

2.L.I.

THE
WORKS
OF

William Chillingworth, M.A.

Of the University of OXFORD;

Containing his Book, Intituled,

The Religion of Protestants,

A

Safe Way to Salvation.

Together with

His NINE SERMONS preached before the King,
or upon eminent Occasions.

His LETTER to Mr. *Lewgar*, concerning the Church of *Rome*'s being the
Guide of Faith and Judge of Controversies.

His Nine Additional Discourses.

And an ANSWER to some Passages in *Rushworth's* Dialogues, concerning
TRADITIONS.

ISAAC. CASAUBON. in Epist. ad Card. PERRON. Regis JACOBI nomine scripta.

Rex arbitrat, rerum absolute necessariarum ad salutem non magnum esse numerum. Quare existimat ejus Majestas, nullam ad ineundam concordiam brevioram viam fore, quam si diligenter separentur necessaria à non necessariis, & ut in necessariis conveniat, omnis opera infumatur: In non necessariis libertati Christianæ locus detur. Simpliciter necessaria Rex appellat, quæ vel expresse verbum Dei præcipit credenda faciendæ, vel ex verbo Dei necessariâ consequentiâ vetus Ecclesia elicit. — Si ad decidendas hodiernas Controversias hæc distinctio adhiberetur, & jus divinum à positivo seu Ecclesiastico candidè separaretur; non videtur de iis quæ sunt absolute necessaria, inter pios & moderatos viros, longa aut acris contentio futura. Nam & pauca illa sunt, ut modò dicebamus, & ferè ex æquo omnibus probantur, qui se Christianos dici postulant. Atque istam distinctionem Sereniss. Rex tanti putat esse momenti ad minuendas Controversias, quæ hodie Ecclesiam Dei tantopere exercent, ut omnium pacis studiosorum judicet officium esse, diligentissime hanc explicare, docere, urgere.

The TENTH EDITION:

*With a PREFACE, giving some Account of the Corrections and Improvements made in
this Impression.*

L O N D O N:

Printed for D. MIDWINTER, A. WARD, J. and P. KNAPTON, T. LONGMAN,
J. OSBORNE, S. AUSTEN, T. ASTLEY, J. WHISTON, C. BATHURST,
J. and H. PEMBERTON, and J. RIVINGTON. M DCC XLII.

*M*Andetur Typis hic Liber, cui Titulus, The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation : In quo nihil occurrit à bonis Moribus, à Doctrina & Disciplina in Ecclesia Anglicana assertis, alienum.

RICH. BAILY Vicecan. Oxon.

*P*Erlegi hunc Librum, cui Titulus est, The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation : In quo nihil reperio Doctrinæ vel Discplinæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ adversum, sed quamplurima quæ Fidem Orthodoxam egregiè illustrant, & adversantia glossemata acutè, perspicuè, & modèstè dissipant.

JO. PRIDEAUX S.T.P. Regius Oxon.

*E*GO Samuel Fell Publicus Theol. Professor in Univer. Oxon. & ordinarius Prælector D. Marg. Comitiss. Richmondia, perlegi Librum, cui Titulus est, The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation : In quo nihil reperio Doctrinæ vel Discplinæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, aut bonis Moribus adversum ; sed multa nervosè & modèstè e ventilata contra Adversarios nostræ Ecclesiæ & Veritatis Catholicæ, quam feliciter tuetur.

Dat. 14 Octob. 1637.

SAM. FELL.



Fiat secunda Editio juxta hoc Exemplar.

Ex Ædib. Londin. Feb. 6, 1637.

SAM. BAKER.

*P*Erlegi hunc Librum, cui Tit. The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation ; item, Novem Conciones nuperrimè additos : In quibus omnibus nihil reperio Doctrinæ vel Discplinæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ contrarium, quo minus cum summa omnium utilitate imprimatur.

Ex Æd. Lambeth,
16 Octob. 1663.

G. STRADLING, S.T.P. Reverendis.
in Christo Pat. D. Gilb. Archiep. Cant.
à Sac. Dom.



T O T H E

Most High and Mighty Prince,

C H A R L E S,

By the Grace of G O D,

K I N G

O F

Great-Britain, France, and Ireland,

Defender of the F A I T H, &c.

May it please Your Most Excellent Majesty,



Present, with all Humility, to Your Most Sacred Hands, a Defence of that Cause, which is, and ought to be infinitely dearer to You, than all the World ; not doubting but upon this Dedication I shall be censured for a double Boldness, both for undertaking so great a Work, so far beyond my weak Abilities ; and again, for Presenting it to such a Patron, whose Judgment I ought to fear more than any Adversary. But for the first, it is a Satisfaction to myself, and may be to others, that I was not drawn to it out of any vain Opinion of myself, (whose personal Defects are the only Thing which

The Epistle Dedicatory.

which I presume to know) but undertook it in Obedience to Him who said, *Tu conversus confirma fratres*, not to St. Peter only, but to all Men : Being encouraged also to it by the Goodness of the Cause, which is able to make a weak Man strong. To the Belief hereof I was not led partially, or by chance, as many are, by the Prejudice and Prepossession of their Country, Education, and such like Inducements ; which, if they lead to Truth in one Place, perhaps lead to Errour in a Hundred ; but having with the greatest Equality and Indifferency, made enquiry and search into the Grounds on both Sides, I was willing to impart to others, that Satisfaction which was given to my self. For my Inscribing to it Your Majesty's Sacred Name, I should labour much in my Excuse of it from high Presumption, had it not some Appearance of Title to Your Majesty's Patronage and Protection, as being a Defence of that Book, which by special Order from Your Majesty was written some Years since, chiefly for the general Good, but peradventure not without some Aim at the Recovery of one of your meanest Subjects from a dangerous Deviation ; and so due unto Your Majesty, as the Fruit of your own High Humility and most Royal Charity. Besides, it is in a manner nothing else but a Pursuance of, and a Superstruction upon that blessed Doctrine, wherewith I have adorned and armed the Frontispiece of my Book, which was so earnestly recommended, by Your Royal Father of happy Memory, to all the Lovers of Truth and Peace ; that is, to all that were like Himself, as the only hopeful Means of healing the Breaches of Christendom, whereof the Enemy of Souls makes such pestilent Advantage. The Lustre of this blessed Doctrine I have here endeavoured to uncloud and unveil, and to free it from those Mists and Fumes which have been raised to obscure it, * by *one of* that Order, which envenoms even Poison itself, and makes the *Roman* Religion much more malignant and turbulent than otherwise it would be : Whose very Rule and Doctrine obliges them to make all Men, as much as lies in them, Subjects unto Kings, and Servants unto Christ, no farther than it shall please the Pope. So that whether Your Majesty be considered, either as a pious Son towards Your Royal Father King *James*, or as a tender-hearted and compassionate Son towards Your distressed Mother, the Catholick Church, or as a King of Your Subjects, or as a Servant unto Christ, this Work (to which I can give no other Commendation, but that it was intended to do you Service in all these Capacities) may pretend, not unreasonably, to Your gracious Acceptance. Lastly, being a Defence of that whole Church and Religion You profess, it could not be so proper to any Patron as to

* By that Order.—*Oxf.*

The Epistle Dedicatory.

the Great Defender of it; which Style Your Majesty hath ever so exactly made good, both in securing it from all Dangers, and in vindicating it (by the well-ordering and rectifying this Church) from all the foul Aspersions both of Domestick and Foreign Enemies, of which they can have no Ground, but* their own Want of Judgment, or Want of Charity. But it is an Argument of a despairing and lost Cause, to support itself with these impetuous Outcries and Clamours, the faint Refuges of those that want better Arguments; like that Stoick in *Lucian*, that cried ὦ κατάρχευ! *O damned Villain!* when he could say nothing else. Neither is it credible the wiser Sort of them should believe this their own horrid Assertion, that a God of Goodness should damn to eternal Torments, those that love Him and love Truth, for Errours which they fall into through Human Frailty! But this they must say, otherwise their only great Argument from their damning us, and our not being so peremptory in damning them, because we hope unaffected Ignorance may excuse them, would be lost: And therefore they are engaged to act on this Tragical Part, to fright the Simple and Ignorant, as we do little Children, by telling them that bites, which we would not have them meddle with. And truly that herein they do but act a Part, and know themselves to do so, and deal with us here, as they do with the King of *Spain* at *Rome*, whom they accurse and excommunicate for Fashion-sake on *Maundy-Thursday*, for detaining Part of *St. Peter's* Patrimony, and absolve him without Satisfaction on *Good-Friday*; methinks their Faltring and Inconstancy herein makes it very apparent: For though for the most part, they speak nothing but Thunder and Lightning to us, and damn us all without Mercy or Exception; yet sometimes, to serve other Purposes, they can be content to speak to us in a milder Strain, and tell us, as my Adversary does more than once, *That they allow Protestants as much Charity, as Protestants allow them.* Neither is this the only Contradiction which I have discovered in this uncharitable Work; but have shewed that, by forgetting himself, and retracting most of the principal Grounds he builds upon, he hath saved me the Labour of a Confutation; which yet I have not in any Place found any such Labour or Difficulty, but that it was undertakable by a Man of very mean, that is, of my Abilities. And the Reason is, because it is Truth I plead for; which is so strong an Argument for itself, that it needs only Light to discover it; whereas it concerns Falshood and Errour to use Disguise and Shadowings, and all the Fetches of Art and Sophistry; and therefore it stands in need of abler Men to give that

* Their own Malice.—Oxf.

The Epistle Dedicatory.

a Colour at least which hath no real Body to subsist by. If my Endeavours in this kind may contribute any thing to this Discovery, and the making plain that Truth (which my Charity perswades me the most Part of them disaffect, only because it hath not been well represented to them) I have the Fruit of my Labour, and my Wish, who desire to live to no other End, than to do Service to God's Church, and Your most Sacred Majesty, in the quality of

Your MAJESTY's

Most faithful Subject,

and most humble,

and devoted Servant,

W. CHILLINGWORTH.

P R E F A C E

TO THE N I N T H E D I T I O N.

THE repeated Complaints in publick Print, as well as in private Conversation, of the very blameable Inconcreteness of most of the foregoing Editions of this Work, having made an exact and careful Review of the Whole absolutely necessary; 'tis thought proper to give an Account, in few Words, what has been done to this Purpose in the Edition now before the Reader.

The Book was first published at Oxford in the Year 1618; and meeting with an extraordinary Reception at its first Appearance, was printed some Months after at London in the same Year. This Second Impression received some Alterations, very probably, from the Hand of the Author, he being then alive. The Third Edition, which was published in 1664, seems to be the last that was printed with any degree of Care; there being in it some small Corrections, which appear to have been made on purpose, and are not improper, though there is no Account given upon what Authority they were made. The succeeding Impressions have no Alterations but what were made for the worse by the Carelessness of the Printers.

From the Three First, therefore, this Edition has been prepared. The Edition of 1664 has been followed in the present, which has been carefully examined and compared with the other two; and the various Readings of these Editions are taken notice of at the bottom of each Page, with the Words Oxf. or Lond. after them. As for such Readers as think these minute Remarks unnecessary, or immaterial; they may please to observe, they are so contrived, as neither to disturb the Sense, nor increase the Bulk or Price of the Book. And those who are desirous to see this Work as compleat and perfect as can be, may conclude, from these nice Corrections, which they will see interspersed every where through the Book, that the Whole has been collated with all possible Application, and that no Pains or Industry has been wanting to do Justice to a Work so truly valuable.

The Book of Charity Maintained by Catholicks has been also compared with like Diligence with the first Edition, published by Mr. Knot himself; it being plain, from the sincere and generous Temper of Mr. Chillingworth, that his Desire and Endeavour was, That his Adversary might be used with all Candour and fair Dealing, and that his Arguments might be set in a proper Light.

And lastly, the Sermons and Additional Discourses are printed from the best Editions of those Pieces; the former, from that printed in 1684; the latter, from that in 1688, which was the first Time these last were made publick.

Upon the Whole, as it has been entrusted to an experienced and careful Hand to correct the Sheets from the Press, who has used a more than ordinary Application on his part, 'tis hoped that, abating a very few Typographical Errors, which the best Performances from the Press are not without, the Reader will here meet with what the Undertaker proposed, a Genuine, Correct, and Beautiful Edition of the Works of Mr. Chillingworth.

The annexed Subscription to the XXXIX Articles of Religion of the Church of England, added to Mr. Chillingworth's known Reputation for Veracity and Christian Sincerity, is an abundant Evidence, that upon Motives of Conscience only, he join'd as heartily with our Church in disowning the Unitarian Principles, as in condemning the Errors of the Church of Rome.

Extract from the Register of the Church of Salisbury.

Ego Gulielmus Chillingworth, Clericus, in Artibus Magister, ad Cancellariatum Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Beatæ Mariæ, Sarum, una cum Præbendâ de Brinsworth alias Bricklesworth in Comitatu Northampton, Petriburgensis Dioceseos, in eadem Ecclesia fundatâ, & eidem Cancellariatui annexâ, admittendus & instituendus, omnibus hisce Articulis & singulis in eisdem contentis volens & ex animo subscribo, & consensum meum præbeo, 20^o die Julii, 1638.

Gulielmus Chillingworth.

That is in English :

I William Chillingworth, Clerk, M. A. to be admitted to the Chancellorship of the Cathedral Church of Sarum, &c. do willingly and heartily subscribe these Articles, and every Thing contained in them, and do give my Consent thereto.

William Chillingworth.


A D V E R T I S E M E N T

Concerning this TENTH EDITION.

IN this Edition We have now first added the LIFE of our Celebrated AUTHOR, carefully collected from the best Authorities, with a History of the Controversies he was engaged in : By the Rev. Mr. BIRCH. His Letters, which have hitherto been improperly omitted, are inserted : So that We can now assure the Reader, he has a compleat Collection of Mr. Chillingworth's WORKS.

September 1, 1742.

The



The CONTENTS of the Chapters, with the Answers thereunto.

THE Author of Charity Maintained, his Preface to the Reader, Page 27
The Answer to the Preface, 34

The FIRST PART.

CHAP. I. *THE State of the Question; with a Summary of the Reasons for which,*
among Men of different Religions, one Side only can be saved, 49

ANSWER I. *Shewing, that the Adversary grants the former Question, and pro-*
poseth a New one: And that there is no Reason why, among Men of different
Opinions and Communions, one Side only can be saved, 53

CHAP. II. *What is that Means, whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to*
our Understanding, and which must determine Controversies in Faith and Religion, 64

ANSWER II. *Concerning the Means, whereby the revealed Truths of God are con-*
veyed to our Understanding, and which must determine Controversies in Faith and
Religion, 78

CHAP. III. *That the Distinction of Points fundamental and not fundamental, is*
neither pertinent, nor true in our present Controversy: And that the Catholick vi-
sible Church cannot err, in either kind of the said Points, 131

ANSWER III. *Wherein is maintained, That the Distinction between Points fun-*
damental and not fundamental, is in this present Controversy good and pertinent:
And that the Catholick Church may err in the latter kind of the said Points, 145

CHAP. IV. *To say, that the Creed contains all Points necessary to be believed, is*
neither pertinent to the Question in Hand, nor in itself true, 188

ANSWER IV. *Wherein is shewed, that the Creed contains all necessary Points of*
meer Belief, 199

CHAP. V. *That Luther, Calvin, their Associates, and all who began or continue*
the Separation from the external Communion of the Roman Church, are guilty of
the proper, and formal Sin of Schism, 231

ANSWER V. *The Separation of Protestants from the Roman Church, being upon*
just and necessary Causes, is not any way guilty of Schism, 260

CHAP. VI. *That Luther and the rest of the Protestants have added Heresy unto*
Schism, 305

ANSWER VI. *That Protestants are not Hereticks,* 323

CHAP. VII. *In regard of the Precept of Charity towards one's self, Protestants are*
in a State of Sin, as long as they remain separate from the Roman Church, 360

ANSWER VII. *That Protestants are not bound by the Charity which they owe to*
themselves, to reunite themselves to the Roman Church, 367

The CONCLUSION. 384



T H E L I F E O F

Mr. William Chillingworth.



MR. *William Chillingworth* was Son of *William Chillingworth*, Citizen, and afterwards Mayor of *Oxford*, and was born in *St. Martin's* Parish in that City, in *October* 1602, and on the last of that Month received Baptism there (a). *William Laud*, afterwards Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and then Fellow of *St. John's College*, and Master of Arts (b), was his Godfather (c). He became a Scholar of *Trinity College* under the Tuition of Mr. *Robert Skinner*, on the 2d of *June*, 1618, being then about two Years standing in the University (d). *June* the 28th, 1620, he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts (e), and *March* the 16th, 1623-4, that of Master (f), and, *June* the 10th, 1628, became Fellow of his College (g). "He was then, says Mr. *Wood*, (h) observ'd to "be no Drudge at his Study, but being a Man of great Parts would do much in a "little Time, when he settled to it." He did not confine his Studies to Divinity, but applied himself with great Success to Mathematicks; and what shews the Extent of his Genius, he was esteem'd likewise a good Poet, in which Capacity he is mention'd by Sir *John Suckling* in his *Sessions of the Poets* (i). His intimate Friends were Sir *Lucius Cary*, afterwards Lord Viscount *Falkland*; Mr. *John Hales* of *Eaton*, &c. but more particularly Mr. *Gilbert Sheldon*, who succeeded Dr. *Juxon* in the See of *Canterbury* (k). The Study and Conversation of the University Scholars at that time turned chiefly upon the Controversies between the Church of *England*, and that of *Rome*; and the great Liberty, which had been allow'd the Popish Missionaries in the End of the Reign of King *James I.* being continued under King *Charles I.* upon the Account of his Marriage with *Henrietta*, Daughter to *Henry IV.* of *France* (l), there was among them a famous Jesuit, who went under the Name of *John Fisher*, tho' his true Name was *John Perse*, or *Percey* (m), and was very busy in making Converts, particularly at *Oxford*; and attacking Mr. *Chillingworth* upon the Necessity of an infallible living Judge in Matters of Faith, the latter forsook the Communion of the Church of *England*, and with an incredible Satisfaction of Mind embrac'd the *Romish* Religion (n), and soon after wrote the following Letter to his Friend Mr. *Gilbert Sheldon* (o).

(a) *Wood*, Athen. Oxon. Vol. II. Col. 40. 2d Edit. Lond. 1721. (b) Diary of Archbishop *Laud*, publish'd by Mr. *H. Wharton*, p. 1, 2. (c) *Wood*, ubi supra, col. 42. (d) Id. col. 40. (e) Id. Fasti Oxon. Vol. I. col. 215. (f) Id. ibid. col. 226. (g) *Wood*, Athen. Oxon. Vol. II. col. 40. (h) Ibid. (i) *Fragmenta aurea*. A Collection of all the incomparable Pieces written by Sir *John Suckling*, p. 7. Edit. London 1646. (k) *Des Maizeaux's* Historical and Critical Account of the Life and Writings of *William Chillingworth*, p. 3. Edit. London 1725, in Octavo. (l) Id. ibid. (m) See *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu: A Nathaniële Sotwello ejusdem Societatis Presbytero*, p. 487, 488. Edit. Romæ 1676. (n) *Wood*, Athen. Oxon. Vol. II. col. 40. (o) *Des Maizeaux*, ubi supra, p. 7.

“ Good Mr. Sheldon,

“ PARTLY mine own Necessities and Fears, and partly Charity to some others, have drawn me out of *London* into the Country. One particular Cause, and not the least, was the News of your Sickneſs, which had I found it had continued with you with any Danger, no Danger of my own ſhould have kept me from you. I am very glad to hear of your Recovery, but ſorry, that your Occaſions do draw you ſo ſuddenly to *London*. But, I pray, leave a Direction with *Charles Green*, where you may be ſpoke with, and how I may ſend to you; and you ſhall very ſhortly hear further from me. Mean while let me intreat you to conſider moſt ſeriously of theſe two Quæries:

“ I. Whether it be not evident from Scripture, and Fathers, and Reason; from the Goodneſs of God, and the Neceſſity of Mankind, that there muſt be ſome one Church infallible in Matters of Faith?

“ II. Whether there be any other Society of Men in the World, beſides the Church of Rome, that can upon good Warrant, or indeed at all, challenge to itſelf the Privilege of Infallibility in Matter of Faith?

