

CHAP. XIV.

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

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

2. Hath your way put an *End* to controversies any more then ours? Are you not yet at controversie with *Infidels*, Whether *Christ* be the Redeemer: and with *Hereticks* whether he be true eternall God? Are you not yet as full of controversies among yourselves, as any Christians on the face of the earth? I do not believe but in the many Volumes of your Schoolmen, Casuists, and Commentators, I can shew more controversies yet depending, then you can find amongst any sort of Christians in the world; yea then you can find among all other Christians in the world set together.

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

2. Our Faith consisteth in those points which are granted by your

your selves, and so are beyond Controversie between us and you. But *yours* lyeth also in a mixture of mens corruptions, which will ever be controverted and condemned.

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

4. We know our Religion, and where to find it : For it is perfect at the first, and receiveth no additions or diminutions. One generation cometh, and another goeth, but the word of the Lord endureth for ever. But *you* never know when you have all , because you know *not* when your Pope will have done defining : that is an article of faith *to you* one year that was none the year before nor ever before.

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

rise again or not? Whether he will judge the world or not? or any such points. If he be a Judge, he must have power to oblige you to stand to his Determination on which side soever he determine. And what if *John 22.* determine that the soul is not immortal, or *John 23.* that there is no resurrection or life to come, but a man dieth like a beast: would you stand to this decision?

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

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

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

9. But if you lay all upon your Popes or Councils Infallibility, I desire you but to read my third Disputation in a Book against Popery, called the *Safe Religion*; and then believe that Infallibility if you can. I should think my self a miserable man, if I were not my self more Infallible then many of your Popes have been. Every Christian (while such) is infallible in his belief of the Christian faith; And the Scripture is an infallible ground of our belief.

10. Is it not a plain Judgement of God upon you, that while you make the Scripture so dark and not intelligible, and

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

And if you knew them, yet what a loss are you at to know their Decrees and Canons? What a Fardel of false Decretall Epistles have you thrust upon the world, as *Blondell*, *Dalleus*, *Reignolds* and others have fully proved. Forsooth decretals that use a translation of the Scripture that was formed a long time after the death of the supposed Authors of those Epistles: And Decretals which make mention of persons and things that were many score or hundred years after the death of the said Authors. These are your new Scriptures, and by these our faith must be regulated, and our controversies decided.

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

Canons called the Apostles : and the like we may say of abundance more.

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

11. Yea and is not Gods hand of Judgement yet more observable against you, that when your Popes and Councils have past their judgement, the several Sects are unable to understand them? witness the late sentence against the Janfenists, of which the persons that seem to be condemned, say, that there is no such thing or words in all *Janfenius* writings, as the Pope faith are in him, and condemneth as his : and the Controversie is as far from a decision, as if the Pope had held his peace. Yea your great Disputer here in *England*, *Thomas White* the Novelist, is the same for all the Popes determination.

Take another instance in the forementioned Case, *whether the Pope or Council be supream* : The Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* determined it one way as *de fide*, and yet that made no end of the Controversie. The Council of *Lateran* and Pope *Leo* determined it the other way; and yet it is a Controversie after two contrary decisions : and some say one way, and some the other : and some say, *It is yet undecided* (for fear of angring the French by casting them off as Hereticks.) Another instance. The Council at *Basil* Sess. 36. (pag 80. in *Binnins*) hath fully determined the Controversie between the Franciscans and Dominicans about the Virgin *Maries* immaculate conception : and yet it is undetermined still ; and *Thomas White* presumes to affirm, that [*Certainly there is no Tradition for it, nor any probability that ever the Negative will be defined.* Apolog. for Tradit. pag. 64, 65, 66. yea he carryeth it as boldly out, as if never Council had made or medled with it. I will therefore recite the words

words of the Council, which are these [*A hard question hath been in divers parts, and before this holy Synod, about the Conception of the glorious Virgin Mary, and the beginning of her Sanctification; some saying that the Virgin and her soul was for some time or instant of time actually under Original sin: others on the contrary, saying, that from the beginning of her Creation, God loving her, gave her grace by which preserving and freeing that blessed person from the Original spot — we, having diligently looked into the authorities and reasons, which for many years past have in publique relation on both sides been alledged before this holy Synod, and having seen many other things about it, and weighed them by mature consideration, do Define and Declare, that the doctrine affirming that the glorious Virgin Mary the Mother of God, by the sign'ar preventing and operating grace of God, was never actually under Original sin, but was ever free from all Original and actual sin, and was holy and immaculate, is to be approved, held and embraced of all Catholikes as godly and Consonant to Church-worship, Catholike faith, right reason, and sacred Scripture: and that henceforth it shall be lawful for no man to preach and teach the contrary*] Is not this plain Defining?

