven Sacraments, out of particular places of S. Augustine, S. Cyprian, S. Ambrose, Innocentius the first, Chrystothe, Bide, and Dionysius Areopagita. Now
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tell me, whether Valentinia say: Not any one Ancient Writer reckons precisely feauen Sacraments? Doth he not prove out of S. Augustine every one of the feauen Sacraments in particular, as you could not but see in the very place cited by you? Is it all one to say: Not any one Ancient Writer reckons precisely feauen Sacraments, as you corrupt these Authors, and to say; The Ancient Writers do not number feauen Sacraments all together in one place? Neither is your falsifying of Bellarmine lesse remarkable, who having laid that the number of feauen Sacraments is proved out of Scriptures, and ancient Fathers, premiseth this Observation: That, Our Adversaries ought not to require of us, that (d) we shew in Scriptures and Fathers the NAME of feauen Sacraments: For neither can they shew the Name of two, or three, or fower: for the Scriptures and Fathers did not write a Catechisme, as now we do, by reason of the multitude of Heresies, but only delivered the things themselves in divers places: Neither is this proper to Sacraments, but common to many other things. For the Scripture reckon the miracles of our Saviour, but never reckon how many there be: It delivereth the Articles of Faith, but never saith how many they be: The Apostles afterward published the Creed of Twelve Articles for some particular causes. In like manner they cannot know out of Scripture, how many Canonickal Brokes there be: But Councils afterward set downe the Canon, and the particular number, which they had learned by Tradition. And afterward he notes:
That it is sufficient if we can shew out of Fathers and Scriptures, that the Definition of a Sacrament doth agree neither to more nor fewer Rites, than seen. By which words it is cleere, that when Bellarmine sayth, Lombard was the first that named the number of seen Sacramens, he only meaneth, as he explicates himselfe, of the name of seen; as Protestants will not find in all Antiquity the name of two Sacramens. So that from the words of Valentin and Bellarmine, as they are indeed, nothing can be gathered, except your very unconscionable Dealing.

14. What you cite out of Bellarmine, that Scotus teacheth Transsubstantiation to have been neyer named, nor made an Article of sayth before the Councell of Lateran, doth not prove it to be a Nouelty, but only that Scotus did thinke it was not to expressly declared before that Councell, which (sayth Bellarmine) he affirmed because he had not read the Councell of Rome under Gregory the Seueneth, nor had observed the consent of Fathers. It is a fond thing to say, that every Truth is a Nouelty, which the Church as occasion serueth doth declare more expressly then before. And if all Truthes must be declared alike at all tymes, under payne of being accounted Nouelties; what will become of Luther’s Reformation, whereby he pretended to teach the world so many things which he falsly, & impiously blasphemed to have been for so long time buried in oblivion, and overwhelmed.
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15. You cite Peter Lombard and S. Thomas; as if they affirmed 
Sacrifice in the Eucharist to be no other, but the image or 
Commemoration of our Saviour's Sacrifice upon the Cross. But your con-
science cannot but tell you, that these Authors never doubted whether the 
Mass be a true Sacrifice or no, and therefore the Question which 
they propounded is, Whether Christ in the 
Mass be immolated, or killed? and according 
to this sense they answered, that he is immolated 
in figure, because the vnibloody Obleation of 
the Eucharist, is a representation of our Sau-
ior's bloody Obleation, or Immolation on the 
Cross. And that this is so, you might have seen 
in S. Thomas in that very place which you (h) 
cite, where he teacheth that in this manner of 
being killed, or immolated in figure, Christ 
might have been sayd to have been immolated 
in the figures of the Old Testament, which did 
prefigure his death; and yet you will not ac-
knowledge your selfe so perfectly Zwingliz-
ed, that you will from hence inferre, that there 
is no more in the Eucharist then in the empty 
figures of the Old Law; and though you did, 
yet it would not serve your turne, for even di-
uers of those figures were truly & properly Sac-
crifices; and therefore though the Eucharist 
were but a Commemoration, yet it might be a 
true Sacrifice withall.

Hanc igitur. 16. You allledge Lindanus, that (i) in for-
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mer Ages, for 1200 years, the holy Cup was administered to the Laiy. But you deceive your Reader, for Lindanus plainly saith; That both kinds were given to the Laiy almost everywhere, but yet not everywhere. Which is sufficient against you, who say, it is against the institution of Christ not to give both kinds to the Laiy. And I shewed before, that in the reign of King Edward the Sixth, Communion in one kind was permitted; and that Melanchthon & Luther held it as a thing indifferent.

17. That divine Sacrifice was celebrated for divers Ages in a known & vulgar Tongue, you would prove out of (k) Lyra. But what is this to prove our doctrine to be a Novelty? Do we teach, that there is any divine Law, either forbidding, or commanding publice Service in a vulgar Tongue? And Lyra in that place teaches that in these times it is more convenient that it be not celebrated in a known language.

18. That the Fathers generally condemned the worship of Images for fear of Idolatry, and allowed, yea exhorted the people with diligence, to read the Scriptures; You seek (l) to prove the former part out of Polycare Virgil, and the latter out of Azor, but still with your wonted sincerity. For how often have you been told that Polycare (m) speaks not of the Ancient Fathers of the New Testament, but of those of the Old, naming Moses, David, and Ezra, and he proves that large, that in the New Law, Images are worthily placed.
Part. 2. Charity maintained in Churches, and worshipped; and concludes, demanding what man is so dissolute, and so brazen faced, that wil, or can doubt, or do-time of the contrary? Azor grants, that in the (n) times of S. Chrysostome, Lay-men were converted, not in Scripture, because then they understood in Greek or Latin, in which language the Scriptures were written; whereas now the common people for the most part understand not the Latin tongue, but such lay people as understand Greek or Latin, do with good reason read the Scripture. Who would ever imagine, that in so short a compass you could have corrupted so many Authors?

19. What you say in this your section, to excuse your Brethren from Schisme, we have answered in the First Part, and have confuted all your evasions & similitudes. And whereas you say, that (o) although our errors be not damnable to him, who in simplicity of heart believeth and professeth them; yet that he, that against faith and conscience shall go along with the stream, to profess and practice them, because they are but little ones, his case is dangerous, and without repentance desperate. I answer, that if our errors be not fundamental, how can they be damnable? and if they be but little ones, that is, not fundamental or damnable, how is it damnable to imbrace them, because they are little ones, that is, because they are, as indeed they are? If they were indeed little ones, & yet by an erroneous conscience were esteemed great ones, to such a man they should indeed be damnable.
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nable; but to one that knowes them to be little ones, and with such a knowledge, or conscience, for some humane respect, of it selfe not damnable, doth yet imbrace them, they are not damnable. For still we suppose that he would not imbrace them, if his Conscience told him, that they were great ones. And who can without smiling read these your words: It is the Do- (p) Tag. 7 Arzine of the Romane Schoole, that veniall sines to him that commits them, not of subversion, or of a sudden motion, but of presumption that to the matter is not of moment, change their kind and become mortall? I pray you what Schoole man teacheth that to commit a veniall sinsne, knowing it to be such, makes it become mortall? For in this sense you must allege this doctrine, if it be to your purpose: and in this sense it being a false doctrine, doth indeed overthrow that for which you allege it; and proveth that to imbrace errors not fundamental, knowing them to be such, cannot be damnable; as it is not a mortall sinne, to do that which one knowes to be but veniall. In the meanie time you do not reflect, that if your doctrine might passe for true, it would be impossible for both Catholiques, and Protestants, Lutherans, and Calvinists to be saued. For all these differ at least in points not fundamental, and to you grant vnawares that which chiefly we intend, that of two differing in Religion, both cannot be saued, whether their differences be great, or smal.

20. I have told you already, that the Au-
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Author of the *Moderate Examination &c.* is no Catholique. That other Treatise entituled, *Syllabus aliquot Synodorum &c.* I have not seen, but if the Author pretend, as you say, that both Hugenots, and Catholiques may be saued, he can be no Catholique.

21. You would faine avoide the note of *Heresiques*, which is to be named by Moderne names, derived for the most part from their first Sect-Maisters. You renounce the names of Lutherans, Zwinglians, or Calvinists, and to that purpose you make halfe a Sermon; But words will not serue your turne. For they are no injurious Nick-names as you say, but names imposed by meere necessity, to distingui.sh you from those from whom you really differ, and to express the variety of your late Reformation. If we speake of Christians, or Catholiques without some addition, no man will dreame of you, but will thinke of us, who had that Name before Luther appeared, and therefore it cannot express the latter Reformation. If you wilbe called the Reformed Church; still the doubt remaines, whether you meane those who follow Luther, or Calvin, or Zwinglius &c. Neyther will the Reformed Church (if she be in her wits) make herselfe lyable to all errors of Lutherans, Calvinists, Anabaptists, Puritans &c. And in this, your prime man D. Field is more ingenious, while he acknowledgeth a necessity of the name of Lutherans, in these words: *Neyther was*
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Is possible (q) that so great an alteration should be
affected, and not carry some remembrance of them, by Church lib.
whom it was procured. And Whitaker lyth: For 2. cap. 9. Pe
distinctions sake we are inforced to use the (r) name
of Protestants. And Grawerus giueth a reason why
those of the same Sect with him be called Luthe
reynolds, saying: The only reason (s) of it is, that we may P. face pag.
be distinguished fro Calunists & Papists, from whom 44.
we cannot be distinguished by the general name cyther (s) in his
of Christiás, or of Orthodoxe, or of Catholiques. And
Hospinianus likewise lyth: I aborre the Schismaticall names (t) of Luthersans, Zwingians, and (t) in his
Calunists; (marke, the Schismaticall names) yet for
distinction sake I will use these names in this Histo-
ry. The vulgar Objection which you bring, that
amongst vs also there are Franciscans, Dominici-
is, Scotistes, Loyalists &c. is pertinent only to con-
vince you of manifest Noveltie; For those Na-
mes are not imposed to signify difference in
fayth, as the Names of Lutherans, Calunists,
are; but cyther divers Institutes of Religion,
as Dominicans, Franciscans &c. or els diversity
of opinions concerning some points not de-
defined by the Church, as Thomists, Scotists &c. And
for as much as these Names be arguments of new
and particular Institutes, and are derived from
particular men, they likewise prove that the
names of Lutherans, Calunists &c. being given
up diversity in fayth, must argue a new begin-
ing, & a new Sect, and Sect-Maisters concern-
ing Fayth. D. Field is full to our purpose, say-

D d 2

ing:
Part 2. Charity maintained

We must observe that they who profess the faith of Christ have been sometymes in these latter ages of the Church called after the speciall names of such men as were the Authors, Beginners, and Deniers of such courses of Monasticall Profession, as they made choyce to follow, as Benedictins, and such like. And in his other words following, he anwers your objection of the Scotists, and Thomists, affirming their differences to have been in the Controversies of Religion, not yet determined by consent of the Universal Church. What can be more cleere, that our differences concerne not matters of Faith, and that the names which you mention of Fraticans, Dominicans &c., signify a Meanes of that for which they are impioled, and which they are appointed to signify, and thersore prove that the names of Lutherans &c., must signify a Newly in faith?

But you say, that the jarses and divisions between (w) the Lutherans, and Calvinists do little concerne the Church of England, which followeth none but Christ. And doth not Lutherans and Calvinists pretend to follow Christ as well as you? Who shall be judge among you? But you may easily be well assured, that as long as you follow him by contrary wayes, you can never come where he is. And yet indeed, doe these jarses little concerne the Church of England? Have you in your Church none of those who are commonly called Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calvinists, Puritans &c., Doth it not behoove you to
consider, whether your Congregation can be one true Church of Christ, while you are in Communion with so many disagreeing Sects? Doth it little concern you, whether your first Reformers Lutherans, Calvinists, Zwinglians, Puritans be Heretiques, or no? How can it be, but that the divisions of Lutherans, and Calvinists must concern the Church of England? For, your Church cannot agree with them all; & if you side with one part, you must iarre with the other. Or if you agree with none of them, you disagree with all, & so make a greater division.

23. And therefore, being really distrustfull of this Answer, you come at length to your maine refuge, namely, that their diversions (x) are neither many, nor so material, as to shake, or touch the foundation. But till you can once tell us what points will shake the foundation, you cannot be sure whether their diversions be not such. You say, their (y) difference about Consubstantiation, (x) Pag. 87, and Vishous is not fundamental, because both agree, that Christ is really, and truly exhibited to each faithful Communicant, and that in his whole Person he is every where. In this manner you may reconcile all heresies, and say, the Arians or Nestorianis believed Christ to be really God; that is, by real, and true affection of Charity, as many among you say, Christ is really in the Sacrament, that is, by a real figure, or by a real act of faith, as the Nestorianis said of a real act of Charity; that even according to them who deny the
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Trinity, there is truly a Father, Sonne, and holy Ghost, as in God there is truly Power, Understanding, and Will; but whether those Persons be really distinct or no, that is (as you say of Consustantiation and Ubiquity) a nicety inscrutable to the wit of man; and so a man may goe discouraging of all other Heresies, which have been condemned by the Church. Is there not a maine difference of receiving our Saviour's body in real substance, and in figure alone? Or betwixt the immensity of our Saviour's Deity, and the Ubiquity of his Humanity, which destroys the Mysteries of his Nativity, Ascension &c. for who can ascend to the place where he is already? You specify only the said difference betwixt Lutherans, and Calvinists, whereas you know there are many more, as about the Canon of Scripture &c. as also between Protestants and Puritans &c. And I could put you in mind of your Brethren, who teach that for divers Ages the visible Church perished; and yet St. Augustine teacheth, that there is nothing more evident in Scripture, then the Universality of the Church: as also who deny that Bishops are by divine Institution; who oppose your whole Hierarchy as Antichristian; who differ from you in the forme of Ordination of Ministers; all which are fundamental points. But I will refer the Reader to the most exact Breachley, who (2) reckons no fewer then seauenty seauen differences among you, punctually citing the Bookes, and
and pages where you may find them. And yet for the present I will set downe some words of Doctor Willet, testifying your differences. From this fountaine (sayth he) have sprung (a) forth (a) in his me-
these and such like whirl-points, and bubbles of new dilution upon doctrine: as for example, that the Scriptures are not the 122 Psal-
means concerning God of all that profitably we know. Pag. 91.
That, they are not alone complete to everlasting felici-
ty: That, the word of God cannot possibly assure us what is the word of God: That, there are works of Supererogation: That, the Church of Rome, as it now standeth, is the family of Christ: That, Idolaters and wicked Heretiques are members of the visible Church:
(let D. Potter heere remember what himselfe layd of the Roman Church, and what he relates about the opinion of M. Hooker and M.
Morton, that among Heretiques there may be a true Church:) That, there is in Ordination given a indeleble Character: That, they have power to make Christ's body: That, Sacraments are necessary in their place, and no lesse required then believe of self: That, the soules of infants dying without Baptisme are dam-
med &c. Do you thinke, that the necessity of Baptisme and other Sacraments, the insufficiency of sole Scripture, which your English Clergy professteth at their Ordination, and those other points are but small matters? But besides these, and many more, there are two other maine, general, & transcendent differences among you. The one, whether you do not differ in maine points, which though you deny, yet others af-
firm;
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The other, what be maine or fundamental points. Upon which two differences, it will necessarily follow, that you cannot know, whether you have the same substance of faith, and hope of salvation, or no. But though your differences were all reduced to one, and that how small soever; that one were sufficient toExclude Unity of faith among you, as I have often said, and proved. I have no mind to spend time in telling you how un-scholler-like you say:

(b) Pag. 37: Two brothers (b) in their choller may renounce each other, and disclaim their amity; yet that heat cannot dissolve their inward, and essential relation. For when a man's brother dies, doth he loose any essential relation? I always thought that essential relations were inseparable from the essence to which they belong, and the essence from them; and a man who still remaines a man, may yet cease to be a brother: It is therefore no essential relation.

24. I grant that Differences in Ceremonies, or discipline, do not always infer diversity of faith; yet when one part condemns the Rites and discipline of the other, as Antichristian, or repugnant to God's word (as it happeneth among Protestants,) then differences in Ceremonies redound to a diversity in faith.

25. Luther tempered by (c) wild Melanthon (that honour of Germany) did much relent and remit of his rigour against Zwingius, and began to approve the good Counsels of peace. If inconstancy con-
By Catholiques. Chap. I. I. concerning matters of Fayth be Mildnes, Melanthon was, I grant, extremely mild, in which respect he was noted even by Protestants, & was disliked by Luther. How much Luther relented of his rigour against Zwingleus, let himself declare in these words, which you could not but read in Charity. Mistaken. I having now one of my feet (d) in the grave, will carry this testimony and glory to the Tribunall of God; That I will with all my heart condemn, and eschew CaroloSadius, Zwingiue, Oecolampadius, and their disciples; nor will I have familiarity with any of them either by letter, writing, words, nor deeds, accordingly as the Lord hath commanded. If in Polonia the followers of Luther, and Calvin have long lived together in concord, as you would have vs believe, the thing being really not true; they must thanke the good Catholicque King under whome they live, who is able, and apt to punish when there is great excess. But if they had the raynes in their owne hand, what greater concord could be hoped for amongst them in that Kingdome, then is found in other places, where they have more power? In Pomeria there are many Arvian, and Trinitarians, who live in outward concord with the rest; But will you acknowledge them for Brethren to Lutherians, Calvinists, and your selves? The answer will be hardly made, if you flock to your owne grounds, and I may well pass on to the rest.
OUR very beginning promises small sincerity in that which followes. For you make Charity - Mistaken say, that Protestants be Heretics at the left, if not Infidels; whereas he only sayth, & substantially proueth, that who soever doth disbelieve any one Article of faith, doth not assent to all the rest, by divine infallible faith, but by an humane persuasion; which is a point of great consideration, and of which it seemes you are very loath to speake.

2. You take much paines to poure what we do not deny. For it makest nothing to the purpose, whether or no the Proposition of the Church belong to the formall Object of faith, as heretofore I have told you. Nor do we deny Scripture to containe all mattes of faith, if it be rightly understood; because Scripture, among other Verities, doth also recommend unto vs the Church & humane Traditions, though they be unwritten. And you egregiously falsi-
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By (a) Bellarmine, as if he excluded the Authority of the Church, whereas in the place by you cited (de verb. Dei lib. I. c. 2.) he only speaks against the private spirit, and even there proves out of S. Augustine, that God will have vs learn of other men. We likewise teach that the Church doth not make any new Articles of faith, but only propounds, and declares to vs the old. Only I would have you here consider that whether or no Scripture be the sole Rule of faith, or whether faith be resolved into divine Revelation alone, or els partly into the Proposition of the Church: all is one, for the main Question, whether persons of divers Religions can be saved. For this remaineth undoubted, that it cannot be but damnable to oppose any truth, sufficiently declared to be contained in Scripture, or revealed by God.

3.  No lesse impertinent is your other discourse concerning the difficulty to know what is Heresy. For we grant, that it is not always easy to determine in particular occasions, whether this or that doctrine be such. Because it may be doubtfull, whether it be against any Scripture, or divine Tradition, or Definition of the Church; and much more, whether the person be an Heretique, which requireth certaine conditions (as Capacity, Pertinacy, sufficient Proposition &c.) which are not always so easily explicated, and discerned: and for these respects S. Augustine in the place cited (b) by you, had

E e e a
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had good reason to say: That it is hard to know what makes an Heretique. But it is strange that you should hold it to be so hard a matter, to give a generall definition of Heresy or Heretique, since in this very Section you dispatch it quickly, saying: He is justly esteemed an Heretique, who yields not to Scripture sufficiently propounded. Or (as you say elsewhere,) It is fundamental (d) to a Christian’s Faith, and necessary for his salvation, that he believe all revealed Truths of God, whereof he may be convinced that they are from God. Nay, if you will speake with coherence to your owne grounds; it is easy for you to define in all particular cases what is damnable Here’y: for you (I say) who measure all Heresy by opposition to Scripture; and further affirme, that Scripture is cleere in all fundamental points. For by this means it will be easy for you to discern what error opposeth those fundamental Truths, which are cleerly contayned in Scripture.