“ When you have applied your moſt attentive Conſideration upon theſe Queſtions, I do aſſure myſelf your Reſolution will be affirmative in the firſt, and negative in the ſecond. And then the Concluſion will be, that you will approve and follow the Way, wherein I have had the Happineſs to enter before you; and ſhould think it infinitely increaſed, if it would pleaſe God to draw you after.

“ I reſt your aſſured Friend, &c.”

Mr. Fiſher, in order to ſecure his Conqueſt, perſuaded Mr. Chillingworth to go over to the College of the Jeſuits at *Doway*; and the latter was deſired to ſet down in writing the Motives or Reaſons, which had engag'd him to embrace the *Romiſh* Religion. But Dr. William Laud, then Biſhop of *London*, hearing of this Affair, and being extremely concerned at it, wrote to him; and Mr. Chillingworth's Answer expreſſing a great deal of Moderation, Candor, and Impartiality, that Prelate continued to correſpond with him, preſſing him with ſeveral Arguments againſt the Doctrine and Practice of the *Romaniſts*. This ſet Mr. Chillingworth upon a new Inquiry, which had the deſired Effect. But the Place, where he was not being ſuitable to the State of a free impartial Inquirer, he reſolv'd to come back to *England*, and left *Doway* in 1631, after a ſhort Stay there (p). Upon his Return to *England* he was receiv'd with great Kindneſs and Affection by Biſhop Laud, who approv'd of his Deſign of retiring to *Oxford*, (of which, that Prelate was then Chancellor,) in order to complete the important Work, in which he was engag'd, a free Inquiry into Religion. At laſt, after a thorough Examination, the Proteſtant Principles appearing to him the moſt agreeable to the Holy Scripture and Reason, he declared for them; and about the Year 1634 wrote a Confutation of the Motives, which had induced him to go over to the Church of *Rome*. This Paper is now loſt. It is true, we have a Paper of his on the ſame Subject, firſt publiſh'd in 1687, in the *Additional Diſcourſes of Mr. Chillingworth*; but it ſeems to be written upon ſome other Occaſion, probably at the Deſire of ſome of his Friends (q).

As in his forſaking the Church of *England*, as well as in his Return to it, he was ſolely influenc'd by a ſincere Love of Truth, ſo he conſtantly perſeверed in that excellent Temper of Mind; and even after his Return to Proteſtantiſm, he made no Scruple to examine the Grounds of it, as appears by a Letter of his to Dr. Sheldon, containing ſome Scruples he had about leaving the Church of *Rome*, and returning to the Church of *England*. Theſe Scruples, which he freely declared to his Friends, ſeem to be the occaſion of a groundleſs Report, that he had turned Papiſt a ſecond Time, and then Proteſtant again (r).

His returning to the Proteſtant Religion making a great deal of Noiſe, he was engag'd in ſeveral Diſputes with thoſe of the *Romiſh* Religion, and particularly with Mr. John Lewgar, Mr. John Floyd, a Jeſuit, who went under the Name of *Daniel*, or *Dan. à Jeſu* (s), and Mr. White, Author of the *Dialogues* publiſh'd under the Name of *Ruſſiworth*, with whom, at the Deſire of Lord George Digby, afterwards Earl of *Briſtol*, he had a Conference at the Lodgings of Sir

(p) Id. ibid. p. 9. See likewiſe The Hiſtory of the Troubles and Tryal of William Laud, &c. publiſh'd by Mr. H. Wharton, p. 227. and Wood, Athen. Oxon. Vol. II. col. 40. (q) Des Maizeaux, ubi ſupra, p. 13.—17. (r) Id. ibid. p. 18. and Remark [F.] (s) Id. ibid. p. 39, 40.

Kenelm Digby, a late Convert to the Church of *Rome* (t). But in 1635 he was engag'd in a Work, which gave him a far greater Opportunity to confute the Principles of that Church, and to vindicate the Protestant Religion, upon the following Occasion. A Jesuit, who went by the Name of *Edward Knott*, tho' his true Name was *Matthias Wilson* (u), had publish'd in 1630, in Octavo, a little Book, called, *Charity mistaken, with the Want whereof Catholickes are unjustly charged, for affirming, as they do with Grief, that Protestancy unrepented destroyes Salvation*. This was answered by Dr. *Christopher Potter*, Provost of *Queen's-College* in *Oxford*; and his answer came out in 1633 with this Title; *Want of Charitie justly charged on all such Romanists, as dare (without Truth or Modesty) affirme, That Protestancie destroyeth Salvation. In answer to a late Popish Pamphlet, intituled, Charity Mistaken, &c.* The Jesuit replied in 1634 under this Title; *Mercy and Truth, or Charity maintayned by Catholiques. By way of Reply upon an Answer lately framed by D. Potter to a Treatise, which had formerly proved, that Charity was mistaken by Protestants; with the Want whereof Catholiques are unjustly charged for affirming, that Protestancy unrepented destroyes Salvation. Devided into two Parts.* Mr. *Chillingworth* undertaking to answer that Reply, and Mr. *Knott* being informed of his Design, resolved to prejudice the Publick both against our Author and his Book, in a Libel, intituled, *A Direction to be observ'd by N. N. if hee meane to proceede in answering the Booke, intituled, Mercy and Truth, or Charity maintained by Catholickes, &c.* printed in 1636, in 8vo. pagg. 42. *Permissu Superiorum*. In this Piece he represents Mr. *Chillingworth*, as a *Socinian*; whose Answer was very near finish'd in the Beginning of the Year 1637; and having been examin'd, at Archbishop *Laud's* Request, by Dr. *John Prideaux*, afterwards Bishop of *Worcester*, Dr. *Richard Baylie*, Vice-Chancellor of the University of *Oxford*, and Dr. *Samuel Fell*, Lady *Margaret's* Professor of Divinity, it was published with their Approbation in the latter End of that Year, with this Title; *The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation: Or an Answer to a Booke, intituled, Mercy and Truth, or Charity maintained by Catholiques. Which pretends to prove the contrary. By William Chillingworth, Master of Arts of the University of Oxford.* This Book was received with a general Applause; and, what perhaps never happen'd to any other controversial Work of that Bulk, two Editions were publish'd within less than five Months. On the other hand, Mr. *Knott* seeing, that he had not been able to deter our Author from publishing his Answer, tried once more to prejudice the Public against it; wherein he was seconded by some Jesuits. For in 1638, Mr. *Knott* publish'd a Pamphlet, intituled, *Christianity maintained: or, A Discovery of sundry Doctrines tending to the Overthrowe of the Christian Religion, contain'd in the Answer to a Book, intituled, Mercy and Truth; or, Charity maintayned by Catholiques*; printed at *St. Omers*, in 4to. pagg. 86. In this Piece (w) he promises a larger Volume in Answer to Mr. *Chillingworth*. To this Pamphlet is subjoin'd a little Piece under the Title of *Motives maintained: Or, A Reply unto Mr. Chillingworth's Answer to his owne Motives of his Conversion to the Catholicke Religion*. The next Pamphlet against our Author was likewise printed at *St. Omers* in 1638, in 4to. pagg. 193, with this Title; *The Church Conquerant over human Wit; Or, The Churches Authority demonstrated by M. William Chillingworth (the Proctour for Wit against her) his perpetual Contradictions in his Booke, intituled, The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation*. The Author was a Jesuit, called *John Floyd*, who in 1639, publish'd likewise another Piece, in 4to. pagg. 104, intituled, *The totall Summe: Or, No Danger of Damnation unto Roman Catholiques for any Errors in Faith; nor any Hope of Salvation for any Sectary whatsoever, that doth knowingly oppose the Doctrine of the Roman Church. This is proved by the Confessions and Saying of Mr. Chillingworth his Booke*. The third Pamphlet, which appeared against Mr. *Chillingworth*, was printed in 1639, most probably at *St. Omers*, in 4to. pagg. 158, and intituled, *The Judgment of an University-Man concerning M. William Chillingworth his late Pamphlet, in Answer to Charity maintayned*. It was written by Mr. *William Lacy*, a Jesuit. To this Piece is subjoin'd another, intituled, *Heautomachia. Mr. Chillingworth against himself*, pagg. 46. It hath no Title Page, nor Preface, being the Sequel of the other, and printed at the same time. The Style is also the same. In 1652, nine Years after our Author's Death, Mr. *Knott* publish'd a large Answer to him, intituled, *Infidelity unmasked: Or, The Confutation of a Booke publish'd by Mr. William*

(t) Id. p. 40, 41, 42, 43, and Letters between the Lord *George Digby*, and Sir *Kenelm Digby*, Knt. concerning Religion, p. 84, 85. Edit. London 1651. (u) Bibliotheca Patrum Societatis Jesu, p. 185. (w) Preface, p. 11.

Chillingworth, under this Title, The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation; printed at Ghent, in 4to. pagg. 949, besides the Preface and Index.

While Mr. Chillingworth was employ'd in the excellent Work above-mention'd, he wrote a Letter to one of his Friends, who had desired to know, what Judgment might be made of Arianism from the Sense of Antiquity. It is without Date; and the Cover being lost, it doth not appear, to whom it was written. The Original is in the Library of the Royal Society, and is as follows.

“ Deare Harry,

“ I Am very sorry it was my ill Fortune not to see thee, the Day that I went out of Oxford; otherwise I should have thank'd thee very heartily for the Favour thou didst the Night before, especially for Mr. Coventry's Company and Discourse, whose excellent Witt I doe very much admire; and had I so much Interest in him as you have, I should desire him often (though I hope I need not) to remember what our Saviour sayes, *To whom much is given, of them much shall be required.*

“ Mr. Taylour did much confirme my Opinion of his Sufficiency; but let mee tell you in your Eare, meethinkes he wants much of the Ethicall Part of a Discourser, and flights too much many Times the Arguments of those he discourses with. But this is a Fault he would quickly leave, if he had a Friend, that would discreetly tell him of it. If you or Mr. Coventry would tell him, that you heard one, that knowes him, magnifye him exceedingly for other Thinges, but censure him for this, you might doe him a very freindly Office; and my writing to you thus much gives you Grownd enough to say so truely. But you must not give the least Suspicion, that I am the Man, and therefore not doe it yet a good while.

“ When Dr. Sheldon comes to Oxford, I will be there againe, and then will be very ready to doe any Service in the Businesse you imparted to mee.

“ I was mistaken in my directing you to Eusebius for the matter you wott of. You shall find it in a Witnesse much farther from Exception herein then Eusebius, even Athanasius himselve, the greatest Adversary of that Doctrine, and Hilary, who was his second. See the first in *Ep. de Synodis Arim. & Seleuc. p. 917. D. Tom I. Edit. Paris. 1627.* See the second *de Synodis, Fol. 97.* In the first you shall find, that the eighty Fathers, which condemned Samosatenus, affirm'd expressely, that *the Sonne is not of the same Essence of the Father*; which is to contradict formally the Councell of Nice, which decreed *the Sonne co-essentiall to the Father.* In the second you shall find these Wordes to the same Purpose, *Octoginta Episcopi olim respuerunt ad Homousion.* See also, if you please, *Iustin. cont. Tryph. P. 283, 356, 357.* Tertull. against Praxeas, c. 9. Novatian *de Trinit. in fine*, who is joyn'd with Tertullian. Athanas. *Ep. de Fide Dion. Alex. T. I. p. 551. Basil, T. II. p. 802, 803, edit. Paris. 1618.* See St. Hierom, *Apol. 2. cont. Ruffinum, T. II. p. 329. Paris 1579.* See Petavius upon Epiph. his *Panar. ad Hæ. 69, quæ est Arii, p. 285*; and consider how well he cleares Lucian the Martyr from Arianisme, and what he there confesses of all the antient Fathers.

“ If you could understand French, I would referre to Perron, p. 633, of his Reply to King James, where you should find these Wordes: *If a Man should demand of an Arrian, if he would submit to the Judgment of the Church of the Ages præcedent to that of Constantine and Marcian, he would make no Difficulty of it, but would presse himselve, that the Controversye might be decided by that little, which remaines to us of the Authors of that Time. For an Arrian would find in Irenæus, Tertullian, and others, which remaine of those Ages, that the Sonne is the Instrument of the Father; that the Father commanded the Sonne in the Works of Creation; that the Father and the Sonne are aliud & aliud; which Thinges he that should now hold, now when the Language of the Church is more ex-amin'd, would be esteem'd a very Arrian.*

“ If you reade Bellarmine touching this matter, you should find, that he is troubled exceedingly to find any tolerable Glosses for the Speeches of the Fathers before the Councell of Nice, which are against him; and yet he conceales the strongest of them; and to counterpoyse them, cites Authors, that have indeed ancient Names, but such, whom he himselve has stigmatiz'd for spurious, or doubtfull, in his Book *de Script. Eccles.*

“ Were I at Leysure, and had a little longer Time, I could referre you to some, that acknowledge Origen's Judgment to be also against them in this Matter. And Fisher
“ in

“ in his *Answer* to Dr. White's *nine Questions* (a), has a Place almost Parallel to that above cited out of *Perron*.

“ In a Word, whosoever shall freely and impartially consider of this Thing, and how on the other Side the ancient Fathers Weapons against the *Arrians* are in a Manner onely Places of Scripture, (and those now for the most part discarded as impertinent and unconcluding,) and how in the Argument drawne from the Authority of the ancient Fathers, they are almost alwayes Defendants, and scarce ever Opponents; he shall not choose but confesse, or at least be very inclinable to beleieve, that the Doctrine of *Arrius* is eyther a Truth, or at least no damnable Hæresy.

“ But the Carryer stayes for my Letter, and I have now no more Time than to adde, that I am thy very true and loving Freind, &c.

“ See *Facundus Hermianensis*, lib. 10. c. 15. Remember alwayes the Wordes of our Saviour, *If you will doe the Will of my Father, you shall know of the Doctrine, whether it be of God.*

“ If you can send me Mr. *Diggse's* Speech. I prythee goe to Dr. *Littleton*, and desire him to send mee all that he has of *Vorstius*. For in the Epistles of his, which I borrowed of him, he referres mee to some other Bookes of his, which I shall have especiall Occasion to use; especially his Booke against *Pistorius* the Jesuit.”

In the Year 1635, Sir *Thomas Coventry*, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, offering Mr. *Chillingworth* some Preferment, he refused to accept it, on Account of his Scruples with regard to the Subscription to the XXXIX Articles of the Church of *England* (b); and wrote a Letter upon this Subject to Dr. *Sheldon*. Mr. *Des Maizeaux* observes (c), that he had two Transcripts of it, one of which (that hath a Postscript) was communicated to him by Dr. *White Kennet*, Lord Bishop of *Peterborough*, to which, and to the Copy of the other Letter of Mr. *Chillingworth*, upon his going over to the Romish Religion, his Lordship had subjoin'd the following Memorandum: “ To the Copies of these two Letters to Mr. *Gilbert Sheldon*, and Dr. *Sheldon*, Mr. *Wharton*, who procured the Transcripts, gave this Attestation under his own Hand, *Ex Autographis Literis penes Danielelem Sheldon Armigerum, Archiepiscopi Nepotem.*” It is dated from *Tew* (d), *Septemb. 21*, 1635. and directed to the right worshipfull, and his much honoured Friend Dr. *Sheldon*, and is as follows, with the various Readings of the other Transcript communicated to Mr. *Des Maizeaux*, noted in the Margin.

“ Good Dr. *Sheldon*,

“ I Do here send you News, as unto my best Friend, of a great and happy Victory, which at length, with extream Difficultie, I have scarcely obtained over the onely Enemie, that can hurt me, that is, my selfe.

“ Sir, so it is, that though I am in Debt to your selfe and others of my Friends above twenty Pounds more than I know how to pay; though I am in Want of many Conveniences; though in Danger of falling into a chronicall Infirmitie of my Body; though in another Thing, which you perhaps guesse at what it is, but I will not tell you, which would make more joyfull of Preferment than all these Things, (if I could come honestly by* it,) though Money comes to me from my Father's* to Purse like Blood from his Veins, or from his Heart; though I am very sensible, that I have been too long already an unprofitable Burden to my Lord, and must not still continue so; though my refusing Preferment may perhaps (which Fear, I assure you, does much afflict me) be injurious to my Friends and intimate Acquaintance, and prejudicial to them in the Way of theirs; though Conscience of my own good Intention and Desire § suggests unto me many flattering Hopes of great Possibilitie † of doing God and his Church Service, if I had the Preferment, which I may fairly hope for; though I may justly fear, that by refusing those Preferments, which I sought for, I shall gain the Reputation of Weaknesse and Levity, and incur their Displeasure, whose good Opinion of me, next to God's Favour, and my own good Opinion of my selfe, I do esteem and desire above all Things: though all these, and many other *terribiles visu formæ*, have represented themselves to my Imagination in the most hideous Manner that may be; yet I am at length firmly and unmoveably resolved, if I can have no Preferment without *Subscription*, that I neither can, nor will have any.

“ For this Resolution I have but one Reason against a thousand Temptations to the contrary; but it is *ἐν μέγα*, against which if all the little Reasons in the World were put in the Ballance, they would be lighter than Vanity. In brief, this it is; as long as I keep that modest and humble Assurance of God's Love and Favour, which

(a) P. 106, 107. (b) *Des Maizeaux*, ubi supra, p. 58, &c. (c) P. 86. (d) In *Oxfordshire*, the Seat of *Lucius*, Lord Viscount *Falkland*.

“ I now enjoy, and wherein I hope I shall be daily more and more confirmed ; so
 “ long, in Despite of all the World, I may, and shall, and will be happy. But if
 “ I once lose this, though all the World should conspire to make me happy, I shall
 “ and must be extremely miserable. Now this inestimable Jewel, if I subscribe (with-
 * as “ out such a Declaration as will make* the Subscription no Subscription,) I shall wittingly,
 makes. “ and willingly, and deliberately throw away. For though I am very well persuaded
 “ of you and my other Friends, who do so with a full Perswasion, that you may do it
 “ lawfully ; yet the Case stands so with me, and I can see no Remedy but for ever it
 “ will do so, that if I subscribe, I subscribe my own Damnation. For though I do verily
 “ believe the Church of *England* a true Member of the Church ; that she wants nothing
 “ necessary to Salvation, and holds nothing repugnant to it ; and had thought, that to
 “ think so had sufficiently qualified me for a Subscription ; yet now I plainly see, if I
 “ will not juggle with my Conscience, and play with God Almighty, I must forbear.
 “ For, to say nothing of other Things, which I have so well consider’d, as not to
 “ be in a State to sign them, and yet no so well as to declare myself against them ;
 “ two Points there are, wherein I am fully resolved, and therefore care not who
 “ knows my Mind. One is, that to say, the fourth Commandment is a Law of
 “ God appertaining to Christians is false and unlawfull. The other, that the damning
 “ Sentences in *St. Athanasius’s* Creed (as we are made to subscribe it) are most false,
 “ and also in a high Degree presumptuous and schismaticall. And therefore I can
 † to these “ neither subscribe, that these Things are agreeable † to the Word of God, seeing I believe
 things as “ they are certainly repugnant to it ; nor that the whole *Common Prayer is lawful to be*
 agreeable. “ *used*, seeing I believe these Parts of it certainly unlawfull ; nor promise, that I *myself*
 § I now “ *will use it*, seeing I never intend either to read these Things, which I have now § ex-
 have. “ cepted against, or to say *Amen* to them.
 “ I shall not need to intreat you, not to be offended with mee for this my most ho-
 “ nest, and (as I very believe) most wise Resolution ; hoping rather, you will do your
 “ Endeavour, that I may neither be honest at so dear a Rate, as the Losse of Pre-
 “ ferment, nor buy Preferment at so much dearer a Rate, the Losse of Honesty.
 “ I think myselfe happy, that it pleased God, when I was resolved to venture upon
 “ a Subscription without full Assurance of the Lawfulness of it, to cast in my Way
 “ two unexpected Impediments to divert me from accomplishing my Resolution. For
 “ I profess unto you, since I entertained it, I have never enjoyed quiet Day nor Night,
 “ till now that I have rid myself of it again. And I plainly perceive, that if I had
 “ swallowed this Pill, howsoever guilded over with Glosses and Reservations, and
 “ wrapt up in Conserves of good Intentions and Purposes ; yet it would never have
 “ agreed nor stay’d with me, but I would have cast it up again, and with it whatso-
 “ ever Preferment I should have gain’d with it as the Wages of Unrighteousness ;
 “ which would have been a great Injury to you and to my Lord Keeper. Whereas
 “ now *res est integra* ; and he will not loose the Gift of any Preferment by bestowing
 “ it on mee, nor have any Engagement to Mr. *Andrewes* for me.
 * howso- “ But however* this would have succeeded, in case I had then subscribed, I thank
 ever. “ God, I am now so resolved, that I will never do that while I am living and in
 “ Health, which I would not do, if I were dying ; and this I am sure I would not do.
 “ I would never do any Thing for Preferment, which I would not do but for Pre-
 || never so. “ ferment ; and this, I am sure, I should not do. I will never|| undervalue the
 “ Happiness, which God’s Love brings to mee with it, as to put it to the least Ad-
 “ venture in the World, for the gaining of any worldly Happiness. I remember ve-
 “ ry well, *querite primum regnum Dei, & cetera omnia adjicientur tibi* : and therefore
 † whenso- “ whenever † I make such a preposterous Choice, I will give you leave to think I am
 ever. “ out of my Wits, or do not believe in God, or at least am so unreasonable, as to do
 “ a Thing, in Hope I shall be sorry for it afterwards, and wish it undone.
 “ It cannot be avoided, but my Lord of *Canterbury* must come to know this my Re-
 “ solution ; and, I think, the sooner the better. Let me entreat you to acquaint him
 “ with it, (if you think it expedient ;) and let me hear from you as soon as possibly
 “ you can. But when you write, I pray remember, that my foregoing Preferment
 § being in “ (in this § State wherein I am) is Grief enough to me ; and do not you add to
 this. “ it, by being angry with mee for doing that, which I must do, or be miserable.
 “ I am your most loving and true Servant, &c.
 “ So much of my Defence of Dr. *Potter* as I have done, I intend to review and
 “ perfect before I proceed, and, if it shall be thought fit, to publish it, annexing
 “ a Discourse to this Effect, that if this be answered, all the rest is so ; which by
 “ the strict Dependence of that which follows on that which goes before, I shall
 “ be able very easily to demonstrate.