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

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

One more instance: How largely hath the Council of Trent dealt about originall sin: And yet the foresaid *Thomas White* *ibid.* saith thus [*If the People were taught Originall sin is nothing but a Disposition to evil, or a natural weakness, which unless prevented brings infallibly sin and damnation: and that in it self it deserves neither reproach nor punishment, as long as it proceeds not to actual sin, the heat of vulgar devotion would be cooled, &c.*] See here a meer *Pelagian* issue of all the Determinations about Originall sin, which they should swear to believe.

CHAP. XV.

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

To all this deceit (for it is no better) we give them our full answer in these Propositions. 1. It is not every kind of unity that is desirable: but Unity with truth, and honesty, and safety. Its easier to agree in evil then in good: for evil findeth more friendship with corrupted nature, and hath more servants in the world. The wicked are more agreed, and far more in number, of one mind, then the Godly are. The Mahometans are far more agreed; and that in a far greater number, then the Papists are.

The

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

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

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

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

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

2. With us, they are usually but here and there a stragling person,

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

3. As I proved before, the Papists are divided into two several pretended Catholick Churches, by making themselves two Sovereigns: but so are not we: For we have but one Head Jesus Christ. That they are two Churches (besides what is said) hear the words of *Cajetane* in the foresaid Oration (in *Bin. p. 552.*) [*This Novelty of Pisa, sprung up at Constance, and vanished. At Basil it sprung up again and is exploded: and if you be men, it will now also be repressed as it was under Eugenius the fourth. For it cometh not from heaven, and therefore will not be lasting. Nor doth it embrace the Principality of that One, who is in the Church triumphant, and preserveth the Church militant; and which the Synod of Pisa ought to embrace if it came from heaven, and not, as it doth, to rely on the Government of a multitude. The Church of the Pisans therefore doth far differ from this Church of Christ. For one is the Church of believers; the other of Cavillers: One of the household of God; the other of the Erroneous: One (is the Church) of Christian men: the other of such as fear not to tear the coat of Christ, and divide the mystical members of Christ from his mystical body.*] This was spoken in Council with applause. And can there yet be greater divisions then these?

4. They have been utterly divided about the very power of choosing their Pope, in whom they must unite. In one age the People chose him: In another the Clergy chose him; sometime both together: For a long time the Emperours chose him: At last only the Cardinals chose him. And sometime a General Council

hath chosen him. *Our Catholick Church* hath no such uncertain Head, but one thats the same yesterday to day and for ever.

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

6. They have killed multitudes of persons in their divisions about the choice of their Pope (as in *Damasus* choice.) And they have had many bloody wars to the dividing of the Church about their Popes, and between Pope and Pope. This was their Unity. It would make a Christian ashamed and grieved to read of the lamentable wars and divisions of Christendom, either between or about their Popes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

versie the just and lawfull Head of the Church.

13. Your Agreement and Unity is with none but your own sect: and is this so great a matter to boast off? you divide your selves from most of the Catholick Church, and cast them off as Hereticks, or Schismaticks; and then boast of a Unity among your selves. And so may the Quakers, the Anabaptists, the Socinians, as well as you: Or if you magnifie your Unity from the greatness of your number that agree, the Greek Church also is numerous: and yet in this we far exceed you. For the true Catholick is in Union with all the Members of Christ on earth. We lay our Unity on the Essentials of Christianity, and so are united with all true Christians in the world: even with many of them that reproach us: when you laying your Unity on I know not how many doubtfull points, yea, on you know not what your selves, can extend it no further then to your sect. Which is the more notable and glorious Unity? to be United to the truly Catholick body, containing all true Christians in the world, or to be at Unity with a sect, which is the lesser and more corrupted part of the Church?

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

worship as to the kind, so that our division from other Christians is nothing to the Papists.