4. In your discourse concerning the Controuersy between Pope Stephen, and S. Cyprian, you shew a great deale of passion against the Roman Church, which you impugne out of an Epistle of Firmilianus, who at that time was a party against the Pope; and who in particular did afterward recant together with the other Bishops who once joyned with S. Cyprian, as we have already shewed out of S. Hirome, & may be also seen in an Epistle of Dionysius Alexandrius apud Eusch hist. b.6. c.7. wherein Firmilianus in
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particular is named(& therfore you are inexcu-
sable, who say they persifted in their opin-
ion;) whereas the proceeding of S. Stephen was
necessary to prevent a pernicious error of rebap-
tizing of such as had been baptized by Hereti-
ques, which afterward was condemned by the
whole Church. And as for S. Cyprians mild pro-
ceeding, which you so much commend out of
your ill will to S. Stephen, because he was Pope;
S. Augustine saith: The things which(c) Cyprian in
anger hath spread against Stephen, I will not suffer to
passe under my pen. Wherefore you could not have
picked out an example more in favour of Popes
then this. And you must giue vs leaue not to
credit what you say, That both Stephen and Cy-
prian erred in some sense. For Stephen only affir-
med, that Baptisme was not invalid precisely
because it is given by Heretiques, as S. Cyprian
affirmed it to be; but yet if the Heretiques er-
red either in the Matter or Forme of Baptisme,
Stephen never affirmed such Baptisme to be va-
lid, which had been more then he granted, even
to the Baptisme of Catholiques.

5. Your Argument to prove, that (f) con-
cerning our greater safety, we dispute against
you as the Donatists did against Catholiques, I
have answered; g) in the First Part. You would
make men beleive that we are like the Donatists, (g) Chap. I.
who washed Church well, and vestments of Catho-
liques, broke their Chalices, scraped their Altars &c.
But I pray you consider, whether Chalices, Vest-
ments, Eec 3
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...Palls, or Corporals, and Altars do expresse the Protestant Church of England, Scotland, Geneua, Holland &c. or the Church of Rome?

6. You spend divers pages in propounding Arguments for the opinion of M. Hooker, and M. Morton: That wheresoeuer a company of men do jointly profess the substance of Christian Religion, which is faith in Jesus Christ the Sonne of God and Saviour of the world, with submission to his doctrine in mynd and will; there is a Church wherein Salvation may be had, notwithstanding any corruption in judgment or practice: yea although it be of that nature that it seeme to fight with the very foundation, and so bayous as that in respect thereof the people staine with this corruption, are worthy to be abhorred of all men, and unworthy to be called the Church of God. But because these and such monstrous Assertions proceed from other errors which I have already both cleerly, and at large confuted; to wit, the Fallibility of the Church, the Distinction of points fundamental and not fundamentall &c. I referre you to those places: and here one only obserue into what precipices they fall, who deny the vniversal Intallibility of the Church. And it is strange that you your selues did not see the manifest contradictions involued in this wicked doctrine. For how can it be a Church wherein Salvation may be had, and yet be unworthy to be called the Church of God? How can that man have faith in Jesus Christ, with submission to his doctrine in mind and will, who is supposed
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posed to joyn with his beleive in Iesus Christ, other errors sufficiently propounded to be repugnant against Gods word, or Reuelation? Can submission in mind or will, or observation of his Commandments stand with actual voluntary error against his word? Is it not a prime Commandment to belieue Gods word? Do not your selfe affirme, that it is Infidelity to deny whatsoever is reveale in Scripture? How then can a Church be said to haue meanes for salvation and life, wherein is wanting Fayth the first ground of salvation? The Fathers sometimes called the Donatists, Brethren, by reason of their true Baptisme, not for their possibility to be saued, according as S. Augustine said to them: The Sacraments of Christ (i) do not make thee an Heretique, but thy wicked disagreement. And Optatus sayth: You cannot (k) but be our brethren, whom the same Mother the Church hath begotten in the same bowels of Sacraments, whom God our Father hath in the same manner received as adopted Children; namely, on his behalfe, and for as much as concernes the vertue of Baptisme. The Conclusion of your discourse may well beforme the doctrine for which you bring it: A learned man (l) anciently was made a Bishop of the Catholique Church, although he did professedly doubt of the last Resurrection of our bodies. You might have added, that he would not believe that the world should ever have an end; and further absolutely refused to be baptiz'd: And that he would not, as the Hi-

(i) Epist. 48.
(k) Lib. 4.
(l) pag. 122.
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story recounteth, live a single life as other Priests, but that he would live with a wife. For Synesius, who is the man you mean, publicly protested all these things; and you are wise enough to take only what might seem to serve your turn, as this, concerning the single lives of Priests did not, because it sheweth that in those anciet times, Priests could not live with wives.

And now I aske, whether in good earnest you believe, that one may be made a Bishop, who will not believe the Resurrection, nor wilbe baptized, or whether he may be baptized against his will? The Answer therfore may be seen in Baronius, who in demonstrates out of the Epistles of Synesius: himselfe, that he did these things, not to be made a Bishop, wishing (as he affirmeth) rather to dye, then to encrease to great a burthen: wherein faith Baronius: he seemes only to have done in words, that which St. Ambrose pretended in deeds, which was to be esteemed incontinent, and unmercifull, to hinder his being made Bishop. But these extraordinary proceedings may be admired, but ought not to be imitated. To say, that the ten Tribes, notwithstanding their Idolatries, remained till a true Church; cannot but make any Christian soule tremble, to consider to what damnable absurdities, and impieties they fall who leave the Roman Church. You falsify Magallanus (n) as if he with M. Hooker affirmed, that, if an

(n) Anno 410. v. 6. Dpond.

(1) Tit. 3. 11.

(c) Pag. 117. Whetst (c) should pursue to death an Heretique, only
By Catholiques. Chap. III. III. only for Christian professions sake, the honour of Martyrdom could not be denied to him: which is contrary to the words and meaning of Magallanus. For he expressly teacheth, that they do not participate of the grace of the Church, but are dead parts, and consequently not capable of salvation: Only he saith, that they may be called members of the Church, because the Church can judge and punish them. It is impossible that any Catholique Author should teach, that an Heretique, remaining an Heretique, (that is, actually and voluntarily, denying a revealed Truth sufficiently propounded for such) can be a Martyr. But such as you are may affirme what you please. The words of Salutianus (p) which you cite, and say, that they are very remarkable, lib. 3. do only signify by way of doubt, whether some of the Heretiques of whom he spake, and who in simpliciy followed their Teachers (as he expressly saith) may not be excused by ignorance. And since you affirme, that he spake of Arians, I would know, whether you do not thinke Arianism to be a damnable Heresy, unless accidentally ignorance excuse some particular persons.

7. You say, that (q) the Errors of the Do. (q) Tag. 151. satisfys concerning the invalidity of the Baptisme given by Heretiques, and of the Novatians, that the Church ought not to absolve some grievous sinners, were not in themselves heretical; &c. Neither was it in the Churches intension (or in F ff her
Part. 2. Charity maintained her power) to make them such by her declaration. If these errors, neither in themselves, nor by the declaration of the Church be heretical, I pray you, how are they heretical? May a má in these rymes hold them without note of Heresy? So you must say, vnles you grant the definitions of Gods Church to be infallible. For S. Augusti-

e professeth, that this point concerning re-
baptization cannot be determined out of Scri-
pture alone, as hath been sayd before. Or if you say, this Error may be confuted out of Scrip-
ture, then you must grant that it is in its selfe her-
etical, which you deny. But no wonder if by
denying the infallibility of the Church, you be
brought to such strayes. I goe on now to the
next.

CHAP.
In this Section, you handle three points. First, that the Church is infallible only in fundamentall points. Secondly, that the Generall Counsels; and, Thirdly, that the Pope may erre in points fundamentall. Concerning the first, I haue spoken in the first Part; the second and third, are particu- lar disputes, from which you ought to haue abstained, if you had meant to haue touched indeed the point of our Controversy. But since you will needs fill you Booke with such particulars, I must also goe out of the way, to answere your objections.

2. If I tooke pleasure, as you doe, to fill my Margent with quotations of Authours, I could easily shew how you mistake and wrong our Schoole-men; as if they held that something which in itself is not infinit, but really distinct from the divine Authority, were the chiefe Motiue of fayth, the first and furthest principle into which it resolves: wheras their difference is only in explicating vnder what precise and for-
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mally consideration, God is the formall object of fayth: some assigning the Divinity itself; others, the authority of God commanding; others, which is the common opinion, teaching, that it is resolved into the divine, or Prime Verity: and lastly even those whose it seems you call unwise, and unwary Writers against Luther, doe not teach that the Authority of the Church is the chiefest, first, and furthest principle into which fayth resolves; but at the most, that her Proposition is necessary to an Act of divine fayth; either because they conceive that matter of fayth ought to concern the common good of Religion, and to require a publique Authority or Propounder; or else because they hold that her Proposition in some sort enters into the formall object of fayth in respect of us; Neither are the Authors of this opinion only Writers against Luther, as you say, but divers other Schoole-mates.

3. Where you say, that there is no question but that Fayth is supernaturall, in regard of the Efficient Caufe, and of the Object, both which ought to be supernaturall; it seemes you are willing to dissemble the doctrine of your great Reforner Zwinglius, who (a) out of his excessive Charity, placed in heaven, Hercules, Theseus, Socrates, Aristides &c. (who had no supernaturall Fayth, nor belief of God) as also the Children of the Heathens dying without (b) Baptisme. Were not such Charitable men, very fit to re-
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forme the Church?

4. You fall againe upon the sufficiency of Scripture, which point I have already answered, & shewed in what sense all points of faith may be contained in Scripture; to wit, in as much as the Scripture doth recommend to vs the Church, and divine unwritten Traditions. Neither can you allege any one Catholique Author, ancient or moderne, who speaking of the sufficiency of Scripture, excludes Tradition, by which euen Scripture itselfe is delivered to vs. And as for S. Augustine, and S. Basil, whom you allege for the sufficiency of Scripture, they be so cleerly for Tradition, that they have been taxed by some Protestants for that cause; as likewise for the same reason some chiefe Protestants have blamed Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Epiphanius, Ambrose, Hierome, Maximus, Theophilus, Damascene, Chrysostome, Tertullian, Cyprian, Leo, Eusebius, and others, as may be seene in (c) Brecley. But though Scripture alone did particularly containe all points necessary to Saluacion; doth it follow, thinke you, from thence, that the Church is not infallible? May not both Scripture, and Church be infallible in what they deliver? Doth not your selfe grant, that the Church is infallible for points fundamentall; and for the same points the Scripture is also sufficient, and cleere? Which evidently sheweth, that you cannot deny, but that the Infallibility of the Church, may well stand
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with the sufficiency of Scripture, & consequent-ly to oppose either the Scripture or Church, is sufficient to make one an Heretique: and this is sufficient for our purpose. Yea, since you cannot deny, but that it is Heresy, to oppose the Scripture, and that you also grant that the Scripture affirms the Church to be infallible in fundamental points, it followes, that even according to you, every one who opposeth the Church in such points is an Heretique, even because he opposeth the Church; although the further reason heerof be, because he opposeth the Scripture, which recommends the Church. So that all which you have said about the sufficiency of Scripture alone, is in divers respects nothing to the purpose.

(d) Pag. 136 5. You affirm, that (d) Eckius, Pighius, Hosius, Turrianus, Coiterus, do everywhere in their writings speake wickedly, and contumeliously of the holy Scriptures. And because this is a common slander of Protestants against Catholique Writers; I do here challenge you to produce but one, I say, but one only place, either out of any one of these whom you name, or any other Catholique Doctor, who speaks wickedly or contumeliously against holy Scriptures. But be sure you do not confound speaking against Scripture it selfe, with speaking against the abuse thereof, or against the letter of Scripture wrested to some heretical sense; against which our Authors speake, and cannot speake too much. And S. Hie-
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You proceed, and say: The Testimony of the present Church works very powerfully & probably, first upon Infidels to win them to a Reverend opinion of Fayth and Scriptures &c. Secondly, upon Novices, weaklings, and doubters in the fayth, to instruct & confirm them, till they may acquaint themselves with, and understand the Scriptures, which the Church delivers as the Word of God. Thirdly, upon all within the Church, to prepare, induce, and persuade the Mind as an outward means to embrace the fayth, to read, and believe the Scriptures. But the fayth of a Christian finds not in all this, any sure ground whereon finally to rest, or settle it self: Because, divine Fayth requires a Testimony absolutely divine, and yet, our Adversaries yield that the Testimony of the present Church is not absolutely divine, (to which purpose you cite in your Margent some of our Authors) and therefore it cannot rely upon the Church.

This your discourse is neither pertinent, nor true. For the Question is not, as I have often told you, whether or no, our Fayth be resolved into the Authority of the Church: but whether we may not truly infer, that who so ever refilsteth the Church in those points which she doth infallibly propose as rewealed by God (which infallibility you yield to her for all fundamental points) be not an Heretique, because at first by refilting the Church, he consequently comes to oppose the Testimony or Revelation of God,
God, which is the formal object of Fayth. Besides, if the Testimony of the Church work but probably upon Infidels, and Nouices, who by you are taught to believe that she may erre (youes you will circumvent them, by disembling her fallibility) they will have witt enough to tell themselves, that since she may erre, and speakes but probably, she cannot work so powerfully upon them, but that they may still doubt whether she do not actually erre, and deceive them. And how can the Church worke upon all within her, to prepare, induce, and persuade the mind to embrace the faith, to read and believe Scriptures? Are they within the Church before they have embraced the Fayth? Or must they want fayth till they read, and believe the Scriptures? Or rather (since according to your Principles all fayth depends on Scripture) must they not believe the Scripture, before they embrace the fayth, and consequently before they be in the Church? How then doth the Church prepare, induce, and persuade them that are within her, to embrace the fayth, and to read, and believe the Scriptures? If our fayth must rest and settle only upon the Written Word of God, how doth S.Iren. (f) Lib. 3. Cap. 4. (f) affirme, that many Nations have been converted to Christ without Scriptures? Were they converted only to an humane fayth?

3. And wheras you say, that the Authority of the Church is not absolutely divine, and therefore cannot be the last, and formal Obiect of fayth,
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faith, it is but an Equiuocation, and you infer that which we do not deny. Cominck whom you cite in your Margent, and translated by haues, answeres your Objection in the very wordes which you alleage. Although ( saith he ) the Church (g) be directed by the infallible assistance of the holy Ghost, and in that sense her Testimony do in (g) Disp. 9. sub. 5. concl. some sort rely upon the divine Authority, and receive from it strength ( all which wordes you do not translate ) yet it is not truly, or properly the Testimony or word, and revelation of God, but properly it is a humane Testimony. You see then, that the Testimony of the Church in some sense is Divine, that is, infallibly directed by the holy Ghost: which is enough for our purpose, although it be not Divine in another sense, that is, her words are not the immediate voice of God, as Scriptures are, because she doth not propose any new Revelations, made immediately to her, but only infallibly declares what Revelations have been made to Prophets, Apostles, &c. Your selfe affirme, that the Church is infallible in Fundamentall points, and consequently her Testimony is not meerly humane and fallible, and yet it is not absolutely divine; and so you must answer your owne Argument: and you must grant that the Church being infallible in some points, may be to vs a ground sufficient for our infallible assent, or beliefe for such Articles. And if you will tell vs that faith must be resolute into some Authority which is absolutely
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Divine, as Divine signifies that which is distinct from all things created, you will find your selfe gone too far. For Scripture it selfe, being a thing created, and not a God, is not Divine in that tense. And the Apostles, who received immediate Revelations from God, when afterwards they did preach, and declare them to others; those Declarations, (which suppos'd the Revelations already made) were not in the opinion of many Divine, the testimony or word of God, but of men infallibly assist'd by God:

And yet I hope you will not hence inferre, that it had not been Herefor to oppose the Declarations of the Apostles, although they did not preach new Revelations, but only declare, and propound such as had been already made to them.

9. Your wordes (which are indeed but

Words) That Scripture (h) is of divine Authority, the Believer sees by that glorious beam of divine light which shines in Scripture, I confuted hereunto. And what greater controversy can there be then by your own words, the Believer sees. For if he see, how doth he believe? Or if he believes, how doth he see? Especially since you say he believes, and

sees, upon the same formal object, or motive. Yet that Scripture is knowne by itselfe, you prove out of Bellarmine, who layth: That the Scripture

res (i) which are contain'd in the Prophetical and Apostolical Writings be most certaine and divine, Scripture itselfe witnesseth. But these words will prove to be against yourselfe. For Bellarmine in

(i) De verb.

Dei lib. 1.

Cap. 20
that place disputing agaynst the Schwenkfeldian Heretiques, who denyed all Scriptures, sayth: That, he doth not allledge (k) Testimonies of Scripture as if he thought that his Adversaries made any great account of them, but left the Scriptures, the Authority whereof his Adversaries did sometimes abuse agaynst vs who reverenced them, may be thought to favour their doctrine. Is this to affirm that Scripture is certainly, and evidentely knowne by Scripture? Or rather contrarily to say, that it must first be beleived, before it be powerfull to perswade? And therefore immediatly after the wordes by you cited which are, The Scripture selfe witnesseth; he adds these (which you as you are wont, leaue out) whose predictions of things to come if they were true, as the event afterward did manifest, why should not the Testimonies of things present be true? Where you see, that he proues not the Scripture by that beame of light which evidently shines in Scripture, but by predictions, which we grant to be a good inducement, or, as Divines speake, an Argument of credibillity, and yet no infallible ground of faythe to beleive that Scriptures are divine; and much lesse a beame of light cleerly convincing vs, that Scripture is Scripture. For one may be inspired to prophesy, or speake truth in some point, and for others be left to humane discourse, or error, as it hapned in Balam, and the friends of Job. And thentherefore Bellarmin in that very place, brings other extrinsecall Argumentes, as Miracles,
Part 2. Charity maintain'd exemplar, and visible strange punishments of such as presumed to abuse holy Scripture &c. Which evidently shews, that he intended to bring Arguments of Credibility, and not infallible grounds of faith, whereby we believe that Scripture is Scripture, which we must take from the infallible Testimony of the Church by means of Tradition, whereof Bellarmine saith:

(m) Dei verbum. This so necessary a point, to wit, that (m) there is some Dei verbum. divine Scripture, cannot be had from Scripture itself. Wherby it is manifest that you plainly corrupt Bellarmine's meaning, when you go about to prove out of him, that Scripture can be proved by Scripture alone, the contrary whereof he affirmes, and proves at large against the Heretiques of these times. The place which you cite of Origen, only proves that those who already believe the Canonickall Bookes of Scripture may prove out of them, that Scripture is divinely inspired, as St. Peter (n) saith. Neither doth the Authority of Salusianus prove any thing els.

(n) Epist. 2. 21. Your saying, that we yield to the Authority of Salusianus prove any thing els.

(o) Pag. 144. Church, an absolute (o) unlimited Authority to propound what the pleath, and an unlimited power to supply the defects of Scripture; let passe as meere frauders. As also, that the Authority of the Church is absolute, not (p) depending on Scripture, but on which the Scripture it selfe depends. And you cannot be ignorant of that, which hath been so often inculcated by Catholique Writers, that the Scriptures in themselves do not depend on the Church,
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Church, but only in respect of us, who learn from her what Bookes be Canonical Scripture, which is to say, not the Scriptures, but our weake understanding, and knowledge of Scripture relies on the Church, which our Saviour Christ commandes vs to heare. And your selfe grant, that the Church is the ordinary outward means to present, and propound divine verities to our Fayth. You will not deny that your knowledge of the Trinity, Incarnation &c. depends on Scripture, will you thence infer that the Blessed Trinity, Incarnation &c. in themselves depend on Scripture? as if God had not been God, unlesse Scripture had beene written. Besides, to such as believe Scripture we may prove the Church herselfe by Scripture, and she in all her definitions doth consult, examine, and submit herselfe to Scripture, against which she never did, nor euer can define any thing; & in this sense also she depends on Scripture. But to make good your flaunder, you (r) cite Bellarmine, after your wonted fashioon. If we take away (s) the Authority of the present Church of Rome, (this of Rome is your addition) and of the Trent-Council, the decrees of all other Ancient Councils, and the whole Christian Fayth may be questioned as doubtful, for the strength of all doctrines, and of all Councils depends upon the Authority of the present Church. Would not one thinke by these words that the strength of all doctrines depends on the Church? whereas Bellarmine only sayth, that we could not
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Part. 2. Charity maintained infallibly know, that there were such General Councils, and that they were lawfull Councils, and that they defined this or that; but because the present Church which cannot erre doth so believe, and teach us. Which words demonstrate, that Bellarmine doth not speake of fayth, or doctrines in themselves, but in respect of us. And do not you your selfe teach that it is the Church, which directs us to Scripture, and that she likewise is the ordinary outward means to present, and propound divine Verities, without which Proposition no object can be conveyed to our (t) fayth? And what is this, but to acknowledge, that in the ordinary way, without the guidance, direction, and Proposition of the Church we have no fayth at all.

