

8. Note also that the shifts of *Bellarmin*, *Binnius*, *Baronius*, *Becanus*, *Gretser*, &c. are apparently false, that say this Canon was surreptitiously brought into the Council: for *Aetius*, *Ast.* 16. openly professed the contrary, and all the Bishops professed their consent to the last.

9. Note also that this is one of the four Great Councils which the Papists themselves compare to the four Gospels; and in it were six hundred and thirty Fathers.

10. Note also that this great Council is against them, and on the Protestant side in the very foundation of all our differences, Whether the Roman Privileges be *jure divino* or *humano*? And though it be but the Privileges, and not the now claimed Vicarship that was in Question, yet the Conclusion is the stronger against them, because the lesser was denied.

But their last shift is, that this Clause or Canon was not approved, and so is Null. 1. Mark then you that wrote this Manuscript, that we have General Councils against you; but we want the Popes Approbation. And in good sadness was that the meaning of your Question [*What Council, that is, what Pope condemned our Church?*] Can it be expected that this one man should condemn himself? or can you be no Heretick till then?

2. But let it be so this once. Did not your Pope approve of this Council, when *Gregory* the first did liken it with the other three to the four Gospels? and said of this [*Tota devotione Complector: integerrima approbatione custodio*] I embrace it with my whole devotion; I keep it with most entire approbation] *Greg. 1. Regist. l. 1. Epist. 24. cited in the Decrees, Dist. 15. c. 2.* I think this is expressly a full Approbation, not without excepting any part only, but excluding all such exceptions. And the like Approbation of *Gelasius* in the Roman Council is cited there also in the Decrees, *ibid. pag. 33.*

I did also before instance the sixth General Council against you, approved by Pope *Adrian* in his Epistle to *Tharasius* in the second Nicene Council.

And indeed it is no hard matter to prove you condemned by your own Popes also. If you could but understand the plainest words in a matter that is against your opinions and wills, there needed no talk to perswade you that Pope *Gregory* the first condemned

demned the Title of *Universal Bishop or Patriarch*, professing earnestly that he was the forerunner of Antichrist that would usurp it. But the plain truth is, as sad experience teacheth us, no words of Fathers, Popes or Councils, much less of Scripture, are intelligible to you, when your wills are against the matter. But we may truly say of you, that lay all on the will of the Pope, as *Austins* Observator, your *Lodovicus Vives* freely speaketh (*in schol. in August. lib. 20. de Civit. Dei, cap. 26.*) [*Those are taken by them for Edicts and Councils, which make for them (or are on their side ;) the rest they no more regard then a meeting of women in a workhouse or a washing place.*] Do you understand this language of one of your own (but too honest to have much company.)

Well ; but you have a third Question [*By what Authority was she otherwise reprov'd ?*] Answ. By the Authority of that Precept, *Levit. 19. 17.* and many the like. By the same Authority that *Paul* reprov'd *Peter*, *Gal. 2.* and withstood him to the face : by such Authority as any man may seek to quench a fire in his neighbours house, or pull a man out of the water that is drowning : or as any one Pastor may reprove another when he sinneth. By the same Authority as *Irenaeus* rebuked *Victor*, and the Asian Bishops withstood him, and as *Cyprian* and the Council of *Carthage* reprov'd *Stephen* ; and the rest aforecited did what they did. By as good Authority as the Church of *Rome* condemneth the Greek Church, doth the Greek Church and many another condemn the Church of *Rome*.

3. The next case is about the Roman schism. To your Questions, I answer, 1. To Question whether Papists be Schismatics, is to question whether *Ethiopians* be black. Do you not at this day divide from all the Christian world, save your selves ? Do you not unchurch most of the Christians on earth (O dreadful presumption ! when Christ is so tender of his interest and his servants, and is bound as it were, by so many promises to save them and not forsake them.) You ask, what Church you left ? and when was it ? and whose company ? Senseless Questions. By a Church if you mean the Universal Church, there is but One in all : and therefore One Universal Church cannot forsake another : but when part of it forsaketh the other part,

part, and arrogateth the title of the whole to themselves, do you doubt whether this be Schism? If you mean a particular Church: How can *Spain, Italy, France*, and many more Kingdoms go out of a particular Church, that contain so many hundred particular Churches in them? No more then *London* can go out of *Pauls* Church. The Catholick is but One containing all true Christians on earth: and you have been guilty of a most horrid Schism, as ever the Church knew. For 1. You have set up a Church in the Church: An Universal Church in the Universal Church: A new form destructive to the old. Your Pope as Christ-representative is now an Essential part of it, and no man is a member of it, that is not a member of the Popes body, and subject to him. So that even the *Antipodes* and the poor *Abassians* that know not whether the Pope be fish or flesh, or never heard of such a name or thing, must all be unchristened, unchurched and damned, if you be Judges. Yea and *Bellarmino* tells us (which indeed your Church Constitution doth infer) that all that are duly baptized, are interpretatively or implicitly baptized into the Pope.