“ Direct

“ Direct your Letters to me at my Father’s House in Oxford, and it will be sufficient.
 “ I am sorry to hear, that Mr. Craven continues ill still. I fear he is in more Danger than he imagines. Pray, if you can see him, send me word how he does”

Dr. Sheldon’s Answer to this Letter of Mr. Chillingworth has not yet been discovered; but by a Paper containing the Heads or Hints of another Answer of his to our Author, it appears, that there passed several Letters between them on that Subject; some for greater Secrecy, written in a third Person. For Mr. Chillingworth being intent upon a full Inquiry into the Sense of the Articles, every new Examination afforded him new Scruples. Dr. Sheldon’s Paper is as follows (e)

“ God forbid I should persuade any to do against his Conscience: be it in itself good or bad, it must be a Sin to lie.

“ It was in a third Person; else I would not have told you what I did.

“ I must deal plainly with you, I am much afraid it will ruin you here, and not advantage you at the last Day.

“ I put not the Title of Conscience upon an Humour of Contradiction.

“ Accordinge] if not against, For ’tis according to Scripture, that the Church hath Power to establish Ceremonie or Doctrine, if Occasion require, not against the Scripture.

“ The End of these general Forms of Peace, if capable of any Construction, lies against the Papists.

“ No Evangelical Counsels, as the Papists, such as presuppose a fulfilling of the Law, and going beyond it, to satisfy and merit for us, that’s according to Scripture.

“ In this Sense the Article condemns them. Consider it well.

“ No such offering of Christ in the Scripture, where you will find it once afford for all: in that Manner they did it, against whom the Article was framed; taken with all aggravating Circumstances of Corporal Presence, as if another Satisfaction for Sin: the Consequences, which may be drawn from Transubstantiation, amount to little less than Blasphemy.

“ Works done by bare Nature are not meritorious *de congruo*: Nature of Sin they must have, if Sin be in them; and so it is, for *malum ex qualibet causa*. Unless a downright Pelagian, you may give it a fayre, and safe, and true Interpretation.

“ Upon these Reasons, I presume, did that Reverend Prelate Andrews, and that learned Mountague subscribe, when they publicly taught *Evangelical Counsels* in their Writings. What you have sent to me in a third Person, &c. Be not forward, nor possessed with a Spirit of Contradiction. Thus you may——”

However at last Mr. Chillingworth surmounted his Scruples; and being promoted to the Chancellorship of the Church of Sarum, July the 20th, 1638, with the Prebend of Brixworth in Northamptonshire annexed to it, he complied with the usual Subscription.

About the same Time he was appointed Master of Wigston’s Hospital in Leicester; both which, says Mr. Wood (f), and perhaps other Preferments, he kept to his dying Day”. In 1640, he was deputed by the Chapter of Salisbury for their Proctor in Convocation. In 1642, he was put into the Roll with some others by his Majesty to be created Doctor of Divinity; but he came not to take that Degree, nor was he diplomated (g). At the Siege of Gloucester, begun August the 10th, 1643, he was in the King’s Army before that City; and observing, that they wanted Materials to carry on the Siege, he suggested the making of some Engines after the Manner of the Roman *Testudines cum pluteis*, in order to storm the Place (h). That Siege being raised by the Earl of Essex, and the War continuing with great Vigour on each Side, the King appointed the Lord Hopton General of his Troops in the West, who forced Arundel-Castle in Sussex to surrender: but that Castle was retaken by Sir William Waller, and Mr. Chillingworth among the rest made Prisoner of War, who out of Respect to my Lord Hopton “ had accompanied him in that March, and being indisposed by the “ terrible Coldness of the Season, chose to repose himself in that Garrison, till the “ Weather should mend (i)”. Mr. Chillingworth’s Illness increased to such a Degree, that not being able to go to London with the Garrison, he was convey’d to Chichester; which Favour he obtained at the Request of his great Adversary, Mr. Francis Cheynell, a bigotted Presbyterian Divine, who accidentally met him in Arundel-Castle, and frequently visited him at Chichester till he died. He hath given us an Account of our Author’s Sicknefs, and his own Behaviour towards him in a Book, printed at London

(e) Des Maizeaux, *ubi supra*, p. 103, 104. (f) Athen. Oxon. Vol. II. Col. 42. (g) Id. Fasti Oxon. Vol. II. Col. 30. (h) Rushworth, Histor. Collect. Vol. II. Part 3. ad ann. 1643. Tom. IV. p. 288, 289. (i) Clarendon, History of the Rebellion, B. VIII. Tom. IV. p. 472, 473.

1644, in 4to, intitled, *Chillingworthi novissima, or the Sicknesse, Heresy, Death, and Buriall of William Chillingworth, (in his own Phrase) Clerk of Oxford, and in the Conceit of his Fellow Souldiers the Queen's Arch-Engineer and Grand Intelligencer. Set forth in a Letter to his eminent and learned Friends; a Relation of his Apprehension at Arundell; a Discovery of his Errours in a briefe Catechisme; and a short Oration at the Buriall of his hereticall Book.* By Francis Cheynell, late Fellow of Merton Colledge. Published by Authority. Mr. Chillingworth died about January 30th, 1643-4, and was interr'd in the Cathedral of Chichester.

Besides his Works printed in this Volume, he wrote several other Pieces, not yet publish'd, which were among the Manuscripts of Mr. Henry Wharton, bought by Dr. Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, and presented to the Lambeth Library; some of which have been mentioned above. I shall give an Account of them all from the Catalogue of those Manuscripts drawn up by Mr. Wharton himself, who observes (k); that the Volume mark'd M. is *Volumen Chartaceum* in fol, containing *A Collection of Papers formerly belonging to Archbishop Laud, many of them wrot with his own Hand, but most of them endorſed with his Hand; together with some Papers of the Archbishops Sheldon and Sancroft, and many of Mr. Chillingworth.* And after having set down Part of the Contents of that Volume, he adds, *Several Papers of Mr. William Chillingworth, viz.*

Mr. Peake's five Questions proposed to Mr. Chillingworth about the Nature of Faith, and the Resolution and Consequence of the Faith of Protestants.

Mr. Chillingworth's Answer to Mr. Peake's Questions: first Draught imperfect.

Mr. Chillingworth's Answer to the same: being compleat and perfect.

The Beginning of a Treatise against the Scots, by Mr. Chillingworth.

Passages extracted out of the Declarations of the Scots, by Mr. Chillingworth.

Observations upon the Scottish Declaration, by Mr. Chillingworth.

A Treatise of the Unlawfulness of resisting the lawful Prince, although most impious, tyrannical, and idolatrous, by Mr. Chillingworth.

A Letter of Mr. Chillingworth excusing his writing against the Rebels (l).

Notes of Mr. Chillingworth concerning God's universal Mercy in calling Men to Repentance.

A problematical Tentamen of Mr. Chillingworth against punishing Crimes with Death in Christian Societies (m): Cancelled.

A Letter of Mr. J. to Mr. Chillingworth of the Imperfection of Naturall Religion and Reason, without the Assistance of Revelation: wrot 1637.

A short Discourse of the Nature of Faith; by Mr. Chillingworth.

A larger Discourse of the Nature of Faith; by Mr. Chillingworth.

Of the Absurdity of departing from the Church of England, for want of Succession of visible Professors in all Ages; by Mr. Chillingworth.

A brief Answer to several Texts of Scripture alledged to prove the Church to be one, visible, universal, perpetual, and infallible; by Mr. Chillingworth.

A Letter of Dr. Sheldon to Mr. Chillingworth, to satisfy his Scruples about subscribing (n).

Letter of Mr. Chillingworth to Dr. Sheldon, containing some Scruples about leaving the Church of Rome, and returning to the Church of England.

Letter of Mr. Chillingworth to Dr. Sheldon, containing his Scruples about Subscription, and the Reason of them (o).

Archbishop Tillotson (p) styles our Author incomparable, and the Glory of his Age and Nation; and Mr. Locke recommends the reading of his *Religion of Protestants* in several of his Works; and particularly in a Piece, containing *some Thoughts concerning Reading and Study for a Gentleman (q)*, wherein after having observ'd, that the Art of Speaking well consists chiefly in two Things, viz. Perspicuity and right Reasoning, and propos'd Dr. Tillotson as a pattern for the Attainment of the Art of Speaking clearly, he adds; " Besides Perspicuity, there must be also right Reasoning, without which Perspicuity serves but to expose the Speaker. And for attaining of this I should propose the constant reading of *Chillingworth*, who by his Example will teach both Perspicuity, and the Way of right Reasoning, better than any Book that I know; and therefore will deserve to be read upon that Account over and over again; not to say any Thing of his Argument."

(k) Catalogus MSS. Hen. Wharton, in Biblioth. Lambeth. ad Vol. M. (l) Printed in Mr. Des Maizeaux's Life of Mr. Chillingworth, p. 300. (m) This Paragraph is razed out in the Catalogue. (n) This Paragraph is razed out in the Catalogue. (o) This Letter hath been inserted above. (p) Sermons on various Occasions, publish'd by Dr. Ralph Barker, Vol. XII. Sermon VI. en Hebr. XI. 6. p. 167, 168. (q) A Collection of several Pieces of Mr. John Locke, never before printed, or not extant in his Works, p. 234, 235.

An ANSWER to the SECOND CHAPTER.

Concerning the Means, whereby the revealed Truths of God are conveyed to our Understanding; and which must determine Controversies in Faith and Religion.



D. § 1. He that would usurp an absolute Lordship and Tyranny over any People, need not put himself to the Trouble and Difficulty of abrogating and disannulling the Laws, made to maintain the common Liberty; for he may frustrate their Intent, and compass his own Design as well, if he can get the Power and Authority to interpret them as he pleases, and add to them what he pleases, and to have his Interpretations and Additions stand for Laws; if he can rule his People by his Laws, and his Laws by his Lawyers. So the Church of Rome, to establish her Tyranny over Mens Consciences, needed not either to abolish or corrupt the Holy Scriptures, the Pillars and Supporters of Christian Liberty; (which in regard of the numerous Multitudes of Copies dispersed through all Places, translated into almost all Languages, guarded with all solicitous Care and Industry, had been an impossible Attempt:) But the more expedite Way, and therefore more likely to be successful, was, to gain the Opinion and Esteem of the *publick and authoriz'd Interpreter* of them, and the Authority of adding to them what Doctrine she pleased, under the Title of *Traditions* or *Definitions*. For by this Means, she might both serve her self of all those Clauses of Scripture, which might be drawn to cast a favourable Countenance upon her ambitious Pretences, which in case the Scripture had been abolished she could not have done; and yet be secure enough of having either her Power limited, or her Corruptions and Abuses reformed by them; this being once settled in the Minds of Men, that *unwritten Doctrines, if proposed by her, were to be received with equal Reverence to those that were written*; and that *the Sense of Scripture was not that which seemed to Mens Reason and Understanding to be so, but that which the Church of Rome should declare to be so, seemed it never so unreasonable and incongruous*. The Matter being once thus ordered, and the holy Scriptures being made in effect not your Directors and Judges (no farther than you please) but your *Servants* and *Instruments*, always press'd and in Readiness to advance your Designs, and disabled wholly with Minds so qualified to prejudice or impeach them; it is safe for you to put a Crown on their Head, and a Reed in their Hands, and to bow before them, and cry, *Hail King of the Jews!* to pretend a great deal of *Esteem, and Respect, and Reverence* to them, as here you do. But to little purpose is verbal Reverence without entire Submission and sincere Obedience; and, as our Saviour said of some, so the Scripture, could it speak, I believe would say to you, *Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not that which I command you?* Cast away the vain and arrogant Pretence of *Infallibility*, which makes your Errors incurable. Leave picturing God, and worshipping him by Pictures. *Teach not for Doctrine the Commandments of Men*. Debar not the Laity of the Testament of Christ's Blood. Let your publick Prayers and Psalms, and Hymns, be in such Language as is for the Edification of the Assistants. Take not from the Clergy that Liberty of Marriage which Christ hath left them. Do not impose upon Men that *Humility of worshipping Angels* which St. Paul condemns. Teach no more proper Sacrifices of Christ but one. Acknowledge them *that die in Christ to be blessed, and to rest from their Labours*. Acknowledge the Sacrament after Consecration, to be Bread and Wine, as well as Christ's Body and Blood. Acknowledge the Gift of Continency without Marriage, not to be given to all.

Let

Let not the Weapons of your Warfare be carnal, such as are Massacres, Treasons, Persecutions, and, in a word, all Means either violent or fraudulent: These and other Things, which the Scripture commands you, do, and then we shall willingly give you such Testimony as you deserve; but 'till you do so, to talk of *Estimation, Respect and Reverence to the Scripture*, is nothing else but Talk.

2. For neither is that true which you pretend, *That we possess the Scripture from you, or take it upon the Integrity of your Custody*; but upon *Universal Tradition*, of which you are but a little Part. Neither, if it were true that Protestants acknowledged *the Integrity of it to have been guarded by your alone Custody*, were this any Argument of your Reverence towards them. For first, you might preserve them entire, not for Want of Will, but of Power to corrupt them, *as it is a hard Thing to poison the Sea*. And then having prevailed so far with Men, as either not to look at all into them, or but only through such Spectacles as you should please to make for them, and to see nothing in them, though as clear as the Sun, if it any way made against you; you might keep them intire, without any Thought or Care to conform your Doctrine to them, or reform it by them (which were indeed to reverence the Scriptures;) but, out of a Perswasion, that you could qualify them well enough with your Glosses and Interpretations, and make them sufficiently conformable to your present Doctrine, at least in their Judgment, who were prepossessed with this Perswasion, that *your Church was to judge of the Sense of Scripture, not to be judged by it*.

3. For, whereas you say, *No Cause imaginable could avert your Will, from giving the Function of supreme and sole Judge to holy Writ; but that the Thing is impossible, and that by this Means Controversies are increased and not ended*; you mean perhaps — *That you can or will imagine no other Cause but these*. But sure there is little Reason you should measure other Men's Imaginations by your own, who perhaps may be so clouded and veiled with Prejudice, that you cannot, or will not see that which is most manifest. For what indifferent and unprejudicate Man may not easily conceive another Cause which (I do not say does, but certainly) may pervert your Wills, and avert your Understandings from submitting your Religion and Church to a *Trial by Scripture*? I mean the great, and apparent, and unavoidable Danger which by this Means you would fall into, of losing the Opinion which Men have of your Infallibility, and consequently your Power and Authority over Men's Consciences, and all that depends upon it. So that though *Diana of the Ephesians* be cried up, yet it may be feared that with a great many among you (though I censure or judge no Man) the other Cause which wrought upon *Demetrius* and the *Craftsmen*, may have with you also the more effectual, though more secret Influence; and that is, that *by this Craft we have our Living*; by this Craft, I mean, of keeping your Profelytes from an indifferent Trial of your Religion by Scripture, and making them yield up and captivate their Judgment unto yours. Yet had you only said *de facto*, that no other Cause did avert your own Will from this, but only these which you pretend, out of Charity I should have believed you. But seeing you speak not of your self, but of all of your Side, whose Hearts you cannot know; and profess not only, that there is no other Cause, but that *No other is imaginable*, I could not let this pass without a Censure. As for the Impossibility of Scriptures being the sole Judge of Controversies, that is *the sole Rule for Men to judge them by* (for we mean nothing else) you only affirm it without Proof, as if the Thing were evident of it self, and therefore I, conceiving the contrary to be more evident, might well content my self to deny it without Refutation: Yet I cannot but desire you to tell me, if Scripture cannot be the Judge of any Controversy, how shall that touching the *Church and the Notes of it* be determined? And if it be the sole Judge of this one, why may it not of others? Why not of All? those only excepted, wherein the Scripture it self is the Subject of the Question, which cannot be determined but by natural Reason, the only Principle, beside Scripture, which is common to Christians.

4. Then

4. Then for the Imputation of *increasing Contentions and not ending them*, Scripture is innocent of it; as also this Opinion, *That Controversies are to be decided by Scripture*. For if Men did really and sincerely submit their Judgments to Scripture, and that only, and would require no more of any Man but to do so, it were impossible but that all Controversies touching Things necessary and very profitable should be ended; and if others were continued or increased, it were no Matter.

5. In the next Words we have direct *Boys Play*, a Thing given with one Hand, and taken away with the other; an Acknowledgment made in one Line, and retracted in the next. *We acknowledge [say you] Scripture to be a perfect Rule, forasmuch as a Writing can be a Rule; only we deny that it excludes unwritten Tradition*. As if you should have said, we acknowledge it to be as perfect a Rule as Writing can be; only we deny it to be as perfect a Rule as a Writing may be. Either therefore you must revoke your Acknowledgment, or retract your Retraction of it; for both cannot possibly stand together. For if you will stand to what you have granted, that *Scripture is as perfect a Rule of Faith as a Writing can be*; you must then grant it both so compleat, that it needs no Addition, and so evident, that it needs no Interpretation: For both these Properties are requisite to a *perfect Rule*, and a Writing is capable of both these Properties.

6. That both these Properties are requisite to a *perfect Rule*, it is apparent; because that is not perfect in any kind which wants some Parts belonging to its Integrity; as, he is not a perfect Man that wants any Part appertaining to the Integrity of a Man; and therefore that which wants any Accession to make it a perfect Rule, of it self is not a perfect Rule. And then, the End of a *Rule* is to regulate and direct. Now every Instrument is more or less perfect in its kind, as it is more or less fit to attain the End for which it is ordained: But nothing obscure or unevident while it is so, is fit to regulate and direct them to whom it is so: Therefore, it is requisite also to a *Rule* (so far as it is a Rule) to be evident; otherwise indeed it is no *Rule*, because it cannot serve for direction. I conclude therefore, that both these Properties are required to a perfect *Rule*: Both to be so compleat as to need no Addition; and to be so evident as to need no Interpretation.

7. Now that a Writing is capable of both these Perfections, it is so plain, that I am even ashamed to prove it. For he that denies it, must say, that *something may be spoken which cannot be written*. For if such a compleat and evident Rule of Faith may be delivered by word of mouth, as you pretend it may, and is; and whatsoever is delivered by word of mouth, may also be written; then such a compleat and evident Rule of Faith may also be written. If you will have more Light added to the Sun, answer me then to these Questions; Whether your Church can set down in writing all these, which she pretends to be divine unwritten Traditions, and add them to the Verities already written? And, Whether she can set us down such Interpretations of all Obscurities in the Faith as shall need no farther Interpretations? If she cannot, then she hath not that Power, which you pretend she hath, of being an *Infallible Teacher of all divine Verities*, and an infallible Interpreter of Obscurities in the Faith: For she cannot teach us all divine Verities, if she cannot write them down; neither is that an Interpretation which needs again to be interpreted. If she can, let her do it, and then we shall have a Writing, not only capable of, but actually endowed with both these Perfections, of being both so compleat as to need no Addition, and so evident as to need no Interpretation. Lastly, whatsoever your Church can do or not do, no Man can, without Blasphemy, deny that *Christ Jesus*, if he had pleased, could have writ us a Rule of Faith so plain and perfect, as that it should have wanted neither any Part to make up its Integrity, nor any Clearness to make it sufficiently intelligible. And if Christ could have done this, then the Thing might have been done; a Writing there might have been, endowed with both these Properties.