11. You likewise cite these words out of (u) Bellarmine: The Scriptures, Traditions, and all doctrines whatsoever depend on the Testimony of the Church (he means lay you, that of Rome) without which all are wholly uncertain. But Bellarmines words are these: Since the Scriptures, Traditions, and all doctrines whatsoever depend upon the Testimony of the Church, all things will be uncertain, unless we be most assured which is the true Church. You see Bellarmine speaks not of the particular Church of Rome, as you in your Paræthesis would make him seeme to speake. And as for the Universal true Church, what principle of Atheisme is it, (as you very exorbitantly (w) affirm) to say, that if we did not know which were the true Church, we could have no certainty of
of Scriptures, Traditions, or anything else? Do you think it were safe to take the Scriptures upon the credit of a false Church? As well might you take them upon the credit of Turkes, or Infidels. And therefore, not the Assertion of Bellarmine, but the contrary to it, is a plain principle of Atheism. Do not you prove the necessity of a perpetually visible true Church, because otherwise men should want that ordinary means which God hath appointed for our instruction, Direction, & Salvation? Now, if we might have Scriptures, and true Faith from a false Church, your more zealous Brethren, who deny a perpetually visible true Church, might easily answer all your Arguments, and tell you, that a true Church is not necessary for Faith, and Salvation. And besides, is it not in effect all one to say (for as much as concerns our instruction) Christ hath no visible Church; & to say, that we cannot know which is the true visible Church of Christ? All the infallibility which we ascribe to the Church, is acknowledged to proceed from the assistance of God; how can he be said not to believe a God, who believes the Church, because she is assisted by God? Remember that even now I told you, that according to your own affirmation, the Church is the ordinary means whereby Divine Truth is conveyed to the understanding: and yet you think yourself free from Atheism. The Apostles of themselves, were but mortal, frail, & subject to error,
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erour, and yet I hope, you will not thinke it a
Principle of Atheisme to say, that all our fayth
depends on them.

12. You taxe vs for teaching, that much of
the Matter, or Object of fayth is not containeyd in
Scripture any way. But I haue already more then
once sayd, that we believe nothing but what
is contain'd in Scripture in some sort, eyther
in it selfe, or from some Principle from which
it may be certaynely deduced, or in those plae-
ces of Scripture which recemend the Church, &
writhen Traditions to vs; as if one should in
his last Testament expresslie divers particulars,
and shou'd in the same Testament referre the
rest to some third person, whome he had fully
instructed concerning his further will, & mean-
ing; whatsoever things were performed ac-
cording to the direction of that third person,
might truly belayd to be containeyd in the Te-
Stament; although they might also be sayd not
to be contain'd therein, because they are not me-
tioned in particular. And according to this ex-
plication, Canus, and Stapleton whome you cite,
and other Catholikes are to be understood,
when they teach, that we believe divers things
not comprehended in Scripture.

(y) Pag. 146. 13. But you aske, with what ingenuity (y) or
conference doe they pretend Scripture in each Confo-
versy against vs, since by their owne Confession ma-
ny of their Assertions are mere unwritten Tradit-
sions, leaning only on the Authority of their Church?
I answeare, that some points of faith are expressly contained in Scripture, yet not so enfor-}
{cingly as they might not be colourably eluded, if we tooke away the declaration of the Church.
Some others, are not contained in Scripture, an-
{y other way then in the generall principles of
{the Churches authority, and divine Traditions;
{as, for example, that such Bookes in partic-
{ular are Canonicall writings. Some others are
{comprehended in Scripture, only probably. O-
{thers are contained so cleerly, that they may
{seeme sufficiently evident to a man not per-
{uerse; and according to these diversities we do
{more or lesse alledge Scripture. If one were di-
{sposed to trie such Arguments as you bring, I
{might aske on the other side, to what purpose
do you alledge Councels, Fathers, & Realsons,
if out of Scripture alone you can convince all
errors against your doctrine? May not diverse
arguments be rightly alledged to prove the selfe
same Conclusion?

14. Once againe, you returne to the suffi-
ciency of only Scripture (that is, you returne to
speake nothing which concerns the Question
in hand) which you prove out of Bellarmine,
though heerr (say you) as not seldome (z) contra-
(z)Pag.147
diting both him:se, and his fellowes. How confo-
nant the writings of Bellarmine are, both to
themselves, and to the common doctrine of o-
ther Catholique Authors, this may serue for a
sufficient proofe, that all his Adversaries could
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neuer shew yet in all his works any one contradiction, but such as themselves had first forged, and then objected. And although in this general cause I do not willingly meddle with personal things; yet that you may learn hereafter to speak with more circumspection, but chiefly for the merit of a person, so eminent in learning and dignity, and yet more eminent in learning, I will not forbear to assure the world and you, that when some years since, a person of high authority in the world, had made himselfe believe that he had discovered many contradictions in Bellarmine, D. Donne in a conference that he had with a person of Honour & Worth, from whom I received it, though I hold it not fit here to give his name, declared that there was no ground for this, but that all his works were so consonant and coherent to one another, as if he had been able to write them all in one hour's space. And if you, D. Potter, be of another opinion, you shall do well to produce some instance to the contrary, which may shew a real contradiction betweene some passage, and some other of his works, wherein it is odds that you will be answered, and he be defended. Let us see also for the present what you bring to make good your allegation. The Cardinal (I lay you) grants (a) that a Proposition is not de fide, unless it be concluded in this Syllogisme: Whatsoever God (b) hath revealed in the Scripture is true; but this or that, God hath revealed in Scripture; ergo, it is true. If matters of
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of fayth must be renewed in Scripture, as this reason supposes, then the Proposall of the Church cannot make any unwritten Verity to become matter of fayth: yet to value the soueraigne power of his Church, he makes all the strength, and truth in this Syllogisme to depend on the Testimony of the Church, and by consequence the truth of the Conclusion, which ever resembles the weaker premisses. So as if this be true, there is no truth in the Scriptures, or in our Religion, without the attestation of the Church. But now how many corruptions, sleights, and vntruths are couched in these lines? Let vs examine them a little. Bellarmine having taught, and proued at large, that the interpretation of holy Scripture belongs not to private persons, but to the Church of God, which, in respect of vs, is to judge of Scripture, and of all other Controversties in Religion: and having made this Objection against himselfe; If our fayth depend upon the Judgment of the Church, then it depends upon the Word of God, super men, and therefore doth rely upon a most vsele foundation; he giues this answer: The Word of the Church, that is, of the Councell or Pope, when he teacheth as out of his Chaire, is not meerly the word of man; that is, a word subject to error, but in some sort the word of God; that is, uttered by the assistance, and direction of the holy Ghost: nay I say, that the Heretiques are those who indeed lean on a rotten staffe: And then he comes to the words which you cited: For we must know that a Proposition of Fayth is concluded in this Syllogisme: Whatsoever God hath
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revealed in Scripture is true: God hath revealed this in Scripture: ergo it is true. Of the premisses in this Syllogisme, the first is most certain among all; the second is most firm, or certain among Catholiques, for it relies on the Testimony of the Church, Council, or Pope (here you break off, but Bellarmin's ads) of which we have in holy Scripture manifest promisses that they cannot erre. Acts 15. It hath seem'd to the Holy Ghost, & to us: And Luke 22. I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail. But amongst Heretiques it doth rely only upon coniectures, or the Judgement of one's own spirit, which for the most part seemeth good, and is ill; and since the Conclusion followes the weaker part, it necessarily followes, that the whole faith of Heretiques, is but conjectural, and uncertain. Thus farre Bellarmini. And now wherein I pray you consilets his contradicting both himselfe, and his fellowes? Perhaps you meane, because here he teacheth that every Proposition of faith must be revealed in Scripture; and therefore contradicts his other doctrine, that besides Scripture there are unwritten Traditions. But the vanity of this objection will by and by appeare among your other corruptions, which now let down. First, you see Bellarmines speakes not of faith in general, but only of matters of faith contain'd in Scripture, his whole question being about the interpretation thereof, that is, Whether we are to rely on the private spirit, or humane industry of conferring places &c. or els upon the Church. And
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And therefore; Secondly, he sayth not, as you cite him in a different letter, by way of an universal negation, that a proposition is not de fide, or not belonging to faith, unless it be concluded in this syllogism: Whatsoever God hath revealed in the Scripture is true; but this, or that God hath revealed in Scripture &c. (from whence it would follow that nothing at all could be believed which is not contained in Scripture) but he onely sayth that a proposition of faith is concluded in this syllogism; which includes no universal negation, but is meant onely of those Propositions of faith which depend on the interpretation of Scripture, which was the subject of his discourse. And therefore I wonder why you should say in general; this reason supposes that matters of faith must be revealed in Scripture. For, to teach that some matters of faith are in Scripture, doth not suppose that all matters of faith must be contained in Scripture, and yet all the contradiction that there you find in Bellarmine must be this: Such Propositions of faith as are contained in Scripture, are concluded in this syllogism: Whatsoever God hath revealed in the Scripture &c. Ergo all Propositions of faith must be concluded in this syllogism; Ergo there are no unwritten Traditions. A goodly contradiction! There, where did Bellarmine ever teach that the Proposall of the Church can make any unwritten Verity to become matter of faith, as you speak? The Church doth not make Verities to be mat-
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ter of faith, but only declares them to be such. 
Fourthly, you leave out the words which clearly 
explicate in what sense the Testimony of the 
Church may be said to be humane, or divine; 
by which your Argument to prove that the de-
claration of the Church cannot be a sufficient 
ground of faith, had been answered, and your 
tallacy discovered. Fifthly, Bellarmin never af-
firmed, as you say he did, that the strength and 
truth of the Minor in the said Syllogisme depends 
on the Testimony of the Church, but only that it is 
most certaine among Catholics by the Testi-
mony of the Church, because, as I have often 
said, the Church cannot make any one Article 
to be true, but only by her declaration can 
make it certaine to all Catholics, as Bellarmin 
said. Sixthly, you leave out Bellarmin’s words, 
wherby he proves the infallibility of Church 
and Pope out of Scripture; and accordingly in 
the seventh place, that which he expressly faith 
of the uncertaine conjectural ground of Hereti-
tiques, which can produce only a conjectural 
and uncertain faith, because the Conclusion 
follows the weaker part, you make him apply to 
the Testimony of the Church as if it were un-
certaine, which contrarily in the words by you 
omitted he proves to be most certaine & infal-
liable; and therefore the Conclusion which relies 
upon a Proposition delivered by her, is not sub-
ject to error. Eighthly, you returne to the flaun-
der, that if Bellarmin’s doctrine be true, there is no 
truth
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truth in the Scriptures, or in our Religion, without
the attestation of the Church: as if Bellarmine had
taught, that the truth of Scripture, and of all
Christian Religion depends on the attestation
of the Church, which could not in you proceed
from ignorance, but from a purpose to deceive
your Reader. For Bellarmine in that very place
which you cite, declares himself so fully and
clearly that you cannot be excused from willful
flaunter. I will put downe the place at large,
that hereafter you, and your Brethren may ei-
ther cease to make the same Objection, or els
endeavour to confute the Cardinal's answer.

Bellarmine then, makes this objection against
himselfe: If the Pope judge of Scriptures, it follows
that the Pope or Councell is above the Scripture: and
if the meaning of Scripture without the Pope or Coun-
cell be not authentical, it follows that the word of
God takes his force and strength from the word of
men: And then he gives this Answer: I answer,
that this Argument of which Heretiques make grea-
test account, consists in a mere Equivocation. For it
may be understood two manner of ways, that the
Church doth judge of Scriptures: the one, That she
should judge whether that which the Scripture teaches
be true, or false: The other, That putting for a most
certaine ground, that the words of Scripture are most
true, she should judge what is the true interpretation
of them. Now, if the Church did judge, according to
the former way, she should indeed be above the Scrip-
ture, but this we do not say, though we be calumni-
ted
15. You cite (g) Waldensis, to prove that the
infallibility of the Church is planted only
in the Church universal, or the Catholique
Body of Christ on earth, comprehending all his
members. But though we cannot allow of Walden-
sis his doctrine in some points, wherein he
contradicts the content of other Catholiques;
yet he doth not teach what you affirm, but only
that the infallibility of the Church consists in
the succession of Doctors in the Church, which
is against your assertion (Pag. 150.) that the
whole Militant Church (that is, all the members
of it) cannot possibly err. &c. And therefore the do-
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ted by the Heretiques as if we did, who every where
cry out, that we put the Scripture under the Popes
Feet. But that the Church or Pope doth judge of Scrip-
tures in the latter sense, which we affirm, is not to
say, that the Church is above Scripture, but above the
Judgment of private persons. For the Church doth not
judge of the Truth of Scripture, but of the understand-
ing of thee, and mee, and others. Neither doth the
Word of God receive strength thereby, but only my un-
derstanding receives it. For the Scripture is not more
ture or certaine, because it is so expounded by the
Church; but my Opinion is truer, when it is confir-
med by the Church. What say you now, Doth Bel-
lamine teach, that the Truth, or certaintie of
Scripture or of the Altnor in the foretold Sylo-
gistme, depend on the Church? But in the mean
time how many corruptions have you commit-
ted in this one Citation?
By Catholiques. Chap. v. 125

Drine of Waldensis is sufficient for our maine Question against you, that who soever ereth in any one point delivered by Doctors and Pasteurs succeeding one another in the visible Church, is an Heretique, and without repentance cannot be saued, whether the point be of itself fundamentall, or not fundamentall. For Waldensis maketh no such distinction as you do: Nay, which is directly against your present Assertion here, and your doctrine els where, this Author (doctrinal fidei tom. i. Art. 2. cap. 47.) having prefixed this Title before that Chapter; That the Pope hath infrangible power to determine verities of faith, and to overcome and cancell all heretical falties; doth in the whole Chapter it selfe prosecute and proue the said Title out of the Fathers. And to the next Chapter 48. having also given this Title: Of the Prerogative of the perpetuall immunity, and purity of the Romane Church from all contagion of Heresy; he proues it in like manner through the whole Chapter. You must therfore be well advis'd how you cite Authors out of one place, without considering, or enquiring what they say in another.

16. Together with Waldensis, you cite Sylvestre, saying: The Church which is (i) affirmed not to (i) Summa be capable of error, is not the Pope, but the Congregation of the faithfull. But this is a plaine falsification. For in that very place he teacheth; That the Pope vsing the Counsell of Cardinals, or his members, cannot erre, but may erre as he is a part of.
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particular person. And then adds: In this manner is to be understood the gloss, Cauf. 24, q. i, c. 1, d. recta, which saith the Church which cannot erre is not the Pope, but the Congregation of the faithful. So as you see that these are not the words of Sylvestre, as you affirm, but of another, which yet he interprets plainly against you. And that you may be wholly inexcusable, he doth here referre himselfe to another place, namely, Verb. oncium. § 3. where he expressly proues, that a Counsell cannot erre, no more then the Church, because if the Counsell could erre, the whole Church might erre. For the Church doth not meet togethers, but only the Counsell, or the Pope. Adding further, that the doctrine of the Church upon which S. Thomas saith we are to rely as upon an infallible Rule, is no other then that of the Counsell. And as for the Pope, he saith, that we must not stand to the Popes declaration, because he hath better reasons then can be alleaged to the contrary; but because he is Head of the Church, whose office is to determine doubts in sayth. And a little after he expressly saith: That the Pope cannot erre when recourse is made to him in doubtfull matters as to the Head of the Church, because (sayth he) this errour would redound to the errour of the whole Church. And likewise in this very place of Sylvestr, which you cite, he also referres himselfe to Verb. fides. § 2. where at large he proues the Popes infallibility, saying: That it belongeth to sayth, that
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that we rely upon the Popes determination in things belonging to faith or manners, because the Church cannot err in such things, and consequently he, as head of the Church, that is, as he is Pope, cannot err, although he determined without advice of the Cardinals. With what conscience then, do you cite this Author against his words, meaning, and designe, and acribe to him words which he citeth out of another, and, as I said, explicates against you? And with the like fidelity, after Sylvester, you do strangely alledge the Glossa Cauf. 14 can. à reela with an, Et, as if the words which you cited out of Sylvester (The Church which cannot err is not the Pope &c.) had been different from that Glossa, whereas they are nothing but that Glossa, and not the words of Sylvester.

17. They (you meane Catholique Doctors) grant, that the infallibility of the Church reacheth not (k) to all questions and points in Religion that may arise, but only to such Articles as may belong to the substance of faith, such as are matters essentiall and fundametall, simply necessary for the Church to know and believe. To omit others D Stapleton is full (l) and punctuall to this purpose. He distinguisheth Controversies of Religion into two sorts. Some, sayth he, are about those doctrines of faith which necessarily pertaine to the publique faith of the Church; others about such matters as do not necessarily belong to the faith, but may be variously b.d. & disputed without hurt or prejudice of faith.

Here is such a Caos of words, and corruptions,
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as I scarce know where to beginne to unfold them. Stapleton in the place by you alledged hath this Assertion. The infallibility of teaching in matters of faith, granted to the Church, hath place only in defining infallibly, and proposing faithfully those doctrines of faith, which either are called in question, or otherwise belong necessarily to the public faith of the Church. And afterward he affirmeth, that those things belong necessarily to faith, and public doctrine of the Church which all men are bound explicitly to believe, or else are publicly practised by the Church, or else which the Pastors are bound to believe explicitly, and the people implicitly in the faith of their Pastors. By which words it is clear that Stapleton saith not, that the infallibility of the Church reacheth only to such Articles as are matters essential, and fundametall, and simply necessary for the Church, to know and believe, as you affirm; but to all points which are called in question, or which are publicly practised by the Church, whether they be fundamental, or not fundamental, and therefore you do miscallege him when you say, that, be distinguisheth Controversies of Religion into two sorts: Some are about those doctrines of faith, which necessarily pertain to the public faith of the Church &c. For Stapleton explicateth himselfe, as you have heard, that whatsoever is called in question, or practised by the Church, is the Object of her infallibility, which is the thing we intend to prove against Protestants; that to oppose, or
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question any one doctrine, or practice of the Church is to resist an infallible Authority, and consequently to be an Heretique. And that Stapleton never dreamed of your imaginary restraining the infallibility of the Church to points fundamentall, is cleere by another place which you (m) cite as out of S. Thomas and him, in this manner: Some are primitive Articles, of the substance of Religion, essentiall in the object of faith. Others are secondary, probable, accidentall, or obscure points. For Stapleton in that place saith, that certaine doctrines (n) are either primary Principles of faith, or else, though not primary, yet defined by the Church, and so, as if they were primary. Others are Conclusions deduced from those principles, but yet not defined. Of the first kind are the Articles of faith, and whatsoever is defined in Councils against Heretiques &c. Of the second, are questions, which either belong to the hidden works of God, or to certaine most obscure places of Scripture, which are beside the faith, and of which we may be ignorant without losse of faith, yet they may be modestly, and fruitfully disputed of. And afterward he teacheth, that whatsoever the Church doth universally hold, either in doctrine or manners, belongs to the foundation of faith: and proues it out of S. Augustine (o) who calles the Custome of the Church, Ecclesiæ semperem fundatis imæ & sidem fundatis imam, confirmatum in Ecclesiæ fundamenta, authoritatem stabilitatis imæ ecclesiae. Could any thing be more cleere to shew, that according to Stapleton,
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the infallibility of the Church reacheth further
then to those points which you call fundamental, and that it belongs to the very foundation of
Fayth, that we beleive whatsoever the Church
holds? And that it is not lawfull for any to dis-
pute against such determinatio's of the Church?
Which doth overthrow your distinction of
points fundamental & not fundamental; though
you alledge the authority of S. Thomas and Sta-
pleton in favour thereof. For S. Thomas (c) in
the very place by you cited, after he had sayd,
that there are some objected of Fayth which we
are bound explicitely to beleue; addeth; that
we are bound to beleue all other points, when
they are sufficiently propounded to vs, as be-
longing to Fayth. You might gayne more re-
putation to your selfe, and allow your adver-
sary more ease, if you would once relieue to
cite your Authours with more sincerity.

