

determine it self, and that which cannot so prevail : And therefore your unformed and your formed faith, have some intrinsic difference.

2. the *Lutherans* that are half the Protestants, do think that justifying faith may be lost. So that (be it right or wrong) you cannot charge this on them all.

3. The rest which be not of their mind, do hold a brotherly communion with them ; and therefore take not that point to be of so much moment as to break communion.

4. Are you not at odds among your selves about perseverance? some laying it first on mans free will, and some with *Austin*, ascertaining perseverance to the Elect, because Elect, and laying it on Gods free Gift ; and some Jesuites and School men affirming that the confirmed in Grace are not only certain to persevere, but that they necessarily believe and are saved, and cannot mortally sin (strange doctrine for a Jesuite!) Of all this controversie of perseverance, I desire the Reader to see a few sheets called *An Account of my Judgement* hereabout. When I wrote those I knew not whom *Alvarez* meant (*lib. 10. Diss. 104. pag. 419. §. 1. de Auxil.*) When he disputed against this sort of men: But since I find it in his *Respons. ad Object. Lib. 2. cap. 9. pag. 522, &c.* Where he tells us that it is the Jesuite *Greg. de Valentia*, *Tom. 2. diss. 8. q. 3. punct. 4. §. 2. & Tom. 1. d. 1. q. 23. punct. 4. §. 7. Ubi docet non solum esse praelectos ut salventur, sed ut necessario salventur, ac per consequens non posse peccare Mortaliter, & Necessario perseverare in gratia, ac eatenus non libere, sed necessario salvari.*

And also that he meant *Alexand. Ales. 3. p. q. 9. Et Almain. in 3. d. 11. q. 2. Qui asserunt confirmatos in Gratia non habere libertatem, &c. Quam sententiam Medina impugnat. 3. p. q. 27. art. 4.*

This is more then Protestants say, And yet will you quarrell?

His ninth Accusation is this [*Scripture saith, If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments: You say that there is no need of keeping the Commandments, and that he that saith, it doth deny Christ and abolish saith, of which the Scripture speaketh not a word.*]

Ans. Still confusion playes your game, and you strive about

about words. We distinguish between the keeping of that Law of Works, or Nature, which made perfect obedience the only condition of Life: and the keeping of the Law of Moses as such, and the keeping of the Law of Christ. For the two first, we say that no man can be justified by the works of the Law. Is this a doubt among Papists, that believe Pauls Epistles? But as for the Law of Christ, as such, we must endeavour to keep it perfectly (thats necessary *necessitate precepti*;) and must needs keep it sincerely (*necessitate medii*) if we will be saved. This all Protestants that ever I spoke with are agreed in: And dare any Papist deny it? If we be not all (nor you neither) agreed on the sense of that text of Scripture, yet are we agreed on the doctrine, and yet you quarrel.

His tenth Accusation is [*Scripture saith, that some that were illuminated and made partakers of the Holy Ghost, did fall, and crucifie again to themselves the Son of God. But you defend, that whoever is once partaker of the Holy Ghost, cannot fall from his Grace: which Scripture speaketh not.*]

Ans. The same again: and a meer untruth! We still maintain that those words of Scripture are of certain truth. But we distinguish between the common and the speciall gifts of the Spirit. The common gifts may be lost: we never denyed it: The special gifts that accompany salvation, some of us judge are never lost: others of us think are left only by those that are not predestinate, as *Austin* thought, and your Dominicans think. And what cause is here of your quarrell?

His eleventh Accusation is this [*Scripture saith that God taketh away, and blotteth out our iniquity as a cloud: and puts our iniquities far from us, as the East is from the West, and maketh us as white as snow; You say, that he takes not away, nor blotteth out our sin, but only doth not impute it, and doth not make us white as snow, but leaveth in us the fault and uncleanness of sin: which Scripture no where speaks.*]

Ans. This is half falsehood, and half confusion, raked up to make a matter of quarrel with. 1. Its false that we say, *He doth not take away, nor blot out our sin, nor make us white as snow*: Do not all Protestants in the world affirm all this? 2. There are these things here considerable. 1. The Act of sin. 2. The Habit. 3. The guilt, or obligation to punishment. 4. The culpability,

pability, or *reatus culpa*. 1. As for the *Act*, how can you for shame say, that God takes it away, when it is a *transient act* that is gone of it self as soon as acted, and hath no existence, as *Scotus* and all your own take notice. 2. As to the *Culpability*, you will not sure for shame say, that God so put away, e.g. *Dauids* Adultery, as to make it *reputable as a vertue*, or not a vice. 3. As to the *Reatus ad penam*, the full Guilt, we maintain that it is *done quite away*: and if your eyes be in your head, you may see that it is in regard of this guilt and punishment that the Scriptures mentioned by you speak (or principally speak at least) For I pray you tell us, what else can they mean, when they speak of actual sins that are past long ago, and have no existence. Learned wranglers! would you make us believe, that Grace is given to *David* to put away the *Act* of his Murder and Adultery, so that it may be *quid prateritum, & non jam existens*? a thing past and gone, which it is without grace? so that when you feign us to say, that *God takes not away sin*, but only *not imputeth it*, you feign us to make synonymal terms to be of different fences. He takes them away by not imputing them.