2. And as you have devised a New Catholick Church: so you hereby cast off and disown all the Christians of the world that be not of your party: determining it as *de fide*, that none of them can be saved; who yet had rather venture on your Curse and Censure, then into your Heresie and Schism.

3. And hereby you fix your selves in this Schism, and put us (that unfeignedly long for peace) out of all Hope of ever having Peace with you: because you will hearken to it on no terms, but that all men become subjects to your usurping Representative-Christ, which we dare as soon leap into the fire as do. Do you know now where the Church or Body was that you forsook? It was all over the world where ever there were any Christians.

Were it not a great Schism, think you, if a few Anabaptists should say, *We are the whole Church, and all others are Hereticks or Schismatics*? Or was it not a great Schism of the Donatists to arrogate that title to themselves, and unchurch so many others? And what Church did they forsake? *Augustine* tells them over and over what the Catholick Church was that they withdrew from: even all true Christians dispersed over

the earth : Or that Church which begun at *Hierusalem*, and thence diffused it self through the world. But he never blames them for separating from the Universal Roman Head or Vicar : but from the Church of *Rome*, as a conspicuous combination of particular Churches. *Optatus* and he do blame them for withdrawing, as also from other Churches.

What if *John* of *Constantinople* in prosecution of his title of Universal Patriarch, had concluded as you, that none in the world are Christs members but his members, nor of the Church, but his subjects, had not this been a notorious schism ? Tell us then what Church he had forsaken, and answer your self.

But your last Caution in a parenthesis, doth condemn your selves. What ! Must that Church that's true be visible from Christs time ? then as *Constantinople*, nor most other were never true Churches (which is false) so *Rome* it self was never a true Church (which is false also) Did you think that there was a Church at *Rome* in Christs time ? Sure you are not so ignorant. By this Rule there should be no true Church, but that at *Jerusalem*, and those in *Judea*.

But suppose you had said [*since the Apostles time*] This also had excluded most Churches on earth. But if you mean the Universal Church, we grant you easily, that it hath been visible ever since Christs time : but not alway in one place or Country. Is not the greater part of Christians in the world, whom you schismatically unchurch, a visible company ? Doubtless you know they are. Yea the *Abassines* and many Churches that being out of the Roman Empire, did never so much as submit to your Primacy of Order, nor had you ever any thing to do with them (more then to own them as Christians) yet now are condemned by your Arrogancy, because they will not begin in the end of the world, to enter into a new Church, which they nor their Fore-fathers had ever any dependance on. It was a shrewd answer of an old woman, that the Emperor of *Habassia's* Mother gave to *Gonzalus Rodericus* the Jesuite, pressing her to be subject to the Pope as the Vicar of Christ, or else she could not be subject to Christ [*Neque ego, inquit illa, neque mei sancto Petro obedientiam negamus : in eadem nunc sumus fide, in qua fuimus ab initio : ea si recta non erat, cur per tot aetates ac secula nemo repertus est, qui nos errantes commonerent*] i. e. We are in the same

same Belief as we were from the beginning: If it were not right, why did no man in so many ages warn us of our error till now?] Mark here a double Argument couched against the Pope, One from Tradition, even Apostolical Tradition, (for *Godignus* himself saith, that no man doubts but *Ethiopia* received the faith from the beginning, even from the the *Eunuch* and *St. Mathew.*) The other is, that sure that Pope that cannot in so many ages look after his flock, no not so much as to send one man to tell them that they erred till about one thousand five hundred years after Christ, was never intended by Christ to be the Universal Governour of the world. What! will Christ set any on an Impossible work? Or make it so necessary to people to obey one that they never so much as hear from? But what said the Jesuite to the old woman! Why he told her [*Non potuisse Romanum Pontificem, qui totius Christi Ecclesia pastor est, prateritis retro annis, Doctores in Abassiam mittere, eò quod Mahometani omnia circumdarent, nec ullum ad ipsos additum relinquerant. Nunc vero aperta jam Maritima ad Aethiopiam via, id prestare quod nequivit prius*] that is, [The Pope of Rome who is the Pastor of the whole Church of Christ, was not able in the years past to send Doctors into *Abassia*, because the Mahomitans compassed all, and lest not any passage to them. But now the seas are open, he can do that which he could not before] *Liter. Gonzal. Roder. in Godign. de Reb. Abass. lib. 2. cap. 18. pag. 324.* A fair answer. As if Christ had set either the Pope, or the *Abassines* an impossible task: and appointed a Governour that for so many hundred years could not govern: or the people must be so many hundred years no Christians, though they believed in Christ, till the Pope could send to them? And how should these and all such Countries send Bishops to a General Council?