18. To prove, that the infallibility of the
Church extends only to fundamental points,
you also alledge Maldonatus, who sayth: That he
will not repugne (b) if one will affirme, that those
words Io. 14. vers. 16. He shall teach you all things;
be referred to those other words; WHATSOEVER I have
spoken to you: as if our Sauiour did say, that the holy
Ghost was to teach the nothing, but that which himselfe had taught them. But do you in good earnest
believe, that our Sauiour taught the Apostles
fundamental points alone, which all Christians are bound explicitely to beleue? Or will you
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you lay, the Apostles were infallibly affliction only when they delivered fundamental points of faith? So you must lay, if Christ did teach them only points fundamental, and the holy Ghost taught them only those things which Christ had taught them, unless you will say, they were infallible without the assistance of the holy Ghost. You see he had good reason to say, that (q) by denying the universal infallibility of the Church, & limiting the promises of Christ made to her, you opened a gap for men to say that the Apostles in their Preaching and Writing were not universally infallible. And here I ask, whether it be not a fundamental error against faith, and salvation, to deny the truth of any one point sufficiently propounded as revealed by God? and since without question it is so, you must either grant, that the Church can err fundamentally and damnable against faith, which yet your self deny; or else you must yield that her infallibility reaches to all points sufficiently propounded as divine Truths, whether they be in themselves fundamental, or not fundamental, which is as much as we desire.

19. Against the infallibility of the Church you bring a long argument, (pag. 157. 158.) the force whereof is this: Nothing according to us can be believed by divine faith which hath not been defined by the Church: But the Church hath not defined that she is infallible in all her decrees; Therefore we cannot believe by
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by divine faith that she is infallible in all her
decrees.

20. Before I answere your Argument, I
must reflect that you do not sincerely allledge
these words out of Bellarmine; Until a doctrine
be declared or defined by the Church, so long it might be
eyther doubted of or denied without danger. For Bel-
larmine makes no such general rule, but only
speaking of the opinion of Pope John the two and
twentieth; That the Saints doe not see God before
the Resurrection (which is your own error) he excuseth him from Hereby, because at that
tyme the Church had not defined the matter.
Where you see Bellarmine speaks only of a par-
ticular point, which that Pope not conceaung
to be contained in Scripture, and the thing ha-
ving not been expressly defined by the Church
nor evidently known to have beene the uni-
versall sense thereof; it was not at that tyme a
matter of faith. And he himselfe before his
death retracted his error. But to come to your
Argument, I wish you would be carfull not to
object against vs, what your selfe must answere.
For doe not you teach, that the Church works

Pag. 139. upon all (s) within her, to prepare, induce, and per-
suade the mind to imbrace the faith, to reade and be-
lieve the Scriptures? And that the ordinary means
Pag. 142.
aptioned by God to present, and propound divine
Verities, is the Church? And therefore we
cannot in the ordinary course believe Scriptures,
or any other divine Verity, but by the Pro-
posall
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posall of the Church. But this doctrine (that the Church is the first Inducer to embrace the faith, and the ordinary Means without which we cannot believe) is not proposed by the Church, and therefore it is not a thing which we can believe. You likewise grant that the Church is infallible in all fundamentall points. And I ask in what decree, definition, or declaration hath the Church proposed to us, that her selfe cannot erre in fundamentall points, especially with your addition, that she may erre in points not fundamentall? Now, to your Argument I anwere: First; That it is not necessary, that the Church should by any particular decree testify her owne infallibility, because it being evident that she is the selfe same Church which was founded by our Saviour Christ, and continued from the Apostles to this Age, by a neuer interrupted succession of Pastours, and faythfull people; it followes that she is the Church of Christ: which being once granted, it is further inferred, that all are obliged to have recourse to her, and to rest in her judgement for all other particular points which concerne faith, or Religion; which we could not be obliged to doe, if we were persuaded, that she were subject to errour. Which yet is more evident, if we add, that there can be no Rule giuen in what points, we should believe her, and in what not: and therefore we are obliged to believe her in all. Moreover, since the true Church must be
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Judge of Controversies in faith, as we have proved, it clearly follows that he must be infallible in all points. Which universal infallibility being supposed out of the general ground of God's providence, which is not determinate in things necessary, we may afterward believe the same infallibility, even by the Church herselfe, when she testifies that particular point of her own infallibility: As the Scripture cannot give Testimony to it selfe, till first it be believed to be God's word, yet this being once presupposed, it may afterward give Testimony to it selfe, as S. Paul affirmeth, that, All Scripture is diviney (u) inspired &c. Secondly I answer, that the Church hath many ways declared her own infallibility, which she professeth even in the Apostles Creed, I believe the holy Catholique Church. For she could not be holy, if she were subject to error in matters of faith, which is the first foundation of all sanctity; she could not be Catholique, or universal for all Ages, if at any time she could err, and be Author that the whole world should err in points revealed by God; she could not be one, or Apostolicall (as she professeth in another Creed) if she were divided in points of faith, or could swarde from the Doctrine of the Apostles; she could not be always existent and visible, because every error in faith destroys all faith, & the Church. So that while the Church, and every faithfull person, belieues & professeth the Sanctity, Universallity, Unity, and Perpetual Visibility.
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My of the Church; she, and they believe & pro-
clai me her infallibility in all matters of faith,
which she doth also avouch by accusing all
such as believe not her definitions; and while
in all occasions of emergent Controversies, she
gathers Councels to determine them, without
examining whether they concern points funda-
mentall, or not fundamentall; while in all
such holy Assemblies, she fauth with the first
Councell; It hath(w) seemed to the holy Ghost and
us, while the proposeth divers points to be be-
lieued, which are not contained in Scripture; as
that those who are baptized by Heretiques, can-
not without sacrilege be rebaptized; that Bap-
tisme of Infants is lawfull; that Easter is to be
kept at a certaine time against the Heretiques
called Quartadecimani; that the Blessed Virgin,
the most Immaculate Mother of God, was etern-
ally a most pure Virgin; that such particular
Matter and Forme is necessary for the validity
of Sacraments; that such particular Bookes,
Chapters, and lines are the word of God, with
divers such other points; of all which we may
say, that which S. Augustine said about Reba-
pitation of Heretiques: The obscenity of this Que-
station(x) before the schisme of Donatus and so mone (x)Lib.1.
men of great note, and Fathers and Bishops endured so unt. Donatus
with great Charity, to dispute and doubt without
breach of peace; that for a long time in several re-
gions there were divers: and amongst divers, and
that which was truly believed was undemored by the
K.k.k.a 1
136 Part. 2. Charity maintain'd blessed by a full Council of the whole world. And yet the point declared in that Council was neither fundamentall, in your sense, nor contained in Scripture. And to the same effect are the words of S. Ambrose, who speaking of the Heretiques, condemned in the Council of Nice, layth that, They were not condemned by humane (y) industry, but by the authority of those Fathers; as likewise the last Generall Council of Trent defines, That it belongs to the Church (z) to judge of the true sense, and interpretation of Scripture, which must needs suppose her infallibility. And lastly, the thirst that every one, who desires to seare his soule, feelles in his soule to find out the true Church; and the quiet which every one conceives he shall enjoy, if once he find her, shewes that the very sense, and feeling of all Christians is, that the Church is infallible. For otherwise what great comfort could any wise man conceiue to be incorporated in a Church, which is conceiued to be subject to error in matters of faith?

21. For want of better arguments you also alledge (a) some Authors within the Roman Church of great learning, (as you say,) who have declared their opinion, that any particular Churches, (and by consequence the Roman,) any Councils, though Generall, may err. But though that which you affirme were true, it would fall short of proving that the Catholique Church is not infallible in all points. For, besides
sides particular Churches, or Generall Coun-
cels, there is the common Content of all Ca-
tholiques, knowne by perpetuall sacred Tra-
dition; and there is likewise the continued Suc-
cession of Bishops and Pastors, in which if one
should place an univerfal infallibility, it were
sufficient to overthrow your assertion of the
fallibility of the Church. And even your selfe
teach, that the Church is infallible in all fun-
damentals, and yet you affirm that any parti-
cular, or Generall Councell may erre, even to
Herefy, or Fundamental, and Damnable errors:
And therefore you must grant, that according
to your Principles, it is one thing to say, Gene-
rall Councels may erre, and another, that the
Catholique Church may erre. But yet for the
thing it selfe, it is a matter of sayth, that true
Generall Councels, confirmed by the Pope,
cannot erre. And if any hold the contrary, he
cannot be excused, except by ignorance, or in-
aduentence. And as for the Romane Authors
which you cite, Occham is no competent wit-
nes; both because that worke of his dialogues
which you cite is condemned, and because he
himselfe was a knowne enemy, and rebellious
against the sea Apostolique. Besides the words
which you cite out of him against the Authori-
ty of Councels are not his opinion, but alled-
ged for arguments sake, for so he professeth ex-
presly in the very preface of that worke, and of-
ten repeats it, that he doth not intend to deliuer
any
any opinion of his owne. Thirdly, whereas he alledgeth reaons for, and against Counsels, he alledgeth but sone against them, and seauen for them. Lastly before he comes to dispute against Counsels he doth in two seneall (b) places, & in the very beginning of those Chapters of which the one is by you cited, deliver his opinion in the person of his Disciple to be directly for the infallible authority of Counsels. So as heer is a double corruption, the one, the citing words for his opinion which are not so: the other, the concealing those which are his, and directly to the contrary. Clemangis his workes are forbidden. That worke of Cusanus which you (c) cite, he afterward retracted. Pannormitanus in the place (d) cited by you, may seeme to speake of Counsellors, disagreeing from the Pope: and though he say, that if the Counsell erred, it did not follow that the whole Church should erre, because the faith might remaine in others; yet that doth not convince that he held a Generall Counsell together with the Pope might erre: For Cusan hath the very same Objection and Answere, and yet, as we shall see anon, he holds it to be a matter of faith, that General Counsels confirmed by the Pope cannot erre. Neuertheles if Pannormitanus did hold that Generall Counsellers with the Pope might erre, he can only be excused, because he did not affirme it with pertinacity. Petrus de Albiaco hath indeed (e) the words which you cite: but
but they are not spoken by him as his opinion, but as the opinion of some others: & so he hath also the cleane contrary proposition, viz. that a generall Counsell cannot erre, nor euen the Romane Church, which you might as well haue alledged for his opinion as the other: but the truth is, that neither are alledged by him as his owne doctrine, but as the opinion of others, as I said, which he expressly layth that he doth forbeare to discusse for the present, contenting himselfe onely with these three Conclusions which expresse his owne opinion. First, that alwayes there is some Church which is ruled by the law of Christ (which according to his former explication is as much as to say, that there is alwayes some Church which cannot erre.) The second, that it is not conuinced out of Scripture, that any particular Church is in such manner conformed to the rule of Christ's law. The third is, that it is conuinced out of Scripture, that alwayes there is some vniversall Church which never swares from the rule of Christ. Neither will it advantage you, that he teacheth that any particular Church may erre; For as I have often told you, the Roman Church in the sense which I haue heretofore declared, is all one with the Vniversall Church, and so his doctrine that the Vniversall Church cannot erre directly proues, that the Roman cannot erre. And when he teacheth, that the Vniversall Church cannot erre, he doth not distinguish betwixt
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between points fundamental, and not fundamental, as you do. You cite out of Canon these words: 'I confesse (f) that every General Council doth represent the whole Church. But when you urge, that the Church cannot err; it is true in that sense in which faithfully people understand it; which is, that the whole Church together, that is, all faithful people do not err: But this doth not hinder, but that the greater part of the Church may err. I should scarcely have believed it to be possible for any man alive who pretends to have credit, & common fame to pervert the sense of this Author, as you do, unless I did see with mine own eyes both what you write, and indeed what Canon affirms. For in the Chapter next precedent (g) to that which you cite, he having affirmed, that a General Council confirmed by the Pope makes a thing certain, and belonging to faith (in respect of vs) addeth, that this conclusion is so certain that the contrary is heretical, which he proves by divers good convincing reasons, and among the rest, that if such a Council could err, there were no way certain to decide Controversies of faith. And in the place which you cite afterward, he implicates their opinion who affirm that a General Council is infallible before it be confirmed by the Pope, which they endeavoured to prove because the Council represents the whole Church, and therefore can err no more than the universal Church itself. To which Argument he answers in the words which I set down, and which
which you allledge to proove that Cnws held a Generall Counsell might erre, namely: (But when you urge that the Church cannot erre, it is true in that sense in which faithfull people understand it, which is, that the whole Church together, that is, all faithfull people do not erre:) and therefore it is evident that you bring them directly agaynst his words and meaning, & bring the Objection for his answer. And besides what we have already related out of him, within five lines after the words cited by you, he sayth, The Counsell would be infallible if it were confirmed by the Pope. I leave it to your owne consideration, what judgement even you would frame of any other beside your selfe, if he should cite Authors in this manner.

22. You have no reason to be so much offended, that we equall divine unwritten Traditions, with the written word of God. For we have so reverend an opinion of God's word, as that wheresoeuer we find it, our faith believe it to be most infallible: nor can we believe that pen, inke, and paper can add any certainty to the Truth thereof. Without cause also you accuse the Romane Church of supine negligence, because she hath not as yet giuen a Catalogue of unwritten Traditions, as well as of all the Bookes of Scripture. For you might also condemn the Ancient Church, which did not for divers ages deliver any Catalogue of Canonicall Bookes, which yet afterward, she did as occasion...
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...tion required. And as the Councell of Trent by reason of your heresies, whereby you denied divers Canonickall Bookes of Scripture, set downe a perfect Canon of Scripture: so, as iust & necessary occasion may require, the holy Ghost by which the is directed, will not faile to assist her in making a Catalogue of unwritten Traditions. I cannot find but that your moderne Brethren will gladly admit of some Apostolick Traditions against the Puritans; and why then doe you not make a Catalogue of them, as you have done of the Bookes of Scripture? Your famous Archbishop of Canterbury saith: For so much as the Originall (i) & beginning of these

(i) M. Wit-names, Metropolitan, Archbishop &c. such is their Antiquity, cannot be found, so farre as I have read, it is to be supposed, they have their Originall from the Apostles themselves; for as I remember S. Augustine hath this Rule in his 118. Epistle. And in proofe of this Rule of S. Augustine he adds: It is of credit (k) with the Writers of our tyme, namely with M.

(k) Vbi sa-Zwingius, M. Calvin, M. Gualer; and surely I thinke no learned man doth dissent from them. Are not I pray you these, and the like Traditions, upon which your Hierarchy depends, of some consequence, and worth your labour to put them in a Catalogue? Or doe you not hold the Traditions of the Apostles to be infallible true?

(l)pag. 163. It is but a Calumny to affirme, that (l) we receive the definitions of the Church, with no lesse devotion then the holy Scriptures. For you
you cite (m) that very place of Bellarmine, where he (n) letteth downe at large five singular Pre-
rogatiues of the holy Scriptures aboue the defi-
nitions of the Church, in which respect your
fault is lesse excusable. It is your owne doctrine
that the Church is infallible in all fundamen-
tals , and yet you will not euen in respect of
such points, equall her Authority with that of
holy Scripture.

24. At length you come to teach that Ge-
nerall Counells may erre euen damnably, and
yet you also teach, that their authority is imme-
diately (o) derived from Christ: and that their de-
crees (p) bunde all persons to externall Obedience.
But will you haue men in matters of fayth ex-
ternally belieue themselues, & disobeyme against
their conscience? And thinke that they doe so
by authority from Christ? The truth is, that
you might as well say, the Church is infallible,
as to say, that her infallibility consits not in
Generall Counells, but in this, that every mem-
ber of the Church cannot erre damnably: For,
towards the effect of instruxting men in doubts
concerning fayth , all comes to one effect. And
with what colour of truth, doe you say (pag.
164.165) that you give Generall Counells much
more respect, then do most of our Adversaries, since
Catholiques belieue the to be infallible, which
you deny?

25. But you would gladly prove, that
Counells are fallible, because they are discou-
(continued on next page)
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 sue in their deliberations, and (r) use the weights and moments of reason, for the drawing out of conclusions from their principles, wherein it is confessed they may mistake.

26. It is true, we grant that the Church conveys no new revelations, but only declares such to us, as have been already delivered in the written, or unwritten word of God; to find which out the vilest means, by searching out true records of antiquity, by discussing the writings of fathers, by consulting the holy scriptures, traditions &c. because it is the will of God that the use such means. But the thing upon which she finally relies in her definitions, *ex parte obiecti*, is the revelation, or attestation of God, which is the formal and last motive of faith; and *ex parte substanti*, in behalf of herself, she relies upon the infallible assistance of the holy Ghost, directing her not to propound any fallacy instead of a revealed truth. Thus we read in the first Council Act 15. Cum magna disquisitio heret: After great search, &c. examination of the case, by citing scriptures, relating miracles, and the blessing of God, declared by the good success, and conversion of so many Gentiles; the final determination did not rely upon these industries, but, *Videmus est Spiritus sanctus et nobis. It hath seemed to the Holy Ghost, and us: Which words express both the formal motive, and chief efficient cause of faith, as also the free, and voluntary concurring of the Apologies,
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fallest, assisted by the Holy Ghost. And yet I hope you will not out of these diligences, & discourses of the Apostles inferre, that this Counsell was fallible: Or that there was no more certainty in the Conclusion, then in the Arguments themselves, of which some, abstracting from the assistance of the holy Ghost, and the Authority of the Apostles, were but, as the Deuines speake, Arguments of Credibility, and dispositions to sayth, as Miracles &c. Or will you perhaps with your first Patriarch Luther, reprehend even this Counsell of the Apostles, and say with him: That James, whose (s) opinion the whole Counsell (s) in Affairs, followed, changed the verdict of Peter, whose judgment, that the Gentiles should not be constrained to observe the Jewish Ceremonies, was most true, & consequently the opinion of James and the Counsell could not be true? You grant (as I must often put you in mind) that the Church is infallible in fundamental points, must she therefore vse no industry, to attain to the knowledge of such points? And Protestants, who hold Scripture to be the only Rule of faith, vse meanes of conferring Text, consulting the Originals, Prayer, &c. for attayingning the true meaning of Scripture; and yet you will not grant, that your faith is fallible: because you will say, it doth not rely vpon those (aid) fallible meanes, but finally (as you apprehend,) it rests in the word of God. And if any Catholique Author equal the definitions of the Church with the holy Scra.
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Scripture, his meaning is, that both the one, and
the other, are so infallible, that they cannot de-
liuer any vntruth. For in other respects we grant
many singular Prerogatives to the holy Scrip-
ture, more then to the definitions of Coun-
cels, as may partly be seen in (t) Bellarmine.