4. But if you speak not of the fence of a particular Text, but of the *Matter* in difference, it can be nothing but the *habit* of sin that you mean, that we say, that *God takes not away*. And here you play partly the Calumniators, and partly the erroneous Pharisees. 1. You Calumniate, in feigning us to deny, that *habitual sin is done away*. Because our Divines say, that it is not the work of meer pardon (which we call Justification) to put it away, therefore you falsely say, that we hold it is not put away at all: whereas we hold (without one contradicting vote that ever I read or heard) that all that are *Justified*, are *Sanctified*, *Converted*, *Regenerate*, *Renewed*, and *must live an holy life*: And that all their sins are so far destroyed, that they shall not have dominion over them: that Gross and Wilfull sin they forsake, and the least infirmities they groan, and pray, and strive against to the last, and then obtain a perfect conquest. 2. But if you mean, that no degree of *habitual or dispositive sin*, or *absence of holy qualities* remaineth in the Justified soul, it is a Pharisaical error, yea worse then a Pharisee durst have owned. And it seems this is your meaning, by the words of *Calvins* which you cite.

And dare you say that you have no sin to resist, or purge, or pardon? Are you in Heaven already? The whole have no need of the Physician, but the sick: and have you no need of Christ to heal your soul? would you be no better then you are? O proud souls! and strange to themselves and the purity of the Law! Hath not the Holy Ghost pronounced him a Lyar and Self-deceiver, that saith he hath no sin, 1 Joh. 1. 8. 10. In many things we offend all, Jam. 3. 2. I shall but recite to you two Canons of a Council, which if you use the Lords prayer, are fit for you to consider. Concil. Milevit. cont. Pelagianos Can. 7. [Item placuit, ut quicumq; dixerit in Oratione Dominica ideo dicere sanctos, Dimitte nobis Debita nostra, ut non pro seipsis hoc dicant, quia non est eis jam necessaria ista, sed pro aliis, qui sunt in suo populo peccatores, & ideo non dicere unumquemque sanctorum, Dimitte mihi debita mea; sed Dimitte nobis debita nostra, ut hoc pro aliis potius quam pro se fustus petere intelligatur, Anathema sit.]

Can. 8. Item placuit ut quicumque verba ipsa Dominica Orationis, ubi dicimus, Dimitte nobis debita nostra, ista volunt à Sanctis dici, ut humiliter, non veraciter hoc dicatur, Anathema sit. Quis enim ferat Orantem, & non hominibus, sed ipsi Domino mentientem, qui labiis sibi dicit dimitti velle, & Corde dicit, quæ sibi dimittantur debita non habere?

You see here the Council curseth all those as intolerable Lyars, that say the Lords prayer, desiring him daily to forgive or remit their sins, and yet think that they have no sins to forgive, yea or that every Saint hath not such sins. What can a Papist say to this, but by making Councils as void of sense, as they feign the holy Scriptures to be?

His twelfth and last Accusation is this [The Scripture saith, that Blessedness is the Reward, the Prize, the Penny, the wages of Labourers, and the Crown of Righteousness: you contend that it is meerly the free gift of God, and not a Reward, which no Scripture doth affirm.]

Answer. A meer Calumny, and perverting of Calvins words, who often saith, as we constantly do, that Eternal life is given as a Reward and Crown of Righteousness. But we distinguish between the Act of God in his Gospel Promise, which is a Conditional Deed of Gift of Christ and Life to all that will Accept them, and the execution of this by Judgement and Glorification. And

we

we say that it was *Antecedenter* meerly of Gods free Grace that he made such a Deed of Gift (the blood of Christ being the purchasing cause,) and nothing of our works had a hand in the procurement (Dare you deny this ?) But that our *Justification in Judgement*, and our *Glorification*, which are the *Execution* of the Law of Grace, do make our works the Reason ; not as having merited it *ex proportionē operis*, or in *Commutative Justice*, but as having performed the condition of the free Gift, and so being the persons to whom it doth belong. And this is the sense of *Scotus* and of one half of the Papists, (for still you are together by the ears) who say that *Merit of Condignity* is but *ex pacto* by virtue of Gods Promise.

And now I leave it to the Conscience of any sober Papist, whether we be guilty in any one point that this great Cardinal chargeth us with ? And whether Papists and Protestants were not in a fair way for reconciliation, if we differed not more in other things then in these ?