As your own *Canus Loc. Theol.* saith of the Jesuites; so say I of your New Church [*Vocati estis ad societatem Jesu Christi, qua sine dubio societas cum Christi Ecclesia sit, qui titulum sibi illum arrogant, hi videant, an Hereticorum more penes se Ecclesiam existere mentiantur. i. e. You are called to the society of Jesus Christ, which society being undoubtedly the Church of Christ, let them see to it, that arrogate this title to themselves, whether they do not imitate hereticks*]

by a Lying affirmation that the Church is only with them. lib. 4. c. 2. fol. (*mihi*) 116.

But we do not hence conclude that all that have lived and dyed in your profession, have been no members of the Church, because that your Church is guilty of Heresie, and notoriously of Schism. For we know that millions that live among you consent not to your usurpations; Nay do not so much as understand your errors thereabout. And some hold them but Notionally as uneffectual Opinions: And every one is not a Heretick that holdeth a point that is judged Heretical, and which is Heresie in another that holdeth it in another sort. And there are errors called Heresies by most, which are not destructive to the Essentials of Christianity, but only to some Integral part. And there is a schism that doth not unchurch men, as well as a schism that doth (of which this is no place to treat.) But *ad hominem*, me thinks your own writers put you hard to it, who conclude (as *Bellarmino* and many more do, though *Alphonfus à Castro* and others be against it) that Hereticks and Schismatics are no members of the Church. And *Melch. Canus* (*Lec. Theol. lib. 4. cap. 2. fol. 117.*) saith that [that Hereticks are no parts of the Church, is the common conclusion of all Divines, not only of those that have written of late, but of them also that by their Antiquity are esteemed the most Noble; This is attested by Cyprian, Augustine, Gregory, the two Councils of Lateran and Florence: Rightly therefore did Pope Nicolas define that the Church is a collection of Catholicks.] If this be true, it is an Article of faith: And then *Alphonfus à Cast.* and all of his mind are Hereticks and lost men. And I pray you note what a case you are in. Two Approved General Councils have determined that a Heretick is no member of the Church: But multitudes of your own writers, and Pope *Adrian*, and many more of your Popes have judged that a Pope may be a Heretick: and consequently no member of the Church. And consequently judge whats become of your Church, when an Essential part of it is no part of the Church.

Your common shift (which *Canus ibid.* and others fly to) is, that He must be a judged Heretick before he is dismembred. But 1. Sure that is but for manifestation to men, for before God he is the same, if men never judge him. 2. Where the case is notorious,

ous, the offender is *ipso jure* cut off. 3. Then it is in the Popes Power to let whole millions of Hereticks to be still parts of the Church. And so the world shall be Christians or no Christians as he please: and why may he not let Turks and Infidels on the same grounds be parts of the Church? For he may forbear to judge them, if that will serve. 4. Then all the Christians in the world that the Pope hath not yet judged and cast out, are members of the Church: And then millions and millions are of the Church that never were subjects of the Pope. If you say, It is enough that there is a General condemnation of all that are guilty as they are: I answer, then it is enough to cut off a Pope, that there was a General condemnat on against such as he.

5. But if all this satisfie you not, yet I told you before, that two or three Councils and three Popes did all judge Pope *Honorius* guilty of Heresie (and consequently both Popes and General Councils have judged that a Pope may be an Heretick) therefore you have been judged Heretical in your Head, which is an essential part of your Church.

And thus I have shewed you what is the schism of the Church of *Rome*, which being but a part, hath attempted to cut off all the rest, and so hath made a new pretended Catholick Church: As a part of the Old Church which consisteth of all Christians united in Christ, we confess all those of you, still to be a part, that destroy not this Christianity. But as you are new gathered to a Christ-Representative, or Vicar General, we deny you to be any Church of Christ. If you be Church members or saved, it must be as Christians; but never as Papists. For a Papist may be a Christian, but not as a Papist.

And if yet you cannot see the Church that you separate from, open your eyes and look into much of *Europe*, and all over *Asia* almost where are any Christians: look into *Armenia*, *Palestine*, *Egypt*, *Ethiopia*, and many other Countries, and you shall find that you are but a smaller part of the Church. If you will not believe what I have before proved of this, hear what your own say. *Anton. Marinarius* in the Council of *Trent* complaineth [that the Church is shut up in the Corners of *Europe*, and yet Domestick enemies arise, that waste this portion shut up in a corner.]

Sonnus Bishop of *Antwerp* (in *Demonstrat. Relig. Christian.*
Ll
Lib.

lib. 2. Tract. 5. c. 3.) faith [I pray you what room hath the Catholick Church now in the habitable world? scarce three elnes long in comparision of that vastness which the Satanical Church doth possess.]