Thus

Thus therefore I conclude; a Writing may be so perfect a Rule, as to need neither Addition nor Interpretation: But the *Scripture you acknowledge a perfect Rule, forasmuch as a Writing can be a Rule*, therefore it needs neither Addition nor Interpretation.

8. You will say, that *though a Writing be never so perfect a Rule of Faith, yet it must be beholden to Tradition to give it this Testimony, that it is a Rule of Faith, and the Word of God.* I answer: First there is no absolute Necessity of this, for God might, if he thought good, give it the Attestation of perpetual Miracles. Secondly, that it is one Thing to be a perfect Rule of Faith, another to be proved so unto us. And thus though a Writing could not be proved to us to be a perfect Rule of Faith, by its own saying so, for nothing is proved true by being said or written in a Book, but only by Tradition, which is a Thing credible of it self: Yet it may be so in it self, and contain all the material Objects, all the particular Articles of our Faith, without any Dependence upon Tradition; even this also not excepted, that *this Writing doth contain the Rule of Faith.* Now when Protestants affirm against Papists, that *Scripture is a perfect Rule of Faith*, their Meaning is not, that by Scripture all Things absolutely may be proved, which are to be believed: For it can never be proved by Scripture to a Gainsayer, that there is a God, or that the Book called Scripture is the Word of God; for he that will deny these Assertions when they are spoken, will believe them never a whit the more, because you can shew them written: But their Meaning is, that the Scripture, to them which presuppose it Divine and a Rule of Faith, as Papists and Protestants do, contains all the material Objects of Faith, is a compleat and total, and not only an imperfect and a partial Rule.

9. *But every Book and Chapter, and Text of Scripture is infallible, and wants no due Perfection, and yet excludes not the Addition of other Books of Scripture: Therefore the Perfection of the whole Scripture excludes not the Addition of unwritten Tradition.* I answer: Every Text of Scripture, though it hath the Perfection belonging to a Text of Scripture, yet it hath not the Perfection requisite to a *perfect Rule of Faith*; and that only is the Perfection which is the Subject of our Discourse. So that this is to abuse your Reader with the Ambiguity of the Word *perfect*. In effect, as if you should say, a Text of Scripture may be a perfect Text, though there be others beside it; therefore the whole Scripture may be a perfect Rule of Faith, though there be other Parts of this Rule, besides the Scripture, and though the Scripture be but a Part of it.

10. The next Argument to the same purpose is, for Sophistry, Cousin-german to the former, *When the first Books of Scripture were written, they did not exclude unwritten Traditions: Therefore now also, that all the Books of Scripture are written, Traditions are not excluded.* The Sense of which Argument (if it have any) must be this, when only a Part of the Scripture was written, then a Part of the Divine Doctrine was unwritten: Therefore now when all the Scripture is written, yet some Part of the Divine Doctrine is yet unwritten. If you say, your Conclusion is not that it is so, but without Disparagement to Scripture, may be so; without Disparagement to the Truth of Scripture, I grant it; but without Disparagement to the Scripture's being a *perfect Rule*, I deny it. And now the Question is not of the Truth, but the Perfection of it, which are very different Things, though you would fain confound them. For Scripture might very well be all true, though it contain not all necessary Divine Truth. But unless it do so, it cannot be a *perfect Rule of Faith*; for that which wants any thing is not perfect. For, I hope, you do not imagine, that we conceive any Antipathy between God's Word written and unwritten, but that both might very well stand together. All that we say is this, that we have Reason to believe that God, *de facto*, hath ordered the Matter so, that all the Gospel of Christ, the whole Covenant between God and Man, is now written. Whereas if he had pleased, he might have so disposed it, that Part might have been written, and Part unwritten; but then he would have

taken order, to whom we should have had recourse for that Part of it which was not written; which seeing he hath not done (as the Progress shall demonstrate) it is evident he hath left no Part of it unwritten. We know no Man therefore that says, it were any Injury to the written Word to be joined with the unwritten, if there were any wherewith it might be joined; but that we deny. The Fidelity of a Keeper may very well consist with the Authority of the Thing committed to his Custody. But we know no one Society of Christians that is such a faithful Keeper as you pretend. The Scripture it self was not kept so faithfully by you, but that you suffered infinite Variety of Readings to creep into it; all which could not possibly be Divine, and yet, in several Parts of your Church, all of them, until the last Age, were so esteemed. The Interpretations of obscure Places of Scripture, which without question the Apostles taught the Primitive Christians, are wholly lost; there remains no Certainty scarce of any one. Those *Worlds of Miracles* which our Saviour did, which were not written, for want of Writing are vanished out of the Memory of Men: And many profitable Things which the Apostles taught and writ not, as that which St. Paul glanceth at in his *second Epistle to the Thessalonians*, of the *Cause of the Hinderance of the Coming of Antichrist*, are wholly lost and extinguished; so unfaithful or negligent hath been this Keeper of Divine Verities, whose Eyes, like the Keeper's of *Israel* [you say] have *never slumbered nor slept*. Lastly, we deny not but a Judge and a Law might well stand together, but we deny that there is any such Judge of God's Appointment. Had he intended any such Judge, he would have named him, lest otherwise (as now it is) our *Judge of Controversies* should be our greatest Controversy.

11. *Ad. §. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.* In your second Paragraph, you sum up those Arguments wherewith you intend to prove that *Scripture alone cannot be Judge in Controversies*: Wherein I profess unto you before-hand, that you will fight without an Adversary. For though Protestants, being warranted by some of the Fathers, have called Scripture the *Judge of Controversy*; and you, in saying, here, that Scripture *alone* cannot be Judge, imply that it may be called in some sense a Judge, though not alone: Yet to speak properly (as Men should speak when they write of Controversies in Religion) the Scripture is not a Judge of Controversies, but *a Rule only, and the only Rule for Christians to judge them by*. Every Man is to judge for himself with the *Judgment of Discretion*, and to choose either his Religion first, and then his Church, as we say; or, as you, his Church first, and then his Religion. But, by the Consent of both Sides, every Man is to judge and choose; and the Rule whereby he is to guide his Choice, if he be a natural Man, is Reason; if he be already a Christian, Scripture; which we say is the Rule to judge Controversies by. Yet not all simply, but all the Controversies of Christians, of those that are already agreed upon this first Principle, that *the Scripture is the Word of God*. But that there is any Man, or any Company of Men appointed to be Judge for all Men, that we deny; and that I believe you will never prove. The very Truth is, we say no more in this Matter, than Evidence of Truth hath made you confess in plain Terms in the Beginning of this Chapter; *viz. That Scripture is a perfect Rule of Faith forasmuch as a Writing can be a Rule*. So that all your Reasons, whereby you labour to dethrone the Scripture from this Office of *judging*, we might let pass as impertinent to the Conclusion which we maintain, and you have already granted; yet out of Courtesy we will consider them.

12. Your first is this: *A Judge must be a Person fit to end Controversies; but the Scripture is not a Person, nor fit to end Controversies, no more than the Law would be without the Judges; therefore though it may be a Rule, it cannot be a Judge*. Which Conclusion I have already granted: Only my Request is, that you will permit Scripture to have the Properties of a Rule, that is, to be fit to direct every one that will make the best Use of it, to that End for which it was ordained: And that is as much as we need desire. For, as if I were to

go a Journey, and had a Guide which could not err, I needed not to know my Way; so on the other side, if I know my Way, or have a plain Rule to know it by, I shall need no Guide. Grant therefore Scripture to be such a Rule, and it will quickly take away all Necessity of having an infallible Guide. But *without a living Judge it will be no fitter [you say] to end Controversies, than the Law alone to end Suits.* I answer, if the Law were plain and perfect, and Men honest and desirous to understand aright, and obey it, he that says it were not fit to end Controversies, must either want Understanding himself, or think the World wants it. Now the *Scripture*, we pretend, *in Things necessary is plain and perfect*; and Men, we say, are obliged under pain of Damnation, to seek the true Sense of it, and not to wrest it to their pre-conceived Fancies. Such a Law therefore to such Men, cannot but be very fit to end all Controversies necessary to be ended. For others that are not so, they will end when the World ends, and that is Time enough.

13. Your next Encounter is with them, who acknowledging the Scripture a Rule only and not a Judge, make the Holy Ghost, speaking in Scripture, the Judge of Controversies. Which you disprove, by saying, *That, the Holy Ghost speaking only in Scripture, is no more intelligible to us, than the Scripture in which he speaks.* But by this Reason, neither the Pope, nor a Council can be a Judge neither. For first, denying the Scriptures, the Writings of the Holy Ghost, to be Judges, you will not, I hope, offer to pretend, that their Decrees, the Writings of Men, are more capable of this Function; the same Exceptions at least, if not more, and greater lying against them as do against Scripture. And then what you object against the Holy Ghost, speaking in Scripture, to exclude him from this Office, the same I return upon them and their Decrees, to debar them from it; that they speaking unto us only in their Decrees, are no more intelligible than the Decrees in which they speak. And therefore if the Holy Ghost speaking in Scripture may not be a Judge for this Reason; neither may they, speaking in their Decrees, be Judges for the same Reason. *If the Pope's Decrees [you will say] be obscure, he can explain himself; and so the Scripture cannot.* But the Holy Ghost, that speaks in Scripture, can do so, if he please; and when he is pleased, will do so. In the mean time, it will be fit for you to wait his Leisure, and to be content, that those Things of Scripture which are plain should be so, and those which are obscure should remain obscure, until he please to declare them. Besides, he can (which you cannot warrant me of the Pope or a Council) speak at first so plainly, that his Words shall need no farther Explanation; and so in Things necessary we believe he hath done. And if you say, *The Decrees of Councils touching Controversies, though they be not the Judge, yet they are the Judge's Sentence*: So I say the Scripture, though not the Judge, is the Sentence of the Judge. When therefore you conclude, *That to say a Judge is necessary for deciding Controversies about the Meaning of Scripture, is as much as to say, He is necessary to decide what the Holy Ghost speaks in Scripture*: This I grant is true; but I may not grant that a Judge (such an one as we dispute of) is necessary either to do the one, or the other. For if the Scripture (as it is in Things necessary) be plain, why should it be more necessary to have a Judge to interpret it in plain Places, than to have a Judge to interpret the Meaning of a Council's Decrees, and others to interpret their Interpretations, and others to interpret theirs, and so on for ever? And where they are not plain, there if we, using Diligence to find the Truth, do yet miss of it and fall into Error, there is no Danger in it. They that err, and they that do not err, may both be saved. So that those Places, which contain Things necessary, and wherein Errors were dangerous, need no infallible Interpreter, because they are plain; and those that are obscure need none, because they contain not Things necessary, neither is Error in them dangerous.

13. *The Law-maker speaking in the Law*, I grant it, *is no more easily understood than the Law it self*; for his Speech is nothing else but the Law: I grant

it very necessary, that besides the Law-maker speaking in the Law, there should be other Judges to determine Civil and Criminal Controversies, and to give every Man that Justice which the Law allows him. But your Argument drawn from hence to shew a Necessity of a visible Judge in Controversies of Religion, I say is Sophistical ; and that for many Reasons.

14. First, Because the Variety of civil Cases is infinite, and therefore there cannot be possibly Laws enough provided for the Determination of them ; and therefore there must be a Judge to supply, out of the Principles of Reason, the Interpretation of the Law, where it is defective. But the Scripture [we say] is a perfect Rule of Faith, and therefore needs no Supply of the Defects of it.

15. Secondly, To execute the Letter of the Law, according to Rigour, would be many Times unjust, and therefore there is need of a Judge to moderate it ; whereof in Religion there is no Use at all.

16. Thirdly, In Civil and Criminal Causes the Parties have for the most Part so much Interest, and very often so little Honesty, that they will not submit to a Law, though never so plain, if it be against them ; or will not see it to be against them, though it be so never so plainly ; whereas if Men were honest, and the Law were plain and extended to all Cases, there would be little Need of Judges. Now in Matters of Religion, when the Question is, whether every Man be a fit Judge and Chooser for himself, we suppose Men honest, and such as understand the Difference between a Moment and Eternity. And such Men we conceive, will think it highly concerns them to be of the true Religion, but nothing at all that this or that Religion should be the true. And then we suppose that all the necessary Points of Religion are plain and easy, and consequently every Man in this Cause to be a competent Judge for himself ; because it concerns himself to judge right as much as eternal Happiness is worth. And if through his own Default he judge amiss, he alone shall suffer for it.

17. Fourthly, in civil Controversies we are obliged only to external passive Obedience, and not to an internal and active. We are bound to obey the Sentence of the Judge, or not to resist it, but not always to believe it just : But, in Matters of Religion, such a Judge is required whom we should be obliged to believe to have judged aright. So that in civil Controversies every honest understanding Man is fit to be a Judge ; but in Religion none but he that is infallible.

18. Fifthly, In civil Causes there is Means and Power, when the Judge hath decreed, to compel Men to obey his Sentence ; otherwise, I believe Laws alone would be to as much Purpose for the ending of Differences, as Laws and Judges both. But all the Power in the World is neither fit to convince, nor able to compel a Man's Conscience to consent to any Thing. Worldly Terror may prevail so far as to make Men profess a Religion which they believe not, (such Men I mean, who know not that there is a Heaven provided for Martyrs, and a Hell for those that dissemble such Truths as are necessary to be professed :) But to force, either any Man to believe what he believes not, or any honest Man to dissemble what he does believe, (if God commands him to profess it,) or to profess what he does not believe, all the Powers in the World are too weak, with all the Powers of Hell to assist them.

19. Sixthly, In civil Controversies the Case cannot be so put, but there may be a Judge to end it, who is not a Party ; in Controversies of Religion, it is in a Manner impossible to be avoided, but the Judge must be a Party. For this must be the first, whether he be a Judge or no, and in that he must be a Party. Sure I am, the Pope, in the Controversies of our Time, is a chief Party ; for it highly concerns him, even as much as his Popedom is worth, not to yield any one Point of his Religion to be erroneous. And he is a Man subject to like Passions with other Men : And therefore we may justly decline his Sentence, for fear temporal Respects should either blind his Judgment, or make him pronounce against it.

20. Seventhly,

20. Seventhly, In civil Controversies, it is impossible *Titius* should hold the Land in question and *Sempronius* too; and therefore either the Plaintiff must injure the Defendant, by disquieting his Possession, or the Defendant wrong the Plaintiff by keeping his Right from him. But in Controversies of Religion, the Case is otherwise. I may hold my Opinion, and do you no wrong; and you your's, and do me none: Nay, we may both of us hold our Opinion, and yet do our selves no Harm; provided the Difference be not touching any thing necessary to Salvation, and that we love Truth so well, as to be diligent to inform our Conscience, and constant in following it.

21. Eighthly, For the deciding of civil Controversies, Men may appoint themselves a Judge: But in Matters of Religion, this Office may be given to none but whom God hath designed for it; who doth not always give us those Things which we conceive most expedient for our selves.

22. Ninthly and lastly, for the ending of civil Controversies, who does not see, it is absolutely necessary, that not only Judges should be appointed, but that it should be known and unquestioned who they are? Thus all the Judges of our Land are known Men, known to be Judges, and no Man can doubt or question, but these are the Men. Otherwise, if it were a disputable Thing, who were these Judges, and they had no certain Warrant for their Authority, but only some topical Congruities; would not any Man say, such Judges, in all likelihood, would rather multiply Controversies than end them? * So likewise if our Saviour, the King of Heaven, had intended, that all Controversies in Religion should be by some visible Judge finally determined, who can doubt, but in plain Terms he would have expressed himself about this Matter? He would have said plainly, *The Bishop of Rome I have appointed to decide all emergent Controversies*; for that our Saviour designed the *Bishop of Rome* to this Office, and yet would not say so, nor cause it to be written ----*ad rei memoriam*---- by any of the *Evangelists* or *Apostles*, so much as once; but leave it to be drawn out of uncertain Principles, by thirteen or fourteen more uncertain Consequences, he that can believe it, let him.

23. All these Reasons, I hope, will convince you, that though we have, and have great Necessity of, Judges in Civil and Criminal Causes; yet you may not conclude from thence, that there is any publick authorized Judge to determine Controversies in Religion, nor any Necessity there should be any.

24. *But the Scripture stands in need of some watchful and unerring Eye to guard it, by means of whose assured Vigilancy, we may undoubtedly receive it sincere and pure.* Very true; but this is no other than the watchful Eye of Divine Providence; the Goodness whereof will never suffer, that the Scripture should be depraved, and corrupted, but that in them should be always extant a conspicuous and plain Way to eternal Happiness. Neither can any thing be more palpably inconsistent with his Goodness, than to suffer Scripture to be undiscernably corrupted in any Matter of moment, and yet to exact of Men the Belief of those Verities, which without their Fault, or Knowledge, or Possibility of Prevention, were defaced out of them. So that God requiring of Men to believe Scripture in its Purity, engages himself to see it preserved in sufficient Purity; and you need not fear but he will satisfy his Engagement. You say, *We can have no Assurance of this, but your Church's Vigilancy.* But if we had no other, we were in a hard Case; for, who could then assure us, that your Church hath been so vigilant, as to guard Scripture from any the least Alteration? there being various Lectons in the ancient Copies of your Bibles. What Security can your new-raised *Office of Assurance* give us, that the Reading is true, which you now receive, and that false, which you reject? Certainly, they that anciently received and made use of these divers Copies, were not all guarded by the Church's Vigilancy from having their Scripture altered from the Purity of the Original in

* In the *Oxford* Edition, what proceeds of this Paragraph, is made the 21st, and the 21st here, together with what followeth of this, and all the 23d, are made the 22d Paragraph: But in the 2d Edition, printed at *London*, it is placed as here.

many Places. For of different Readings, it is not in Nature impossible, that all should be false; but more than one cannot possibly be true. Yet the Want of such a Protection, was no hindrance to their Salvation; and why then shall having of it be necessary for ours? But then, this Vigilancy of your Church, what Means have we to be ascertained of it? First, the Thing is not evident of it self; which is evident, because many do not believe it: Neither can any thing be pretended to give Evidence to it, but only some Places of Scripture; of whose Incorruption more than any other, what is it that can secure me? If you say the Church's Vigilancy, you are in a Circle, proving the Scriptures uncorrupted by the Church's Vigilancy, and the Church's Vigilancy by the Incorruption of some Places of Scripture, and again the Incorruption of those Places by the Church's Vigilancy. If you name any other Means, then that Means which secures me of the Scriptures Incorruption in those Places, will also serve to assure me of the same in other Places. For my part, abstracting from Divine Providence, which will never suffer the Way to Heaven to be blocked up, or made invisible; I know no other Means (I mean, no other natural and rational Means) to be assured hereof, than I have, that any other Book is uncorrupted. For though I have a greater Degree of rational and human Assurance of that than this, in regard of divers Considerations, which makes it more credible, *That the Scripture hath been preserved from any material Alteration*; yet my Assurance of both is of the same Kind and Condition; both Moral Assurances, and neither Physical nor Mathematical.

25. To the next Argument the Reply is obvious: *That though we do not believe the Books of Scripture to be canonical, because they say so*, (for other Books that are not canonical may say they are, and those that are so, may say nothing of it:) yet we believe not this upon the Authority of your Church, but upon the Credibility of *Universal Tradition*, which is a Thing *credible of it self*, and therefore fit to be rested on; whereas the Authority of your Church is not so. And therefore your Rest thereon is not rational, but meerly voluntary. I might as well rest upon the Judgment of the next Man I meet, or upon the Chance of a Lottery for it. For by this Means I only know I might err, but by relying on you, I know I should err. But yet (to return you one Suppose for another) suppose I should for this and all other Things submit to her Direction, how could she assure me, that I should not be misled by doing so? She pretends indeed Infallibility herein; but how can she assure us, that she hath it? What, by Scripture? That you say cannot assure us of its own Infallibility, and therefore not of yours. What then, by Reason? That you say, may deceive in other Things, and why not in this? How then will she assure us hereof? By saying so? Of this very Affirmation there will remain the same Question still, how can it prove it self to be infallibly true? Neither can there be an end of the like multiplied Demands, 'till we rest in something evident of it self, which demonstrates to the World that this Church is infallible. And seeing there is no such Rock for the Infallibility of this Church to be settled on, it must of necessity, like the Island of *Delos*, float up and down for ever. And yet upon this Point, according to Papists, all other Controversies in Faith depend.