27. Your objection that the great Council (u)
of Chalcedon corrected the Second of Ephesus, and
that S. Augustine sayth, Provinciall Councils (w)
may be corrected by Plenary, and Plenary Councils,
the former, by the latter, hath beene anwered a
hundred times; and I doubt not but that you
have read Bellarmine who (x) shewes that the se-
cond Council of Ephesus proceeded unlawfully,
wherin S. Flavianus Bishop of Constantinop-
ole was murthered by the faction of Dioscorus,
and the Popes Legates were driven away, and
finally the Eutichian Heresy was confirmed; for
which causes that Council was annulled by
Pope Leo. You have pickt out a pretty exam-
ple to prove that lawfull Councils, confirmed
by the Pope may err. To the words of S. Augu-
istine, Bellarmine answers, that (y) either they are
understood of unlawfull Councils, such as was
the second of Ephesus; or els, they are to be un-
derstood of Questions concerning matter of
fact, as whether Cæcilianus had delivered up the
Bible; or finally, that latter Councils may be
said to correct the former, because some de-
crees which concerne manners may by change
of circumstances prove inconvenient; although

(t) De Conc. lib. 2. cap. 12.
(n) Pag. 170.
(w) De Bap. cont. Donat. lib. 2. cap. 3.
(x) De Conc. lib. 1. cap. 6.
(y) De Conc. cit. lib. 2. c. 7. Resp. Primo.
in the beginning, they were very holy and fit. Which interpretation is gathered out of S. Augustine himselfe, who sayeth: That Counsels may be corrected, when Experience doth manifest something which before did not appear. Now, experience hath no place in universeall doctrines, but in particular facts, or lawes, which respect particular circumstances of time, and place &c.

Your second Citation in your Margent out of S. Augustine, (a) whole words you did not recite, Bellarmine answeres in the place which I haue cirted now. And heerfore I haue declared at large in what sense, and vpon what occasion, and reason, S. Augustine against the Donatists made recourse to Scripture alone.

26. You begin to impugne the Popes infallibility, by saying, that Charity-Mistaken means by his infallible Church, only the Pope. Which saying of yours doth well declare how fallible your affirmations are. And that if the Pope define that to be white, which the eye judges to be blacke, it must be so admitted by vs, you pretend to proue, out of I know not what papers of the Iesuites found in Padua, in witnes wherof you alleage Paulus Sourpius, a sediticous, scandalous, and condemned Author: & we must by no means believe you without better proofe. You cite also out of Bellarmine, these words: If he (the Pope) should err, and command the practise of vice, or forbid the exercise of vertue, the Church were bound in conscience to believe.
Part. 2. Charity maintained

tieue vices to be good, and vertues to be bad. Who would not thinke by these words of Bellarmine, as you corrupt him, that indeed we might believe Vice to be good, and Vertue ill? The direct contrary wherof he affirnnes; and from thence infers that the Pope, whom the Church is obliged to obey as her Head, and Supreme Pastor, cannot erre in decrees of manners prescribed by him, to the whole Church. These be his words. If the Pope did erre in commanding vices, or forbidding Vertue, the Church were bound to believe that Vice is good and Vertue ill, unless she would sinne against her conscience. For in doubtfull things, the Church is bound to subject herselfe to the judgment of the Pope, and to do what he commands, and not to do what he forbids; and lest she should sinne against her conscience, she is bound to believe, that what he commands is good & that what he forbids is ill. For the auyding of which inconuenience, he concludes, that the Pope cannot erre in Decrees concerning manners, by forbidding Vertue, or commanding Vice. If one should prove that Scripture cannot erre in things concerning manners, because otherwise Christians, who are bound to believe whatsoever the Scripture saith, should be oblished to believe Vertue to be ill, and Vice to be good; would you infer that indeed we are to believe, Vertue to be ill, and Vice to be good? Or rather that indeed Scripture could not propose or command any such thing? This is that which Bellarmine saith. But your
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your selfe is he, according to whose principles we might be obliged to imbrace vice &c. For since you affirm, that the authority (d) of Gene-

rarall Councils is immediately derived from Christ, and that, their Decrees bind all persons to externall Obser-
dience; and being you hold that they may err perniciously both in fayth, and manners; What remains but that we must be obliged, even by authority immediately derived from Christ himselfe, to err with the Council, and at least externally imbrace Vice.

29. You come afterward to discourse thus:

These men (e) deal not plainly with us, when they (e) pretend often in their disputations against us, Scriptures, Fathers, Councils and the Church; since in the issue their salual and infallible argument for their fayth is only the Popes Authority. It were indeed a happy thing, and a most effectual way to end all Controversies if people would submit themselves to some visible living Judge, by whom they might be instructed, & by whom it might be declared who alledge Scriptures, and Fathers right or wrong. Which since you, and your Bre-
tthren refuse to do, no wonder, if we be con-
strained to alledge Scriptures, and Fathers, as you likewise do, though you say, that Scripture is infallible, and that all Controversies must be decided by it alone. Besides, though the Pope be infallible, yet he is not so alone, as if he did ex-
clude all other infallible means: for Scriptures, Generall Councils, and the Consent of the whole
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whole Catholique Church are also infallible.
And therefore (as I was saying) it is no wonder
that we allege other Arguments besides the
decrees of Popes alone. For since in our dispu-
tes with you, we abound with all kind of argu-
ments, why should we not make use thereof?
And if you will know the reason why Coun-
cells be gathered to the great good of the
Church; notwithstanding the Popes infallibi-
ity, you may read Bellarmine, who gives the
reason thereof. I hope you will grant that St. Peter
was infallible, and yet he thought good to ga-
ther a Council, Act. 15. for greater satisfaction
of the faithful, and to take away all occasions
of temptation in the weaker Christians. What
estimation Antiquity made of the Popes Au-
thority I have shewed herefores. And if some
who have written Pleas, or Prescriptions against
Heretiques, do not without more ado, appeal (g)
all Heretiques to the Popes Tribunal, you have no
cause to wonder; since commonly the first error
of all Heretiques, is to oppose the Pope, and the
Church of Rome, and therefore they must be
convinced by other Arguments. Tertullian
in his Prescriptions against Heretiques doth par-
ticularly advise, and direct that Heretiques are
not to be admitted to dispute out of Scripture,
and that it is but in vain to seek to convince
them by that means: and yet you hold that the
Scripture is not only infallible, but the sole Rule
also of faith: How then do you infer against

(f) De Rom. Pontif. lib. 4. cap. 7. §

(g) Pag. 173.
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vs, that if the Pope be infallible, Tertullian should have appealed all Heretiques to his Tribunall; since he doth not appeale them to Scripture, which yet he believed to be infallible. And nevertheless the two Authors whom you cite, Tertullian, and Vincentius Lyrinensis speake, as much in advantage of the Pope and Church of Rome, as can be imagined. If (sayth Tertullian) thou liue (h) neere Italy, thou hast the (h) Pref. City of Rome, from thence Authority is neere at cript. cap. hand, even to us (Africans.) A happy Church, into &.

which the Apostles have powerd their whole doctrine together with their blood. And Vincentius Lyrinensis calls the (i) Pope, and Church of Rome, the Head, and other Bishops as S. Cyprian from the (i) In fad South, S. Ambrose from the North &c. and others from other places, the sides of the world. And I cited these words out of him before, who speaking of Rebaptization, saith: Then (k) the blessed (k) In Com. Stephen refuseth, together with, but before his Colleagues, judging it as I conceive, a thing worthy of him, that he should surmount them as much in Faith, as he did in the authority of his place. Of the opposition of some particular men to the Pope we have spoken already, and in your laying that his Authority hath beene oppoted by Generall Councils we will not believe you, til you bring better proffes. That the divisions of the Easterne from the Laune Church proceeded from the ambition, & pretensions of the Bishop of Rome, you prove by the Authority of Nilus, a Schif-
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matique, an Heretique, and a professed enemy of the Church of Rome, and of Protestants also, unless they have a mind to believe that the holy Ghost proceeds not from the Sonne. And how can Nilus affirm as he doth, that the Pope refuseth to have the groundes of that distinction fully heard and discussed in a generall Councell? For under Urbanus the second a Councell was held at Barium in Apulia, where the Gracian Bishops being present, were convicted of error, in denying God the holy Ghost to proceed from God the Sonne, S. Anselme (1) our Primate of Canterbury being the chief disputant in the behalfe of the Latins. Whereupon the Gracian Emperour that then ruled Alexius Comnenus became Catholicke, and caused the Gracian Bishops to hold Communion with the Roman Church fo long as he lived, as Baronius sheweth. And greater cause I have to wonder, that you would now revive this Caull of Nilus. For to say nothing of the Councell of Lyons in France under Gregory the tenth, where the Patriarke of Constantinople was present, and other Hierarchs of Greece to the number of 40, besides innumerable Bishops and Prelates of the Latins, being more then a thousand in all, some Kings being there in person, and all by their Embassadors, namely Michael Paleologus, and Andronicus his Sonne Emperours of the East, in whose name their Embassadors recanted & abjured all errors against the Roman Church, namely

(1) Anselm. lib. de pro. gest. Spirit. sanc.
namely that about the Holy Ghost: to pretermit this instance, who doth not know, that in the general Council at Florence, the matter was debated under Eugenius the fourth, where the Greeks with their Emperour, and their Patriarch, and the Legates of three other Patriarches, and the Armenians, and the Deputies of the Ethiopians were present, and a perfect concord was then made: from which the Greeks departing afterward, were subdued and made slaves to the Turke. And that they might see the cause of their destruction to be pertinacity in their Error about the Holy Ghost, upon the very feast of Pentecost (as Bellarmine proueth) the City of Constantinople was taken, their Emperour killed, and their Empyre exterminated. And it is well known that the true cause of their dispersion, whereupon a separation at last ensued, was the Controversy between Ignatius lawfull Patriarch of Constantinople, whom the Pope still kept in his Communion, and Photius an ambitious Intruder into the Patriarchate, by strength of the Imperiall Power. Which Schisme hath enlarged itself, by addition of the heresy, about the procession of the holy Ghost. For want of better matter, you bring here that old Objection about the Counsell of Constan[t]ance and Basil, defining that the Counsell is aboue the Pope. The Answer whereof you may read in Bellarmine, De Civ. that (m) the Popes who were deposed, were in lib. 2. c. 19. time.
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time of Schisme, when it was not knowne who was the true Pope; in which case the Church hath power to provide herself of an undoubted Pastor: To say nothing that two of those Popes voluntarily renounced their pretence. As for the decree of the Counsell of Constance, that all ought to obey a Generall Counsell; he answeres, that either it is meant for time of Schisme, or if it be otherwise, that the Counsell could not make any such definition of Faith, because it was never confirmed by the Pope, for as much as concerns that point. And the Counsell of Basil was in that particular expressly repealed by divers Popes; and the whole Church received Eugenius as true Pope, who yet was deposed by that Counsell. To dispute the Popes Infallibility, you cite Victoria saying:

Give me (n) Clements, Linus, Silvester, and I will leave all to their pleasure. But to speak no worse of latter Popes, they are much inferior to those ancient ones. But you allege this Author according to your wonted manner, that is, very unfaithfully. For he in that place speaks only of Dispensations in Lawes, the facility and frequency whereof Victoria disliketh in these latter times; Which being wholly matter of Fayth, doth nothing prejudice the Popes Infallibility for points of Fayth.

To proove that there is nothing but vna-

[Page 176] certainty in prooving the Popes Infallibility, you allledge some places out of Bellarmin, but with

---
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So great confusion and fraud, that they serve only to prove the certainty of your ill dealing. Bellarmin distinguishes two Questions: the one, whether S. Peter had any Successor in being head of the Church, and this he saith is most certain, and De iure divino, or by divine institution. The other: whether it be De iure divino, or of divine institution, that S. Peter's Successor must be the particular Bishop of Rome, and this he saith is not so certain (thought it be true) because if S. Peter had placed his Seat in some other City, or else had chosen no particular City at all; yet his Successor had been, iure divino, Head of the Church; howbeit in that case, he had not been the particular Bishop of Rome. Nevertheless, because S. Peter did in fact, choose Rome, it is upon that supposed a matter of faith, that the Bishop of Rome, & S. Peter's Successor is all one. As for example by the Law of God all lawfull Superiors are to be obeyed, and therefore thought it be not of divine institution, that this or that man should be superior; yet supposing that in fact he be Superior, the general divine Law pitches, & fastens vp to him, & obligeth vs to obey him in particular. This being presupposed, let vs now heare what you alledge out of (q) Bellarmin. S. Peter sat many yeares Bishop of Rome, & there he died. You change the very Question. Bellarmin's words in the Title of the Chapter are: Petrum Rome usque ad mortem Episcopum fuisset. That S. Peter was Bishop of Rome.
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Rome till his death. And he explaines his meaning to be, That S. Peter was Bishop of Rome, and that he kept that Bishoprick till his death: which is a different thing from what you say; That S. Peter late many yeares Bishop of Rome, and there he died. For he might have been many yeares Bishop of Rome, and also died at Rome, and yet not died Bishop of Rome; as one may be Bishop of London for some yeares, and dye at London, & yet not dye Bishop of London. No w Bellarmine sayth, that S. Peter died Bishop of Rome, which indeed was the maine point; and proues, that the Bishop of Rome is S. Peter's successour; whereas to dye at Rome is accidentall to his being Bishop of Rome, and in fact duers Bishops of Rome died in France, and els where. But let vs goe on. You say that the first reason by which Bellarmine proues that S. Peter died Bishop of Rome, is so weake, that himselfe layth only suadere videatur, it seemes to perswade. This Bellarmine sayth only of one reason, besides which he bringeth duers other demonstrations: neither is it necessary for the certainty of any truth, that every reason for it, be evident. And it is the doctrine of Philosophers, that the best methode is, to begin with probable Arguments, and then to ascend to demonstrations. Moreover in this very subject Vdalricus Veienia, a Lutheran, wrote a Booke to prove that S. Peter was never at Rome, and to that purpose he brings eighteen reasons, which he calls Persuasions, & yet he holds them for
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for evident Demonstrations. If then Bellarmine, out of his great modesty say, that his first reason seems to persuade, must you thence inferre, that it doth not demonstrate? And indeed it is a very good, and solid argument. After this you go forward, and cite Bellarmine saying: There God commanded him to fixe his Chaire, & to leave his full Power to his eyres and Successours, the Popes. And then you add: But what certainty of this? Indeed (faith Bellarmine) it is no where expressed in Scripture, that the Pope (you should add of Rome, as Bellarmine hath it) succeseth Peter, & therefore happily it is not of divine right that he succeseth him; Yet, it is not improbable, that (s) God commanded (s)bid. (r) De Rom. Pont. lib. 2. cap. 12. § 5. Ob- formandum est tertio.

him to faster his Seate at Rome, and it may be de- quoniam. nosely so believed. And it may be truly believed, that you corrupt Bellarmine. First, when you speake of Popes, you leave out of Rome, in which word consiseth the maine point. For Bellarmine teaches, that it is most certaine, and de iure divin- mo, that S. Peter should haue Popes to succeed him, but he holdeth it not so certaine, whether it be of divine institution, that his Successour should be Pope of Rome; that is, haue his Seate fixed at Rome, although de facto it be there. Bellarmines wordes are: It is not all one, that a thing be a point of faith, and that it be of divine institution. For it was not a divine Law that S. Paul should haue a cloake, yet it is a point of faith that S. Paul had a Cloake. Though then it be not expressly contained in Scripture, that the Bishop of Rome should


Charity maintained succeed S. Peter (thus far you goe, and leave out the words immediately following, which explicate the whole matter:) yet it is evidently deduced out of Scripture that some must succeed S. Peter: but that he who succeeds him is the Bishop of Rome, we know by the Apostolical Tradition of S. Peter, which Tradition, Generall Councils, Decrees of Popes, and Consent of Fathers, have declared, as herafter shall be demonstrated. And according to this clearer explication he said a little before: Because S. Marcellus Pope in his Epistle ad Antiochenos,writes that S. Peter came to Rome by the Commandment of our Lord; and S. Ambrose (t) and S. Athanasius (u) affirm, that S. Peter suffered Martyrdom at Rome by the commandment of Christ; it is not improbable, that our Lord did also expressly command that S. Peter should so settle his Seate at Rome, that the Bishop of Rome should absolutely succeed him. But hovsoever this be, at least this manner of Succession proceeds not from the first institution of the Popedome, which is delivered in Scripture. Do you not see what Bellarmine delivers for certaine, & what for lesse certaine? It is certaine that S. Peter must have Successours; it is certaine that in fact his Successour is the Bishop of Rome: but it is not so certaine, that by divine institution, his Successour is the Bishop of Rome, but that might proceed from the act of S. Peter, who actually liued and died Bishop of Rome, though he might haue chosen some other particular Diocese. These things Bellarmine delivers very clearly;
clearly, but you do so involue his words, as one would believe, that he held it for uncertaine, whether actually the Pope of Rome be S. Peter Successour, or whether it be certaine, and of divine institution, that S. Peter left any Successour at all: both which are plainely against his meaning, and expresse words.

31. Your other objections are so old and triviall, that they deserue no answer: I sayd already, that in time of Schisme the Church hath power to declare, or elect a true and undoubted Pope; and in the mean time God in his Providence can governe his Church without new definitions of Popes, of which there is not always so precise necessity, as that the Church may not subsist without the for a time; as for three hundred yeares from the Apostles times, he was without any one General Council; and as the Iewes for two thousand yeares were without Scripture. If any should enter strangely, & be accepted by the Church as Pope, God will either not permit him to define any matter of faith, or else will assist him not to erre perniciously, not for his owne sake but in respect of the Church which cannot be ledde into errour, as he might, if that reputed Pope could define a falskehood, because the members are obliged to conform themselves to one whome they esteeme their Head. And you your selfe must lay the same. For since all the spiritual Power, and Jurisdiction of your first Prelate, 
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tes, was derived from Rome, you must affirm, that a Pope accepted for such by the Church, is sufficiently enabled for all necessary acts and functions, notwithstanding that secret impediment: For otherwise you might endanger the Authority of your owne Prelates. And the same you must in proportion say, of all publicque Magistrates. The same answeres servces to your other Obiection, that we are not sure whether he that is elected Pope be baptized. For it belongs to Gods providence, not to permit any whom the Church hath elected for her head, to erre perniciously, though indeed your suppositions are newer to be admitted; but we are to believe that whosoever in a tyme free from Schisme, is accepted by the Church for true Pope, is such indeed. And I wonder you doe not reflect, that these objections are also against your owne Bishops. Or if you say, that your spirituall Jurisdiction comes from the Temporall Prince, the same difficulty wil remaine concerning him. For I suppose you will not say that one who is not baptized, and consequently not a Christian, can meerly by vertue of his Temporall Power giue spirituall Jurisdiction. And though you say that it is not want of intention in the Minister which can make voyde the Sacrament of Baptisme; yet you will not deny, but that there may be other essentiall defects, hindring the validity therof: as for example, if by error the water be so mingled, that it be not elemen-
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elementall water; or if the forme of the words in Baptisme be not pronounced entirely &c.
For in your forme of Publique Baptisme it is said: That water, and, in the name of the Father, of
the Sonne, and of the Holy Ghost, are essential parts of Baptisme: and this you have gained by your
objections. And finally if your doctrine be true
that intention in the Minister is not necessary,
the Pope cannot (according to your doctrine)
want Baptisme for want of due intention in
the Minister. You proceed.

32. No Papsit (x) in Europe (excepting only (x) pag. 180.
these few, that stand by, and heare his Holynes when
he gives out his Oracles) can be infallibly sure what it
is which he hath defined. A goodly Objection! As
if there were no meanes to know what one
sayth, vnles he heare him speake. For ought I
know you neither haue seene the Pope, nor
Rome, will you therefore thinke, you are not
sure that there is a Pope, and Rome? Haue you all
this while spoken against a thing in the aire,
while you impugned the Pope? Can no body
know what the Apostles spake, or wrote, except
them who were present at their preaching,
or writing? Or can no body be sure that the Bi-
ble is truly printed, vnles he himselves correct the
Print? I grant that you, who deny the certainty
of Traditions, haue cause to beleue nothing
beside what you see, or heare. But we acknow-
ledge Traditions, and so must you, vnles you
will question both the preaching, and writing.
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of the Apostles. And beside hearing or seeing, there are other meaning, as History, Letters, true Relations of many, and the like. And thus we have answered all your objections against the fallibility of the Church, Councils, and Pope, without descending to particular Controversies, which are disputed off among Catholiques without breach of sayth, or Unity. But here I must put you in mind, that you have left out many things in the first Chapter of Charity Mistaken against your promise, notwithstanding that to answer it alone, you have employed your third, fourth, and fifth Section. You have omitted (pag. 44.) what it is that maketh men to be of the same Religion: & (pag. 46.) divers differences between you & vs; as about the Canon of Scripture; five Sacraments; necessity of Baptism, and real presence; unwritten Traditions; Primacy of S. Peter; Judge of Controversies; Prayer to Saints, and for the soules in Purgatory: and so, that we are on both sides resolved to persist in these differences &c. Why did you not say one word to all these particulars? Why did you not answer to his example of the Quartadecimani, who were ranked for Heretiques, although their error was not Fundamental in your acception? as also to his example of rebaptizing Heretiques, for which the Donatists were accounted Heretiques, although the error be not of it selfe fundamentall? The same I lay of his Example, drawn from the
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Novatian Heretiques: And of his reason, that if disobedience to the Church were not the rule whereby heresies, & schisms must be knowne, it were impossible to conclude what were an Heresy, or Schisme: As also to his Assertion proved out of S. Thomas, that error against any one revealed truth destroyeth all faith &c. But necessity hath no law, you were forced to dissemble what you knew not how to answere.