If yet you boast that you have the same seat that formerly you had; I answer, so have the Bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and others whom you condemn: And we say as Gregory Nazianz. Orat. de laud. Athanasii [It is a succession of Godliness that is properly to be esteemed a succession: For he that professeth the same doctrine of faith, is also partaker of the same throne; But he that embraceth the contrary belief, ought to be judged an adversary, though he be in the throne. This indeed hath the name of succession; but the other hath the Thing itself, and the Truth] And he next addeth such words as utterly break your succession in pieces: saying [For he that breaketh in by force (as abundance of Popes did) is not to be esteemed a successor; but rather he that suffereth force: nor he that breaketh the Laws: but he that is chosen in manner agreeable to the Laws: nor he that holdeth contrary tenets; but he that is endued with the same faith: Unless any man will call him a successor, as we say a sickness succeedeth health; or darkness succeedeth light, and a storm succeeds a calm, (or madness or distraction) succeedeth prudence] Thus Nazianz. pag. 377.

We conclude therefore with one of your own (Lyra Glof. in Math. 16.) [Because many Princes and chief Priests (or Popes) and other inferiors, have been found to Apostatize, the Church consisteth in those persons in whom is the true knowledge and confession of Faith and Verity] And so much to this empty Manuscript.

C H A P. XXXVI.

Detect. 27. **A** Nother of their Deceits is this: To charge us with introducing New Articles of faith or points of Religion, because we contradict the New Articles which they introduce; and then they require us to prove our doctrines which are but the Negatives of theirs.

We receive no Doctrines of faith or worship but what was delivered:

delivered by the Apostles to the Church: These men bring in abundance of New ones, and say without proof, that they received them from the Apostles. And because we refuse to receive their Novelties, they call our Rejections of them [*the Doctrines of our Religion* ;] and feign us to be the Innovators. And by this device, it is in the Power of any Heretick to force the Church to take up such as these men call New points of faith. If a Papist shall say, that besides the Lords Prayer Christ gave his Disciples another Form, or two, or three, or many; or that he gave them ten New Commandments not mentioned in the Bible, or that he oft descended after his Ascension and conversed with them, or that there are many more worlds of men besides this earth; or that Christ instituted twenty Sacraments, how should we deal with these men, but by denying their fictions as sinfull Novelty, and rejecting them as corrupt additions to the Faith? And were this any Novelty in us? And should they bid us prove in the expresse words of Scripture or antiquity, our Negative Propositions, [that Christ gave but one form of prayer, that he did not oft descend, that he gave no more Decalogues, Sacraments, &c.] Is it not a sufficient proof of any of these, that they are not written: and that no Tradition of them from the Apostles is proved; and that they that hold the Affirmative, and introduce the Novelty, must prove, and not we? Our Articles of faith are the same, and not increased, nor any new ones added: But the Papists come in with a new faith as large as all the Novelties in the Decretals and the Councils, and these innovations of theirs we reject. Now our Rejections do not increase the Articles of our faith, no more then my beating a dog out of my house, or keeping out an enemy, or sweeping out the filth, doth enlarge my house, or increase my family. They do not take all the Anathema and Rejections in their own Councils, to be Canons or Articles of faith.

For example, The Pope hath made it an Article of faith, that no Scripture is to be interpreted but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. This we reject, and make it no Article of our faith, but an erroneous Novelty. Do we hereby make a new Article? because we reject a new one of theirs, (yea a part of the Oath of their Church made by Pope Pius after the Council of Trent) 1. If this be an Article, prove it

if you can. 2. If it be a Truth, and no Novelty, I pray you tell us which be Fathers, and which not? and help us to know certainly when we have all, or the unanimous Consent. And then tell us whether every man is not forsworn with you that interprets any text of Scripture before he have read all the Fathers, or any text which six of them never expounded; or any text which they do not unanimously agree on? And (though it be not our necessary task) we can easily prove to you, that this is a New Article of your devising. 1. Because else no man must expound any Scripture at all before these Fathers were born. For how could the Church before them have their unanimous consent? And 2. Because that otherwise these Fathers themselves wanted an Article of faith, unless it was an Article to them, that they must expound no Scripture but by their own Consent. 3. Because these Fathers do few of them expound all, or half, or the twentieth part of the Scripture. 4. Because they took liberty to disagree among themselves, and therefore do not unanimously consent in abundance of particular texts. 5. Because they tell us that they are fallible, and bid us not take it on their trust. 6. Because the Apostles have left us no such rule or precept, but much to the contrary. 7. Your own Doctors (for all their Oath) do commonly charge the Fathers with error and misexpounding Scripture, as I shewed before, *Cannus* and many others charge *Cajetan* (a Cardinal and pillar in your Church) with making it his practise to differ from the Fathers, and choosing expositions purposely for the Novelty; *pro more suo, as his custom*: And when he hath highly extolled *Cajetan*: (*1. oc. Theol. lib. 7. pag. 223.*) he adds, that [yet his doctrine was defiled with a Leprosie of errors, by an affection and lust of Curiosity, or confidence on his wit, expounding Scripture as he list, happily indeed for the most part, but in some few places more acutely then happily, because he regarded not antient Tradition, and was not versed in the reading of the Fathers, and would not learn from them the Mysteries of the sealed book] And in another place he blames him, that he alway followed the Hebrew and Greek text: And many other Papists by him and others are blamed for the same faults: *Andradinus*, and more of the later plead for it. And yet these men are counted members of your Church, that go against an Article of your new faith and Oath.

