

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?

And what a wonder is it that Learned Doctors see not their own contradiction? they suppose a man to believe in the Pope, or as the Church believeth, and yet not to believe in Christ! And is not the Church essentially a *company of Christians*; the spouse, and body, and school, and Kingdom of Christ? And is not the Pope essentially the pretended Vicar of Christ? How then can they believe in Christs Vicar, or Christs School, or Kingdom, or followers, before they believe in Christ himself?

And by all this you may perceive the Holiness of the Roman Church, and the nature of that Discipline or Church Government that all the world must needs submit to, or be damned. Even such as takes in Infidels and all, and layeth the Church as common to the world, for as many as will but believe in the Pope and Clergy.

You see here also another mysterie opened: that a man may have enough to Justifie him, that yet will not save him: For most of them are here said to hold that a man may be justified without an explicate faith in Christ, or that the knowledge of Christ is not necessary to his Justification, but to his salvation it is (Though the other half say, that its necessary to neither) And if a man die in a Justified State, must he be condemned? when *Paul* saith, *Rom. 8. 30. Whom he justified, them he also glorified.*

You see also here what their Baptism doth, that can *ex opere operato* infallibly put away the sins of all these Infidels, and so the Eucharist, &c. And yet they must not be saved for all that their sins are all done away. O what a Maze is the Romish Divinity! And you see how well they are agreed about these fundamentals, when half of them think that an *Actual belief in Christ is necessary to salvation, and not to justification*; and others that *its necessary to both*: and a great part that *its necessary to neither*. And you see here the benefit of having an *Infallible Living judge of controversies*, and expounder of *Scriptures*: and how admirably he hath ended all their differences.

And again I say, If formally these *Unbelievers* are in their Catholick Church, they shall give us leave to say that the Greeks and other Eastern and Southern Christians are in the same Catholick

tholick Church as we are, when we differ not so much.

And when they have made the Non-belief of Articles of the faith consistent with salvation, they will never while they breath be able to confute him that on the same grounds affirmeth the contrary belief consistent with salvation, in case of the same want of teaching and sufficient means.

And by this time I hope you see of how small moment the Popish Censures are, when they judge that a Protestant cannot be saved.

Its true that S. Clara here judgeth otherwise: but 1. Its said his Book was burnt or condemned at Rome for it. 2. He alloweth Infidels as much. 3. And he proveth himself a Heretick by it at Rome; seeing a General Council and Pope have determined the contrary, even that it is necessary to salvation to be a subject of the Pope of Rome.

CHAP. XXXVIII.

Detect. 29. **A** Nother of their Deceits, and I think the most successfull of all the rest is, *Their suring their Doctrines, and Government, and Worship to the flesly humours of the ungodly: by which means the Greatest and the Most are alwayes like to be on their side:* When on the contrary our Doctrine, Discipline and worship is all so contrary to carnal interest and conceits, that we are still like to lose the most, if not the greatest, and consequently to be a persecuted people in the world. This is their unanswerable Argument: By this means they captivate the Nations to their Tyranny. The Most are every where almost licentious, sensual, worldly and unsanctified: Wise men and Godly men are few in comparison of the rest of the world. And it is the multitude commonly that hath the strength, and the Great ones that have the wealth. So that I confesse I take it for a wonder of mercy, that they are not Lords in every Countrey, and that the Reformed Catholicks be not used every where as they be in Spain and Italy. For where they have but opportunity to shew themselves, the Principles and Practises of the Papists are

are such, as will be most likely to win the Rabble rout to them, and make them Masters of the multitude, and of all except a few believing Heavenly persons: (For the flock is little that must have the Kingdom.) And then, when they have got the multitude thus to follow them, and club'd the rest into prisons, or burned them in the flames, they reckon of this as one of the surest Evidences that they are the Catholick Church, because forsooth *they are the greater number* (in the Countries where they have advantage,) and *it is but a few* whom they were able to persecute or burn as *Hereticks that were against them*. The very Argument of the Jews against Christ and his Disciples.