And here again I must let them know, that Scripture only is the Rule and Test of our Faith and Religion. Their *Polidor Virgil* in this speaks truly of us, saying [*They are called Evangelical, because they maintain that no Law is to be received in matters of Salvation, but what is delivered by Christ or his Apostles*] (so senseless and putrid is their scorn of the *Evangelium quintum*.) If therefore *Luther*, *Calvin*, or any man speak in any word amiss, blame the man that spoke it for that word ; but blame not all, or any others for it, if you are men. *Austin* Retracted his own errors, and which of us dare Justifie every word that hath fallen from our mouths or pen, before God ? How many hundred points do Schoolmen and Commentators charge on one another as Erroneous, among yourselves ? Shall all the errors of the Fathers be charged on the Catholick Church, or all your writers errors upon yours ?

And that we do well to stick to the Holy Scriptures as the sufficient Rule, we are the more encouraged to think, by the concessions of our adversaries of greatest Note (as well as by the Testimony of the Scripture it self, and the consent of the ancient Doctors of the Church, and the unprovedness of of their pretended additions.) Among others even this great Cardinal *Richlien* saith thus, pag. 38. [*Nos autem nullam*

aliam, &c. i. e. As for us we put (or assert) no other Rule but Scripture, neither of another sort, nor totall: Yea we say that it is the Whole Rule of our Salvation: and that on a double account, both because it containeth immediately and formally the summ of our salvation; that is, all the Articles that are necessary to mans salvation, by necessity of means (N. B.) and because it mediately containeth whatsoever we are bound to believe, as it sends us to the Church to be instructed by her, of whose infallibility it certainly confirmeth us.]

Note here that 1. He grants us that all Articles necessary to our Salvation, as Means, are immediatly and formally in the Scripture: And then surely they may be saved that believe no more then is in the Scripture: 2. That we are to believe no Church but that which the Scripture sends us to, and to believe its infallibility no further then the Scripture doth confirm it. And that the Scripture is our whole and only Rule. O that all Papists would stand to this! But let them not blame us now for standing to it. Had this Cardinall done no more by Policie and Power then by Disputing against the Reformation, he might easily have been dealt with.

CHAP. XL.

Detect. 31. A Nother of their frauds is, *By ranking the Protestants among the rabble of Sects and Heresies that are in the world, and then asking ignorant souls, If you will needs be of any sect, how many are here before you? and what reason have you rather to be of the Protestants, then of any other?*

Ans. Indeed this question is worth the considering by a Papist, or any sectary; but the true Catholick is quite out of the reach of it. The Church of Christ is One, and but One. This one Catholick Church containeth all the true Christians in the world. This is the Church that I am a member of, which is far wider then the Roman Church. The Church that I profess my self a member of, containeth three parts; 1. *The most sound and healthfull*
part;

part; and that is the *Reformed Churches*. 2. *The most unsound in doctrine*, though possesse of many Learned men; and that is the *Papists themselves*; (not as *Papists* simply, but as *Christians*, though infected with Popery.) 3. *The middle part*, which is sounder then the *Papists* in doctrine, but less learned; and below the *Protestants* in both: and that is all the *Greeks* and other *Eastern and Southern Churches* that are no subjects of the Pope. All these, even all true *Christians*, are members of the Church that I belong to, though some of them be more sound, and some be leprous or lamentably polluted. To these I may add many particular lesser sects, that subvert not the foundation, as some *Anabaptists*, and divers others. And will you ask me now why I will not be of another sect, as well as of the *Protestants*? Why, my answer is ready: A Sect divided from the body, I abhor: I am of no Sect, It is the Unity, Universality and Antiquity of the Church that are its honourable attributes in my eyes. *Protestants* that unchurch all the rest of the world, and count themselves the whole Church of Christ, do in some sort make themselves a Sect: But where is there any such? I know none such, nor I hope ever shall do: And therefore I may say that *Protestants* are no more a sect, then the Patients in an Hospital that are almost healed, or then the higher form of Scholars in a school, or then the Merchants or richer sort of Tradesmen in a City: And such a Sect God grant that I may be of, even one in the Church that shall be of soundest understanding, and of purest worship, and of the most carefull, holy, honest life; But still I shall acknowledge them of the lowest form, even them that learn the A. B. C. to be in the same School with me: And if they (*Papists* or any others) will disclaim me, that shall not unchurch me, as long as Christ disclaims me not: Nor shall it provoke me to disclaim them any further then I see Christ leading me the way. So that the *Papists* may see that if they will deny the Church that I am of, they must deny their own, and all the *Christian* world.

But how will they answer this themselves? Seriously I profess, that besides their other errors, it is one of the greatest reasons why I dare not be a *Papist*, because then I know I must be a *Sectary*. What is a *Papist* but as meer a *sectary* as any that retaineth a name in the Church? They are a company of men

that have set up a Humane Usurping Head or Vice-christ over the Catholick Church, owning him themselves, and unchurching and condemning all the Church that will not own him. The Church that I am of is neer thrice as big as the Papists Church is. Theirs is but a piece, and a polluted piece, that would divide it self from all the rest by condemning them.