So Transubstantiation is one of your New Articles in that Oath. Do we make a New one now if we reject it? Or need we be put to prove the Negative? And yet we can easily do it: And *Edm. Albertinus* (among many others) hath done it unanswerably.

Another of your Articles is, that [*it belongeth to your Holy Mother the Church to judge of the true sence of Scripture*] And you mean the Roman Church; and that they must judge of it for all the Christian world. Prove this to be the Antient doctrine if you can. If we reject this Novelty, are we Innovators? or need we prove the Negative? And yet we can do it, and have oft done it at large. Did *Athanasius, Basil, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Augustine, Hierom, Chrysostome, Epiphanius*, and the rest of the Fathers, send to Rome for the sence of the Scriptures which they expound, or did they procure the Popes Approbation before any of them published their Commentaries? You know sure that they did not.

The like may be said of all the rest of your New Articles, and Practises: We stand our ground. Some of your Novelties we reject as trifles, some as smaller errors, and some as greater: but still we keep to our antient faith, of which the Scripture is a full and sufficient Rule (as *Vincentius Lirinens. ubi supra*) though we are glad of all helps to understand it, we say with *Tertullian de carne Christi, cap. 6. Nihil de eo constat, quia Scriptura non exhibet.* — *Non probant, quia non Scriptum est* — *His qui insuper argumentantur nos resistemus.*

CHAP. XXXVII.

Dect. 28. **A** Nother of their Decrets is this: *They make advantage of our charitable judgement of them, and of their uncharitable judgement of us and all other Christians, to affright and enice people to their sect. They say that we cannot be saved, nor any that are not of the Roman Church: But we say that a Papist may be saved: They say that we want abundance of the Articles of faith that are of necessity to salvation: We say that the Papists hold all that is necessary to salvation: Luther saith that the Kernel of true faith is yet in the Church of*

Rome; therefore say they, *Let Protestants take the shell.* And hence they make the simple people believe, that even according to our own Confessions, their Church and way is safer then ours.

I have answered this formerly in my [*Safe Religion,*] but yet shall here once more shew you the nakedness of this Deceit.

1. The Papists denying the faith and salvation of all other Christians, doth no whit invalidate our faith, nor shake our salvation. Our Religion doth not cease to be true, when ever a peevish adversary will deny it, or accuse it. Men are in never the more danger of damnation, because a Papist or any other partial Sectary will tell them that they shall be damned. We believe not that the Pope hath so far the Power of the Keyes of Heaven, as that he can keep out whom he please. We have a promise of salvation from Christ, and then we can bear the threatening of a Pope. When *Bellarmino* judgeth Pope *Sixtus* damned himself, its strange that he should have a power before to dispose of Heaven for others, and shut out whom he pleased, that must be shut out himself. The Novatians, Donatists, Anabaptists, or any such Sect, that held the substance of the Christian faith, might have pleaded this Argument as well as the Papists: for they also have the courage to pass the sentence of damnation upon others, if that will serve turn: and we have the Charity to say, that some of them may be saved.

2. If by the Papists own confession, Charity be the life of all the graces or holy qualities of the soul, and that which above all others proveth a man to be Justified, and in a state of salvation, then judge by this Argument of their own, whether our charitableness, or their uncharitableness be the better sign: and whether it be safer to joyn with the charitable or the uncharitable? yea with them that are so notoriously uncharitable, as to condemn the far greatest part of the Church of Christ, meerly because they are not Papists.