CHAP. VI.

HIS Section is chiefly employed in relating some debates betwene Catholiques; and is soone answered, by distinguishing betwenee a potentiall and actuall Unity; that is, we deny not, but that Controversies may arise amongst Catholique Doctours, as well for matters concerning practile, as speculation: But still we have a Judge to whole known determinations, we hold our selves obliged to submit our understanding, and will: whereas your debates must of necessity be endles, because you acknowledge no subjectio to any visible living Judge,
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Judge, whom you hold to be infallible in his determinations. All the instances which you allledge against vs, prove this, and no more. For some of them concern points not expressly defined by the Church: Others touch upon matters of fact, and as it were suits of Law in the Catholique Clergy of England, wherein you ought rather to be edified, then to object the as any way prejudicial to the Unity of faith, because Pope Clement the 8. in his tyme, and our holy Father Urban the VIII. could, and did, by their decrees end those Controversies, & forbid writing Bookes on all sides.

2. I wonder you will, like some of the country Ministers, tell vs that we have enlarged the Creed of Christians one moiety. And to prove it, you cite the Bull of Pius Quintus, which is properly no Creed, but a Profession of our faith. And if this be to enlarge the Creed, your Church in her 39. Articles, hath enlarged the twelve Articles of the Apostles Creed, more then one moiety thrice told. For the Church makes no new Articles of fayth, as you must likewise say in defence of your Church Articles. Was the Creed of Nice, or of S. Athanasius &c. new Creeds, because they explicate old truths by a new word of Homousion, or Consubstantial? It is pretty that you bring Pappus and Flaccus, flat Heretiques, to prove our many Contradictions. Your comparing the Decrees of the Sacred Councell of Trent, which you say, that both
both the Dominicans and Jesuits pretend to
favour their contrary opinions, to the Deuill in
the old oracles, is by your leave wicked; & which
you might upon the same pretense as blasphemo-
mously apply to the holy Scriptures, which all
Heretiques, though never so contrary in them-
theselves, do alledge as favouring them: Which is
a sufficient Argument to shew against Prote-
stants, that no writing, though never so perfect,
can be a sufficient Judge to decide Controversy-
s. And you were ill advised, to make this ob-
jection against the Councell of Trent, since in
his Maiesties Declaration before the 39. Arti-
cles, printed 1631. it is said: We take comfort in
this, that even in those curious points in which the
present differences be, men of all sorts, take the Arti-
cles of the Church of England to be for them. And it
is worthy the observation, that the difference
betwixt the Dominicans and Jesuits, (who as
you say do both pretend to have the Councell
of Trent on their sides,) is concerning a Que-
ston, which you conceive to be the same with
that which is disputed among Protestants, and
in which Protestants of all sorts take the Articles of
the Church of England to be for them. Your de-
mand, why the Pope determines not that Con-
trouersy betwixt the Dominicans and Jesuits,
might as well be made against the whole An-
cient Church, which did not determine all
Controuersies at once, nor on a sudden, but af-
ter long, and mature deliberation, looper, or:
Ooo
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latter, as occasion did require. In the meantime, the Pope hath commanded, that neither part censure the other; and his Command is most religiously observed by them, with readiness to submit their Judgment, when the holy Ghost shall inspire him to decree it, one way or other. And who assured you, that the point wherein these learned men differ, is a revealed truth, or capable of definition, or is not rather

(b) Pag. 112. (as you speak) by plain (b) Scripture indeterminable, or by any other Rule of faith.

3. It is worthy to be observed, that after you had told vs that the dissensions of the Church of Rome are of greater importance, then any among the Reformed; you can name only two, which may have any colour of difficulty, the rest being mere Scholasticall disputations in obscure points for the better explanations of the Mysteries of our Faith, against Infidels, and Heretics. The one concerns the Popes Authority: And in particular his Superiority above Councells; to which we have answered more than once: & all Catholiques agree that he is the Vicar of Christ, the Successour of S. Peter, & the Visible Head of the Church, to whom all particular persons, and Churches are subject. The other, is touching a Contrariety between Sixtus 5. and Clement the 8. about the Edition of the Bible: which objection, Adamus Tannerus answers (c) so fully, that I have thought good to set downe his words, wherein

(c) Adam. Tanner. tom. 2. disp. 1. q. 4. deub. 6. n. 284.
he affirmes, That this Question having been disputed in the University of Ingolstadt, for being satisfied concerning the truth, he wrote to P. Ferdinandus Alberus, (who afterward was Vicar Generall of the Society of Jesus,) and he by letters dated 28. Aug. 1610. answerd in these words, which I have thought best to set down in Latin, as they lye (the summe of them being this, that the Decree of Sixtus was never sufficiently promulgated;) that such as haue not the Booke it selfe, may read them here. Circa Bibliæ Sixtina, post diligentem inquisitionem & discussionem, hanc denique responsonem dederunt i, qui huic rei incumbebant, qua omnis tollitur difficulas, & cui omnes merito acqueiscunt. Responsio sic habet. Certum est, Bullam de iis Biblijs non fuisse promulgatam; cuius rei certissimum indicium est, in Registro huiusmodi promulgationem non reperiri: & illustrissimus Cardinalis Bellarminus testatur, se cum ex Gallia Roman redisset, a pluribus Cardinalesibus audiviisse, Bullam illâ non fuisse promulgatam, & id quidem illâ se certissime sacrum affirmabant. And the same P. Alberus added: Sciat praterè R. V. hoc eadem ex S. D. N. (Pope Paul the 5.) habita suisse, ut tum ad adherence licet, & oporteat. And in his letters dated the 4. of September in the same yeare 1610. for confirmation of the same matter, he adiouneth these words: Item P. Azor, eo ipso tempore, quo caperant (typis) publicari illa Bibliæ, cum insistant aliquid, Papam posse errare, quia videbatur iam eratasse de facto in Bibliis; Respondit publicè P. Azor, Bullam illam
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Thus he. And befd all this, Po. Sixtu, himelfe
marking that divers things had crept in which nee-
ded a feco Revie, had declared that the whole worke
should be re-examned; though he coule not do it by
reason he was prevented by death, as is affirmed in
the Preface before the Bible let forth by Pope
Clement the 8.

4. If any Catholique Writers teach abso-
lutely, that it is fuficient to believe with an im-
plicite faith alone, you know and acknowledge
(pag. 198, and 71. and 241.) they are rejefted
by the rest. And yet that doctrine is neither to
aburd, nor dangerous as the opinion of M.
Hooker, and D. Morton as you relate, with much
shew of faveouring them; Who yet not only
grant, that one may be ignorant of some funda-
mentall Articles, but also may deny them, with-
out ceasing to be a member of the Church: No,
not fo hurtfull, as your owne doctrine, who
muft (if your distinction of points be to any
purpose) teach that an Error against a reveale
truth in points not fundamentall, is not damna-
ble. Yea, after you haue set downe the Creed, as

(d) Pag. 341. a perfef summary (d) of those fundamentall truths,
wherein consists the Unity of faith, and all men are
bound actually to know necessitate preceptis you add,
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but happily not so, necessitate medii, vel finis; so that upon the matter (speaking of things to be believe, necessitate medii, it will not be easy for you to free your selve, even from that for which you impugne the Authors who do at least say, that we must believe all Articles implicitly, in the explicite belief of the Article of the Catholique Church: and yet that Article you do not believe as you ought, while you deny her universal Infallibility in propounding divine Truths.

5. I will end with a notorious falsification which I find almost in the end of this your section. For, in your first Edition (pag. 65. Marg.) you cite Tanner saying (in Colloquio Ratisbon. Sess. 9.) If the Prelates of the Church did erre in defining any doubt, Christian people by virtue of such a government, might, yea ought to erre. And these words you bring to proue, that whatsoever the Pope, assisted with some few of his Cardinalls and Prelats, shall define, that must be recoguied though it be false and erroneous; whereas in you discouery their intollerable ignorance, or lupine negligence, or willfull malice. For Tanner in that place proues the infallibility of the Church, that is, of the Prelates of the Church, because the people are obliged to believe their Pastours; and since it is aburd to say, that they can be obliged to believe that which is erroneous, it followes that the Prelates of Gods Church cannot define any errour: yea, in express termes he sayth; (e) I say not, that the
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(e) Fol. 106.
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Pope is to be obeyed, when he erra; but say only, that if the Superiour might err, & yet were endued with publique authority, the people might be led to error. And in this very same manner, you falsify Bellarmine in your second Edition (pag. 172) speaking to the same purpose, as I shewed in this second (g) Part. Lastly, I must put you in mind that you leave out the discourse of Charity Mistaken (pag. 64.) wherein he answers the vulgar objection, that we have differences among vs of Thomists, Scotists, Benedictins &c. and yet (pag. 84.) you bring this very same objection as freshly as if it had neuer beene answered.
HE maine points treated in your sequent Section are: the distinction of points fundamentall, and that the Creed is a perfect Summary of all fundamentall points of faith. In answer whereof I employed the third and fourth Chapter of the First Part.

2. You say, that the Rule of faith, (a) being clearly, but diffusedly set downe in the Scriptures, hath beene afterward summed up in the Apostles Creed: and in the Margent you cite S. Thomas, as if he did affirme that the Rule of faith is clearly contained in Scripture: Whereas he rather saith the contrary in these words: The Verities of faith (b) are contained in Scripture diffusedly, &c: so that to draw the Verity of faith out of Scripture, there is required long study and exercise. Is this to say the Scripture is cleere, even for fundamentall points?

3. I see not how you can prove that the Creed contains all fundamentalls, out of those Letters called Formatae, formed; the manner whereof is set downe by (c) Baronins. Among other things
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things one was, to write the first letter in Greke of the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghost; & of S. Peter: the one, faith Baronius, being to profess their fayth against the Arrian Heretiques of those times; the other, to shew their Communion with the Catholique Church; because he was esteemed truly Catholique, who was ioyned in Communion with the Successour of S. Peter. And this Baronius proues out of Opctatus. Wherby it appeares that the intention of those formed Letters was not to expresse all fundamentall points of fayth, but particularly aymed at the Arrians: & besides the Articles of our Creed, they contained the Primacy of S. Peter, teaching vs that it is necessary for every true Catholique to be vnited with the Sea of Peter. You cite the circular letters of Sophronius, Tarasius, Pelagius Patriarch of Rome, and Photius of Constantinople, & for those of Pelagius you cite Baronius (Ann. 556. n. 33.) But the letters of Pelagius which Baronius lets downe at large, do not so much as mention the Apostles Creed: and besides the foure fix Generall Councils, he professes to receive the Canons which the Sea Apostolique (that is, the Romane Sea) hath receiued, the Epistles of the Popes, Celestine, Sixtus, Leo, Hilarius, Simplicius, Felix, Gelasius (the first) Anastasius, Hormisda, John, Felix, Boniface, John, Agapetus; and then adds: This is my Fayth. I wonder by what Logick you will inferre out of these Letters, that the Creed alone, explained by
By Catholiques. Chap. VII. 173

by the first Councils, contains all Articles of faith, since Pelagius professes to receive divers other things not contained in the Creed. Sophronius also (Sext. Synod. Aet. 11.) in his letters recites, and condemns by name a very great number of particular Heresies, and Hetetiques which are not mentioned in any of the Creeds, and adds a full condemnation of all Heretics. Neither are you more fortunate or faithfull in Tarasius, who in his Confession of faith doth expressly teach Invocation of our blessed Lady, Angels, Apostles, Prophets, Martyrs, Confessors &c. as also worship of Images, of which he was a most zealous defender against the Iconomachi, and was the chief in the seventh Synod, who condemned those Heretics. And since he was a most famous both for sanctity and miracles, we may note by the way, what persons they were who in ancient times opposed Protestants in those Iconomachi. Photius likewise is by you misalledged. For he in his Letter to Pope Nicholas set downe by Baronius (ad Ann. 859.) wherein he maketh a profession of his faith, saith: I receive the seven holy General Counsels. And having mentioned the six Councils, and what Heretiques were condemned by them, he adds: I also receive that holy, and great Council, which was the second held at Nice, which cast out, and overcame, as filth, the Iconomachi, that is, the opposers of Images, wHo therefore were Chris- 
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pugners of Saints. Tell me now, I pray you, by
what art can you extract out of Photinus his Let-
ter, an argument to prove, that the Apostles
Creed as it was explained in the Creeds of Nice, Con-
stantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, and Athanasius,
comprehends a perfect Catalogue of fundamentall
truths, and implies a full rejection of fundamentall
heresies (as you affirmes pag. 217.) since he ex-
pressly professes to receive also the seven General
Councels, and that in particular, which con-
demned the Impugners of Images, that is, such as
your selve, and other Protestants are? Will you
grant that the Creed implies a rejection of the er-
ror of the Iconomachi, or opposers of Images, as
of a Fundamentall Heresie? Who will not won-
der at your ill fortune in mis-alleging Au-
thors? Yet I grant that fraud can never be im-
ployed better, then to the disadvantage of him,
who useth it.

You say (d) to little purpose, that; the
(c) Replyke learned Cardinal Peron thinks (e) it probable, that
the Article of the Catholique Church, and the Com-
munion of Saints is all one, the latter being only an
Explication of the other. But what is this for your
purpose, which was to prove that Articles not
expressed in the Creed, cannot be reduced to
the Catholique Church; Because no learned Ro-
manist will say that the new doctrines of the Romane
Church are contained in the Communion of
Saints? For Cardinal Peron only means, what
he sayth in expresse words; That the Catholi-
que
que Church consists not in the simple number of the faithful, every one considered a part; but in the joint Communion also of the whole body of the faithful: From whence it doth not follow, that the Church is not she, who ought to deliver and propound divine Verities to us as she is the Mother and Teacher of all Christians. Doth not Charity and Communion in the Spirit of Love include Faith; and consequently some infallible Propounder of the Articles thereof? The Explication of Azor, concerning the Article of the Catholique Church which you bring, maketh nothing in the world to your purpose. I have told you already, that while we believe the Unity, Universality, Perpetuity, Sanctity of the Church, we jointly believe her Infallibility, and freedome from all error in faith. But it is a mere slander to talk, as if we held that she had soueraigne and infallible power to prescribe, or define what she pleases. You say, that the Creed is a sufficient Rule of faith, to which nothing essential can be added, or may be detracted: As if the addition of Materiall objects, added anything to the Essence of faith, which is taken, not from the materiall Object, or the things which we believe, but from the Formall Object, and Motive, which is the Testimony of Almighty God.

5. Though it were granted, that the Creed being rightly understood, containes all fundamentals, yet doth it not follow that Prote-
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Itants agree in them, both because they may disagree in the meaning of some of those Articles; as also, because disagreement in any one point of Faith, though not fundamental, cannot stand with the Unity, and Substance of Faith, even in such points as both of them believe. As for the Author of the Examen pacifique, I have told you already, that he is no Catholique.

6. You set down your own opinion about the necessity of good works, which you know is contrary to many of your prime Brethren; yet, this I will not urge for the present, but only lay, that you forget that Charity Mistraken, among other instances, alleges this to prove that all points of Faith are not contained in the Creed; to which you give no answer at all, but only tell vs what your own opinion is. And that it may appear how you comply with your promise, not to omit without Answer any one thing of moment; heare what Charity Mistraken sayth to this purpose, in these words. S. Peter sayth, that S. Paul in his Epistles had written certaine things, which were hard to be understood, and which the unlearned, and unstable, did pervert to their own destruction. S. Austin declares upon this place, that the places misunderstood concerned the doctrine of Justification, which some misconceived to be by Faith alone. And of purpose to counterminde that error, he sayth, that S. James wrote his Epistle, and proved therein that good works were absolutely necessary to the act of Justification. Hereupon we may observe two things;
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the one, that an error in this point alone, is by the judgment of S. Peter, to worke their destruction, who imbrace it: and the other, that the Apostilles Creed which speakes no one word thereof, is no good rule, so let us know all the fundamentall points of faith. Did not all this discourse deserve some answere from one, who professest to omit nothing?

7. But now you come to a new busines, and say: if the (f) Romane Church be not guilty of (f) Pag. 239. Manicheisme; why is single life called Chastity, and commended as an eminent degree of sanctimony? As if (forsooth) Marriage must be ill, because a single lyfe is better. Why doe you not lay the same aspersion vpon our Saviour Christ, who proposed Chastity as one of the Evangelicall Councells; vpon S. Paul, who sayth that (h) he who doth not marry, melius facit, doth better; & vpon the Ancient Fathers, who so highly extoll a single life? You cannot be ignorant but that among diuers degrees of Chastity, Catholique Deuines do also place Coniugall Chastity, which they hold to be good, and meritorious, though yet inferiour to the other.