The Reasons why they have not by this Policie won the Christian world to their side, are (under God, the great Defender of the innocent) these four; 1. Because in the Eastern and Southern Churches they have not had opportunity to lay their snares, as they have had here in the West: And also those Churches have too many corruptions and neglects at home for the gratifying of the worser sort. 2. Because God hath been pleased in some places so to bless the endeavours of the smaller part, as to enable them against the multitude to preserve some liberty. 3. Because God hath sometime given Wise and Godly Princes to the people, that will not be cheated with the Popular deceits. 4. And principally because that the Papal Tyranny is directly contrary to Princes Rights, so that its only those that are blinded by ignorance, or strengthened by an extraordinary league with Rome, or forced by the multitude of Popish subjects and neighbours, that put their necks into the Romish yoke. For what by the Popes pretended Power in temporals, at least *in ordine ad spiritualia*, and what by his excommunicating Princes, and his pretended power to depose them and give their kingdoms to another, and to absolve their subjects from their oaths and fidelity, (which is an Article of their faith, agreed on by the Pope and General Council, *Later. sub. Innoc. 3. cap. 3.*) and what by his exempting the Clergy from their Princes Power, and what by the pillaging their Countries for money, and what by their doctrine and practises of murdering Princes that are not of their mind, by these and many other Evidences, they have awakened many of the Princes of the earth to look about them, and consequently to befriend the Truth against these Tyrannous

Usurpers.

Usurpers. Had it not been for these helps under God, we had not been like to have a name where they can reach, nor to have had liberty to breath in the common air.

It would be a voluminous work to shew you how all the Doctrines, Government, and worship of the Papists is suted to the humor of the sensual multitude, and fitted to take with ungodly men. I shall but instance in twenty particulars (which are far from all.)

1. The Reformed Catholicks hold, that none should be taken into the Church by Baptism, unless themselves, or their Parents, if they be Infants, do make Profession of the Christian faith, and of an holy life, for the time to come, and seem to understand what they say and do, and be serious in it ; which exasperateth the grossly ignorant and ungodly, when we deny them this Priviledge of Believers. But the Papists admit of the ignorant, ungodly, and such as believe not explicately in Christ, as you heard even now ; and so please the people, and fill their Church.

2. The Orthodox hold, that Baptism giveth Remission of sin to none but true believers and their seed. The Papists perswade many millions more, that all their sins are not only pardoned, but actually abolished *ex opere operato*, in their Baptism, which is comfortable News to such ungodly souls.

3. The Protestants say, that Original sin liveth after Baptism in some degree, though it reign not, or condemn not those that are true believers ; and that Concupiscence, that is, all inordinacy of the sensual appetite, or inordinate inclination to sensual objects is a sin. The Papists tell them that when once they are baptized, there is no such thing in them as Original sin, and that Concupiscence is no sin at all.

4. The Orthodox hold, that none are to be admitted to the Eucharist and Communion of the Church therein, but those that believe actually (or profess so to do) the Articles of the faith, and understand the nature of the Sacrament, and live according to the Laws of Christ. But the Papists give it to all, and drive men to the Sacrament ; so that *Albaspinus* before cited, saith, he knows not whether ever any one was kept away in his age.

5. The Protestants hold, that men are not to be let alone in scandalous sin, but admonished privately, and then openly before

the Church, and if yet they Repent not, and Reform not, to be cast out; and not to be absolved or re-admitted, without a Publick Confession and Penitence answerable to the sin: And this wicked people hate at the very heart, and will not endure. But the Papists have got a device to please them by Auricular secret Confession to a Priest, where if he will but confess and sin, and sin and confess again, he may have a pardon of course without any open shame or true Reformation. If we durst but imitate the Papists in this one particular, we should do much to please the people that are now exasperated: for I find, that almost any of them will confess in secret that they have sinned, that will not endure the open shame.