3. When we say that a Papist may be saved, it is with all these limitations. 1. We say that a Papist as a Christian may be saved, but not as a Papist. As a man that hath the Plague may Live; but not by the Plague. 2. We say that Popery is a great enemy and hinderance to mens salvation; and therefore that those
among

among them that are saved, must be saved *from* Popery, and not *by* it. 3. We say, that therefore salvation is a rarer thing among the Papists, then among the Reformed Catholicks: where it is most difficult, it is like to be most rare: many more of the Orthodox are like to be saved then of the Papists. 4. And we say, that where Popery prevaileth against Christianity, and so much mastereth the heart and life, that the Christian doctrine is not Practically received, there is no salvation to be had for such without Conversion. Thus is it that we say a Papist may be saved. And for my part, I will not be the more uncharitable to them, for fear of giving them advantage. I know *Hannius* hath written a Book to prove them no Christians, and *Perkins* hath written another to prove, that a Papist cannot go beyond a Reprobate: and I must needs say so too, of all those in whom Popery is predominant practically, and overcometh Christianity. But yet I doubt not, but God hath thousands among them that shall be saved: partly of the common people that are forced to forbear contradicting the Priests; and that understand not, or receive not all the mysteries of their deceit: and partly among the Fryars and Jesuites, where some of them take in the venom but speculatively: or not predominantly and practically give themselves to Mortification and an holy Life: though I have known none such, yet when I read the writings of *Gerson*, *Kempis*, *Thaulerus*, *Ferus*, *Barbanson*, *Benedictus Anglus*, the Life of *Monsieur de Renty*, and such others (though I see in some much of error, and meer affectation, yet) I am easily perswaded to believe, that they had the spirit of God, and that there are many more such among them. But I should be sorry if Holiness were not much more common among us, and freer from the mixtures of error and affectation.

4. And for our saying that *they have the Kernel*, and so much as is necessary to salvation, it is true; but it is the same Kernel that we hold: and we have it undefiled and unpoysoned, and the Papists mix it with the venom of their Errors. He that hath all things in his meat and drink that I have in mine, may yet make it worse then mine, if he will put dung or poysen in it. When you have all things necessary in a precious Antidote or other Medicine, you may soon marr all, by putting in more then all, as the Papists do.

The

The plain truth is, the Papists and Reformed Catholicks are both Christians, and Christianity is enough to save them that mar it not, but keep it practically and predominantly: even as a man that takes poyson, and he that taketh none, are both of them men: and he that takes the poyson may be said to have all the same parts and members as the other, and yet not be so likely to live, as he that lets it alone: And I cannot say but many that take it may recover: and if you ask me *which be they?* I say, *All those that timely cast it up again, or else whose strength of Nature prevaieth against it, and keepeth it from mastering the Heart or vital Powers, shall be recovered and live:* but those in whom the poyson prevaieth and is predominant, shall die. So all those Papists that so receive the Errors of Popery, as either to cast them up again; or that they are not predominant to the subduing of the power of Christian Faith and Holiness, (by keeping them from being sincere, and practical, and predominant) these shall be saved, but not the rest.

Now if upon these grounds, any man shall think that Popery is the safer way, because we say, that they have all that is necessary to salvation (objectively in their Creed) and that a Papist may be saved; upon the same terms that man may be persuaded that it is safest taking poyson, because that he hath all the parts of a man that takes it, and possibly nature may prevail, and he may live. But yet I shall choose to let it alone.

§. The same Papists that say, that a Protestant cannot be saved, do yet maintain that an Infidel may be saved, or one that believeth not the very Articles of the Christian faith. You will think this strange. But I will a little insist on the proof of it, to these uses. 1. That you may see, that their censures proceed from meer design or partiality. 2. That you may see, that they make believing in the Pope to be more necessary then believing in Christ, or in the Holy Ghost. 3. That you may see, how holy their Church is that admitteth of Infidels. 4. That you may see, on how fair grounds they deny, that we may be one Catholick Church with the Fathers, *Greeks, Egyptians, Abassines, Armenians, Waldensis, &c.* because of some differences; when yet they themselves can be one Church with Infidels, or such as deny the Articles of the Creed, or at least believe them not. 5. And that you may see, how well their Religion hangs together,

together, and also how well they are agreed among themselves, even about the essentials of Christianity it self, whether they be of Necessity to salvation or nor.

I before cited the words of *Albericus* the Jesuite. I shall now give you many more, and more fully, which *Frans. à Sancta Clara* hath gathered to my hands in his *Deus, Natura, Gratia*, Problem. 15. & 16. pag. 109 &c.

And 1. pag. 110. he tells us himself that [the Doctors commonly teach, that a just and probable ignorance ought to excuse: and that it is probable, when one hath a probable foundation (or ground) as a Country-man, when he believes that a thing is lawful, drawn by the Testimony of his Parish Priest or Parents: or when a man seeing reasons that are probable on both sides, doth choose those which seem to him the more probable, which yet indeed are against the truth, to which he is otherwise well affected: in this case he erreth without fault, though he err against the truth, and so labour of the contrary ignorance] [Hither is it to be reduced, when the Articles of Faith are not propounded in a due manner, as by frivolous reasons, or by impious men: for then to believe, were an act of imprudence, saith Aquin. 2. 2. q. 1. ar. 4.]