And now I would seriously desire any Papist living to resolve the question, If he will needs be of a sect, and forsake the Universal Church, why of the Popish sect rather then another? If because it is the greatest, I answer, its less then the whole. If because it is the purest, it is one of the most impure: If for Antiquity, it is founded (as Papal) upon Novelty. If because it is the Richest, their money perish with them that measure the Church and truth of Christ by the Riches and splendor of this world. For my part I cannot help you out of this snare.

CHAP. XLI.

Detect. 32. **A** Nother of their jugglings is, *By working upon the peoples natural affections, and asking them, Where they think all their fore-fathers are that dyed in the communion of the Roman Church? Dare they think they are all damned? Intimating that its cruelty to say their ancestors are in Hell; and if they say they be in Heaven, then there is but one way thither, and therefore you must go the way that they went.*

But a weak understanding may easily deal with this kind of Sophistry, if it be not mastered by affection. For 1. What if we grant that many of our fore-fathers that dyed Papists are in Heaven? Doth it follow that we must therefore be Papists? No: because it was not by Popery that they came to Heaven, but by Christianity. What if many recover and live that eat not only Earth and Dirt, but Hemlock or Spear-wort, or other poysons; must I therefore eat them? Or doth it follow that there is no other way to health?

2. Our fore-fathers were all saved that were holy, justified persons, and no others. But among so many and great impediments as Popery cast in their way, we have great reason to fear that far fewer of them were saved, then are now among the Reformed

Reformed Churches: And must I needs go that difficult way to Heaven, because that some of them get thither? Must I needs travail a way that is commonly beset with thieves, because some that go that way do scape them? This is our case.

3. If this were a good way of Reasoning, then may all the Heathens, Infidels, Mahometans, use it, that have been educated in darkness. And indeed it is the Argument which the barbarous Heathens use, when the Gospel is preached to them; [*What think you, say they, is become of our fathers? If they were saved without the Gospel, so may we.*] The story of that Infidel Prince is common, that being ready to go to the water to be baptized, slept back, and asked, *Where are all my Ancestors now?* And when he was told that they were in Hell, and that the Christians go to heaven, he told them then he would be no Christian, for he would go where his Ancestors are.

4. If this be good reasoning, then we may use it much more than you. For we would ask you, where be all our fore-fathers that are dead since the Reformation? and where be all those that dyed between the Resurrection of Christ and the appearing of Popery, or the prevailing of it in the world? And where be all that die in the Eastern and Southern Churches, that are no subjects of the Pope of Rome? Have we not as little reason to think that all these millions of men are damned, as to think so of our Popish Ancestors.

5. Why should we be more foolish for our souls then for our bodies? I would not be poor because my Ancestors were so: Nor would I have the Stone or Gout because my Ancestors had them: Nor will I say that they are no diseases, for fear of dishonouring my Ancestors that had them. And why then should I willfully lick up any Popish errors, because my Ancestors by the disadvantage of the times and of their education were cast upon them.

6. It is not our fore-fathers but God that we must follow: It is he, and not they, that is the Lord of our faith and of our souls. It will not excuse us in judgement for disobeying God, to say that our fore-fathers led us the way; Nor will it ease us in Hell to suffer with our fore-fathers. Christ tells us, *Luke 16.* of a Rich man that in Hell would have had his brethren warned, lest they should follow him: But these men would have us to follow

follow our fore-fathers, even in their sin against God. Whereas the Scriptures constantly make it an aggravation of a peoples sin, when they follow their fathers in it, & take not warning by their falls. The *Jewish* Christians were redeemed from the *vain conversation*, received by Tradition from their fathers, 1 Pet. 1. 18. Stephen tells the *Jews*, *Act.* 7. 51, 52. [*As your Fathers did, so do ye: which of the Prophets have not your Fathers persecuted?*] Christ condemneth the *Jews* for allowing the deeds of their fathers, *Luk.* 11. 47, 48. *Mat.* 23. 32. Nay God asketh wicked men where their fathers are, with a clean contrary meaning to this question of the Papists, [*Zach.* 1. 4, 5, 6. *Turn unto me saith the Lord of Hosts, be not as your fathers unto whom the former Prophets have cryed, Turn — your fathers, where are they, and the Prophets, do they live for ever?*] *Ezek.* 20. 18, 27, 30. [*I said unto their children, — walk ye not in the Statutes of your Fathers, neither observe their judgments, nor defile your selves with their Idols: I am the Lord your God, walk in my Statutes — 30. Say unto the house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God; Are ye polluted after the manner of your fathers? and commit ye whoredom after their abominations?*] *Jer.* 44. 9. [*Have ye forgotten the wickedness of your fathers — They are not humbled even to this day.*] The 18. of *Ezek.* is almost all of this, that the son that followeth his father in his sins, shall die, and he that takes warning and avoideth his fathers sins, shall live. A hundred more such texts there are.