6. The Protestants hold, that every sin deserveth death, and that every breach of the Law is such a sin; (though God will not inflict the Punishment on them that have a pardon) But the Papists tell us of a multitude of sins that are but venial, that is, sins that deserve pardon, and yet deserve not Hell, and are indeed no sins, but analogically so called. And they make those to be such venial sins, which Protestants account abominably gross; as some lying, some swearing in common talk, some drunkenness, some fornication, and the like, are with them but venial sins, which are properly no sins (And yet here also they are by the ears among themselves, some saying that venial sins are properly sins, and most denying it) Yea all sins that are not *deliberated* on, are with them but *venial sins*. So that if they will but sufficiently brutifie themselves by suspending the exercise of reason, and will swear, curse, murder, without *deliberation*, they are then free from sin and danger. And how easie and pleasing is this to the ungodly? Those are but Evangelical Counsails with the Papists, that are the Precepts or Laws of Christ to the Protestants.

7. The Protestants teach men, that it is their duty to seek the understanding of the holy Scripture, and to meditate in it day and night: but the Papists do forbid the Common people to read it in a language which they understand, and save them all that labour that Protestants put them on: Nothing can win the people more then cherishing them thus in sloth and ignorance.

8. The Protestants say, that a man cannot be justified or saved without an actual faith in Christ (or being the Infant of a believer

believer Dedicated to Christ) and that this faith must extend to all things that are Essential to Christianity. But what the Papists say of the Justification and Salvation of Infidels, if they believe in the Pope, you heard in their own words in the last *Deduction*. A comfortable doctrine to the unbelieving world, to whom God hath spoken no such Comfort.

We confess that those that never had the Gospel, are under the Law of nature or works, and that the penalty of this is such as God can in some cases dispense with (or else we could not be saved by Christ) and so that all Pagans are not under the Peremptory undispensible threatening of the Gospel against final Private unbelievers: But yet, though God may pardon some of these, he hath made them no promise that he *will*; and therefore they can have no positive hope grounded on a promise; nor can any man say, that *God will save any of them, or that he will not*; it being certain that they are under the condemnation of the Law, which God *can* dispense with, in wayes of security to his Justice and Ends, but uncertain whether he will or not; and therefore is to be left among his unrevealed things. The true believer is under a *certain promise of salvation*. The *unbeliever that hath had the Gospel, or might have had it and would not*, is under the Gospel sentence of *damnation*, which is certain and irreversibile, if he die in that Condition. The *negative unbeliever that never had or could have the Gospel*, is under the *Condemning sentence of the Law* (of works or nature,) that is, *his sin Deserveth eternal death*; but this sentence is not *peremptory and undispensible*; but yet it is such as *God will not dispense with rashly*, but on terms that may secure his Ends and Justice. This is the true mean between extreams in this weighty point.

9. The Protestants say, that all our best works are imperfect, and the sin that adhereth to them deserves Gods wrath, according to the Law of works, though he pardon it by the Law of Grace: and that when we have done all, we are unprofitable servants, and properly Merit nothing of God for the worth of our works, or in Commutative Justice. But the Papists take those very works to Merit heaven, *ex Condigno*, and (for here they are by the ears again) say some of them, *by the Proportion of the work, and in Commutative Justice*, which the Protestants say, deserve damnation for their sinful imperfections, and therefore

need a pardon through the blood of Christ. Yea they take these works to be perfect, and the man to be perfect, and say, that by such works as these, they may Merit for others as well as for themselves. And how easie and pleasing is this to proud corrupted Nature?

10. The Protestants think, that no Faith Justifieth, but that which is accompanied with unfeigned Love and Resolution for Obedience. But the Papists make a Faith that's separated from Charity, and joyned with Attrition, to be sufficient for admission to the Sacrament, which shall be instead of Love or Contrition, and so shall put away all sin.

11. The Protestants knowing that God is a Spirit, and will be worshipped in Spirit and truth, do teach people a spiritual way of worship, which Carnal men are undisposed to, and unacquainted with. But the Papists do accommodate them by a multitude of Ceremonies, Images, and a Pompous histrionical kind of worship, which is easie and pleasant to flesh and blood. To have an Image before them, and Copes, and Ornaments, and abundance of formalities, and to drop so many Beads, and be saved for saying over so many *Ave Marias*, or such like words; what an easie kind of Religion is this, and how agreeable to flesh and blood? How much easier is it to say over their offices, then to Love God above all, and desire after Communion with him in the spirit, and to delight in him, and to pray in Faith, and heavenly fervour?