8. You goe on, and aske, why Marriage is sayd to be incompatible with (i) holines, or with (k) God's favour; nor counted a (l) pollution worse then (m) whoredome? With better reason we may say, why doe you pervert and corrupt Authours a-gainst your owne conscience? Innocentius, whom you cite sayth only: It is not lawfull that they should be admitted to sacred functions (that is, holy
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holy Orders, whose life with their wives, because it is written: Be holy, because I am holy, saith our Lord. Is this to say absolutely, that Marriage is incompatible with holiness, because it is incompatible with that holiness which by the Churches Ordination is required in Priests? S. Paul layth, that an unmarried woman (n) and a Virgin thinkes of things belonging to God, that she may be holy in body and soule. Will you hence inferre, that the Apostle affirmes, Marriage to be incompatible with holiness, because it is incompatible with that peculiar holiness, which Virginity is apt to breed? Those words, Be holy, because I am holy, are taken out of Levit. chap. 11. ver. 44. where the Jewes are forbidden to touch certaine beasts: and yet I hope you will not accuse God of Monotheisme, as if the eating of such beasts were incompatible with holiness? The other words alleged by Innocentius, Those who are in flesh cannot please God, are understood, as I said, of that particular holiness and pleasing of God, which is required in those that take holy Orders. To prove that Bellarmine accounts Marriage a pollution, you allege out of him these words: (o) Not only the Marriage of Priests, which is sacrilege & not marriage; but even the Marriage of holy persons is not exercised without a certaine pollution & turpitude. But why doe you take pleasure in alleging Authours against their owne meaning? Bellarmine to prove how congruous & convenient it is, that Priests should lead a single life, after many Autho-
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Authorities of Scriptures, Councils, & Fathers proceedfio to by reason it selve, in regard that Marriage is a great impediment to Ecclesiastical functions; and beginning with the action of sacrificing, he sayeth: Matrimony, as Saint Hierome saith, lib. i. in Louinius, hinders the office of sacrificing, because there is required most great purity and sanctity therein, as S. Chrysostome in his sext Booke of Priesthood doth declare; and it cannot be denied, but that in the act of Marriage there is mingled a certaine impurity and pollution, not which is sinne, but which arose from sinne. For though Calvin exclaim against Pope Siricius, who is so ancient that he late an. 385. because he called the Marriage of Priests, Pollution; yet that not only the Marriage of Priests, which is not marriage but sacrifice; but also the Mariage of holy persons is not exercised without a certaine pollution and turpitude, appeares by the rebellion of nature, and the shamefastnes of men in that act, who alwayes seek to be hidden, as S. Augustine hath observed, lib. 14. de Civitate Dei. cap. 17. Thus Bellarmine: and indeed S. Augustine in the next Chap. expressly speakes de pudore Concubitus non solum vulgari, sed etiam coniugali. And now what but malice can reprehend any one tittle in this doctrine of Bellarmine? or rather in the doctrine of the Fathers by him cited, which contains against you, Sacrifice, & single life of Priests? Moreover you falsify both Innocentius and Bellarmine, who speake not of Marriage in it selfe, of which you make them speake in your
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your Text, but of the act thereof; and therefore Innocentius sayth: Qui exercet cum uxore carnale consortium; And Bellarmino sayth: Non exercetur sine pollutione quadam &c. Which is not even so much as to say, the act itself is pollution, but only, Non exercetur sine pollutione &c. And this also not absolutely, but with a limitation, non sine pollutione quadam &c. For Matrimony of itself may stand with most perfect Chastity, yea with Virginity, as appeareth in the most Immaculate Mother of God. And at this day, a married man may be made Priest, if his wife content, and other Conditions prescribed in the holy Canons be observed. And whereas you say, It seemes by S. Augustine, they (the Manichees) did not forbid meats, or marriage as absolutely impure, or to all: only their choyce Elect ones must obtaine; the other vulgar, their Auditors, were left at their liberty: This objection taken out of Peter Martyr, is answered by Bellarmino in the Chapter next to that which you cited, that S. Augustine lib. 30. contra Faustum cap. 6. writes, that the Manichees did absolutely forbid Marriage, because though they did permit it to their Auditors, yet it was only for that they could not do otherwise. You cannot (faith S. Augustine,) say that you do not forbid (Marriage) because without breach of friendship you tolerate many of your Auditors, being either not willing, or not able to obey you in this. Thus S. Augustine. But we do not only permit, or tolerate the Marriage of Christians, but do also commend them. And besides the
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Manichees did so permit Marriage to their Auditours for satisfying their lust, that they jointly warned them to avoid procreation of Children, which is manifestly to detest Marriage. But Catholiques do therefore chiefly commend Marriage, because it is known to have been instituted by God for the procreation of Children. Thus Bellarmine. And now I hope you see how free he is from Manicheisme, & that the places which in your Margent you alledge out of S. Aug. to prove that some of the Manichees might marry, are brought by you very contrary to his express words, in the place which now we have heard Bellarmine cite out of him. The doctrine of Costerus (a) that, though a Priest be guilty of a grievous sacrilege if he commit fornication; yet be sins more grievously, if he contract Matrimony, is very true, because Matrimony in a Priest is no Matrimony at all by reason of his soleene vow of Chastity, & the Churches prohibition, as Bellarmine (o) prooves (o) De Matrim. Sacr. 1. c. 21. (p) In Epist. 6. ad Theo. who sayth, that Marriage after a soleene vow of Chastity, is not only worse then fornication, as Costerus said, but even then Adultery? as S. Ambrose also calls (q) the Marriage of a vowed Virgin, Adultery. Now supposing this doctrine of Catholiques, that the Matrimony of Priests is no Matrimony; it followes that by attempting to contract Matrimony, besides the sinnes

Qqq of
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of fornication and Sacrilege, he comits a grievous disobedience to the Church, a sacrilegious irreverence against the Sacrament of Matrimony, which he celebrates invalidly; and may be presumed also to add a profession of Herefy, as if the Church could not forbid, or make void the Marriage of Clergy men; as in fact, Luther, & such Apostates, sinned not only against Contiency, against their vow, against the Sacrament of Marriage, against the precept of the Church; but also against Faith: & lastly both they and all Priests, that marry, doe to the uttermost of their power, add a greater immobility in sinne, then if they did comit fornication, without attempting to marry. But I beseech you doth he, who teaches that a double sinne is committed by abusing Marriage, teach thereby that Marriage is ill, & unlawful; or rather doth he not shew that in itself it is holy and must not be abused? If one should not onely commit incest within the forbidden degrees, but also attempt to marry, should not he comit a greater sinne by the abuse of Marriage ioyned with incest, than by incest alone? Or is it not a greater sinne both to commit Adultery, and attempt Marriage with the Adultresse, while his lawfull wife liues, then onely to commit Adultery? The one by the lawes of the Kingdome is punished with death, but not the other. So as it is cleere that the doctrine of Coferus cannot be blamed, but by such as oppose the Church, and all
all Antiquity, about Marriage after a solemn vow of Chastity. But if Cöiterus deserve blame, what say you to your Patriot Luther, who teaches, that (r) if the Councell should grant Churchmen liberty to marry, he would think that man more in God's grace, who during his life kept three harlots, then he who married according to the decree of the Councell: and that he would command under paine of damnation, that no man should marry by the permission of such a Council, but either live chaste, or if that were impossible, then not to despair, though he kept a harlot. O holy Reformer of the Romane Church! What can please these men? If the Church permit them not to marry, they will Apostatate under pretence of reforming her corruptions; if they be permitted to marry, they will rather choose to be infamous wicked, then to marry. In your first Edition, you say, that Marriage is (by vs) counted a Crime; and you prove it out of Pelagius, dist. 61. can. Gatinensis, where it is said: Adulfe, that one may be chosen, whom neither hath a wife, nor children, nor any Crime repugnant to the Canons. But, with what conscience can you deceive your unlearned Reader, since the Latin, even as you allege it, hath the quite contrary to your English, as is evident by the words which I have now set downe, in which, Marriage is distinguished from a Crime? But what if after all this your objecting Manicheisme to
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vs, cither your selfe, or at least many chiefe Protestants be found more lyable to that Herefy, if they will speake with coherence to their other grounds? For as the Manichees in your opinion did not forbid Marriage to all, but only to their Elect: so doe Protestants say, that those who haue the gift of Chastity not onely may, but ought to abstaine from Marriage, because they teach that there are no workes of Supererogation, but that men are bound to performe whatsoever God doth inspire them to, & consequently such Elect Persons should sinne against the law of God if they married, which is more then Catholiques affirme, who do not teach that the prohibition of Priests to marry proceeds immediatly from the law of God.

9. You goe from Marriage to Meate, and (s)Pag.239. say: And for Meates; (s) why is abstinence from flesh accounted a perfect Christian fast, yea holy and meritorious? And why is he that eates flesh in Lent, punished with a more grievous penance, then he that commonly blasphemes the name of God, or defiles his Neighbours bed, or abuses himselfe by drunkenness, or others by rayling, slandering, &c. But these Arguments might better become some illiterate Rayling Lecturer, then a man of your place; especially in a Treatise tending to Pacification. For how doe you thinke we can be saved, if we were indeed guilty of Manichees, and such absurd impieties, as those whereof you talke. Abstinence from flesh, is meritorous, not
not because flesh of its own nature is evil, as neither was the forbidden apple; but because obedience to lawful Superiors is good; and if fasting to subdue the flesh, and overcome temptations were not holy, why did not the Ancient Fathers commend fasting, as highly as fasting? For I will not thinke you to be so great a stranger to the Fathers, that you can be ignorant how frequently they extoll fasting. And I desire to know, whether you do not thinke, that his Maiesties Lawes, and in particular his Proclamations about keeping Lent, do not bind in conscience? And if you answere me at all, I beseech you forget not this demand; and whether the observation of them be not holy, and forasmuch as belongs to that particular object, a perfect Christian fast, and meritorious in that sense, and degree, according to which you grant that other works are meritorious, or deserving a reward? For the other part of your objection, that he that eats flesh in Lent is punished with a more grievous penance then he that blasphemes &c., you shew how modest a man you are, and with all, that you are little scene either in the Canon, or Civil Law. For *in Aventica, ut the Civil Law commandes, that* (t) Blasphemers should be punished with death, because, says the Law, Hunger and earthquakes, &c. 77. and plagues, come by reason of such crimes. In the 10) Cap. (u) Canon Law, Blasphemers, beside other punishments, must, are told and as Penitents at the Church do maledictio;
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door for the space of some Sundayes, and for
some Fridayes to fast in bread & water &c. and
by other decrees of Popes the same sinne is griev-
ously punished, as in particular the Council of
Lateran under Leo the 10. commands, That
none be abfolued from Blasphemy without a
grious penance: and to the same purpose Iu-
lius III. and Pius V. have made very freee
decrees. Neuertheles it is also true, that greater
punishment may infuro externo, be appointed
for some sinnes which are lesse then other, as
S. Thomas doth (w) truly affirme. Do not your
selues more visfully punish such, as without li-
ce of eate flesh in Lent, then them who take the
name of God in vaine, or abuse themselfes by
drunkenesse, or wrong their Neighbours by de-
traction? And besides, to eate flesh in Lent may
be an act of Heresie, which how grievous a sinne
it is, hath been explicated heeretofore.

10. By occasion of mentioning the Mani-
chees, you charge your Margent, as your fashion
is, with a deep piece of erudition, that the name
((forsooth)) of their founder Manes, is conforme
to the Greeke word, which signifieth Madenes.But
if we delighted is take hold of such goodly oc-
casions of Vanity, we could say, that he was a
Persian, and his name was first Cubricus, which
he changed into Mames, which in the Babylonian
Tongue signifieth (x) a Vessel. But let vs leave
these toyes to Grammar Schollers.

11. It seemes you are willing off set purpose
to
to mistake the point in question, which was; whether the Creed contain all fundamental points of faith or no? about which Charity Misstaken, having instanced in some points of faith not contained in the Creed, as the Scriptures, and Sacraments; he adds these words: Besides that, there are (y) some great differences betweene (y) Pag. 86, them (meaning Protestants) and us about the un. 87.
derstanding of the Article of the descent of Christ our Lord into hell, and that other of the Holy Catholique Church, and that also of the Communion of Saints, which we believe, and they deny to involve both Prayers for the dead, and Prayers to Saints, as that we should not be much better, either for our knowing, or confessing that the Creed contains all fundamental points of Faith, unless withall there were some certaine way how to understand them a-right, and especially unless under the Article which concerns the holy Catholique Church, they would understand it to be endued with so perfect infallibility, and great Authority, as that it might teach us all the rest. This solid discourse you mangle as you please, still forgetting the promise you made in your Preface to the Reader not to omit any one thing of moment. For you answer not a word to his particular instances of Prayer for the dead; or to Saints; nor to his generall exception, that we should not be much better for knowing that the Creed contains all fundamental points of faith, unless withall there were some way of understanding them a-right.

If
If you answer, that Prayers for the dead, or to Saints, are not Fundamentall points, whether they be denied, or affirmed; then you must grant that you forsooke the Church of Rome for things indifferent, and not fundamentall one way or other. For these two points, and such as these, were the pretended errors, wherewith you seek to cloake your Schisme. To the other you answered; The Church of England (2) Pag. 240. (2, questioneth not the sense of those Articles; She takes them in the old Catholique sense: and the words are so plain, they bear their meaning before them. Why do you answer to these two points of the Catholique Church, and our Saviours descent into Hell, rather than to the other which Charity, Mijaken doth mention? And in these two of which you take notice, why doe you use so much tergiversation? Why doe you not plainly, and honestly acquaint us with the meaning of them. If you say, that by the Catholique Church is understood a Church alwayes visible, & not capable of error in fundamentall points, many of your chief Brethren will contast that which you judge to be plain: and your Church of England speakes so generally, Art. 19. of the Church, that, as it is affirmed in the Preface, men of all sorts may take that Article to be for them. And as for the other Article of our Saviours descent, if it be so plain as it beares the sense before it, how comes Calvin to understand it one way, Brentius another, Beza another, and o-
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other Protestants in another, differently from Catholiques, with whom neither the other Protestants agree, who teach a Lymbus Patrwm, as Lascitius, Oecolampadius, Zwingleius, Peter Martyr, Bullinger, and (a) Bilson, and we may add D. Potter as one different from all the rest, who saith, the sense is plain, and yet he keeps it to himself.

12. But, the Roman Doctors (b) cannot agree among themselves about this Article. Is there any Catholique that denies Lymbus Patrum, or that Christ descended to Hell as it signifies Lymbus? Yes; because, say you, (c) Stapleton affirms the Scripture is silent that Christ descended into Hell, & that there is a Catholique, & an Apostolique Church. Bellarmine (d) on the contrary is resolute, that the Article of the descent is everywhere in Scripture: and Thomas grants (e) as much for the whole Creed.

What is all this to the purpose? It is one thing to disagree in the doctrine of Christ's descent, & another, whether that doctrine which they believe be proved out of Scripture, or delivered by the Church out of Unwritten Traditions. Among Protestants who hold Scripture only to be the Rule of faith, it is all one not to be contained in Scripture & not to be a point of faith; but not so with Catholiques, who besides Scripture, believe infallible Unwritten Traditions. And whereas you say; Bellarmine is resolute, that the Article of the descent is everywhere in Scripture, and in Latin Scripture passim hoc docet:

(a) Vide Breveleg. tr. 3, sect. 7. under Min. num. 26.
(b) Pag. 246.
(c) Contra.
(d) 4. De Christo. cap. 5. sect. 12.
(e) 2. q. 3. art. 9. ad 1.

By Katholiques.
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Bellarmines wordes are; All men agree that Christ descended into Hell aliquo modo, in some manner or sense, because Scripture everywhere teaches so much. Why did you leave out aliquo modo, which words might well have shewed that there was no contrariety betweene Bellarmin & Stapleton. S. Thomas doth not purposely dispute, whether all Articles of the Creed be contayned in Scripture, but only upon another occasion teaches, that the Creed is not an Addition to Scripture, out of which it is taken, & that the truths believed by faith are contained in Scripture divers ways, and in some obscurely; which doth in no wise exclude the Authority of the Church to declare the meaning of the Creed. For if some be contayned in Scripture but obscurely, who shall declare them to vs, but the Church?

3. As, for the sense of that (F) Article, some hold that Christ descended really into Hell. Others, virtually, and by effect: This virtual descent is taught by one only, namely Durant, and therefore your Others is but an exaggeration; and even he doth not deny Lymbus Patrum, or that the Fathers were there, nor that Christ descended thither in some sort, but only differeth from others, whether he descended secundum substantiam: which doctrine, or rather doubt of his (for he leaueth the thing doubtfull) is rejected by all other Divine, as erroneous.

14. By Hell some (g) understand the lowest pit,
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pit, or the place of the damned, as Bellarmine at first; others, the Lybus Patrum, as Bellarmine at last. Would not one conclude by your words, that in the opinion of Bellarmine, Christ descended only into the place of the damned? And yet your conscience cannot but tell you, that Bellarmine never doubted, but that Christ descended into Lybus Patrum, and only proposed it as doubtfull whether or no he descended into the Hell of the damned, and resolved probable est: It is probable that the soule of Christ descended to all the infernal places, or Hells. But afterward in his Recognitions he retracted his opinions for as much as concerned the place of the damned; whereby it is cleere, that he never doubted of our Saviours descent to Lybus; and that you affirming the contrary, doe without doubt, desire to deceive your Reader.

15. You say, that it is the most important (h) and most fundamentall of all Articles in the Church (h) pg.242 to believe, that Jesus Christ the Sonne of God, & the Son of Mary, is the only Saviour of the World: wherein you give a deadly blow to D.Morton, who teaches that the Arians denying our Saviour to be God, do notwithstanding make a true Church: and if the opinion of M. Hooker for which you bring divers Arguments, be true, you cannot exclude the Arians, or Trinitarians from being members of a true Church.

16. To cleere the confusednes of your Church in her 39. Articles, you lay the fault upon vs.

But
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But by your leave, if you read, either Catholique Deuines, or the Councell of Trent, you will find, that they speake most clearly and distinctly. But Charity Mistaken doth truly say, that you are very careful not to be too clearly understood; and therefore in many Controversies where of that Booke (of the 39 Articles) speaks, it comes not at all to the maine question between them and us &c. Which affirmation of his, is most true, both in the points by him specified, & in divers others; as for example: The third of our Sauiours descent into Hell. The 26 of the Nature and effect of Sacraments. The 27. will haue the Baptisme of Children to be retained, but doth not specify whether or no it be necessary. The 28. about the Lords Supper, is so generall, and of so large a size, that it may reach to Zuinglians, Calvinists, & Lutherans, who yet in this Article are known to be as farre asunder from each other, as East from West. I omit other Articles, and only urge that which Charity Mistaken preseth, and you wholly dissemble, that: Those Articles do not so much as say, that the Articles of doctrine which they deliver are fundamentall, either all, or halfe, or any one thereof, or that they are necessarily to be believed by them, or the contrary damnable if it be believed by vs. Is this to keep your promise, not to omit without answer any thing of moment in all his discourse? Certainly this which Charity Mistaken doth urge here, is according to your principles, the very quintessence of all other points. I will not stand
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to examine how truly you affirm, that our Will is essentially free from all necessity. Such motions of our Will as prevent the deliberation of reason, are they not necessary? The Will in good Philosophy cannot suffer coaction, but it may be necessitated, without changing the essence thereof.

17. To the demand of Charity Mistaken; (Why do they not particularly enumerate all the Books which they acknowledge to be of the New Testament, as they had done them of the Old; but only because they must so have named those Books of S. James, and others for Canonical, which the Lutherans have cast out of their Canon?) You answered that the Lutherans do now admit the Epistle of S. James, and the rest, as Canonical, which you prove by D. Gerhard a Lutheran. But if this be so, you do not answer his Question, what the reason is, why your Church doth not particularly enumerate all the Books which they acknowledge to be of the New Testament, as they had done them of the old? Besides, what Authority had D. Gerhard to speak for all the Lutherans, of which there be divers sorts, condemning one another? If once you deny the infallibility of the Church, what infallible ground hath D. Gerhard this day to admit of those Books, which yesterday other Lutherans rejected? In the Bibles of Luther to this day, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of S. James, and S. Jude, and the Apocalypse of S. John, are excluded from the Canon.

Reg. 3

18. Now
Part. 2. Charity maintained

18. Now that none of those Bookes which we hold for Canonickall, be Apochryphall, as you teach, Bellarmine (m) proues at large, and answers all your objections. And if any heer-tofore doubted of some of them, the Authority of the Visible Catholique Church of Christ ought to preponderate all doubts of particular persons. And it is strange that you cite S. Augustine against the Machabees, who in that very place which you cite, sayth: The Scripture (n) of the Machabees is received by the Church not unprofitably, if it be read and heard soberly: which latter words are understood only against desperate inferences of the Donatists, who upon the example of Razias in the History of the Machabees did kill and precipitate themselves; as is cleere by his other ensuuing words in the same place. We ought not then to approve by our consent, all things which we read in the Scriptures to have been done by men, even adored with praises by the testimony of God himselfe, but to mingle our consideration with discretion, bringing discretion with us, not grounded upon our owne Authority, but upon the Authority of the holy and divine Scriptures, which permit not us to praise or imitate all the actions even of those, of whom the Scripture giveth good, and glorious Testimony, if they have done any thing, that hath not been well done, or that agreeth not with the consent of the present time. In which words we see S. Augustine calls the Bookes of the Machabees, Scriptures, euene as afterward he calls Canonickall.
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call Bookes in generall, Divine, and holy Scriptures; and that the Sobriety of Circumspection, which he aduiseth to be obserued, in reading them, is not, how far they be true or falle, but whether the example of Razias recounted by them, is to be imitated more or lesse. What you allledge out of S. Gregory (o) is easily answered. For he doth not call the Machabees, not Canonical, as if he would exclude them from the number of true, and divine Scriptures, but because they were not in the Canon of the Iewes, or in that which he wrote his first draught of his Commentaries vpon Job. For he was at that time the Popes Nuncio, or Legate at Constantinople, and the Greeke Rapsody of African Canons had vntruly put out of the Canon the two Bookes of the Machabees, though they were received in Africa as Canonical, by the decree of the African Councell. And therefore you were ill advised, under colour of commending Pope Gregory,( but indeed the more to impugne vs by his authority) to write Greg: M. or Magnus, the Great, whereas he was not Pope, but only Deacon, when he first wrote those Commentaries vpon Job.