7. Our fore-fathers might be saved that sinned in the dark, and yet we be damned if we will follow them in the Light, or at least we shall be beaten with more stripes then they, if both must perish. They had not our means, or liberty: If they had seen and heard what we have done, many of them would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. Shall we sin wilfully after the knowledge of the Truth, because our fathers sinned ignorantly for want of information?

CHAP. XLII.

Detest. 33. **A** Nother of their frauds is, By pretending to a Divine Institution and Natural excellency of a visible Monarchical Government of the Church. And so they would

would deriue it from Peter, from Christ yea from Nature, and God the Author of Nature.

All their writings take this as their strength. I shall at this time tie my self to Boverius his *Cheating Consultation*, de *Ratione vera fidei*, &c. ad *Carolus Principem*, intended for the perverting of our late King then in Spain.

In his *Part. 1. Reg. 6.* he asserteth that [besides Christ the invisible Head of the Church, there is a necessity that we acknowledge another certain visible Head subrogate to Christ, and instituted of him, without which none can be a member of Christ, or any way subsist alive.] (Yet Cardinal Richliens will not have the Pope called Another Head.)

He begins his proof with a cheat, as gross as common, even an abuse of Cyprians words, *l. 1. Ep. 3.* where Cyprian speaks for the necessity of obeying *One in the Church*, meaning a particular Church, (as the whole scope of his Epistle testifieth): And this man would make them simple believe that he speaks of the *Universal Church*.

His Reasons proceed thus: First (p. 128. &c.) he tells us, that [the invisible God thinks meet to Govern the world by visible men.] *Ans.* And who denies that Christ also governeth his Church by men?

But he concludeth hence [Num alia ratione, &c. Shall we believe that Christ doth govern his Church in another way then God governeth the whole world?] *Ans.* Reader, doth not this man give up the cause of the Pope, and say as much against it fundamentally as a Protestant? Saith Boverius [We must not believe that Christ doth govern the Church in another way then God doth govern the world.] But (saith common sense and experience) God doth not govern the whole world by any one (or two, or ten) Universal Vice-monarch: Therefore Christ doth not Govern the Church by any one Universal Vice-monarch.

His next Reason is, [Because Christ was a visible Monarch once on earth himself. And if the Church had need of a visible Monarch then, it hath need of it still.] *Ans.* 1. Here the Reader may see, that it is to no less then to be Christs successor, or a Vice-christ, that the Pope pretendeth. And then the Reason, if it were of any worth, would as well prove, that there must

must be one on earth still that may give the Holy Ghost immediately, and make Articles of Faith *de novo*, and Laws for the Church (with promise of Salvation) and may appoint new Offices and orders in the whole Church, &c. And why not one also to live without sin, and to die for our sins, and rise again, and be our Saviour? And why not one to give us his own body and blood in the Sacrament?

2. Christ himself doth oppose himself to all terrestrial inhabitants, saying, [*One is your Master, even Christ.*] And what then? why [*Be not ye called Masters? But he that is greatest among you, shall be your servant.*] And [*Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are Brethren,*] Mat. 23. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. where most evidently he shews that neither Peter, or any of his own Disciples were to be called *Masters*, as Christ was, nor was any such to be on earth, and so no *Vice christ*; yea that all his Apostles being Brethren, were not to be Masters one to another, but servants: so that here is a plain bar put in against any of Peters Mastership or Headship of the Universal Church.

3. We do on these and many other Reasons, deny your consequence. It follows not that we must still have a Christ on earth, because we once had.

4. Christ hath chosen another Vicar (though invisible) as Tertullian calls him: and that is, the Holy Ghost, whom he sent to make such supply as was necessary, by various gifts proportioned to the several states and members of the Church.

5. If Christ would have left a Vice-christ upon earth, which should have been an Essential part, even the Head of his Church; he would doubtless have plainly expressed it in Scripture, and described his Office and Power, and given him directions to exercise it, and us directions how to know which is he, and to obey him: But there is not a word of any such matter in the Scripture, (nor Antiquity) when yet it is a point (if true) of such unspeakable importance.

6. You might at well feign, that if it were then necessary to have twelve or thirteen Apostles, it is so still: and if then it was necessary to have the gift of tongues and miracles, it is so still: which yet the Pope himself is void of.

7. It is not enough for your silly wit, to say its fit that Christ have

have a Successor, therefore he hath one: but let him that claimeth so high an honour as to be the Vice-christ, produce his Commission, and prove his claim if he will be believed.