12. Protestants tell men of Hell-fire, as the remediless punishment of those sins, which Papists say deserve but a Purgatory: and they have hopes of coming out of Purgatory; but there's none of coming out of Hell.

13. Protestants tell them of no hope of ease or pardon of sin after this life, if it be not pardoned here. But Papists tell them, that when they are in Purgatory, the Pope hath power to pardon them, and the saying of so many Masses for their souls, may ease them, or rid them out; and the Merits of other folks may deliver them.

14. Protestants tell them, that they must be holy for themselves: but Papists tell them, that they may hire another man to say their prayers for them, which may serve turn.

15. The Protestants do ingenuously confess, that they have

no way to end all Controversies in this life, but that we have a sufficient way so far to decide them as is necessary to the peace of the *soul*, of the *Church*, and of the *Commonwealth*; but no way for a final absolute Decision, till the day of Judgement. The Pastors of the Church are to be Judges, so far as they are to execute: And the Magistrates are to be Judges so far as they must execute: And every Christian hath a judgement of Discerning so far as he is to execute. But the absolute final judgement is reserved to the last day; when God will fully end our controversies. But this satisfyeth not men that would have all in hand, and the sentence past before the Assizes: And therefore the Papists better fit their humour, and tell them (and they do but tell them) of an End of all their controversies at hand; of an easie cheap remedy by believing the Infallible Pope and Council; and so putting an end to all divisions and doubts.

16. The Protestants would have none but seeming Professing Saints in their Churches: But the Papists Canonize a Saint as a wonder; and shut them up in Monasteries, and call a few [*Religions*] that are separated from other Christians, as Christians formerly were from the world: which brings the people to think that Holiness and Religion is not necessary to all but to a few Devotaries that will be better then they are commanded to be.

17. The Protestants bind men to keep their vows, and fidelity to their Governors: But the Papists tell them that the Pope hath Power to free them from their fidelity, and dispense with their oaths.

18. The Papists teach men to fast: by eating the pleasantest meats: but the Protestants use a total abstinence while they fast, unless in meer necessity.

19. The main business and administration of Protestant Pastors, is against that flesh that is predominant in the unregenerate, and therefore must needs be distastefull to the multitude of the ungodly. Our preaching is to open mens sin and misery, and cause them to perceive their lost condition, and so to reveal to them a crucified Christ, and then to set them on the holy self-denying heavenly life that Christ hath prescribed them. And to speak terrour to the rebellious, and to cast the obstinate out of

our communion, and to comfort none as the heirs of heaven, either in life or at death, but only the truly sanctified and renewed souls. But for the Papists, their Preaching in most places is but seldome; but they have a Mass in Latine: And as the old saying is, [*The Mass doth not bite.*] It galleth not a guilty conscience to see a Mass, and here a many of Prayers which he understandeth not: And when they do preach, when they should shew wicked men their misery, they flatter and deceive them too often by their false doctrine: They cannot humble them in the sense of their Original sin and Misery, for that they tell them was quite extinct and done away in Baptism: And for their following sins, Absolution upon their customary confessions, hath done away all the guilt at least: so that here is no Misery for the Miserable souls to see: but like a Constables presentment at a Sessions, an *Omnia bene*: Unless perhaps some gross actual sin be apparent among them: and then they shall have an Oration against it, to drive them to *auricular confession*, and to receive the Body of Christ, and be Absolved. And so do they by Ceremonies and Sacraments *ex opere operato* quiet the Consciences of unsanctified men, and humour them in all their rites and customs, and at last turn them to Heaven or Purgatory with an Absolution, and Extreame Unction. And how pleasing a Religion this is to the ungodly people, those Ministers can tell, that see the rage of such, against those that deny them even better Forms and Ceremonies when they desire them; to pacifie their Consciences instead of real Holiness and Obedience.