19. You cite S. Hierome prafat. in lib. Salom. The Church reade the Bookes of Judith, Tobias, and the Machabees, but she doth not receive them among Canonical writings. But S. Hieromes words are these: As the Church reade Tobias, Judith, and the Machabees, but receiveth them not among the Canonical:
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call Bookes; so may she read Wisedome, and Ecclesiasticus, for the edification of the people, but not for the confirmation of Ecclesiastical doctrines. Thus S. Hierome. And you had reason to cite his words by halues: For he afterward retracted what he said of the Bookes of Judah, and Tobias (with which the Machabees are yet joyned in the words cited by you) saying in his Preface upon the History of Judah: The Booke of Judah is read by the Hebrewes among the Hagiographes, whose authority is esteemed less sufficient to decide Controversies: but for as much as the Council of Nice hath reckoned it among the holy Scriptures, I have obeyed your request. Where you see that S. Hierome affirms, that the most ancient, and grave Council of Nice, received the Booke of Judah in that sense, in which the Iewes did not receive it; & consequently as a Booke esteemed sufficient to decide Controversies, which the Iewes denied. And in another place the same Father sayth: Ruth, Hester, and Judah have bene (q) so glorious, as they have given their names into the sacred Volumes. Where you see that S. Hierome placeth Judah with Ruth and Hester, the former wherof you admit for Canonical, and part of the latter. In his Preface upon the Booke of Tobias, he sayth: The Hebrewes (r) cut off the Booke of Tobias from the Catalogue of the divine Scriptures. And againe: The jealousy of the Iewes, doth accuse us, that against their Canon we translate the Booke of Tobias into Latin: but I judge it better to displease the
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the judgment of the Pharisees, and to obey the Com-
mandment of the Bishops. And elsewhere he pla-
ceth (t) the Machabees among Canonickall (c) In Io.
Bookes, laying: The Scripture reports that Ale-
xander king of the Macedonians came out of the land
of Cethim. And wonder not if S. Hierome Spake
not always in the same manner of the Canon
of the Old Testament, since upon experience,
examination, and knowledge of the sense of the
Church he might alter his Opinion; as once he
said of the Epistle to the Hebrewes, that it (u)
was put out of the number by the greatest part of men:
and yet elsewhere he receives it (w) as the Epi-
stle of S. Paul. And if you will have a general
explication of S. Hierome concerning his reje-
ting of Bookes, not admitted by the Hebrewes,
hears it in his owne words: Whereas I haue repre-
ted (x) what the Hebrewes used to object against the
History of Susanna, and the Hymne of the three Chil-
dren, and the Story of the Dragon Bell, which are in log. 2.
the Hebrew, I haue not declared what I thought, but
what the Hebrews were wont to say against vs. And he
calls Russius a foolish Sycophant for charging him
with the opinion of the Hebrews about these
parts of Daniel. And S. Hierome explyning him-
selfe in this manner, is acknowledged by (y) (y)
Answer Cowell, and (z) Bankcroft. How then will you
excuse your Church, which in her sixt Article pag. 87.
sayth in generall of all the Bookes which you
elteeme Apochryphall, among which are the
History of Susanna, the Hymne of the three Chil-
dren.
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dren, and that of the Dragon: (The other Books
(as Hierome sayth) the Church doth reade for exam-
ple of life, and instruction of manners: but yet it doth
not apply them to establish any doctrine?) How can
the (I say) be excused, since S. Hierome, even
according to the Confession of your owne
Brethren, doth explain himselfe, that he utte-
red only what the Iewes were wont to say against
us; and calls Ruffinus a foolish Sycophant for saying
the contrary? So as, instead of S. Hierome,
and the Church of God, you put on the per-
son of Ruffinus against S. Hierome, and of the
Synagogue against the Church of Christ our Lord;
so your whole Canon of the old Testament relies
upon the Authority of the Iewes. And finally,
D. Potter while he grants that Catholiques and
Protestants disagree about the very Canon of
Scripture, forgets to answere what Charity-
Mistaken (pag. 43. & 46.) doth thence inferre, to
wit, that they cannot be accounted of one and
the same Religion, Faith, and Church.

20. The Chymerical Church of your
Maister, D. Vsher, consisting of men agree-
ing only in fundamentall points, is indeed a
Chymera, or non Ens. For it is impossible that
there can be a visible Church, which professing
fundamentall points, doth not in other points
eyther agree with vs, or you, or els disagrees
from vs both. For eyther they must hold, for
example, the Reall Presence, Transubstantia-
ti, Prayer for the dead, and to Saints, Worship
of
By Catholiques. Chap. vii.

of Images, Supremacy of the Pope, Sufficiency of one kind for the Lay ly & c. and then they agree with vs: Or els they deny all these points, and to agree with you against vs. And this is that pernicious fallacy, whereby you deceive yourself and others; as if there were a visible Catholique Church, or company of men, holding all fundamental points, and being neither Romane Catholiques, nor Lutherans, nor Calvinists & c. nor any other Church in particular; which is a mere impossible fiction. For Fayth is not Faithly extend to all points sufficiently propounded as divine Truths, the least whereof if any one deny, he giveth his Fayth a deadly wound, and his seeming Belief of other Articles availeth him nothing. To which purpose this laying of St. Augustine is remarkable: If a man grievously wounded in some necessary part of his body, be brought to a Phisitian, and the Phisitian say, s.8. if he be not dressed he will dye, I thinke they who brought him, will not be so senseles, as to answer the Phisitian, after they have considered and viewed his other parts which are sound; What, shall not so many sound parts have power to preserve him alive? And shall one wounded part have power to bring him to his death? In vain then do you flatter yourselves with a seeming sound belief of the Articles of the Creed, if in the mean time you receive a deadly wound, by opposing any one truth revealed by God, and propounded by the true Catholique Church. For as all the living mem-
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members of a man's body, are so united in one life, that a deadly blow received immediately but in one, doth necessarily redound to the destruction of all: so all the objects of faith, being united in the same Formal Motive of God's testimony sufficiently propounded to us, the denial or wounding of any one truth, which is vested with that Formal Motive, and life of faith, doth inevitably redound to the death, and destruction of all the rest. When by this occasion you cite our late soueraigne Lord king James affirming, that (d) the things which are simply necessary to be believed, are but few in number; and yet that all things are simply necessary, which the word of God commands us to believe; it had beene your duty to explaine the contrariety which appears betwixt those two sayings. For since the word of God commands us to believe every Proposition contained in holy Scripture, which are many thousands, how are the things necessary to be believed, but few in number?

21. But now I must put you in mind of not performing your promise, not to omit any one thing of moment. For besides other, you omit to set downe what Charity Mislaken writes (e) about the true sense of the distinction of points fundamental and not fundamental, which if you had set downe as he deliveres it, it had cleerly appeared, how through your whole Booke you had still auoyded the true State, and point of the Question. To which purpose you conceale
By Catholiques. Chap. VII. 201

in particular, what he alleageth out of D. Dunne, late Deane of S. Paulus, who having put great strength in the distinction of Fundamentall and not Fundamentall points, he wipes out with a wet finger the whole substance of his discourse by saying, That (f) difference in points which are not important is not to prejudice a man's salutation, unless by not believing them he commits a disobedience withall (as certainly every one doth, who denies any least point sufficiently propounded to him, as revealed by God, whosoever that Propounder be: ) For (sayth he) obedience indeed (g) is of the Essence of Religion.

(f) Pag. 96.
(g) Pag. 97.
AND thus having in this Second Part answered the particulars in D. Potter Booke, and having proued in the First Part, that this truth, Amongst men of different Religions, one onely side can be saued, is so evidently true, as no Christian that understands the terms, can call it in question; in so much as if any will goe about to persuade the contrary, we must say with S. Augustine; He doth err. (a) so much the more absurdly, and against the true word of God more peruerfly, by how much he seemeth to himselfe to judge more charitably: It cannot but appeare, how much it importeth every soule, to seek out that one sauing Truth, which can be found only in the true Visible Catholique Church of Christ. Wherefore our greatest care must be to find out that one true Church; which we shall be sure not to misse, if our endeavour be not wanting to his grace, who desires that (b) all men should be saued, and come to the knowledge of the TRVTH. For, the words of the sacred Councell of Trent are most true: God commands not (c) impossible things, but by commanding warns thee both to do what thou art able, & to aske what thou art not
The Conclusion.

not able, and helpes thee, that thou maist be able. Let not men therefore flatter, and deceive themselves, that ignorance will excuse them. For if they want any one thing absolutely necessary to salvation, ignorance cannot excuse. And there are so many, and so easy, and yet withall so powerfull means to finde the true Church, that it is a most dangerous, and pernicious error, to rely upon the excuse of invincible ignorance. And I wish them to consider, that he can least hope for relishe by ignorance, who once confines therein: because his very alledging of ignorance, sheweth that God hath put some thoughts into his mind of seekig the safest way; which if he, relying on God's grace, do carefully and constantly endeavour to examine, discourse, and perfect, he shall not fail to find what he seeketh, and to obtaine what he askes. Neither will the search prove so hard and intricate, as men imagine. For, as God hath confined salvation within the Communion of his visible Church; so hath he endued her with so conspi- cuous Markes of Unity, and agreement in doctrine; Universality for Time, and Place; a neuer interrupted Succession of Pastors; a perpetuall Visibility from the Apostles, to vs &c. far beyond any probable pretence that can be made by any other Congregations; that whosoever doth seriously and impartially weigh these Notes, may easily discern to what Church they belong. But all this diligence must be vfed with perfect in-
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differency, and constant resolution to proceed in this affaire, which is the most important of all other, as at the hower of their death, and the day of their finall accompl the would will to have done: For nothing can counterpoyte an Eternity of Felicity, or Misery. Their Prayer will be much holpen with Almes deeds, offered to this intention of obtaining Light of Almighty God, according to that saying of the Prophet Elay: Breake thy bread (d) to the hungry, and needy, and harbourles; when thou shalt see the naked cover him, and despise not thy flesh. Then shall thy LIGHT breake forth as the Morning, and thy Health shall soone arise, and thy Justice shall goe before thy face, and the Glory of our Lord shall imbrace thee. Then shalt thou call, and our Lord will heare: Thou shalt cry, and he will say; Lo, heere I am. And so he will not fayle to shew thee Where he is: Namely, in his owne Catholique visible Church. Fasting likewise giveth strength and wings to our Prayer: for Prayer is good (e) with fasting. But nothing is more necessary then that they roote out of their soules, prejudice of Opinion, Fear, Hope, Avarice, Interest, humane Respect, and such eather corruptions of nature, or temptations of our Enemy; to which men will the more easily be led to yield, by the desire which they have naturally to leade a life in liberty, and not to ad- venture the losse of such conueniences & delights, as they are wont to like so well; as also not to incure those disaduantages and afflictions
The Conclusion.

ons to which a contrary course might make the subject. Some of these things, are excellently pointed at by S. Augustine, when he writes against the Donatist Heretics of his time, which every man ought seriously to consider how farre they may perhaps concern himself.

How many (sayth he) being convinced by evidence of truth, did desire to be Catholiques, but did deferre it from day to day, for fear of offending their friends or kinsfolkes? How many were tye, not by truth, wherein they never much confided, but by the heavy chaine of obedient custome? How many did believe the faction of Donatus to be the true Church, because too much assurance made them dreszy, disdainfull, and sithful? To how many did the reports of ill Tongues shut up the way to enter, who sayd, that we put, I know not what, upon the Altar? How many thinking that it was no matter on what side one were a Christian, did therefore remaine among the Donatists, because there they were borne?

And afterward: We were frighted to enter, by reason of false reports, which we should not have knowne to be faller nies we had entred, into the Catholique Church (as daily we hear from the mouth of Protestants converted to Catholique Religion.) Others say: We did indeed believe, that it imported nothing, in what Company, we did hold the faith of Christ. But thanks be to our Lord, who hath gathered us from the division.
The Conclusion.

division, and hath shewed to us, that it agreeeth to one God, that be be worshipped in Vnsty.

FINIS.
Faults escaped in the Print.

Good Reader, whereas through the absence of the Author of this Work, and by reason of an uncorrected written Copy sent unto the press, many errors & mistakes have happened in the printing, especially having been constrained, through the difficulties of these times, to use the help of strangers, and such as are ignorant in our tongue; it is in all humble manner desired, that (these said Circumstances duly considered) thou wouldst in no wise herein condemn the said Author as accessory hereto, but favourably affording thy Censure hereof, and in reading over the Book, to correct them with thy pen, they being here exactly gathered by himselfe, and set downe as followeth.

Epistle Dedicatory. Pag. 7. lin. 3. Catholiques
Corrige Catholique

In the Preface.

Pag. 2. lin. 26. indifferent Corrige in different
Pag. 7. lin. 26. transfered Corrige transfered

Corrige

In the first Part.

Pag. 33. lin. 26. one, the other Corrige one, and the
other
Pag. 44. lin. 6. contentions Corrige contentions
Pag. 45. lin. 29. as there is Corrige as in Job is
Pag. 51. lin. 15. affirm knowledge Corrige affirm that
our first knowledge
Pag. 54. lin. 8. it Corrige is
Ibid. lin. 24. then Corrige them

Ttt 2

Pag.
Pag. 56. lin. 25. languages. Corrige languages?
Pag. 57. lin. 25. Hospini ans Corrige Hospini ans
Pag. 59. lin. 7. Carlile corrige Carlile
Pag. 61. lin. 11. No! Corrige No.
Pag. 67. lin. 7. seditions corrige seditious
Pag. 78. lin. 6. not corrige no
Pag. 79. lin. 1. seuerally corrige seuerally
Pag. 89. lin. 16. they holy corrige the holy
Pag. 95. lin. 30. deleatur be
Pag. 99. lin. 4. sayth corrige he sayth
Pag. 102. lin. 8. Hold corrige hold
Pag. 103. lin. 7. Circumcision D. Potter corrige Circum-
cision. D. Potter
Pag. 105. lin. 3. errors : But (x) corrige errors (x): But
& c. for the letter (x) is not referred to Philalethes, but to
the Moderate examination &c.
Pag. 111. lin. 2. at corrige it
Pag. 113. lin. 9. Text corrige Texts
Ibid. lin. 17. or corrige nor
Pag. 115. lin. 15. nor. corrige not .
Pag. 119. in the Title Chap. III. corrige Chap. III:
Pag. 124. lin. 2. beli e corrige beli e
Pag. 126. lin. 25. their corrige there (for in Latin it is
(ibi) not (illorum.)
Pag. 135. lin. 17. of few corrige or few
Pag. 136. lin. 22. danably corrige damnably
Ibid. lin. 26. damnably corrige damnably. I meane, it ought
not to be in a different or eusebe letter, because it is not
D. Potters word, though it follow out of his doctrine.
Pag. 140. lin. 5. before, to auoyd corrige before. To auoid
Pag. 141. lin. 4. supposes; it doth corrige supposes. It doth
Pag. 146. lin. 25. name; confesse corrige name; confesse
Pag. 147. lin. 19. which corrige with
Pag. 149 lin. 10. deleatur wc
Pag. 155. lin. 11. we was corrige he was
Ibid. lin. 19. goodly corrige godly
Ibid. lin. 29. wilernes corrige wilernes
Ibid. lin. 31. Haibronners corrige Hailbronnernus
Pag. 162. lin. 15. for that corrige that for
Ibid. lin. 17. could corrige could
Page 163: lin. 29. have also corrigre have not also
Page 165: lin. 22. men depart. corrigre men to depart.
Page 174: lin. 5. Christopher Potter, corrigre D. Christopher Potter,
Page 183: lin. 20. at last corrigre at last
Page 184: lin. 29. your grounds corrigre your own grounds
Ibid. lin. 30. inough corrigre enough
The like also Pag. 185: lin. 2. 6. 7. 8. inough corrigre enough
Page 185: lin. 9. delectar nor
Page 187: lin. 6. breach in corrigre breach in
Page 190: lin. 1. & 2. And D. Potter corrigre And yet D. Potter
Page 193: lin. 7. Reformation corrigre Reformation
Page 197: lin. 18. unceleleness corrigre uncelleness
Page 200: lin. 25. manuer corrigre manner
Page 204: lin. 6. afterimpossible, adde, and damnable.
Page 209: lin. 26. correct the parenthesis this: (What? do you mean that they are his own conceyts, and yet grounded upon evidencie of Scripture? )
Page 212: lin. 16. the government corrigre but government
Page 215: lin. 18. Augustine corrigre Augustine
Page 217: lin. 14. deceat: that
Page 221: lin. 16. Gods Church, corrigre God's Word,
Page 230: lin. 5. for corrigre from
Page 233: lin. 8. see by a corrigre see now by a
Page 235: lin. 2. summoned corrigre summoned
Page 238: lin. 22. these corrigre those
Ibid. lin. 24. Certainly corrigre certainly
Page 239: lin. 9. from Authority corrigre from divine Authority.
Ibid. lin. 25. any heredy corrigre an heresy
Page 245: lin. 18. mut impulant corrigre mut impulant
Page 248: lin. 1. ever corrigre ever
Ibid. lin. 23. began corrigre begun
Page 251: lin. 25. Our of corrigre Out of
Page 252: lin. 27. write corrigre write
Page 257: lin. 8. Church, because corrigre Church: yet because
Page 259: lin. 23. Greecke Turke corrigre Greake Turke
Page 263: lin. 17. the parenthesis should end after the word baptism
Ibid. lin. 19. repeated: so corrigre repeated: and so
In the Second Part.

Pag. 2. in the tittle Part. 1. Corrige Part. 2.
Pag. 9. lin. 6. do, with truth you corrige do with truth, you
Pag. 12. lin. 22. the many corrige there are many.
Pag. 19. lin. 27. Priest corrige Triest
Pag. 23. lin. 1 & 2. Second directly corrige Second is directly.
Pag. 28. lin. 19. declaratur will
Ibid. lin. 20. aoth corrige dos
Pag. 33. lin. 26. spirit, as he was who corrige spirit as he was, who
Pag. 37. lin. 8. your Text your corrige your Text you
Pag. 45. lin. 24. generalize corrige general all
Pag. 50. lin. 5. man binded corrige man is bound
Pag. 61. lin. 5. in fact corrige of fact
Pag. 78. lin. 28. scene corrige scene
Pag. 86. lin. 29. ingenious corrige ingenuous
Pag. 88. lin. 14. means corrige Newnes
Pag. 94. lin. 19. matters corrige matters
Pag. 97. lin. 18. it is given declaratur it is
Ibid lin. 29. Church wall corrige Church walls
declaratur the
Pag. 103. lin. 5. the General corrige your Booke
Ibid. lin. 13. you Booke corrige unwary
Pag. 14. lin. 7. unwary corrige unwary

Pag.
Ibid. lin. 17. after us; corrigi after us. And blot out all the words following. Neither are the Authors &c. unto the next, and 3. Paragraph, as put in by errour.

Pag. 105. lin. 26. Doth not corrigi Do not
Ibid. lin. 28. and for corrigi and that for
Pag. 109. lin. 3. translated corrigi translate
Ibid. lin. 30. if you corrigi if still you
Pag. 111. lin. 14. selfe corrigi it selfe
Pag. 127. lin. 20. delectat corrigi may
Pag. 131. lin. 8. he had corrigi I had
Pag. 143. lin. 16. believe corrigi beleie
Pag. 145. lin. 13. & 14. these words only [James changed the verdict of Peter] should be put in a different letter, as the direct affirmation of Luther.

Pag. 162. lin. 2. meaning corrigi means
Ibid. lin. 5. fallibility corrigi infallibility
Pag. 169. lin. 3. medij, corrigi medij
Pag. 171. lin. 4. fundamentall and that corrigi fundamentall and that
Pag. 177. lin. 16. Councells corrigi Counsells
Pag. 186. lin. 28. Mauces corrigi Maues
Pag. 197. lin. 20. arc in corrigi are not in
Ibid. lin. 25. S. Hierome corrigi S. Hieromes

---

In the Margent. 1. Part.

Pag. 12. Rejoynders corrigi Rejoynder.

---

In the Margent. 2. Part.

Pag. 13. Petricor. corrigi Petricor:
Pag. 92. (c) pag. 93. corrigi (c) pag. 92.

FINIS.