8. Christ is still the visible Head of his Church, seen in Heaven, and as much seen over all the world, except *Judea* and *Egypt*, as ever he was. When he was on earth, he was not visible at *Rome*, *Spain*, *Asia*, &c. He that is Emperor of the *Turkish* Monarchy, perhaps was never personally an hundred miles from *Constantinople*. The King of *Spain* is no visible Monarch in the *West-Indies*. And if all the world except *Judea* might be without a Present Christ, then why that may not as well as the rest, you must give him an account, if you will tie him to be here resident.

9. And yet if the Pope would usurp no more Power than Christ exercised visibly on earth, it would not be all so bad as it is or hath been. He would not then divide inheritances, nor be a temporal Prince, nor wear a Triple Crown, nor keep so glorious a Court and Retinue, nor depose Princes, nor deny them tribute, nor exempt his Prelates from it, nor from their judgement Seats, nor absolve their Subjects from their fidelity, &c. nor trouble the world as now he doth: He would not exercise the power of putting any to death: much less would he set up Inquisitions, to burn poor people for reading the Scriptures, or no being of his mind.

Page. 133. He makes Christ the visible Pope while he was on earth, and tells us that Promulgating the Gospel, sending Apostles, instituting Sacraments, &c. were Pontificalia munera, Papal Offices. *Answ.* And indeed was Christ a Pope? and is the Pope a Christ? Jesus I know, and Peter and Paul I know: but this Vice-christ I know not. If indeed the Vice-christ have power to do these Papal works, to promulgate a new Gospel, to send out Apostles, to institute Sacraments, &c. as Christ did, let us but know which be the Popes Sacraments, and which be Christs; which be the Popes Apostles, and which be Christs; and which is the Popes Gospel, and which is Christs, and we shall use them accordingly. The *Law* and *Testimony* will help us to distinguish them.

Page. 134. He comes to prove that Christ hath a Successor; and his first proof is from *Mic. 2*. Let the Reader peruse it, and judge

judge without any help of mine, what proof there is that the Pope is a Vice-christ.

The next is in *Hosea* 1. which speaketh of the return of the *Israelites* from Captivity. Let the Reader make his best on it for the Pope, for I think it not worth my labour to confute the Papists impudent perverting such Texts as these.

By the way he tells us (as *Card. Richliu* and the rest commonly do) that [*its no dishonour to Christ to have a Deputy, no more then for the King of England to have a Deputy, or Vice-king in Ireland.*] *Answ.* 1. But our first question is, *Whether de facto such a thing be?* Prove that Christ hath Commissioned a Vice-christ, and we will not presume to say that he hath dishonoured himself.

2. Though it should not dishonour Christ, it is such a transcendent honour to man, as we will not believe that any man hath, that proveth not his claim. It was no dishonour to the Godhead to be united to the manhood of Christ in Personal union; but if the Pope say, that the Godhead is thus united to his manhood, verily I will not believe him.

3. Though we should not have presumed to question Christ if he had done it, yet we must presume to tell the Pope that he is guilty of dishonouring Christ by his usurpation. 1. Because he sets up himself as Vice christ, without his Commission; and takes that to himself, that is, Christs Prerogative. God saith, *This is my beloved Son in whom I am well-pleased. Hear him*] And the Papists say of the Pope, *This is the Vice-christ, Hear him*] 2. Because the Power of a King is more communicable, then the Power of Christ, it being such as is fit for one meer man as well as for another. But the Power of Christ is such as no meer man is fit for. The capacity of the Subject is Considerable as Necessary to the reception of the form of Power. He that is God as well as Man is fit for an Universal Monarchy, when he that is meer man is not. From whence we argue thus.

If there was never such a thing by Gods institution as a meer man to be the Christ or Universal Head of the Church, then there is no such thing to be imagined now: But there never was such a thing: Therefore there is no such _____

Christ

Christ that was the visible Head was God and Man: when the Pope is so, we will believe in him as his Successor.

4. It would ruine the Church to have built on so sandy a foundation, and to have laid so much work on one that is so unable to perform it. Doubtless common reason tells us, that if God made any one man the Monarch of the whole world (especially leaving his Commission as obscure, as the Popes is, were it any) and should not give him a divine or supra-humane strength to execute it, it would be the confusion of the world. I am not well acquainted with the Power of Angels; but I hope without dishonouring them, I may suspect, that the due managing of such an Universal Monarchy is above their abilities: At least I am confident, it is an honour that their Modesty and Reverence of Christ will not permit them to own, as the Pope doth. If this Vice-christ be not a false Christ, he may apply that of Heb.