20. Lastly, how the Jesuites have fitted their whole frame of Moral doctrine and Case Divinity to humour the unconscionable, *Montanus the Jansenist* will fully shew you through the whole (fore-cited) *Mysterie of Jesuitism*. Those that would escape any worldly trouble or danger, the Jesuites have a help at hand for, even their doctrine of Equivocation, and Mentall reservation (which makes the Popes Dispensation with oaths and promises needless.) What accommodations they have for him that hath a mind to Murder his adversary, to calumniate another, to take Use without Usury, to forbear restoring ill-gotten goods, to commit fornication, to rob another, and many the like, you may see in their own words cited in the said Book.

Yea

Yea what comfort they have for a man that loveth not God, so he will not hate him. Trust not my report, but read the Book; for its worth the reading.

So that we see the advantage that the Papists have to sweep away the vicious ignorant multitude, and then to boast that they are the Catholics, and we but Schismatics, because they are the greater part: and then they are armed also by the Multitude, to oppress us by their violence.

Now what remedy to use against this *Fraud*, I cannot tell, but only to deal plainly and faithfully, though it do displease, and to administer Gods Ordinances as he prescribeth, though never so distastefull to flesh and blood; and so to commit our selves to God, and trust him with his Church and cause, who is able to preserve it, and is most engaged to appear for us, when we lay all upon him, and have none to trust but himself alone. Let us not hearken in this case to flesh and blood that would advise us to remit the reins of Discipline, and to bend our Administrations to some pleasing compliance with carnal minds. We disengage God when thus we begin to shift for our selves out of his way. But withall we must acquaint those Princes that are faithful to Christ, how much it is their duty in this case to assist us; not by any cruelty to the Papists (that I desire not) but only by quieting the ungodly part of our People in a state of Catechumens, or expectants, or a Learning condition fitted to their state; and to restrain such in the mean time as would take advantage of their discontents, to seduce them by pleasing licentious doctrines to their undoing.

CHAP. XXXIX.

Detect. 30.

A Nother of their frauds is, by culling out all the harsh, unhandsome passages, or mistakes that they meet with in any Protestant Writers, and charging all these upon the Protestant Religion, as if they were so many Articles of our Faith: or at least were the common doctrines of our Churches.

They will not give us leave to do so by them, when yet we have much more reason for it. For 1. They teach the People that they are bound to believe as their Teachers bid them: and they reproach

reproach us for confessing that we are not in all points of Doctrine infallible : And yet we still confess this fallibility, and say in plain terms, that we know but in part. 2. Divers of their particular Doctors that we use to cite, are such as the *Pope hath Canonized for Saints* : and they tell us that in Canonizing he is infallible : And therefore an Infallibly Canonized Saint must not be supposed to err in a point of faith. 3. They boast so much of Unity and Consent among themselves, that we may the better cite particular Doctors. And yet we think our selves bound to stand to their own Law in this, and to charge nothing on them as the faith of their Church but what their Church doth own : and therefore while they refuse to stand to particular Doctors, we will not urge them to it: for its good reason that all men should be the Professors of their own belief.

But what reason is there then that we may not have the same measure from them which they expect ? We profess to take no man, nor Council of men, for the Lords of our faith, but for the *Helpers* of our faith. They tell us, that they know not where to find our Religion. We tell them it is *entirely in the written word of God*, and that we know no other Infallible Rule ; because we know no other Divine Revelation (supposing what in Nature is revealed.) They tell us that, *All Hereticks do pretend to Scripture, and therefore this cannot be the Test of our Religion* ? I answer, that so all cavillers, and defrauders and extortioners, may pretend to the Law of the Land, to undo poor men by quirks of wit, or tire them with vexatious suits : And yet it follows not that we must seek another Rule of Right, and take the Law for insufficient : And what if Hereticks pretend to Tradition, to General Councils and the Decretals of the Popes (as you know how frequently they do) Will you yield therefore that these are an insufficient Rule, or Test of your own Religion ? Open your eyes, and judge as you would be judged.