26. To the 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, §. The Sum and Substance of the Ten next Paragraphs is this, *That it appears by the Confessions of some Protestants, and the Contentions of others, that the Questions about the Canon of Scripture, what it is; and about the various Readings and Translations of it, which is true, and which not; are not to be determined by Scripture, and therefore that all Controversies of Religion are not decidable by Scripture.*

27. To which I have already answered, saying, that when Scripture is affirmed to be the Rule by which all Controversies of Religion are to be decided; those are to be excepted out of this Generality, which are concerning the Scripture it self; for as that general Saying of Scripture, *He hath put all Things under his Feet*, is most true; though yet St. Paul tells us, *That when it is said, he hath put all Things under him, it is manifest he is excepted who did put all Things under him*:

him: So when we say, that all Controversies of Religion are decidable by the Scripture, it is manifest to all, but Cavillers, that we do, and must except from this Generality, those which are *touching the Scripture it self*. Just as a Merchant shewing a Ship of his own, may say, all my Substance is in this Ship; and yet never intend to deny, that his Ship is Part of his Substance, nor yet to say, that his Ship is in it self. Or as a Man may say, that a whole House is supported by the Foundation, and yet never mean to exclude the Foundation from being a Part of the House, or to say, that it is supported by it self. Or, as you your selves use to say, that the Bishop of *Rome* is the Head of the whole Church, and yet would think us but captious Sophisters, should we infer from hence, that either you made him no Part of the Whole, or else made him Head of himself. Your Negative Conclusion therefore, that these *Questions touching Scripture, are not decidable by Scripture*, you needed not have cited any Authorities, nor urged any Reason to prove it; it is evident of it self, and I grant it without more ado. But your Corollary from it, which you would insinuate to your unwary Reader, *That therefore they are to be decided by your, or any Visible Church*, is a meer Inconsequence, and very like his Collection, who because *Pamphilus* was not to have *Glycerium* for his Wife, presently concluded that he must have her; as if there had been no more Men in the World but *Pamphilus* and himself. For so you, as if there were nothing in the World capable of this Office, but the Scripture, or the present Church; having concluded against Scripture, you conceive, but too hastily, that you have concluded for the Church. But the Truth is, neither the one nor the other have any thing to do with this Matter. For first, the Question, *whether such or such a Book be Canonical Scripture*, though it may be decided negatively out of Scripture, by shewing apparent and irreconcilable Contradictions between it and some other Book confessedly Canonical; but affirmatively it cannot, but only by the Testimonies of the Ancient Churches; any Book being to be received as undoubtedly Canonical, or to be doubted of as uncertain, or rejected as Apochryphal, according as it was received, or doubted of, or rejected by them. Then for the Question, *Of various Readings which is the true?* It is in Reason evident, and confessed by your own Pope, that there is no possible Determination of it, but only by Comparison with ancient Copies. And lastly, for Controversies about different Translations of Scripture, the Learned have the same Means to satisfy themselves in it, as in the Questions which happen about the Translation of any other Author; that is, Skill in the Language of the Original, and comparing Translations with it. In which Way, if there be no Certainty, I would know what Certainty you have, that your *Doway* Old, and *Rhemish* New Testament, are true Translations? And then for the unlearned, those on your Side are subject to as much, nay, the very same Uncertainty with those on ours. Neither is there any Reason imaginable, why an ignorant *English* Protestant may not be as secure of the Translation of our Church, that it is free from Error, if not absolutely, yet in Matters of moment, as an ignorant *English* Papist can be of his *Rhemish* Testament, or *Doway* Bible. The best Direction I can give them, is to compare both together, and where there is no real Difference (as in the Translation of controverted Places I believe there is very little) there to be confident, that they are right; where they differ, there to be prudent in the choice of the Guides they follow. Which Way of proceeding, if it be subject to some possible Error, yet it is the best that either we or you have; and it is not required, that we use any better than the best we have.

28. You will say, *Dependence on your Church's Infallibility is a better*. I answer, it would be so, if we could be infallibly certain, that your Church is infallible, that is, if it were either evident of it self, and seen by its own Light, or could be reduced unto, and settled upon some Principle that is so. But seeing you your selves do not so much as pretend to enforce us to the Belief hereof, by any Proofs infallible and convincing; but only to induce us to it, by such as are, by your Confession, only probable and *prudential Motives*; certainly it will
be

be to very little purpose, to put off your Uncertainty for the first Turn, and to fall upon it at the second; to please your selves in building your House upon an imaginary Rock, when you your selves see and confess, that this very Rock stands it self at the best but upon a Frame of Timber. I answer secondly, that this cannot be a better Way, because we are infallibly certain, that your Church is not infallible, and indeed hath not the real Prescription of this Priviledge, but only pleaseth her self with a false Imagination and vain Presumption of it; as I shall hereafter demonstrate by many unanswerable Arguments.

29. Now seeing I make no Scruple or Difficulty to grant the Conclusion of this Discourse, that *These Controversies about Scripture, are not decidable by Scripture*; and have shew'd, that your Deduction from it, that *therefore they are to be determined by the Authority of some present Church*, is irrational and inconsequent; I might well forbear to tire my self with an exact and punctual Examination of your Premisses *κατὰ πόδα*, which whether they be true or false, is to the Question disputed wholly impertinent: Yet because you shall not complain of Tergiversation, I will run over them, and let nothing that is material and considerable pass without some Stricture or Animadversion.

30. You pretend that M. Hooker acknowledgeth, that *That whereon we must rest our Assurance that the Scripture is God's Word, is the Church*, and for this Acknowledgment you refer us to l. 3. §. 8. Let the Reader consult the Place, and he shall find, that he and M. Hooker hath been much abused, both by you here, and by M. Breerlèy, and others before you; and that M. Hooker hath not one Syllable to your pretended Purpose, but very much directly to the contrary. There he tells us indeed, *That ordinarily the first Introduction and probable Motive to the Belief of the Verity, is the Authority of the Church*; but that it is the last Foundation whereon our Belief hereof is rationally grounded, that in the same Place he plainly denies. His Words are, *Scripture teacheth us that saving Truth which God hath discovered unto the World by Revelation, and it presumeth us taught otherwise, that it self is divine and sacred. The Question then being by what Means we are taught this: Some answer, That to learn it we have no other Way than Tradition: As namely, that so we believe, because we from our Predecessors, and they from theirs, have so received. But is this enough? That which all Men's Experience teacheth them, may not in any wise be denied; and by Experience we all know, that the first outward Motive leading Men to esteem of the Scripture, is, the Authority of God's Church. For when we know the whole Church of God hath that Opinion of the Scripture, we judge it at the first an impudent Thing for any Man, bred and brought up in the Church, to be of a contrary Mind without Cause. Afterwards, the more we bestow our Labour upon reading or hearing the Mysteries thereof, the more we find, that the Thing it self doth answer our received Opinion concerning it; so that the former Inducement prevailing somewhat with us before, doth now much more prevail, when the very Thing hath ministered farther Reason. If Infidels or Atheists chance at any Time to call it in question, this giveth us Occasion to sift what Reason there is, whereby the Testimony of the Church, concerning Scripture, and our own Perswasion, which Scripture it self hath settled, may be proved a Truth infallible. In which Case the ancient Fathers, being often constrained to shew what Warrant they had so much to rely upon the Scriptures, endeavoured still to maintain the Authority of the Books of God, by Arguments, such as the Unbelievers themselves must needs think reasonable, if they judge thereof as they should. Neither is it a Thing impossible or greatly*

^c Some answer so, but he doth not. ^e The first outward Motive, not the last Assurance whereon we rest. ^f The whole Church, that he speaks of, seems to be that particular Church wherein a Man is bred and brought up; and the Authority of this he makes an Argument, which presseth a Man's Modesty more than his Reason. And in saying, it seems impudent to be of a contrary Mind without Cause, he implies, There may be a just Cause to be of a contrary Mind, and that then it were no Impudence to be so. ^h Therefore the Authority of the Church is not the Pause whereon we rest; we had need of more Assurance, and the intrinsical Arguments afford it. ⁱ Somewhat, but not much, until it be backed and enforced by farther Reason; it self therefore is not the farthest Reason, and the last Resolution. ^k Observe, I pray, our Perswasion, and the Testimony of the Church concerning Scripture, may be proved true; therefore neither of them was in his Account the farthest Proof.

hard, even by such kind of Proofs, so to manifest and clear that Point, that no Man living shall be able to deny it, without denying some apparent Principle, such as all Men acknowledge to be true. ¹ By this Time I hope the Reader sees sufficient Proof of what I said in my Reply to your Preface, that Mr Breerly's great Ostentation of Exactness, is no very certain Argument of his Fidelity.

31. But, *Seeing the Belief of the Scripture is a necessary Thing, and cannot be proved by Scripture, how can the Church of England teach, as she doth, Art. VI. That all Things necessary are contained in Scripture.*

32. I have answered this already. And here again I say, That all but Cavillers will easily understand the Meaning of the Article to be, that all the divine Verities, which Christ revealed to his Apostles, and the Apostles taught the Churches, are contained in Scripture; that is, all the material Objects of our Faith, whereof the Scripture is none, but only the Means of conveying them unto us; which we believe not finally, and for it self, but for the Matter contained in it. So that, if Men did believe the Doctrine contained in Scripture, it should no way hinder their Salvation, not to know whether there were any Scripture or no. Those barbarous Nations, *Irenæus* speaks of, were in this Case, and yet no doubt but they might be saved. The End that God aims at, is the Belief of the Gospel, the Covenant between God and Man; the Scripture he hath provided as a Means for this End, and this also we are to believe, but not as the last Object of our Faith, but as the Instrument of it. When therefore we subscribe to the Sixth *Article*, you must understand, that by *Articles of Faith*, they mean the final and ultimate Objects of it, and not the Means and Instrumental Objects; and then there will be no Repugnance between what they say, and that which *Hooker*, and *D. Covel*, and *D. Whitaker*, and *Luther* here say.

33. But, *Protestants agree not in assigning the Canon of Holy Scripture; Luther and Illyricus reject the Epistle of St. James; Kemnitius and other Lutherans, the Second of Peter, the Second and Third of John; the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, of Jude, and the Apocalyps. Therefore without the Authority of the Church, no Certainty can be had what Scripture is Canonical.*

34. So also the *Ancient Fathers*, and not only Fathers, but *whole Churches*, differed about the Certainty of the Authority of the very same Books; and by their Difference shewed, they knew no Necessity of conforming themselves herein to the Judgment of your or any Church: For, had they done so, they must have agreed all with that Church, and consequently among themselves. Now, I pray, tell me plainly, had they sufficient Certainty what Scripture was canonical, or had they not? If they had not, it seems there is no great Harm or Danger in not having such a Certainty whether some Books be canonical, or not, as you require; if they had, why may not Protestants, notwithstanding their Differences, have sufficient Certainty hereof, as well as the ancient Fathers and Churches, notwithstanding theirs?

35. You proceed: And whereas the Protestants of England in the Sixth *Article* have these Words; *In the Name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those Books, of whose Authority was never any Doubt in the Church; you demand, What they mean by them? Whether, that by the Church's Consent they are assured what Scriptures be canonical?* I answer for them, Yes, they are so. And whereas you infer from hence, *This is to make the Church Judge.* I have told you already, that of this Controversy we make the Church the Judge; but not the present Church, much less the present Roman Church, but the Consent and Testimony of the *Ancient and Primitive Church*, which though it be but an highly probable Inducement, and no demonstrative Enforcement; yet methinks you should not deny, but it may be a sufficient Ground of Faith; whose

¹ Natural Reason then built on Principles common to all Men, is the last Resolution, unto which the Church's Authority is but the first Inducement.

Faith, even of the Foundation of all your Faith, your Church's Authority is built lastly and wholly upon *Prudential Motives*.

36. But by *this Rule the whole Book of Esther must quit the Canon, because it was excluded by some in the Church*; by *Melito, Athanasius, and Gregory Nazianzen*. Then, for ought I know, he that should think he had Reason to exclude it now, might be still in the Church as well as *Melito, Athanasius, Nazianzen* were. And while you thus inveigh against *Luther*, and charge him with *Luciferian Heresy*, for doing that which you in this very Place confess, that Saints in Heaven before him have done; *are you not partial, and a Judge of evil Thoughts?*

37. *Luther's Censures of Ecclesiastes, Job, and the Prophets*, though you make such Tragedies with them, I see none of them but is capable of a tolerable Construction, and far from having in them any fundamental Heresy. He that condemns him for saying, the Book of *Ecclesiastes is not full, that it hath many abrupt Things*, condemns him, for ought I can see, for speaking Truth. And the rest of the Censure is but a bold and blunt Expression of the same Thing. The Book of *Job* may be a true History; and yet, as many true Stories are, and have been, an Argument of a Fable to set before us an Example of Patience. And though the Books of the Prophets were not written by themselves, but by their Disciples, yet it does not follow, that they were written casually; (though I hope, you will not damn all for Hereticks, that say some Books of Scripture were written casually.) Neither is there any Reason they should the sooner be called in question for being written by their Disciples, seeing being so written they had Attestation from themselves. Was the Prophecy of *Jeremy* the less canonical, for being written by *Baruch*? Or, because *St. Peter* the Master, dictated the Gospel, and *St. Mark* the Scholar writ it, is it the more likely to be called in question?

38. But leaving *Luther*, you return to our *English Canon of Scripture*; and tell us, that *in the New Testament, by the above-mentioned Rule (of whose Authority was never any Doubt in the Church) divers Books must be discanonicalized*. Not so, for I may believe even those questioned Books to have been written by the Apostles, and to be canonical; but I cannot in reason believe this of them so undoubtedly, as of *those Books which were never questioned*; at least I have no Warrant to damn any Man that shall doubt of them or deny them now, having the Example of Saints in Heaven, either to justify, or excuse such their Doubting or Denial.

39. You observe in the next place, that *our Sixth Article, specifying by name all the Books of the Old Testament, shuffles over those of the New with this Generality.—All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them canonical*: And in this you fancy to your self a *Mystery of Iniquity*. But if this be all the Shuffling that the Church of *England* is guilty of, I believe the Church, as well as the King, may give for her Motto, *Honi soit qui mal y pense*: For all the Bibles, which since the composing of the Articles have been used and allowed by the Church of *England*, do testify and even proclaim to the World, that by *commonly received*, they meant *received by the Church of Rome, and other Churches before the Reformation*. I pray take the pains to look in them, and there you shall find the Books which the Church of *England* counts Apocryphal, marked out, and severed from the rest, with this Title in the Beginning, *The Books called Apocrypha*; and with this Close or Seal in the End, *The End of the Apocrypha*. And having told you by name, and in particular, what Books only she esteems *Apocryphal*, I hope you will not put her to the Trouble of telling you, that the rest are in her Judgment *Canonical*.

40. But if by *Commonly received*, She meant by the Church of *Rome*; then by the same Reason, must She receive divers Books of the *Old Testament*, which she rejects.

41. Certainly a very good Consequence. The Church of *England* receives the Books of the New Testament which the Church of *Rome* receives: Therefore she must receive the Books of the Old Testament which she receives. As if you should say, if you will do as we in one Thing, you must in all Things. If you will pray to God with us, ye must pray to Saints with us. If you hold with us, when we have Reason on our Side, you must do so, when we have no Reason.

42. The Discourse following, is but a vain Declamation. No Man thinks that this Controversy is to be tried by most Voices, but by the Judgment and Testimony of the Ancient Fathers and Churches.

43. But *with what Coherence can we say in the former Part of the Article, That by Scripture we mean those Books that were never doubted of; and in the latter say, We receive all the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, whereas of them many were doubted?* I answer, when they say, *of whose Authority there was never any Doubt in the Church*, they mean not those only of whose Authority there was simply no Doubt at all, by any Man in the Church; but such as were not at any Time doubted of by the whole Church, or by all Churches; but had Attestation, though not universal, yet at least, sufficient to make considering Men receive them for Canonical. In which Number they may well reckon those Epistles which were sometimes doubted of by some, yet whose Number and Authority was not so great, as to prevail against the contrary Suffrages.

44. But *if to be commonly received, pass for a good Rule to know the Canon of the New Testament by, why not of the Old?* You conclude many times very well; but still when you do so, it is out of Principles which no Man grants: For who ever told you, that to be *commonly received* is a good Rule to know the Canon of the New Testament by? Have you been trained up in Schools of Subtilty, and cannot you see a great Difference between these Two, We receive the Books of the New Testament *as they are* commonly received, and we receive those that are commonly received, *because they are so?* To say this, were indeed to make *being commonly received*, a Rule or Reason to know the Canon by. But to say the former, doth no more make it a Rule, than you should make the Church of *England* the Rule of your receiving them, if you should say, as you may, the Books of the New Testament we receive for Canonical, as they are received by the Church of *England*.

45. You demand, *Upon what infallible Ground we agree with Luther against you in some, and with you against Luther in others?* And I also demand, upon what infallible Ground you hold your Canon, and agree neither with us, nor *Luther*? For sure your differing from us both, is of it self no more apparently reasonable, than our agreeing with you in part, and in part with *Luther*. If you say, Your Church's Infallibility is your Ground; I demand again some infallible Ground, both for the Church's Infallibility, and for this, that *Your's is the Church*; and shall never cease multiplying Demands upon Demands, until you settle me upon a Rock; I mean, give such an Answer, whose Truth is so evident, that it needs no further Evidence. If you say, *This is Universal Tradition*; I reply, Your Church's Infallibility is not built upon it, and that the Canon of Scripture, as we receive it, is: For we do not profess our selves so absolutely, and undoubtedly certain; neither do we urge others to be so, of those Books, which have been doubted, as of those that never have.

46. The Conclusion of your 10th § is, *That the Divinity of a Writing cannot be known from it self alone, but by some extrinsecal Authority*: Which you need not prove; for no wise Man denies it. But then, this Authority is that of *Universal Tradition*, not of your Church. For to me it is altogether as *αὐτόπιστος*, that the Gospel of St. *Matthew* is the Word of God, as that all which your Church say is true.

47. That Believers of the Scripture, by considering the divine Matter, the excellent Precepts, the glorious Promises contained in it, may be confirmed in
I their

their Faith of the Scriptures divine Authority ; and that among other Inducements and Enforcements hereunto, internal Arguments have their place and force, certainly no Man of Understanding can deny. For my part, I profess, if the Doctrine of the Scripture were not as good, and as fit to come from the Fountain of Goodness, as the Miracles by which it was confirmed were great, I should want one main Pillar of my Faith ; and for want of it, I fear, should be much staggered in it. Now this, and nothing else, did the *Doctor* mean in saying, *The Believer sees, by that glorious Beam of divine Light, which shines in Scripture, and by many internal Arguments, that the Scripture is of divine Authority.* By this (saith he) he sees it, that is, he is moved to, and strengthened in his Belief of it ; and by this partly, not wholly ; by this, not alone, but with the concurrence of other Arguments. He that will quarrel with him for saying so, must find fault with the *Master of the Sentences*, and all his Scholars, for they all say the same. The rest of this Paragraph, I am as willing it should be true, as you are to have it ; and so let it pass as a Discourse wherein we are wholly unconcerned. You might have met with an Answerer, that would not have suffered you to have said so much Truth together ; but to me it is sufficient, that it is nothing to the purpose.