So that if the truth of Scripture be so propounded as to seem most improbable, it is no sin to disbelieve it: and if such are excused, as by a Parent or Parish-Priest are seduced, and that have not a due proposal of the Truth, then it must follow, that the Heathens and Infidels are innocent, that never had Christ proposed any way to them, and by their Parents have been taught Mahometanism, or Paganism. But what if I can prove, that even the want of a due proposal is a punishment for their sin? and that they ought themselves to seek after the truth? and that it is long of their own sins that necessary truths do seem improbable to them? will sin excuse sin?

And pag. 111. he telleth us, [That as to the Ignorance of things necessary as means (to salvation) the Doctors differ; for Soto 4. d. 5. q. 5. & l. denatur. & grat. c. 12. And Vega l. 6. c. 20. sup. Trid. will have no more explicate faith required now in the Law of Grace, then in the Law of Nature. Yea Vega loco citato, and Gab. 2. d. 21. qu. 2. art. 3. & 3. d. 21. qu. 2. think that in the Law of Nature, and in cases in the Law of Grace, a man may be saved with only Natural Knowledge, and that the

habit of faith is not required. And Horantius (being of the contrary opinion) saith, that they are men of great name that are against him, whose gravity and great and painfull studies moved him, not to condemn them of heresie, in a doubtfull matter, not yet judged] (O happy Rome that hath a judge that can put an end to all their controversies ! And yet cannot determine whether it be Necessary to salvation to be a Christian !)

[Yea (saith S. Clara) Alvarez de Auxil. disp. 56. with others, seems to hold that to Justification is not required the knowledge of a supernatural object at all. Others say that both to Grace and to Glory an explicate faith in Christ is necessary, as Bonavent. 3. d. 25. and others. Others say that to salvation at least an explicate faith in the Gospel, or Christ is required, though not to Grace or Justification. And this is the commoner in the Schools, as Herera declareth, and followeth it.]

And for Scotus S. Clara saith [I take him to be of that opinion that is not necessary as a Means to Grace or Glory to have an explicate Belief of Christ or the Gospel. (ut 4. d. 3. q. 4.) he seems at large to prove.]

Pag. 113. he adds [What is clearer, then that at this day, the Gospell bindeth not, where it is not authentically preached; that is, that at this day men may be saved without an explicate belief of Christ: for in that sence speaks the Doctor concerning the Jews. And verily what ever my illustrious Master hold, with his Learned Master Herera, I think that this was the Opinion of the Doctor (Scotus,) and the common one, which also Vega, a faithful Scotist followeth; and Faber 4. d. 3. Petigianis 3. d. 25. q. 1. and of the Thomists Bannes, 22. q. 2. a. 8. Cano, and others.]

And he gathers it to be the mind of the Council of Trent, Sess. 6. cap. 4. and adds pag. 113. [Its effectually proved by the Doctor, from John 15. If I had not come and spoke to them, they had not had sin: I know the Doctors of the contrary opinion answer, that such are not condemned for the sin of Infidelity precisely, but for other sins that hinder the illumination and special help of God. But verily the Doctor there argueth, that the Jews might by circumcision be cleansed from Original sin, and saved without the Gospel: and accordingly he may argue as to all others, to whom the Gospel is not authentically promulgate: Else his reason would not hold. And

our most grave Corduba l. 2. qu. Theol. q. 5. subscribes to this opinion, saying ——— since the promulgation of the Gospel, an Explicite Belief of Christ is necessary: except with the irrevocably ignorant, to whom an implicate sufficeth to the life of grace, but whether it suffice to the life of glory, is a probleme; but it is more probable that here also an implicate sufficeth.]

Page 114. he addeth the consent of *Medina recta in Damm fide, lib. 4. cap. ult.* and of Bradwardine fol. 62. that an Implicate belief of Christ is sufficient to salvation.

And pag. 115. he saith that this is the way to the end debates of them that think the Article of the Trinity, of Christ, of the incarnation, &c. are necessary to salvation, though not to justification: and answering them, he saith that [such are not formally without the Church.] You see then formally Infidels are in their Church and may be saved, in his opinion.

And pag. 116. after a blow at Vellofillus he citeth also *Victoria Relect. 4. de Indis. & Richard. de Med. Villa, 3. 25. art. 3. qu. 1.* and others for this opinion: And tells you what his Implicate faith is: [to believe as the Church believeth.]

And page 118. he answereth from Scotus the Question, whether such persons may hold the contrary error to the truth that they are ignorant of: and saith, No, (out of Scotus:) while it is preached but in some one place, till he know it to be believed as a truth by the Church, and then he must firmly adhere to it. Which the charitable Fryar applieth to England as excusable for not believing some of their Articles. And he citeth *Petigianis* saying, [If a simple old woman shall hear a false opinion from a false Prophet, (as that the substance of the bread remains with Christs body in the Eucharist) and believe it: doth she sin because of this?] No: This were too hard and cruel to affirm.]