But I will come to some of the particular Opinions which they charge us with. And because I know not a more weighty renowned Champion of their cause then *Cardinal Richlein* (then Bishop of *Lucion* :) I shall take notice of his twelve great errors which he so vehemently chargeth on the Reformed Churches, as contrary to the Scripture. And sure I shall do much

to make clean our Churches, if I fully wipe off all the pretended blots of error, that so wise a man could charge upon them. In his *Defens. contra Script. 4. Ministr. Charenton. cap. 2. pag. 12. &c.* he begins his enumeration thus.

1. [*The Scripture saith, Jam. 2. that a man is not justified by Faith only; but you say, that he is justified by Faith alone, and by Faith only, which is found in no place of Scripture: and do you not then resist the Scriptures?*]

Ans. 1. We believe both the words of Paul and James, that a man is justified by Faith without the Deeds of the Law, and saved through Faith — not of works, lest any man should boast, Rom. 3. 28. Ephes. 2. 8, 9. and also that a man is justified by works, and not by Faith only, Jam. 2. Did not this Learned man know that we believe all the Bible? why then should he charge us with denying that which we retain, and publicly read in our Churches as the word of God? Did he think that we set so much by *Luthers*, or any mans writings, as by the Bible? 2. But if he can prove that we understand not these words aright, he should have evinced it better then by the use of the words [*Faith alone*] For our Churches by [*Faith alone*] do profess openly to mean no more then Paul doth by [*Faith without works*] And can they find fault with Paul? 3. Indeed we are not all agreed upon the fittest Notion of the interest of Faith and works in our Justification: but our difference is more in words and notions then matter, of which see my *Disput. of Justification*. 4. And why do you not quarrel with your own Cardinal Contarenius de *Justif.* and others of your own, that joyn with us in the doctrine of Justification.

His second Accusation is, [*The Scripture saith, that we can Love God with all the heart: you say, that no man can Love God with all the heart, which is no where read in Scripture: and yet do you not resist the Scriptures?*]

Ans. 1. Unprofitable Confusion! we distinguish between Loving God with all the Heart, as it signifieth the sincerity and predominant degree of Love, and so every true Christian hath it: and as it signifieth some extraordinary degree above this meer sincerity; and so some eminent stronger Christians have it, and as it signifieth the highest Degree, which is our duty, and which

excludes all sinful imperfection: And thus we say, that no man actually doth Love God perfectly in this life: nor do we think he speaks like a Christian, that dare say, *Lord I Love thee so much, that I will not be beholden to thee to forgive the imperfection of my Love, or to help me against any sinful imperfection of it.* Your own Followers whom you admire as the highest Lovers of God, do oft lament the imperfections of their Love (as *M. de Renty*, for instance, in his Life.) But now if the question be only of the *posse*, and not the *act*, we say, that the *Potentia naturalis* is in all: and the *Potentia Moralis*, which is the *Habir*, is in the sanctified: but this *Moral Power* is not perfect it self, that is, of the highest degree, and without any sinful imperfection; though yet it hath the perfection of sincerity, and in some, the perfection of an eminent degree. And will not this content you?

His third Accusation is, [*The Scripture saith, that the Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ, with the adjunction of those words that signifie a true Body and Blood: you say that it is not Christs Body and Blood, but only a figure, sign, and testimony, which the Scripture nowhere saith.*]

Ans. 1. The Scripture saith not that it is his Body and Blood *substantially*, or by *Transubstantiation*: And we say not, as you feign, that it is *not his Body and Blood, but a figure, &c.* For we say, that it is *his Body and Blood Sacramentally and Representative*: as he that personateth a King on some just account, is called a King; and as in actions of Investiture and Delivery; the delivering of a Key is the delivering of the House, and the delivery of a twig and turf, is the delivery of the Land; and the deliverer may say, *Take, this is my House, this is my Land, which I deliver thee.* If you be among many Images in a room, you will not blame him that saith, *This is Peter, and this is Paul, and this is the Virgin Mary.* 2. The Scripture often calls it *Bread* after the Consecration; which you condemn us for: therefore we are taught to call it so. 3. The Scripture saith, *1 Cor. 10. 4. [That Rock was Christ]* and he saith, *[I am the door, John 10. 7. I am the true Vine, John 15. 1.]* David saith, *[I am a worm and no man, Psal. 22. 6.]* we believe all this. But must we be therefore reproached, if we say, that *David was a man*; that the *Rock* was *Christ typically*;

that

that he was a Vine and Door Metaphorically only? And yet these are as plain as, *This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood*.