48. In the next Division, out of your Liberality, you will suppose, that Scripture, like to a corporal Light, is *by it self alone* able to determine and move our Understanding to assent ; yet notwithstanding this Supposal, *Faith still* (you say) *must go before Scripture ; because as the Light is visible only to those that have Eyes, so the Scripture only to those, that have the Eye of Faith.* But to my Understanding, if Scripture do move and determine our Understanding to assent ; then the Scripture, and its moving, must be before this Assent, as the Cause must be before its own Effect : Now this very Assent is nothing else but Faith, and Faith nothing else than the Understanding's Assent. And therefore (upon this Supposal) Faith doth, and must originally proceed from Scripture, as the Effect from its proper Cause, and the Influence and Efficacy of Scripture is to be pre-supposed before the Assent of Faith, unto which it moves and determines ; and, consequently, if this Supposition of your's were true, there should need no other Means precedent to Scripture to beget Faith ; Scripture it self being able (as here you suppose) to determine and move the Understanding to assent, that is to believe them, and the Verities contained in them. Neither is this to say, that the Eyes with which you see, are made by the Light by which we see. For you are mistaken much, if you conceive, that in this Comparison, Faith answers to the Eye. But if you will not prevent it, the Analogy must stand thus ; Scripture must answer to Light ; the Eye of the Soul, that is, the Understanding or the Faculty of assenting, to the bodily Eye : And, lastly, Assenting or Believing, to the Act of Seeing. As therefore the Light, determining the Eye to see, though it presupposeth the Eye, which it determines, as every Action doth the Object on which it is employed, yet it self is presupposed and antecedent to the Act of Seeing, as the Cause is always to its Effect : So, if you will suppose that Scripture, like Light, moves the Understanding to assent, the Understanding (that is, the Eye and Object on which it works) must be before this Influence upon it ; but the Assent, that is, the Belief whereto the Scripture moves, and the Understanding is moved, which answers to the Act of Seeing, must come after : For, if it did assent already, to what purpose should the Scripture do that which was done before ? Nay indeed, how were it possible it should be so, any more than a Father can beget a Son, that he hath already ? Or an Architect build a House, that is built already ? Or, that this very World can be made again, before it be unmade ? Transubstantiation indeed is fruitful of such Monsters : But they that have not sworn themselves to the Defence of Error, will easily perceive, that *jam factum facere*, and *factum infectum facere*, are equally impossible. But I digress.

49. The Close of this Paragraph, is a fit Cover for such a Dish: There you tell us, *That if there be some other Means precedent to Scripture to beget Faith, this can be no other than the Church.* By the Church, we know you do, and must understand the *Roman Church*: So that in effect you say, no Man can have Faith, but he must be moved to it by your Church's Authority: And that is to say, that the King and all other Protestants, to whom you write, though they verily think they are Christians, and believe the Gospel, because they assent to the Truth of it, and would willingly die for it, yet indeed are Infidels, and believe nothing. The Scripture tells us, *The heart of man knoweth no man, but the spirit of man which is in him.* And who are you, to take upon you to make us believe, that we do not believe what we know we do? But if I may think verily that I believe the Scripture, and yet not believe it; how know you that you believe the *Roman Church*? I am as verily and as strongly persuaded, that I believe the Scripture, as you are, that you believe the Church: And if I may be deceived, why may not you? Again; what more ridiculous, and against Sense and Experience, than to affirm, that there are not Millions amongst you and us, that believe upon no other Reason than their Education, and the Authority of their Parents and Teachers, and the Opinion they have of them? The Tenderneſs of the Subject, and Aptneſs to receive Impressions, supplying the Defect and Imperfection of the Agent. And will you proscribe from Heaven all those Believers of your own Creed, who do indeed lay the Foundation of their Faith (for I cannot call it by any other Name) no deeper than upon the Authority of their Father, or Master, or Parish-Priest? Certainly, if they have no true Faith, your Church is very full of Infidels. Suppose *Xaverius* by the Holiness of his Life had converted some *Indians* to Christianity, who could (for so I will suppose) have no Knowledge of your Church but from him, and therefore must last of all build their Faith of the Church upon their Opinion of *Xaverius*: Do these remain as very Pagans after Conversion, as they were before? Are they brought to assent in their Souls, and obey in their Lives the Gospel of Christ, only to be tantaliz'd and not saved, and not benefited, but deluded by it, because, forsooth, it is a Man, and not the Church that begets Faith in them? What if their Motive to believe be not in Reason sufficient? Do they therefore not believe what they do believe, because they do it upon insufficient Motives: They chuse the Faith imprudently perhaps, but yet they chuse it. Unless you will have us believe, that that which is done is not done, because it is not done upon good Reason; which is to say, that never any Man living ever did a foolish Action. But yet I know not why the Authority of one holy Man, which apparently hath no Ends upon me, joined with the Goodness of the Christian Faith, might not be a far greater and more rational Motive to me to embrace Christianity, than any I can have to continue in Paganism. And therefore, for shame, if not for Love of Truth, you must recant the Fancy when you write again, and suffer true Faith to be many times, where your Church's Infallibility hath no hand in the Beginning of it: And be content to tell us hereafter, that we believe not enough; and not go about to persuade us we believe nothing, for fear with telling us what we know to be manifestly false, you should gain only this, *Not to be believed when you speak Truth.* Some pretty Sophisms you may haply bring us, to make us believe, we believe nothing; but wise Men know, that Reason against Experience is always sophistical. And therefore as he that could not answer *Zeno's* Subtilties against the Existence of Motion, could yet confute them, by doing that which he pretended could not be done. So, if you should give me a hundred Arguments to persuade me, because I do not believe in God, and the Knots of them I could not untie, yet I should cut them in pieces with doing that, and knowing that I do so, which you pretend I cannot do.

50. In the thirteenth Division, we have again much ado about nothing: A great deal of stir you keep in confuting some, *that pretend to know Canonical Scripture to be such, by the Titles of the Books.* But these Men you do not name;

which makes me suspect you cannot : Yet it is possible there may be some such Men in the World ; for *Gusman de Alferache* hath taught us, that the Fools-Hospital is a large Place.

51. In the fourteenth §. we have very artificial Juggling. *D. Potter* had said, *That the Scripture* (he desires to be understood of those Books wherein all Christians agree) *is a Principle, and needs not to be proved among Christians.* His Reason was, because *that needs no farther Proof, which is believed already.* Now by this (you say) he means either, that the Scripture is one of these first Principles, and most known in all Sciences, which cannot be proved : Which is to suppose, it cannot be proved by the Church ; and that is to suppose the Question : Or, he means, that it is not the most known in Christianity, and then it may be proved. Where we see plainly, that two most different Things, *most known in all Sciences*, and *most known in Christianity*, are captiously confounded. As if the Scripture might not be the first and most known Principle in Christianity, and yet not the most known in all Sciences : Or, as if to be a first Principle *in Christianity*, and *in all Sciences*, were all one. That Scripture is a Principle among Christians, that is, so received by all, that it need not be proved in any emergent Controversy to any Christian, but may be taken for granted, I think few will deny : You your selves are of this a sufficient Testimony ; for urging against us many Texts of Scripture, you offer no Proof of the Truth of them, presuming we will not question it. Yet this is not to deny, that Tradition is a Principle more known than Scripture ; but to say, it is a Principle not in Christianity, but in *Reason*, not proper to Christians, but common to all Men.

52. But, *It is repugnant to our Practice to hold Scripture a Principle, because we are wont to affirm, that one Part of Scripture may be known to be Canonical, and may be interpreted by another.* Where the former Device is again put in practice. For to be known to be *Canonical*, and to be *Interpreted*, is not all one. That Scripture may be interpreted by Scripture, that Protestants grant, and Papists do not deny ; neither does that any way hinder, but that this Assertion — Scripture is the Word of God, may be among Christians a common Principle. But the first — That one Part of Scripture may prove another Part Canonical, and need no Proof of its own being so ; for that you have produced divers Protestants that deny it ; but who they are that affirm it, *nondum constat.*

53. It is superfluous for you to prove out of *St. Athanasius*, and *St. Austin*, that we must receive the sacred Canon, upon the Credit of God's Church : Understanding by Church, as here you explain your self, *The Credit of Tradition.* And that not the Tradition of the present Church, which we pretend may deviate from the Ancient, but *such a Tradition, which involves an Evidence of Fact, and from Hand to Hand, from Age to Age, bringing us up to the Times and Persons of the Apostles, and our Saviour himself, cometh to be confirmed by all these Miracles and other Arguments, whereby they convinced their Doctrine to be true.* Thus you. Now prove the Canon of Scripture, which you receive by such Tradition, and we will allow it : Prove your whole Doctrine, or the Infallibility of your Church by such Tradition, and we will yield to you in all Things. Take the alledged Places of *St. Athanasius*, and *St. Austin* in this Sense (which is your own) ; and they will not press us any thing at all. We will say, with *Athanasius*, *That only four Gospels are to be received, because the Canons of the Holy and Catholick Church* (understand of all Ages since the Perfection of the Canon) *have so determined.*

54. We will subscribe to *St. Austin*, and say, *That we also would not believe the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Catholick Church did move us,* (meaning by the Church, *the Church of all Ages*, and that Succession of Christians which takes in *Christ himself* and his *Apostles*). Neither would *Zuinglius* have needed to cry out upon this Saying, had he conceived as you now do, that by the Catholick Church, the Church of all Ages, since Christ, was to be understood.

As

As for the Council of *Carthage*, it may speak not of such Books only, as were certainly Canonical, and for the regulating of Faith, but also of those which were only profitable, and lawful to be read in the Church: Which in *England* is a very slender Argument that the Book is Canonical, where every Body knows, that Apocryphal Books are read as well as Canonical. But howsoever, if you understand by Fathers, not only their immediate Fathers and Predecessors in the Gospel, but the Succession of them from the Apostles; they are right in the Thesis, that *whatsoever is received from these Fathers, as Canonical, is to be so esteemed*; though in the Application of it, to this or that particular Book, they may haply err, and think that Book received as Canonical, which was only received as profitable to be read; and think that Book received alway, and by all, which was rejected by some, and doubted of by many.

55. *But we cannot be certain in what Language the Scriptures remain uncorrupted.* Not so certain, I grant, as of that which we can demonstrate; but certain enough, morally certain, as certain as the Nature of the Thing will bear: So certain we may be, and God requires no more. We may be as certain as St. *Austin* was, who in his *second Book of Baptism, against the Donatists*, c. 3. plainly implies, *the Scripture might possibly be corrupted.* He means sure in Matters of little moment, such as concern not the Covenant between God and Man. But thus he saith, the same St. *Austin*, in his 48 *Epist.* clearly intimates, ^m *That in his Judgment, the only Preservative of the Scripture's Integrity, was the translating it into so many Languages, and the general and perpetual Use and Reading of it in the Church; for want whereof the Works of particular Doctors were more exposed to Danger in this kind; but the Canonical Scripture being by this means guarded with universal Care and Diligence, was not obnoxious to such Attempts.* And this Assurance of the Scriptures Incorruption, is common to us with him; we therefore are as certain hereof, as St. *Austin* was, and that, I hope, was certain enough. Yet if this does not satisfy you, I say farther, we are as certain hereof as your own *Pope Sixtus Quintus* was. He in his *Preface to his Bible* tells us, ⁿ *that in the Pervestigation of the true and genuine Text, it was perspicuously manifest to all Men, that there was no Argument more firm and certain to be relied on, than the Faith of ancient Books.* Now this Ground we have to build upon as well as he had; and therefore our Certainty is as great, and stands upon as certain Ground as his did.

56. This is not all I have to say in this Matter: For I will add moreover, that we are as certain in what Language the Scripture is uncorrupted, as any Man in your Church was, until *Clement* the Eighth set forth your own approved *Edition of your Vulgar Translation*. For you do not, nor cannot, without extreme Impudence, deny, that until then, there were great Variety of Copies current in divers Parts of your Church, and those very frequent in various Lections; all which Copies might possibly be false in some Things, but more than one Sort of them could not possibly be true in all Things. Neither were it less Impudence to pretend, that any Man in your Church, could until *Clement's* Time have any Certainty what that one true Copy and Reading was (if there were any one perfectly true). Some indeed, that had got *Sixtus his Bible*, might, after the Edition of that, very likely think themselves cock-sure of a perfect true, uncorrupted Translation, without being beholden to *Clement*: But how foully they were abused and deceived that thought so, the Edition of *Clement*, differing from that of *Sixtus* in a multitude of Places, doth sufficiently demonstrate.

^m *Neque enim sic potuit integritas atque notitia literarum quamlibet illustris Episcopi custodiri, quemadmodum Scriptura Canonica tot linguarum literis & ordine & successione celebrationis Ecclesiasticæ custoditur; contra quam non defuerunt tamen, qui sub nominibus Apostolorum multa confingerent. Frustra quidem; quia illa sic commendata, sic celebrata, sic nota est. Verum quid possit adversus literas non Canonica auctoritate fundatas etiam hinc demonstrabit impiæ conatus audaciæ, quod & adversus eos quæ tanta notitiæ mole firmatæ sunt, sese erigere non prætermisit. Aug. ep. 48. ad Vincent. cont. Donat. & Rogat.* ⁿ *In hac germani textus pervestigatione, satis perspicue inter omnes constat, nullum argumentum esse aut certius aut firmitus, quam antiquorum probatorum codicum Latinorum fidem, &c. sic Sixtus in Præf.*

57. This Certainty therefore, in what Language the Scripture remains uncorrupted, is it necessary to have it, or is it not? If it be not, I hope we may do well enough without it. If it be necessary, what became of your Church for 1500 Years together? All which Time you must confess she had no such Certainty; no one Man being able truly and upon good Ground to say, *This or this Copy of the Bible is pure and perfect, and uncorrupted, in all Things.* And now at present, though some of you are grown to an higher Degree of Presumption in this Point, yet are you as far as ever from any true, and real, and rational Assurance of the absolute Purity of your authentick Translation, which I suppose my self to have proved unanswerably in divers Places.

58. In the *sixteenth Division*, it is objected to Protestants, in a long Discourse transcribed out of the *Protestants Apology*, that their *Translations of the Scripture are very different, and by each other mutually condemned.* Luther's Translation by Zuinglius, and others; that of the Zuinglians, by Luther; the Translation of Oecolampadius, by the Divines of Basil; that of Castalio, by Beza; that of Beza, by Castalio; that of Calvin, by Carolus Molinæus; that of Geneva, by M. Parks, and King James; and, lastly, One of our Translations by the Puritans.

59. All which might have been as justly objected against that great Variety of Translations extant in the Primitive Church, and made use of by the Fathers and Doctors of it. For which, I desire not that my Word, but St. *Austin's* may be taken: *They which have translated the Scriptures out of the Hebrew into Greek, may be numbred; but the Latin Interpreters are innumerable: For, whensoever any one, in the first Times of Christianity, met with a Greek Bible, and seemed to himself to have some Ability in both Languages, he presently ventured upon an Interpretation.* So He, in his *second Book of Christian Doctrine*, Cap. 11. Of all these, that which was called the *Italian Translation* was esteemed best; so we may learn from the same St. *Austin*, in Chap. 15. of the same Book: *Amongst all these Interpretations (saith he) let the Italian be preferred; for it keeps closer to the Letter, and is perspicuous in the Sense.* Yet so far was the Church of that Time from presuming upon the absolute Purity and Perfection even of this best Translation, that St. *Hierom* thought it necessary to make a new Translation of the Old Testament out of the Hebrew Fountain (which himself testifies in his Book *de Viris illustribus*); and to correct the vulgar Version of the New Testament, according to the Truth of the original Greek; amending many Errors which had crept into it, whether by the Mistake of the Author, or the Negligence of the Transcribers; which Work he undertook and performed at the Request of *Damascus*, Bishop of Rome. *You constrain me (saith he) to make a new Work of an old: That after the Copies of the Scriptures have been dispersed through the whole World, I should sit, as it were, an Arbitrator amongst them; and because they vary among themselves, should determine what are those Things (in them) which consent with the Greek Verity.* And after: *Therefore this present Preface promises the four Gospels only, corrected by Collation with Greek Copies. But, that they might not be very dissonant from the Custom of the Latin Reading, I have so tempered with my Stile the Translation of the Ancients, that those Things amended, which did seem to change the Sense, other Things I have suffered to remain as they were.* So that in this Matter Protestants must either stand or fall with the Primitive Church.

60. The Corruption that you charge Luther with, and the Falsification that you impute to Zuinglius, what have we to do with them? Or why may not we as justly lay to your Charge the Errors, which *Lyranus*, or *Paulus Brugenfis*, or *Laurentius Valla*, or *Cajetan*, or *Erasmus*, or *Arias Montanus*, or *Augustus Nibensis*, or *Pagnine*, have committed in their Translation?

61. Which yet I say not, as if these Translations of *Luther* and *Zuinglius* were absolutely indefensible; for what such great Difference is there between Faith without the Works of the Law, and Faith alone without the Works of the Law? Or, why does not *Without, Alone*, signify all one with *Alone, Without*?

Consider

Consider the Matter a little better, and observe the Use of these Phrases of Speech in our ordinary Talk, and perhaps you will begin to doubt whether you had sufficient Ground for this Invective. And then for *Zuinglius*, if it be true (as they say it is) that the Language our Saviour spake in, had no such Word as *to signify*, but used always *to be* instead of it, as it is certain the Scripture does in an hundred places; then this Translation, which you so declaim against, will prove no Falsification in *Zuinglius*, but a Calumny in you.

62. *But the Faith of Protestants relies upon Scripture alone; Scripture is delivered to most of them by Translations; Translations depend upon the Skill and Honesty of Men, who certainly may err because they are Men, and certainly do err, at least some of them, because their Translations are contrary. It seems then the Faith, and consequently the Salvation of Protestants relies upon fallible and uncertain Grounds.*

63. This Objection, though it may seem to do you a great Service for the present; yet I fear you will repent the Time that ever you urged it against us as a Fault, that we make Mens Salvation *depend upon Uncertainties*: For the Objection returns upon you many ways; as first thus, the Salvation of many Millions of Papists (as they suppose and teach) depends upon their having the Sacrament of Penance truly administred unto them. This again upon the Minister's being a true Priest. That such or such a Man is Priest, not himself, much less any other can have any possible Certainty; for it depends upon a great many contingent and uncertain Supposals. He that will pretend to be certain of it, must undertake to know for a certain all these Things that follow.

64. First, that he was baptized with due Matter. Secondly, with the due Form of Words, which he cannot know, unless he were both present and attentive. Thirdly, he must know that he was baptized with due Intention, and that is, that the Minister of his Baptism was not a secret Jew, nor a Moor, nor an Atheist (of all which Kinds, I fear, Experience gives you a just Cause to fear, that *Italy* and *Spain* have Priests not a few) but a Christian, in Heart as well as Profession (otherwise believing the Sacrament to be nothing, in giving it he could intend to give nothing) nor a *Samosatenian*, nor an *Arrian*, but one that was capable of having due Intention, from which they that believe not the Doctrine of the Trinity are excluded by you. And, lastly, that he was neither drunk nor distracted at the Administration of the Sacrament, nor out of Negligence or Malice omitted his Intention.

65. Fourthly, he must undertake to know, that the Bishop which ordained him Priest, ordained him compleatly with due Matter, Form, and Intention; and, consequently, that he again was neither Jew, nor Moor, nor Atheist, nor liable to any such Exception, as is inconsistent with due Intention in giving the Sacrament of Orders.

66. Fifthly, he must undertake to know, that the Bishop, which made him Priest, was a Priest himself; for your Rule is, *Nil dat quod non habet*: And, consequently, that there was again none of the former Nullities in his Baptism, which might make him incapable of Ordination, nor no Invalidity in his Ordination, but a true Priest to ordain him again, the requisite Matter and Form, and due Intention all concurring.

67. Lastly, he must pretend to know the same of him that made him Priest, and him that made him Priest, even until he comes to the very Fountain of Priesthood. For take any one in the whole Train and Succession of Ordainers, and suppose him, by reason of any Defect, only a supposed, and not a true Priest; then, according to your Doctrine, he could not give a true, but only a supposed Priesthood; and they that receive it of him, and again they that derive it from them, can give no better than they received; receiving nothing but a Name and Shadow, can give nothing but a Name and Shadow; and so from Age to Age, from Generation to Generation, being equivocal Fathers, beget only equivocal Sons; no Principle in Geometry being

more certain than this, that *the unsuppliable Defect of any necessary Antecedent, must needs cause a Nullity of all those Consequences which depend upon it.* In fine, to know this one Thing you must first know ten thousand others, whereof not any one is a Thing that can be known, there being no Necessity that it should be true, which only can qualify any thing for an Object of Science, but only, at the best, a high Degree of Probability that it is so. But then, that of ten Thousand Probables, no one should be false; that of ten Thousand Requisites, whereof any one may fail, not one should be wanting, this to me is extremely improbable, and even Cousin-german to impossible. So that the Assurance hereof is like a Machine composed of an innumerable Multitude of Pieces, of which it is strangely unlikely but some will be out of order; and yet if any one be so, the whole Fabrick of Necessity falls to the ground: And he that shall put them together, and maturely consider all the possible Ways of lapsing, and nullifying a Priesthood in the Church of *Rome*, I believe will be very inclinable to think, that it is an Hundred to One, that amongst an hundred seeming Priests, there is not one true one: Nay, that it is not a Thing very improbable, that amongst those many Millions, which make up the *Romish* Hierarchy, there are *not Twenty* true. But be the Truth in this what it will be, once this is certain, that they, which make Mens Salvation (as you do) depend upon Priestly Absolution; and this again (as you do) upon the Truth and Reality of the Priesthood that gives it; and this lastly upon a great Multitude of apparent Uncertainties, are not the fittest Men in the World to object to others, as a horrible Crime, *That they make Mens Salvation depend upon fallible and uncertain Foundations.* And let this be the first retorting of your Argument.