1. [*Being made so much better then Angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name then they: For unto which of the Angels said he at any time*] thou art the Successor of Christ, thou art the Universal Head of the Church? Whether the Pope will be called the Vice-son of God, the Vice-saviour, and say, [*Let all the Angels worship him; sit thou on my right hand, &c.*] I leave to his modesty to consider? But I must profess here to the Reader, that though my modesty and consciousness of my weakness, hath made me so suspicious, lest I understand not the *Apocalips*, as to suspend my judgement, whether the Pope be the Antichrist, the Beast, &c. yet the reading of their serious immodest arguings, to prove the Pope to be the *Vice-christ on Earth*, doth exceedingly more increase my suspicion that he is *The Antichrist*. For to be *Peters* Successor, as a first Apostle, is a contemptible thing in these men's eyes. This is not it that they plead for. *Bellarmino* (*ubi supr.*) expressly tells us, that the Pope succeeds not *Peter* as an Apostle. No, it is as a *Vice-christ* to the whole Church, as *Boverius* here professedly maintaineth. And this they make the Foundation of their Catholick Church, and the acknowledgement of it Essential to every member of it. Which I even tremble to read and think of.

Next *Boverius* comes to his proofs from the New Testament. And those are the same that I have answered (as *Bellarmino*)

in my [*Safe Religion*] and are an hundred times answered by our writers, and therefore the Reader may excuse me, if I put him to no long trouble about them.

The first is the old [*Tues Petrus, & in hanc Petram, &c.*] *Answ.* 1. He doth not say [*Thou art Christ, or the Vice-christ, or my Successor, or the Universal Monarch of the Church: No such words as these.* 2. It is Christ himself here that is called the Rock, and not Peter. *q. d.* [*Thy name is Peter who confessest me, in allusion to which I tell thee, that I whom thou hast confessed am Petra, the Rock upon which I will build me a Church, which the gates of Hell shall not prevail against.*] As the Apostle saith of the spiritual Rock, 1 Cor. 10. *That Rock was Christ.*] So may I of this.

3. But if it had been spoken of *Peter*, it had been no more then is spoken of the other Apostles, on whom as on a *Foundation* the Church is said to be built, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner stone, *Eph. 2. 20.*

But what need we more, if we put not out our eyes, then to find in all the New Testament, that *Peter* was never called or taken for a Vice-christ by the Apostles, (unless *Secundum quid*, as every Embassador of Christ is that speaks his message in his stead, 2 Cor. 5. 19, 20.) and that he never is said to exercise any Universal Government over the rest of the Apostles, nor so much as give them a Law, or Convent them before him, or send them out, or do any more in Ruling them, then they in Ruling him, nor so much as *Paul* did in rebuking him to his face for disorderly walking, &c. *Gal. 2.* Yea when *Paul* calls them carnall that sided with *Peter*, though but in the same over-valuing way as others did of *Apollos* and *Paul*, saying [*I am of Paul, and I am of Apollo, and I am of Cephas,*] 1 Cor. 1. 12. He saith to them that said [*I am of Christ*] [*Is Christ divided?*] as shewing that he was the common Universal Head and Master of them all. But when he mentioneth meer men, he hath no such word: He saith not [*Is Peter divided*] But implying all in one, he saith [*Was Paul crucified for you, or were yee baptized into the name of Paul?*] And [*Who then is Paul, and who is Apollo?* (implying also, Who is *Peter*) but Ministers by whom ye believed as the Lord gave to every man, 1 Cor. 3. 5.] See 1 Cor. 4. 6.

Pag. 144. *Boverius* plays his game with Metaphors and Similitudes,

litudes, and saith [*The Church is Christs Kingdom, an Army, a Sheepfold, a House, a Ship, or Noahs Ark; and whats a Kingdom without a visible King: or an Army without a Visible General: or a Flock without a visible Shepherd: or a House without a Householder: or a Ship without a Pilot?*] *Ans.* 1. The whole earth is Gods Kingdom! And can he not Govern it without a Visible Monarch? Why then did the world never hear of such a man? Yea the whole world is the Kingdom of Christ himself, though not in that special sort as his Church is: *For all Power in heaven and earth is given him* Mat. 28. 18, 19. and for that end he Dyed, Rose and Revived, that he might be Lord of the Dead and Living, Rom. 14. 9. and he is made Head over all things to the Church, Eph. 1. 22, 23. And hath this Kingdom an Universal Visible Monarch? Yes: the Pope is the man: Long hath he laid claim to it. Princes, you see whose hands your Crowns and Kingdoms are in: Deceive not your selves, they are the Popes: For certainly they are all Christs; and if he be to be believed, he is the Vice-christ, and so succeedeth him in the Monarchy of the world. But then why doth not this simple Pope lay claim to the Empire of *Indostan*, and *Tartarie*, and *China*, and *Constantinople*, as well as of these smaller Kingdoms of *Europe*?