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

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

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

18. They have not so sure a means of retaining men in their unity as we have: Let experience be Judge of this: For where one hath forsaken our Unity and Communion, I suppose hundreds, if not thousands, have forsaken theirs, as *France, Belgium, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, Hungary, Transilvania, England, Scotland, Ireland, &c.* can witness: and if themselves might be believed, the Greek Church, and all, or almost all the Christians else in the world have gone from their unity. And yet will they glory in the effectualness of their means of unity? Why then did they not retain all these Nations in their unity?

19. Moreover, indeed they have very little Religious unity at

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

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

20. And yet besides all this, and after all this tyranny, they have more difference among themselves then we have, or then all the Christians that I hear of in the world. And to hide the Infamy of their differences, they tolerate them, and extenuate them. For differences in Discipline, and order of Worship they allow abundance of sects called *Orders*, that men and women may chooise which they please. And the voluminous differences of their Schoolmen, Casuists and Commentators, they say are not in matters of faith. But call them what you will, they are many of them greater differences then are with us. I pray read over the *Iansenians* Myserie of Jesuitism, and take notice of the differences between the Jesuites and them in Case-
Divi-

Divinity, and judge whether they be small. And let it not offend your ears if I recite some of their Differences in that Papists own words, as he cites the Jesuites, and tells you where to find what he saith.

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

Basilus Pontius & Bunney the Jesuites teach, that a man may seek an opportunity of sinning *primò & per se*, when the spiritual or temporal concernment of our selves or our neighbours inclineth him thereto, But the Jansenists think the contrary : Pag. 91.

Eman. Sa the Jesuite holds, that [a man do what he conceives lawfull according to a probable opinion, though the contrary be the more certain : and for this the Opinion of one grave Doctor is sufficient.] And *Filintius* the Jesuite held [that it is lawfull to follow the less probable opinion, though it be the less certain, and that this is the common opinion of modern authors] Pag. 95. And yet the Jansenists are against it.

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

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

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

Pope Gregory the fourteenth declareth Murderers unworthy to have Sanctuary in Churches. But the Jesuits and Jansenists agree not who are the Murtherers. The 29 Jesuites in their *Praxis* page 600. by murderers understand those who have taken money to kill one treacherously : and that those who kill without receiving any reward, but do it only to oblige their friends, are

not called *murderers*.] But the Jansenists think otherwise. (No marvel if you cannot understand the Scripture without a judge, when you can no better understand your judge, no not what he means by a murderer.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Escombar saith, that regularly it is lawfull to kill a man for the value of a crown, according to Molina. p. 151. Father Amicus saith [It is lawfull for a Church-man, or a Religious man to kill a detractor that threatens to divulge the scandalous crimes of his community or himself, when there is no other means left to hinder him from doing it, as if he be ready to scatter his calumnies, if not suddenly dispatched out of the way] p. 152, 153. And Caramuel in his Fundamental Theologie takes it for certain, and thence concludes, that [a Priest not only may kill a detractor on certain occasions, but sometimes ought to do it] And yet the peevish Jansenist believeth none of this.

But I must stop: you may read in the said Jansenians Mysterie of Jesuitism, a volumin of such passages of the Jesuites, allowing men to give and receive the Sacrament when they come that day from Adultery: and allowing a man to eat and drink as much as he can with his health: and discharging men from a Necessity of Loving God, unless it be once in their lives, or as

others say, upon Holy-daies, or as *Hurtado de Mendoza*, once a year, or as *Comink*, once in three or four years, or as *Henriquez*, once in five years, or as *Anthon. Sirmond*, *not at all*, so we do not hate him, and do obey his other commands, with abundance more.

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

Well! but suppose the loving of God, the avoiding murder, bribery, and the like, be no matter of faith at *Rome*, yet I have not done with them so. I desire to know whether the holy Scripture be matter of faith or not? They dare not deny but it is. Well! and what is the Scripture, but the words *ut signa*, and the sense or matter *ut res significata*? And are the Papists agreed among themselves about either of these? no: For the words, its well known how some of the best Learned of them have stood for the preheminance of the Hebrew and Greek Texts: and others, and the most, for the vulgar Latine. And that vulgar Latine Translation hath been altered and altered again by them. And after many others comes Pope *Sixtus* the fifth, and makes it so compleat, that the Church is required to use his Edition; yet after him comes Pope *Clement* the eighth and mends it in many hundred, if not thousand places, and imposes this upon the Church; which of these Popes was Infallible? I am sure they much differ in their Translations.