His fourth Accusation is, [*The Scripture saith, that Baptism saveth us, and that we are cleansed and regenerate by the washing of water: On the contrary you say, that Baptism doth neither save us, nor regenerate us, but is only to us a symbol of salvation, ablu-tion, and regeneration, which is no where said in Scripture.*]

Ans. A childish contest about words! we say, that two things go to our full possession of our state of Regeneration, Justification, and Cleansing. One is our *fundamental Right*, which the *Promise* of the Gospel gives us upon our *Heart consent* or *Covenant* with God: the other is our *Solemn Investiture*: in regard of the former, we are *Christians*, and *Regenerate*, and *Justified* before Baptism: In regard of the later, we are made *Christians*, *regenerate*, *justified*, *saved* by Baptism. This we commonly hold, and so never denied what you falsely say we deny. As a man is made a King by his Coronation, that yet in a sort was one before; or as Marriage makes them Husband and Wife by publick solemnization, that were fundamentally so before by Private Covenant; or as possession is given by a Key, a twig and a turf (as I said) of that which a man had right to before; so are we solemnly invested with those benefits by baptism, which we had a fundamental Title to before. Do not your own writers confess this of a man that is Baptized many years after he had Faith and Charity? Do you think *Cornelius* and the rest that had the Holy Ghost before Baptism, *Act. 10.* had not Justification before? Do you think that *Constantine* the great was unpardoned, unregenerate and no Christian till he was Baptized? Or rather would you make quarrels against your own Confessions?

His fifth Accusation is [*Scripture saith, that Priests do forgive sin: on the contrary you say that they do not rem t them, but only testify that they are remitted, which the Scriptures no where say.*]

Ans. As if Testification could not be a Remission. We say, that *whose sins* the Pastors of the Church remit, *they are remitted*. Do you not know that these very words were used to every Presbyter in our Ordination here in England? We say 1. That Pastors do as Gods Embassadors, proclaim his General Conditional Pardon unto all. 2. That they are Gods Ministers to make a particular

particular Application, and delivery of pardon in Baptism, on supposition that the Baptized be qualified for pardon. 3. That they are as his Ministers, to make the same Application by Declaration and Delivery in the *Absolution of the Penitent*; on supposition that their *penitence* be sincere. 4. And as Church Governors, they may on good considerations sometimes remit some humbling disgraceful acts that were imposed on the penitent for the testification of his repentance, and the satisfaction of the Church. And are not these four concessions enough? Or are you minded to pick quarrels, that your selves and others may have fewel for the rancour and uncharitableness of your minds?

But indeed we do not think that any man can primarily as the chief Agent forgive sins; but God must be the first pardoner: Nor that any man can pardon the sins of the dead, and abate or shorten the pains of the soul in a fire called Purgatory. Here we leave you.

And verily if the Pope have power to remit but the very temporal punishment, he is a cruel wretch that will not forgive men, even good men, the torments of the Gout, and the Stone, and an hundred diseases; nay that will not remit them to himself, no nor the pains of death, when he is so loath to die: (But I forgot that the Pope hath no body to forgive him, because none above him) He that cannot remit the punishments which we see, and feel, how shall we believe him (without any Divine Testimony) that he can remit a penalty that he never saw nor felt, nor no man else, that can be proved.