68. But suppose this Difficulty assoyled, and that an Angel from Heaven should ascertain you (for other Assurances you can have none) that the Person you make use of, is a true Priest, and a competent Minister of the Sacrament of Penance; yet still the Doubt will remain, whether he will do you that Good which he can do, whether he will pronounce the absolving Words with intent to absolve you? For perhaps he might bear you some secret Malice, and project to himself your Damnation for a compleat *Italian* Revenge. Perhaps (as the Tale is of a Priest that was lately burnt in *France*) he may upon some Conditions have compacted with the Devil to give no Sacraments with Intention. Lastly, he may be (for ought you can possibly know) a secret Jew, or Moor, or Anti-Trinitarian, or perhaps such a one as is so far from intending your Forgiveness of Sins and Salvation by this Sacrament, that in his Heart he laughs at all these Things, and thinks Sin nothing, and Salvation a Word. All these Doubts you must have clearly resolved (which can hardly be done but by another Revelation) before you can upon good Grounds assure your self, that your true Priest gives you true and effectual Absolution. So that when you have done as much as God requires for your Salvation, yet can you by no Means be secure, but that you may have the ill Luck to be damned; which is to make Salvation a Matter of Chance, and not of Choice; and which a Man may fail of, not only by an ill Life, but by ill Fortune. Verily, a most comfortable Doctrine for a considering Man lying upon his Death-bed, who either feels or fears that his Repentance is but Attrition only, and not Contrition, and consequently believes, that if he be not absolved really by a true Priest, he cannot possibly escape Damnation. Such a Man for his Comfort, you tell first (you that will have *Mens Salvation depend upon no Uncertainties*) that though he verily believe that his Sorrow for his Sins is a true Sorrow, and his Purpose for Amendment a true Purpose, yet he may deceive himself, perhaps it is not; and if it be not, he must be damned. You bid him hope well; but *Spes est rei incertæ nomen.* You tell him secondly, that though the Party he confesses to, seem to be a true Priest, yet for ought he knows, or for ought himself knows, by reason of some secret undiscernable Invalidity in his Baptism or Ordination, he may be none; and if he be none, he can do nothing.

This is a hard Saying ; but this is not the worst : You tell him, thirdly, that he may be in such a State, that he cannot, or if he can, that he will not give the Sacrament with due Intention ; and if he does not, all is in vain. Put case a Man by these Considerations should be cast into some Agonies ; what Advice, what Comfort would you give him ? Verily, I know not what you could say to him, but this ; that, first, for the Qualification required on his part, he might know that he desired to have true Sorrow, and that that is sufficient : But then if he should ask you, Why he might not know his Sorrow to be a true Sorrow, as well as his Desire to be sorrowful to be a true Desire ? I believe you would be put to silence. Then, secondly, to quiet his Fears, concerning the Priest and his Intention, you should tell him, by my Advice, that God's Goodness (which will not suffer him to damn Men for not doing better than their best) will supply all such Defects, as to human Endeavours were unavoidable. And therefore though his Priest were indeed no Priest, yet to him he should be as if he were one ; and if he gave Absolution without Intention, yet in doing so he should hurt himself only, and not his Penitent. This were some Comfort indeed, and this were to settle Mens Salvation upon reasonable certain Grounds. But this, I fear, you will never say ; for this were to reverse many Doctrines established by your Church ; and besides, to degrade your Priesthood from a great Part of their Honour, by lessening the strict Necessity of the Laities Dependence upon them : For it were to say, that *the Priest's Intention is not necessary to the obtaining of Absolution* ; which is to say, that it is not in the Parson's Power to damn whom he will in his Parish, because, by this Rule, God should supply the Defect which his Malice had caused : And besides, it were to say, that *Infants dying without Baptism might be saved* ; God supplying the Want of Baptism, which to them is unavoidable : But beyond all this, it were to put into my Mouth a full and satisfying Answer to your Argument, which I am now returning ; so that in answering my Objection you should answer your own : For then I should tell you, that it were altogether as abhorrent from the Goodness of God, and as repugnant to it, to suffer an ignorant Layman's Soul to perish, merely for being misled by an undiscernable false Translation, which yet was commended to him by the Church, which (being of Necessity to credit some in this Matter) he had Reason to rely upon, either above all other, or as much as any other, as it is to damn a penitent Sinner for a secret Defect in that desired Absolution, which his ghostly Father perhaps was an Atheist, and could not give him, or was a Villain, and would not. This Answer therefore, which alone would serve to comfort your Penitent in his Perplexities, and to assure him, that he cannot fail of Salvation, if he will not ; for fear of Inconvenience you must forbear : And seeing you must, I hope you will, come down from the Pulpit, and preach no more against others for *making Mens Salvation depend upon fallible and uncertain Grounds*, lest by judging others, you make your selves, and your own Church inexcusable, who are strongly guilty of this Fault, above all the Men and Churches of the World ; whereof I have already given you two very pregnant Demonstrations, drawn from your presumptuous tying God and Salvation to your Sacraments ; and the Efficacy of them to your Priest's Qualifications and Intentions.

69. Your making the Salvation of Infants depend on Baptism a casual Thing, and in the Power of Man to confer, or not confer, would yield me a Third of the same Nature. And your suspending the same on the Baptizer's Intention, a Fourth. And, lastly, your making the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist depend upon the Casualties of the Consecrator's true Priesthood and Intention, and yet commanding Men to believe it for certain that he is present, and to adore the Sacrament, which, according to your Doctrine, for ought they can possibly know, may be nothing else but a Piece of Bread, so exposing them to the Danger of Idolatry, and consequently of Damnation, doth offer me a fifth Demonstration of the same Conclusion, if I thought fit to insist upon them.

them. But I have no mind to draw any more out of this Fountain; neither do I think it Charity to cloy the Reader with Uniformity, when the Subject affords Variety.

70. Sixthly, therefore, I return it thus: The Faith of Papists relies alone upon their Church's Infallibility. That there is any Church infallible, and, that theirs is it, they pretend not to believe, but only upon *prudential Motives*. Dependence upon prudential Motives they confess to be obnoxious to a Possibility of erring. What then remaineth, but Truth, Faith, Salvation, and All, must in them rely upon a fallible and uncertain Ground.

71. Seventhly, The Faith of Papists relies upon the Church alone. The Doctrine of the Church is delivered to most of them by their Parish-Priest, or ghostly Father, or, at least, by a Company of Priests, who, for the most part, sure, are Men and not Angels, in whom nothing is more certain than a most certain Possibility to err. What then remaineth, but that Truth, Faith, Salvation, and All, must in them rely upon a fallible and uncertain Ground.

72. Eighthly thus: It is apparent and undeniable, that many Thousands there are, who believe your Religion upon no better Grounds, than a Man may have for the Belief almost of any Religion. As some believe it, because their Forefathers did so, and they were good People. Some, because they were christened and brought up in it. Some, because many Learned and Religious Men are of it. Some, because it is the Religion of their Country, where all other Religions are persecuted and proscribed. Some, because Protestants cannot shew a perpetual Succession of Professors of all their Doctrines. Some, because the Service of your Church is more stately, and pompous, and magnificent. Some, because they find Comfort in it. Some, because your Religion is farther spread, and hath more Professors of it than the Religion of Protestants. Some, because *your Priests compass Sea and Land to gain Profelytes to it*. Lastly, an infinite Number by Chance, and they know not why, but only because they are sure they are in the right. This which I say, is a most certain experimented Truth, and if you will deal ingenuously, you will not deny it. And, without question, he that builds his Faith upon our *English Translation*, goes upon a more prudent Ground than any of these can, with Reason, be pretended to be. What then can you alledge, but that with you, rather than with us, Truth, and Faith, and Salvation, and All, rely upon fallible and uncertain Grounds?

73. Ninthly, your *Rhemish* and *Doway* Translations are delivered to your Profelytes (such, I mean, that are dispensed with, for the reading of them) for the Direction of their Faith and Lives. And the same may be said of your Translation of the Bible into other national Languages, in respect of those that are licensed to read them. This, I presume, you will confess. And moreover, that these Translations came not by Inspiration, but were the Productions of human Industry; and that not Angels, but Men, were the Authors of them. Men, I say, meer Men, subject to the same Passions, and to the same Possibility of erring with our Translators. And then, how does it not unavoidably follow, that in them which depend upon these Translations for their Direction, Faith, and Truth, and Salvation, and all relies upon fallible and uncertain Grounds?

74. Tenthly, and lastly (to lay the Ax to the Root of the Tree) the *Helena* which you so fight for, your vulgar Translation, though some of you believe, or pretend to believe, it to be, in every Particular of it, the pure and uncorrupted Word of God; yet others among you, and those as good and zealous Catholics as you, are not so confident hereof.

75. First, for all those who have made Translations of the whole Bible or any Part of it different many times in Sense from the Vulgar, as *Lyranus*, *Cajetan*, *Pagnine*, *Arias*, *Erasmus*, *Valla*, *Steuchus*, and others, it is apparent, and even palpable, that they never dreamt of any absolute Perfection and au-
thetical

thetical Infallibility of the *Vulgar Translation*. For, if they had, Why did they in many Places reject it, and differ from it?

76. *Vega* was present at the Council of *Trent*, when the Decree was made, which made the *Vulgar Edition* (then not extant any where in the World) *authentic*, and not to be rejected upon any Pretence whatsoever. At the forming this Decree, *Vega*, I say, was present, understood the Mind of the Council as well as any Man, and professes, that he was instructed in it by the President of it, the Cardinal *S. Cruce*. And yet he hath written, that the Council in this Decree means to pronounce this Translation free (not simply from all Error) but only from such Errors, out of which any Opinion pernicious to Faith and Manners might be collected. This, *Andradius*, in his Defence of that Council, reports of *Vega*, and assents to himself. *Driedo*, in his *Book of the Translation of Holy Scripture*, hath these Words very pregnant and pertinent to the same purpose; *The See Apostolick hath approved or accepted Hierom's Edition, not as so wholly consonant to the Original, and so entire, and pure, and restored in all things, that it may not be lawful for any Man, either by comparing it with the Fountain to examine it, or, in some Places, to doubt, whether or no Hierom did understand the true Sense of the Scripture; but only, as an Edition to be preferred before all others then extant, and no where deviating from the Truth in the Rules of Faith and good Life.* *Mariana*, even where he is a most earnest Advocate for the *Vulgar Edition*, yet acknowledges the Imperfection of it in these Words; *The Faults of the Vulgar Edition are not approved by the Decree of the Council of Trent, a Multitude whereof we did collect from the Variety of Copies.* And again, *We maintain, that the Hebrew and Greek were by no means rejected by the Trent-Fathers; and that the Latin Edition is indeed approved: Yet not so, as if they did deny, that some Places might be translated more plainly, some more properly, whereof it were easy to produce innumerable Examples.* And this he there professes to have learnt of *Laines* the then General of the Society; who was a great Part of that Council, present at all the Actions of it, and of very great Authority in it.

77. To this so great Authority he adds a Reason of his Opinion; which with all indifferent Men will be of a far greater Authority. *If the Council* (saith he) *had purposed to approve an Edition in all Respects, and to make it of equal Authority and Credit with the Fountains, certainly they ought with exact Care first to have corrected the Errors of the Interpreter: Which certainly they did not.*

78. Lastly, *Bellarmino* himself, though he will not acknowledge any Imperfection in the *Vulgar Edition*, yet he acknowledges, that the Case may, and does oft-times, so fall out, that^p *it is impossible to discern, which is the true Reading of the Vulgar Edition, but only by recourse unto the Originals and Dependance upon them.*

79. From all which it may evidently be collected, that though some of you flatter your selves with a vain Imagination of the certain absolute Purity and Perfection of your *Vulgar Edition*, yet the Matter is not so certain, and so resolved, but that the best learned Men amongst you are often at a stand, and very doubtful sometimes whether your *Vulgar Translation* be true, and sometimes whether this or that be your *Vulgar Translation*, and sometimes undoubtedly resolved, that your *Vulgar Translation* is no true Translation, nor consonant to the Original, as it was at first delivered. And what then can be alledged, but that out of your own Grounds it may be inferred and enforced upon you, that not only in your Laymen, but your Clergymen and Scholars, Faith and Truth, and Salvation, and All, depends upon fallible and uncertain Grounds? And thus, by ten several Retortions of this one Argument, I have endeavoured to shew you, how ill you have complied with your own Advice,

^o *Pro edit. vulg. c. 21. p. 99.*

^p *Bell. de verbo Dei, l. 2. c. 11. p. 120.*

which was, *to take heed of urging Arguments that might be returned upon you.* I should now, by a direct Answer, shew, that it presseth not us at all : But I have in passing, done it already in the End of the second Retortion of this Argument, and thither I refer the Reader.

80. Whereas therefore you exhort them, *that will have Assurance of true Scriptures, to fly to your Church for it ;* I desire to know (if they should follow your Advice) how they should be assured, that your Church can give them any such Assurance, which hath been *confessedly* so negligent, as to suffer many whole Books of Scripture to be utterly lost : Again, in those that remain, *confessedly* so negligent, as to suffer *the Originals of these that remain to be corrupted* : And, lastly, so careless of preserving the Integrity of the Copies of her Translation, as to suffer *infinite Variety of Readings* to come into them, without keeping *any one perfect Copy*, which might have been as the Standard and Polycletus his Canon to correct the rest by. So that *which was the true Reading, and which the False, it was utterly undiscernable, but only by comparing them with the Originals*, which also she pretends to be corrupted.

81. But Luther himself, by *unfortunate Experience*, was at length enforced to confess thus much, saying, *If the World last longer, it will be again necessary to receive the Decrees of Councils, by reason of divers Interpretations of Scripture which now reign.*

82. And what if Luther, having a Pope in his Belly (as he was wont to say that most Men had) and desiring perhaps to have his own Interpretations pass without examining, spake such Words in Heat of Argument : Do you think it reasonable, that we should subscribe to Luther's Divinations and angry Speeches ? Will you oblige your self to answer for all the Assertions of your private Doctors ? If not, why do you trouble us with what Luther says, and what Calvin says : Yet this I say not, as if these Words of Luther made any thing at all for your present purpose. For what if he feared, or pretended to fear, that the Infallibility of Councils being rejected, some Men would fall into greater Errors than were imposed upon them by the Councils ? Is this to confess, that there is any present visible Church, upon whose bare Authority we may infallibly receive the true Scriptures, and the true Sense of them ? Let the Reader judge. But, in my Opinion, to fear a greater Inconvenience may follow from the avoiding of the Less, is not to confess, that the less is none at all.

83. For Dr. Covel's commending your Translation, what is it to the Business in hand ? Or how proves it the Perfection of it, which is here contested, any more than St. Augustine's commending the Italian Translation, argues the Perfection of that, or that there was no Necessity, that St. Hierom should correct it ? Dr. Covel commends your Translation, and so does the Bishop of Chichester, and so does Dr. James, and so do I : But I commend it for a good Translation, not for a perfect. Good may be good, and deserve Commendations ; and yet better may be better. And though he says, that *the then approved Translation of the Church of England, is that which cometh nearest the Vulgar*, yet he does not say, that it agrees exactly with it. So that whereas you infer, *that the Truth of your Translation must be the Rule to judge of the Goodness of ours ;* this is but a vain Flourish. For, to say of our Translations, that is the best which comes nearest the Vulgar (and yet it is but one Man that says so) is not to say, it is therefore the best, because it does so : For this may be true by Accident, and yet the Truth of our Translation no way depend upon the Truth of yours : For, had that been their Direction, they would not only have made a Translation that should come near to yours, but such a one, which should exactly agree with it, and be a Translation of your Translation.

84. Ad. 17. §. In this Division you charge us *with great Uncertainty concerning the Meaning of Scripture* : Which hath been answered already, by saying, that, if you speak of plain Places (and in such all Things necessary are contained) we are sufficiently certain of the Meaning of them, neither need they

they any Interpreter : If of obscure and difficult Places, we confess we are uncertain of the Sense of many of them : But then we say there is no Necessity we should be certain : For, if God's Will had been, we should have understood him more certainly, he would have spoken more plainly. And we say besides, that as we are uncertain, so are you too ; which he that doubts of, let him read your Commentators upon the Bible, and observe their various and dissonant Interpretations, and he shall in this Point need no further Satisfaction.

85. But seeing *there are Contentions among us, we are taught by Nature and Scripture and Experience* (so you tell us out of Mr. Hooker) *to seek for the Ending of them, by submitting unto some judicial Sentence, whereunto neither part may refuse to stand.* This is very true. Neither should you need to persuade us to seek such a Means of ending all our Controversies, if we could tell where to find it. But this we know, that none is fit to pronounce for all the World a judicial definitive obliging Sentence in Controversies of Religion, but only such a Man, or such a Society of Men, as is authorized thereto by God. And besides, we are able to demonstrate, that it hath not been the Pleasure of God to give to any Man, or Society of Men, any such Authority. And therefore though we wish heartily, that all Controversies were ended, as we do, that all Sin were abolish'd, yet we have little Hope of the one, or the other, 'till the World be ended : And in the mean while, think it best to content our selves with, and to persuade others unto, an *Unity of Charity, and mutual Toleration* ; seeing God hath authorized no Man to force all Men to *Unity of Opinion*. Neither do we think it fit to argue thus ; To us it seems convenient there should be one Judge of all Controversies for the whole World ; therefore God hath appointed one : But more modest and more reasonable to collect thus ; God hath appointed no such Judge of Controversies ; therefore, though it seems to us convenient there should be one, yet it is not so ; or though it were convenient for us to have one, yet it hath pleased God (for Reasons best known to himself) not to allow us this Convenience.

86. Dr. Field's Words, which follow, I confess, are somewhat more pressing : and if he had been infallible, and the Words had not slipped unadvisedly from him, they were the best Argument in your Book. But yet its evident out of his Book, and so acknowledged by some of your own, that he never thought of any one Company of Christians invested with such Authority from God, that all Men were bound to receive their Decrees without Examination, though they seem contrary to Scripture and Reason, which the Church of Rome requires. And therefore, if he have in his Preface strained too high in Commendation of the Subject he writes of (as Writers very often do in their Prefaces and Dedicatory Epistles) what is that to us ? Besides, by *all the Societies of the World*, it is not impossible, not very improbable, he might mean, all that are, or have been in the World, and so include even the *Primitive Church* : And her Communion we shall embrace, her Direction we shall follow, her Judgment we shall rest in, if we believe the Scripture, endeavour to find the true Sense of it, and live according to it.

87. *Ad. §. 18.* That the true Interpretation of the Scripture ought to be received from the Church, you need not prove ; for it is very easily granted by them, who profess themselves very ready to receive all Truths, much more the true Sense of Scripture, not only from the Church, but from any Society of Men, nay, from any Man whatsoever.

88. That the *Church's Interpretation of Scripture is always true*, that is it which you would have said : And that in some Sense may be also admitted ; viz. if you speak of that Church (which before you spake of in the 14. §.) that is, of the Church of all Ages since the Apostles. Upon the Tradition of which Church you there told us, *we were to receive the Scripture, and to believe it to be the Word of God.* For there you teach us, that *our Faith of Scripture depends on a Principle, which requires no other Proof* ; and that, *such is Tradition,*
which,

which, from Hand to Hand, and Age to Age, bringing us up to the Times and Persons of the Apostles and our Saviour himself, cometh to be confirmed by all those Miracles, and other Arguments whereby they convinced their Doctrine to be true. Wherefore the Ancient Fathers avouch, that we must receive the sacred Scripture upon the Tradition of this Church. The Tradition then of this Church you say must teach us what is Scripture: And we are willing to believe it. And now, if you make it good unto us, that the same Tradition down from the Apostles, hath delivered from Age to Age, and from Hand to Hand, any Interpretation of any Scripture, we are ready to embrace that also. But now, if you will argue thus: The Church in one Sense tells us what is Scripture, and we believe; therefore, if the Church, taken in another Sense, tells us, This or that is the Meaning of the Scripture, we are to believe that also; this is too transparent Sophistry, to take any but those that are willing to be taken.