Pag. 119. he citeth *Angles*, and agreeth with him, [that such as have no knowledge of these things to stir them up, are not bound so much as to seek information.]

And pag. 120. he cites *Vega lib. 6. cap. 18.* saying that as [Ignorance puræ negationis about many Articles of faith, may be without fault: so there is the same reason of Ignorance prævæ dispositionis.] Which he maintains against Gerson and Hugo. And *S. Clara* adds of his own [To speak my sense freely, I think that the common people committing themselves to the instru-

tion of the Pastors, trusting their knowledge and goodness, if they be deceived, it shall be accounted Invincible Ignorance, or probable at least: So Herera: which excuseth from fault. Yea some Doctors give so much to the Instruction of Doctors, on whom the care of the flock lyeth, that if they teach hic & nunc that God would be hated, that a rude Parishoner is bound to believe them.]

And so page 121. concludeth that he hopeth many of us are saved.

Page 122. he citeth the consent of Azorius, To. 1. l. 8. Just. c. 6. and Corduba again.

And pag. 123. saith [It seemeth to be the common Opinion of the Schools and Doctors at this day, that the Laity erring with their Teachers or Pastors, are altogether excused from all fault: yea by erring thus many wayes materially, they merit, for the act of Christian Obedience, which they owe their teachers, as Valentia saith, Tom. 3. disp. 1. q. 2. pag. 5. and others, with Angles, Vasquez, &c.]

Pag. 124, 125. After Cajetan, he cites Zanchez, teaching that those that are brought up among Hereticks are not bound presently to believe, and yet are not to be accounted Hereticks, till they refuse Belief sufficiently propounded to them —] And he cites Alph. a Castro, and Simancas, Aragon, and Tannerus, and Faber for the same.

And pag. 126. he cites Eman: Sa, affirming that even among Catholicks many are excused from the explicate knowledge of the Trinity and Incarnation, specially if there want a Teacher: For what (saith he) shall we say that an infinite number of Christians, otherwise good people, perish, that scarce know anything aright of the Myserie of the Trinity and Incarnation; Yea judge perversely (or falsly) of them, if you ask them? And cites Rozella and Medina of the same mind. Lastly gives also the judgement of Gr. Valentia fully, for his opinion, Analys. fid. lib. 2. cap. 3. lit. D.

In the sixteenth Probleme page 127. he puts another Question, Whether the Law of Nature and Decalogue may be unknown without fault? And saith that though Alex. Ales say, No, yet [It is the more common and received Opinion, (citing Adrian, Corduba, Herera, & alios communiter) that there may be such

invincible

vincible ignorance in respect of the Law of Nature and the Decalogue.]

And note for the understanding of all this, that this which they call an *Implicite faith in Christ*, is no actual faith in Christ at all. He that only believes as the Church believes, and knows not that the Church believes in Christ, in the Resurrection of Christ, &c. hath no actual belief in Christ or the Resurrection at all. *Ignorantia nulla fides*: If I believe that one of you is true of his word, it doth not follow that I actually believe the particular propositions which I never heard. This which they call an *implicite Belief*, is nothing but the *explicite actual belief* of the *Formal Object* of Faith, Divine or Humane, as that God is True, or the Church True and infallible; but it is no belief at all of the particular material object.

And note that every one in the world that believeth that there is a God, must needs believe that he is no Lyar; and so hath in God an *Implicite belief*. Now if this will save men, without a particular belief in Christ, then Christianity is not necessary: Every Turk, and Jew, and Infidel that believeth in God, may then be said to have an *Implicite faith in Christ*, in the Popish language; because he believeth all that God revealeth to be true; But if an *Implicite faith in God* will not serve, how should an *implicite faith in the Church* serve; unless the Church, that is the Pope, be better than God.

See here, whether they make any more of the Christian faith than a meer shooing horn, to draw and keep men to their side. By a General Council and the Pope it is determined that no man can be saved out of their Church; as headed by the Pope: To believe in the Pope is of Necessity to Salvation; but to believe in Christ, in his Incarnation, Death, Resurrection, is not so. An *Implicite faith in the Pope or Church*, yea or erring Doctors may save, and men may merit by following them in error; but an *Implicite faith in God himself* will not save, if we believe not in the Pope. So that if we were Infidels we might be saved, so we were of the Church of Rome, and believed in the Pope: but the Holiest Christian that believeth explicite in God, and all the Articles of the faith, cannot be saved, if he believe not in the Pope. Do you think they believe these Doctrines themselves? or rather frame them to the building of their Kingdom?