His sixth Accusation is [*Scripture saith, If a Virgin marry she sinneth not: but you say that the just sin in all works: which Scripture mentions not.*]

Ans. 1. Do you believe in your Conscience that the Scripture meaneth that a Virgin sinneth not at all in any circumstance or defect in the manner or Concomitants of her Marriage? Then I pray tell your Nuns so, that if *they marry they sin not*. Tell Priests so, that if *they marry they sin not*. Your own reason can expect no other sense in the words, but that *Marriage, as such, is no sin to the Virgin*. And this we grant: But yet if you think that in this or in any other work, you see God as apprehensively, and believe as strongly, and restrain every wandring

wandering thought as exactly, and Love God as much as you are bound to do by the very Law of Nature it self; so that you are perfectly blameless, and need not be beholden to the blood of Christ, to the Mercy of God, to the Spirit of Grace, either for the forgiveness of these failings; or the cure of them, you shew then a proud Pharisaical spirit, unacquainted with it self and with the Gospel. Do you go on and say, *Lord I thank thee that I am not as other men:* and I will rather say, *Lord be mercifull to me a sinner:* and which shall be rather justified, Christ hath told us. The streams cannot be perfectly sinless, till the fountain be so: and [*who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?* Prov. 20. 9.] [*For there is not a just man upon earth, that doth good, and sinneth not, Eccl. 7. 20.*] Christ telleth us that the fruit will be like the Tree, the actions like the heart: and therefore an imperfect Heart will have imperfect duties. If you dare say there is no remnant of sin in your hearts, you have so much of it that hindereth you from seeing it. Humility and self-knowledge would soon end this controversie. We say not that all our works are sins, that is, either materially forbidden, or done in wickedness, and from vicious predominant habits; But that the same works which *Materially are good*, are tainted with our sinfull imperfections, having not in them that measure of knowledge, faith, love, &c. as we ought to have; and therefore that we must beg pardon for our imperfections, and fly to the blood and merits of Christ, through whom God will accept both our works and us, for all the imperfections, which he pardoneth to us of his grace.

His seventh Accusation is [*Scripture saith that there are wicked men and reprobates, that believe in Christ: But you contend that they believe not, but have only a shadow of faith: which no Scripture saith.*]

Ans. Again, a quarrel about the name of faith, unworthy serious men! We say that Reprobates do believe, and we say that they believe not, taking belief in different senses. We believe what ever the Scripture saith, even that the Devils believe and tremble: and yet as Believers and Christians are all one, we are loath to call the Devils Believers and Christians; but you may do it, if you please. As *Belief* signifieth a bare uneffectual

all conviction or superficial Assent which you call *fides informis*, so we still confesse that the wicked may believe. But as Believing planted into him as his members, and taking him heartily as Christ, our Lord and Saviour, and so becoming Christians and Disciples: as it signifieth such a faith that hath the promise of pardon of sin, of Adoption, and of Glory, so we say that the wicked have but a shew or shadow of it. And this is the sense of the words of Calvin, P. Martyr, Beza, and Danais, whom you cite. And do you not thinke so your selves? Indeed you know not what to believe in this, as I have shewed in Postscript to my Disput. of Sacraments.

His eighth Accusation is this [*Scripture saith, that there are some that believe for a time, and after at another time believe not. You deny that there are any that believe for a time, and then fall from faith, and that he that once believeth doth ever lose that faith, which is not in any Scripture to be found.*]

Ans. It is too light in serious matters, to play thus upon words. 1. We still maintain that there are some that believe but for a time, and afterward fall away: but we say it is but with an uneffectual or common assent that they believe, such as you call *fides informis*. Your accusation therefore is false. The *semen vite* and faith that Calvin speaks of, in the place which you cite, is meant only of a saving faith, such as you call *fides charitate formata*. If any of you thinke that faith is called *charitate formata*, or justifying or saving faith, only by an extrinsecal denomination, from a concomitant, and that there is no difference in the faith it self between that of the unjustified and of the justified, you are mistaken against all reason. Your own Philosophers frequently maintain that the will (which is the seat of charity) followeth the practical dictates of the Intellect (which is the seat of Assent.) And therefore according to those Philosophers, a Practical Belief must needs be accompanied with charity. And those that deny this, do yet maintain that a powerfull clear Assent of the Intellect will infallibly procure the determination of the Will, though every assent will not, and though it do it not Necessarily. So that on that account (and in common reason) there must needs be an intrinsic difference between that Assent which prevaieth with the will to determine

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