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

But

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

CHAP. XVI.

Detect. 7. **B**Y what hath been said, you may discern how to deal with them, when they would industriously confound the Essentials and the Integral parts of our Faith: for this is another of their jugglings.

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

1. We must desire the Papists to tell us whether Christianity be any thing or nothing ? If any thing, it hath its Essence: and
2. Whether this Essence of Christianity be Knowable or not ? If not, then they cannot know a Christian from another: and they cannot know the Church from other Societies. If it be knowable, then its Essence must needs be knowable.
3. And we would be informed by them, whether all true Christians in

the

the world are of the same stature or degree of knowledge and explicite belief? If they be, then there's no difference between Fathers and Babes, Strong and Weak, Priest and People; and then the Jesuites have no more Knowledge or Faith then the simplest woman of their Church: but if there be a difference, then 4. We would know whether the Essence of Christianity be varied according to these degrees. If so, then there are as many sorts of Christianity in the world, as there be degrees of Faith; which they have more wit, I suppose, then to affirm. If not, then the Essence of Christianity is distinguishable from the Integrity or superadded Degrees, which is the thing that we contend for. 5. We desire also to know whether the Apostles did not go on to teach their people more, after they had made them Christians, in a state of salvation. And whether the Priests, Fryers, and Jesuits will give men up, and teach them nothing more when they have made them Christians. I know they will say, There's more to be taught. And if so, then the Essentials of Christianity are distinguishable from the Integrals or Degrees. 6. And we would know else how they will understand that in *Heb. 5. 10, 11, 12, 14. and 6. 1, 2.* [*For when for the time ye ought to be Teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the Oracles of God, and are become such as have need of milk and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness, for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern good and evil: therefore leaving the Principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on to perfection, not laying again the foundation, &c.*] Tell us now whether the Apostle do not here distinguish between babes and strong men; milk and strong meat; the principles or foundation and perfection? 7. And we would know of them whether all that is Revealed by God be of absolute Necessity to every mans salvation that do or may hear it? If so, then no man can be saved that knoweth not all that God hath revealed; and then no one in the world can be saved: for here we know but in part. And their own Commentators differ about the word of God, which sheweth that they are imperfect in the Knowledge of its sense. And their Pope knows it not, or else he is shamefully to blame, that will not tell it the world, and reconcile his Com-

men;

mentators and Disputers. But if all revealed be not of Absolute Necessity, then we may have leave to distinguish between points absolutely Necessary, and the rest. 8. And we would know whether all shall be damned, that know not as much as the most Learned and Wise? if not, then still we may have leave to distinguish. 9. Further we demand, whether any ignorance or error that is culpable, will stand with Charity and Salvation? If not, then who shall be saved? If yea; then we may still distinguish the points of Absolute Necessity from the rest. 10. We demand also, whether the whole holy Scripture be the word of God? If so, then whether we ought not to believe it all as far as we can understand it? And if so, whether it be not all, *de fide* matter of Faith? If not, they must tell us, what part of Gods word is to be believed, and what not. If yea; then certainly men may err *de fide* in points of Faith, and yet have Charity, and be saved: as their disagreeing Commentators, Casuists and Schoolmen do. 11. We would know whether the matters that their Divines are disagreed in, be Revealed by God, or things unrevealed? If not revealed, do they not deserve to be kickt out of the world, for troubling the world so with unrevealed things? If they be Revealed, are they not Revealed to be believed, and so are *de fide*? 12. And we would know whether there be not some things *Essential* to true Obedience, and some things not Essential? If not, then no sinner hath sincere Obedience, and can be saved: If yea; then why may not the same be said of faith? 13. Also we would know, when they baptize the Adult, whether they require any profession of the faith from them or not? If not, they may as well baptize Infidels or Heathens. If they do, then what is that profession? Is it a profession of every particular truth that God hath revealed to be believed? No sure: for then none but Doctors must be baptized. Nor they neither. Or is it a profession of some particular Truths only? If of some only, why of those more than the rest, if they be not the Essentials distinguishable from the rest? And do they make men true Christians by baptizing them, or not? If they do, then sure the Baptismal faith must contain all that is Essential to Christianity. 14. We desire also to be informed by them, what is the use of the Churches Creed, and why they have used frequently to make confession of their