2. And for the Metaphorical title of an *Army*, I answer, It sufficeth that it hath an Universal General in Heaven, that can command it twice as well there as the Pope can on earth, yea and is as Visible to the Antipodes, yea to me, as ever the Pope was. All the world is Gods Army: But I will not say that the Pope or any man is General of it (save Christ) nor will I call him, *The Lord of Hosts*.

3. And for the *Sheepfold* of Christ, he hath appointed particular Shepherds to watch for the several parts of the flock. But if one man were to look to all the sheep in the world, he would make such work as the Pope would do with the sheep of Christ. If you tell us still that Christ is out of sight, I answer, He is even at hand: he is coming: he will not be long: In the mean time it is the duty of every Pastor [*to feed the flock of God that is among them* — not as Lords over Gods Heritage (as the Vice-christ would be:) and when the chief Shepherd doth appear, we shall receive the Crown,] 1. Pet. 5. 1, 2, 3, 4. Pe-

ter never dreamed, poor man, that he was the chief Shepheard himself.

4. For the Metaphor of a Family, I answer, That God can Govern all the Families in the world: and when the Pope can do so, then all the world shall acknowledge him the Master of the Family. Till then we have learned that the whole Family of Heaven and Earth is named of God, and of the Redeemer-God-and-Man: but not of the Pope of *Rome*.

5. And for the similitude of a Ship, I answer, One man can Govern a ship of the common size; but a ship as big as all the world, I think no man but Christ can govern: And so confident am I in this opinion, that I profess I will not be in that ship as big as the world which the Pope shall undertake to Govern, if I do but know how to get out of it.

Pag. 146. He goes on to tell us, that *even the bruits have their Governours*, and instanceth in the Bees. *Answ.* I am not well acquainted with *Irrational Governours* or *Governments*: but seriously it is no Article of my faith, that one Bee can Govern all the Bees in the world: Nor one Ape all the Apes in the world. Let it suffice the Pope that every particular Church be a *Bee-hive*, and every *Hive* have its proper Governour.

Next he again tells Prince *Charles* [that we should not deny that to the Church which we see is necessary to all humane Societies] *Answ.* Was this man in his wits! Have all Societies, or any Society an Universal Humane Governour? Who is it that is the Universal Chancellor of all the Academies on Earth? Who is it that is the Ruler of all the Colledges of Physitians in the world? I know what Schoolmaster we have in our own School here; but I never heard of an Universal Schoolmaster for all the world; nor for all *England*: who is the Universal Governour of all the Companies of Merchants in the world? Or who is the Universal King?

In the Conclusion he gathers up all into seven reasons, *Why the Church should have a Vice-christ*! 1. *That the militant Church might be like the triumphant, who have one Invisible Head.* *Answ.* 1. Christ is visible to the Church in Heaven. 2. When you have proved that any meer man is Christ or Head in Heaven, then we will grant that a meer man shall be Christ and Head on earth. 3. Earth is not yet fit to be conformed to Hea-

ven

ven in its Government. 4. Is it not the truest conformity, that Heaven and Earth have one and the same Lord, though visible to them and not to us, yet ruling us by visible officers? 5. But if this will not serve, lets have on earth a visible Government: therefore let us have no Pope that is invisible to almost all the world; but Pastors that are visible in their particular Churches.

The second Reason is [*That the militant Church differ not from it self, but as each particular Church hath one Visible Head or Pastor, so the whole should have.*] *Ans.* 1. Content, if the Pope can shew as good a Commission for the whole, and be as able to Govern the whole, and will really be present with the whole, and visible to them. 2. Is the world unlike it self, if all the world have not one King, as every particular Kingdom hath? Or one Schoolmaster, as every particular School hath?

The third Reason is [*For preserving Unity.*] *Ans.* 1. And well it is done by you? And what unity will you keep at the Antipodes? Or in the vast dominions of Heathen and Mahometan Princes, where Christians are dispersed, but you come not near them? 2. We have a better unity already in One God, One Christ, One Spirit, One Gospel, One Baptism, One Hope, &c. 3. The Mahometans have more unity then you.

The fourth Reason is [*To fulfill the doctrine of the Prophets and Christ.*] *Ans.* You should have better shewed such a doctrine before you had made use of it as a reason.

The fifth Reason is [*That the Christian Church may be like the Jewish*] *Ans.* When the Christian universal Church is no bigger then the Jewish, that one may Govern it as well, we will hearken to you: Let the Pope undertake no larger a Circuit.

The sixth Reason is [*That there may be some one Supream judge to punish Bishops, and define matters of faith, call Councils, extinguish heresies and schisms.*] *Ans.* 1. One Christ is enough for the Catholick Church for all these uses. I find the Articles of faith as well defined by Christ, as by the Vice-christ. I have searcht the writings both of Christ and the Vice-christ, and in my poor judgement there is no comparison between them, nor hath the Pope one jot mended the Scripture. 2. And for Heresies and Schisms, Christ hath extinguishd many, but