89. If there be any traditive Interpretation of Scripture, produce it, and prove it to be so; and we embrace it. But the Tradition of all Ages is one Thing; and the Authority of the present Church, much more of the *Roman Church*, which is but a Part, and a corrupted Part of the Catholick Church, is another. And therefore, though we are ready to receive both Scripture, and the Sense of Scripture, upon the Authority of *Original Tradition*, yet we receive neither the one nor the other, upon the Authority of your Church.

90. First, for the Scriptures, how can we receive them upon the Authority of your Church, who hold now those Books to be Canonical, which formerly you rejected from the Canon? I instance in the *Book of Maccabees*, and the *Epistle to the Hebrews*: The first of these you held not to be Canonical in St. Gregory's Time, or else he was no Member of your Church; for it is apparent^a he held otherwise. The second you rejected from the Canon in St. Hierom's Time, as it is evident out of many Places of his Works.

91. If you say (which is all you can say) that *Hierom spake this of the particular Roman Church, not of the Roman Catholick Church*; I answer, there was none such in his Time, none that was called so. Secondly, what he spake of the *Roman Church*, must be true of all other Churches, if your Doctrine of the Necessity of the Conformity of all other Churches to that Church, were then Catholick Doctrine. Now then chuse whether you will, either that the particular *Roman Church* was not then believed to be the Mistress of all other Churches, notwithstanding *Ad hanc Ecclesiam, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, omnes qui sunt undique fideles*; which Cardinal Perron, and his Translatress so often translates False: Or, if you say she was, you will run into a greater Inconvenience, and be forced to say, that all the Churches of that Time rejected from the Canon the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, together with the *Roman Church*. And, consequently, that the Catholick Church may err in rejecting from the Canon, Scriptures truly Canonical.

92. Secondly, How can we receive the Scripture upon the Authority of the *Roman Church*, which hath delivered at several times Scriptures in many Places different and repugnant, for Authentical and Canonical? Which is most evident out of the Place of *Malachy*, which is so often quoted for the Sacrifice of the Mass, that either all the ancient Fathers had false Bibles, or yours is false: Most evident likewise from the comparing the Story of *Jacob* in *Genesis*, with that which is cited out of it, in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, according to the vulgar Edition: But above all, to any one who shall compare the Bibles of *Sixtus* and *Clement*, so evident, that the Wit of Man cannot disguise it.

93. And thus you see what Reason we have to believe your Antecedent, *That your Church it is, which must declare what Books be true Scripture*. Now, for the Consequence, that certainly is as liable to Exception as the Antecedent: For, if

^a See Greg. Mor. l. 19. c. 13. Thus he testifies, *Com. in Isa. c. 6.* in these Words: *Unde & Paulus Apost. in Epist. ad Heb. (quam Latina consuetudo non recipit).* And again in c. 8. in these, *In Epist. quæ ad Hebræos scribitur (licet eam latina Consuetudo inter Canonicas Scripturas non recipiat) &c.*

it were true, that God had promised to assist you, for the delivering of true Scripture, would this oblige him, or would it follow from hence, that he had obliged himself to teach you, not only sufficiently, but *effectually* and *irresistably* the true Sense of Scripture? God is not defective in Things necessary; neither will he leave himself without Witness, nor the World without Means of knowing his Will and doing it. And therefore it was necessary, that by his Providence he should preserve the Scripture from any undiscernable Corruption in those Things which he would have known; otherwise it is apparent, it had not been his Will, that these Things should be known, the only Means of continuing the Knowledge of them being perished. But now neither is God lavish in Superfluities; and therefore having given us Means sufficient for our Direction, and Power sufficient to make use of these Means, he will not constrain or necessitate us to make use of these Means: For that were to cross the End of our Creation, which was to be glorified by our free Obedience; whereas Necessity and Freedom cannot stand together: That were to reverse the Law which he hath prescribed to himself in his dealing with Man; and that is, *to set Life and Death before him, and leave him in the Hands of his own Counsel.* God gave the Wise Men a Star to lead them to Christ, but he did not necessitate them to follow the Guidance of this Star; that was left to their Liberty. God gave the Children of Israel a Fire to lead them by Night, and a Pillar of Cloud by Day; but he constrained no Man to follow them; that was left to their Liberty. So he gives the Church the Scripture; which in those Things which are to be believed or done are plain and easy to be followed like the Wise Mens Star. Now that which he desires of us on our Part, is the Obedience of Faith, and Love of the Truth, and Desire to find the true Sense of it, and Industry in searching it, and Humility in following, and Constancy in professing it; all which, if he should work in us by an absolute irresistible Necessity, he could no more require of us as our Duty, than he can of the Sun to shine, of the Sea to ebb and flow, and of all other Creatures to do those Things which by meer Necessity they must do, and cannot chuse. Besides, what an Impudence is it to pretend, that *your Church is infallibly directed concerning the true Meaning of the Scripture*, whereas there are Thousands of Places of Scripture, which you do not pretend certainly to understand, and about the Interpretation whereof, your own Doctors differ among themselves? If your Church be infallibly directed concerning the true Meaning of Scripture, why do not your Doctors follow her infallible Direction? And if they do, how comes such Difference among them in their Interpretations?

94. Again, Why does your Church thus put her Candle under a Bushel, and keep her Talent of interpreting Scripture infallibly, thus long wrapt up in Napkins? Why sets she not forth infallible Commentaries or Expositions upon all the Bible? Is it, because this would not be profitable for Christians, that Scripture should be interpreted? It is blasphemous to say so. The Scripture it self tells us, *All Scripture is profitable.* And the Scripture is not so much the Words as the Sense. And if it be not profitable, why does she employ particular Doctors to interpret Scriptures fallibly? unless we must think that fallible Interpretations of Scripture are profitable, and infallible Interpretations would not be so.

95. If you say, *The Holy Ghost, which assists the Church in interpreting, will move the Church to interpret when he shall think fit, and that the Church will do it when the Holy Ghost shall move her to do it.* I demand, Whether the Holy Ghost's moving of the Church to such Works as these, be resistible by the Church, or irresistible: If resistible, then the Holy Ghost may move, and the Church may not be moved. As certainly the Holy Ghost doth always move to an Action, when he shews us plainly, that it would be for the Good of Men, and Honour of God; as he that hath any Sense will acknowledge, that an infallible Exposition of Scripture could not but be; and there is no conceivable Reason why such a Work should be put off a Day, but only because you are conscious

to your selves, you cannot do it, and therefore make Excuses. But if the Moving of the Holy Ghost be irresistible, and you are not yet so moved to go about this Work, then I confess you are excused. But then I would know, whether those Popes, which so long deferred calling of a Council for the Reformation of your Church, at length pretended to be effected by the Council of *Trent*, whether they may excuse themselves, for that they were not moved by the Holy Ghost to do it? I would know likewise, as this Motion is irresistible when it comes, so whether it be so simply necessary to the moving of your Church to any such publick Action, that it cannot possibly move without it? that is, whether the Pope now could not, if he would, seat himself in *Cathedra*, and fall to writing Expositions upon the Bible for the Direction of Christians to the true Sense of it? If you say he cannot, you will make your self ridiculous; if he can, then I would know, whether he should be infallibly directed in these Expositions or no; if he should, then what need he to stay for irresistible Motion? Why does he not go about this noble Work presently? If he should not, how shall we know that the calling of the Council of *Trent* was not upon his own voluntary Motion, or upon human Importunity and Suggestion, and not upon the Motion of the Holy Ghost; and, consequently, how shall we know whether he were assistant to it or no, seeing he assists none but what he himself moves to? And whether he did move the Pope to call this Council, is a secret Thing, which we cannot possibly know, nor perhaps the Pope himself.

96. If you say, your Meaning is only, *That the Church shall be infallibly guarded from giving any false Sense of any Scripture, and not infallibly assisted positively to give the true Sense of all Scripture*: I put to you your own Question, Why should we believe the Holy Ghost will stay there? Or, why may we not as well think he will stay at the first Thing, that is, in teaching the Church what Books be true Scripture? For, if the Holy Ghost's Assistance be promised to all Things profitable, then will he be with them infallibly, not only to guard them from all Errors, but to guide them to all profitable Truths, such as the true Sense of all Scripture would be. Neither could he stay there, but defend them irresistibly from all Vices: Nor there neither, but infuse into them irresistibly all Virtues; for all these Things would be much for the Benefit of Christians. If you say, he cannot do this without taking away their Free-will in living; I say, neither can he necessitate Men to believe aright, without taking away their Free-will in believing, and in professing their Belief.

97. To the Place of St. *Austin*, I answer, that not the Authority of the present Church, much less of a Part of it (as the *Roman Church* is) was that which alone moved St. *Austin* to believe the Gospel, but the perpetual Tradition of the Churches of all Ages. Which you your self have taught us to be the *only Principle by which the Scripture is proved, and which it self needs no Proof*; and to which you have referred this very Saying of St. *Austin*, *Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi, &c.* ^s Chap. 2. §. 14. And in the next Place, which you cite out of his Book, *De Util. Cred.* c. 14. he shews, that his *Motives to believe, were Fame, Celebrity, Consent, Antiquity*. And seeing this Tradition, this Consent, this Antiquity did as fully and powerfully move him not to believe *Manichæus*, as to believe the Gospel (the Christian Tradition being as full against *Manichæus*, as it was for the Gospel) therefore he did well to conclude upon these Grounds, that he had as much Reason to disbelieve *Manichæus*, as to believe the Gospel. Now if you can truly say, that the same Fame, Celebrity, Consent, Antiquity, that the same Universal and Original Tradition lies against *Luther* and *Calvin*, as did against *Manichæus*, you may do well to apply the Argument against them, otherwise it will be to little Purpose to substitute their Names instead of *Manichæus*, unless you can shew the Thing agrees to them as well as him.

98. If you say, that *St. Austin speaks here of the Authority of the present Church, abstracted from Consent with the Ancient*, and therefore you, seeing you have the present Church on your Side against *Luther and Calvin*, as *St. Austin* against *Manichæus*, may urge the same Words against them which *St. Austin* did against him.

99. I answer, First, that it is a vain Presumption of yours, that the *Catholick Church is of your Side*. Secondly, that if *St. Austin* speak here of that present Church, which moved him to believe the Gospel, without consideration of the Antiquity of it, and its both personal and doctrinal Succession from the Apostles; his Argument will be like a *Buskin*, that will serve any Leg: It will serve to keep an *Arian* or a *Grecian* from being a *Roman Catholick*, as well as a *Catholick* from being an *Arian* or a *Grecian*: In as much as the *Arians* and *Grecians* did pretend to the Title of *Catholicks* and the Church, as much as the *Papists* now do. If then you should have come to an ancient *Goth* or *Vandal*, whom the *Arians* converted to Christianity, and should have moved him to your Religion; might he not say the very same Words to you as *St. Austin* to the *Manichæans*? *I would not believe the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Church did move me. Them therefore whom I obeyed, saying, believe the Gospel, why should I not obey, saying to me, do not believe the Homoeousians? Chuse what thou pleasest: If thou shalt say, Believe the Arians, they warn me not to give any Credit to you: If therefore I believe them, I cannot believe thee. If thou say, do not believe the Arians, thou shalt not do well to force me to the Faith of the Homoeousians, because by the preaching of the Arians, I believed the Gospel it self. If you say, you do well to believe them, commending the Gospel, but you did not well to believe them, discommending the Homoeousians: Dost thou think me so very foolish, that without any Reason at all, I should believe what thou wilt, and not believe what thou wilt not?* It were easy to put these Words into the Mouth of a *Grecian*, *Abyssine*, *Georgian*, or any other of any Religion. And I pray, bethink your selves what you would say in such a Case, and imagine that we say the very same to you.

100. Whereas you ask, *Whether Protestants do not perfectly resemble those Men to whom St. Austin spake, when they will have Men to believe the Roman Church delivering Scripture, but not to believe her condemning Luther?* I demand again, whether you be well in your Wits to say, that Protestants would have Men believe the *Roman Church* delivering Scripture, whereas they accuse her to deliver many Books for Scripture which are not so? And do not bid Men to receive any Book which she delivers, for that Reason, because she delivers it; and, if you meant only, Protestants will have Men to believe some Books to be Scripture which the *Roman Church* delivers for such; may not we then ask as you do, Do not *Papists* perfectly resemble these Men, which will have Men believe the Church of *England* delivering Scripture, but not to believe her condemning the Church of *Rome*?

101. And whereas you say, *St. Austin may seem to have spoken prophetically against Protestants, when he said, Why should I not most diligently enquire what Christ commanded, of them before all others, by whose Authority I was moved to believe, that Christ commanded any good Thing?* I answer, until you can shew, that Protestants believe that Christ commanded any good Thing, that is, that they believe the Truth of Christian Religion, upon the Authority of the Church of *Rome*, this Place must be wholly impertinent to your purpose, which is to make Protestants believe your Church to be the infallible Expounder of Scriptures and Judge of Controversies. Nay rather, is it not directly against your Purpose? For why may not a Member of the Church of *England*, who received his Baptism, Education, and Faith from the Ministry of this Church, say just so to you as *St. Austin* here to the *Manichees*? Why should not I most diligently enquire what Christ commanded, of them (the Church of *England*) before all others, by whose Authority I was moved to believe, that Christ commanded any good Thing? Can you *F.* or *K.* or whosoever you are, better declare

to me what he said, whom I would not have thought to have been, or to be, if the Belief thereof had been recommended by you to me? This therefore (that *Christ Jesus* did those Miracles, and taught that Doctrine which is contained evidently in the undoubted Books of the New Testament) I believed by Fame, strengthened with Celebrity and Consent (even of those which in other Things are at infinite Variance one with another); and lastly, by Antiquity (which gives an universal and a constant Attestation to them); but every one may see that you, so few (in comparison of all those upon whose Consent we ground our Belief of Scripture) so turbulent (that you damn all to the Fire, and to Hell, that any ways differ from you; that you profess it is lawful for you, to use Violence and Power whensoever you can have it, for the planting of your own Doctrine, and Extirpation of the Contrary): Lastly, so new in many of your Doctrines, as in the Lawfulness and Expedience of debarring the Laity the Sacramental Cup, the Lawfulness and Expedience of your Latin Service, Transubstantiation, Indulgencies, Purgatory, the Pope's Infallibility, his Authority over Kings, &c. So new, I say, in comparison of the undoubted Books of Scripture, which evidently containeth, or rather is our Religion, and the sole and adequate Object of our Faith: I say, every one may see that you, so few, so turbulent, so new, can produce nothing deserving Authority (with wise and considerate Men). What Madness is this? Believe then the Consent of Christians, which are now, and have been ever since Christ in the World, that we ought to believe Christ; but learn of us what Christ said, which contradict and damn all other Parts of Christendom. Why, I beseech you? Surely if they were not at all, and could not teach me any thing, I would more easily persuade my self, that I were not to believe in Christ, than that I should learn any thing concerning him, from any other, than them by whom I believed him; at least, than that I should learn what his Religion was from you, who have wronged so exceedingly his Miracles and his Doctrine, by forging so evidently so many false Miracles for the Confirmation of your new Doctrine, which might give us just occasion, had we no other Assurance of them but your Authority, to suspect the true ones. Who, with forging so many false Stories, and false Authors, have taken a fair Way to make the Faith of all Stories questionable, if we had no other Ground for our Belief of them but your Authority; who have brought in Doctrines plainly and directly contrary to that which you confess to be the Word of Christ, and which, for the most part, make either for the Honour or Profit of the Teachers of them; which (if there were no Difference between the Christian and the *Roman Church*) would be very apt to make suspicious Men believe, that Christian Religion was a human Invention, taught by some cunning Impostors, only to make themselves rich and powerful; who make a Profession of corrupting all sorts of Authors; a ready Course to make it justly questionable whether any remain uncorrupted. For if you take this Authority upon you, upon the six Ages last past; how shall we know, that the Church of that Time did not usurp the same Authority upon the Authors of the six last Ages before them, and so upwards, until we come to Christ himself? Whose questioned Doctrines, none of them came from the Fountain of Apostolick Tradition, but have insinuated themselves into the Streams, by little and little; some in one Age, and some in another; some more anciently, some more safely; and some yet are Embrio's, yet hatching, and in the Shell; as the Pope's Infallibility, the blessed Virgin's immaculate Conception, the Pope's Power over the Temporalities of Kings, the Doctrine of Predetermination, &c. all which yet are, or in Time may be, imposed upon Christians under the Title of *Original and Apostolical Tradition*; and that with that Necessity, that they are told, they were as good believe nothing at all, as not believe these Things to have come from the Apostles, which they know to have been brought in but yesterday, which whether it be not a ready and likely Way to make Men conclude thus with themselves—I am told, that I were as good believe nothing at all, as believe some

Points

Points which the Church teacheth me, and not others; and some Things which she teacheth to be Ancient and Certain, I plainly see to be New and False; therefore I will believe nothing at all. Whether I say, the aforesaid Grounds be not a ready and likely way to make Men conclude thus, and whether this Conclusion be not too often made in *Italy* and *Spain*, and *France*, and in *England* too, I leave it to the Judgment of those that have Wisdom and Experience. Seeing therefore the *Roman Church* is so far from being a sufficient Foundation for our Belief in Christ, that it is in sundry Regards a dangerous Temptation against it; why should not I much rather conclude, seeing we receive not the Knowledge of Christ and Scriptures from the Church of *Rome*, neither from her must we take his Doctrine, or the Interpretation of Scripture.

102. *Ad. §. 19.* In this Number, this Argument is contained. *The Judge of Controversies ought to be intelligible to Learned and Unlearned: The Scripture is not so, and the Church is so; therefore the Church is the Judge, and not the Scripture.*

103. To this I answer: As to be understandable is a Condition requisite to a Judge, so is not that alone sufficient to make a Judge; otherwise you might make your self Judge of Controversies, by arguing, the Scripture is not intelligible by all, but I am; therefore I am Judge of Controversies. If you say, your Intent was to conclude against the Scripture, and not for the Church: I demand why then, but to delude the Simple with Sophistry, did you say in the Close of this §, *Such is the Church, and the Scripture is not such?* But that you would leave it to them, to infer in the End (which indeed was more than you undertook in the Beginning); *Therefore the Church is Judge, and the Scripture not.* I say, secondly, that you still run upon a false Supposition, that God hath appointed some Judge of all Controversies, that may happen among Christians about the Sense of obscure Texts of Scripture; whereas he hath left every one to his Liberty herein, in those Words of St. Paul, *Quisque abundet in sensu suo*, &c. I say, thirdly, whereas some Protestants make the Scripture Judge of Controversies, that they have the Authority of Fathers to warrant their Manner of speaking; as of ¹ *Optatus*.

104. But speaking truly and properly, the Scripture is not a Judge, nor cannot be, but only a *sufficient Rule*, for those to judge by, that believe it to be the Word of God (as the Church of *England*, and the Church of *Rome* both do) what they are to believe, and what they are not to believe. I say sufficiently perfect, and sufficiently intelligible, in Things necessary, to all that have Understanding, whether they be Learned or Unlearned. And my Reason hereof is convincing and demonstrative, because nothing is necessary to be believed, but what is plainly revealed. For to say, that when a Place of Scripture, by reason of ambiguous Terms lies indifferent between divers Senses, whereof one is true, and the other is false, that God obliges Men under pain of Damnation, not to mistake through Error and human Frailty, is to make God a Tyrant; and to say, that he requires us certainly to attain that End, for the attaining whereof, we have no certain Means; which is to say, that, like *Pharaoh* he gives no Straw, and requires Brick; that he reaps where he sows not; that he gathers where he strews not; that he will not be pleased with our utmost Endeavours to please him, without full, and exact, and never-failing Performance; that his Will is, we should do what he knows we cannot do; that he will not accept of us, according to that which we have, but requireth of us what we have not. Which, whether it can consist with his Goodness, with his Wisdom, and with his Word, I leave it to honest Men to judge. If I should send a Servant to *Paris*, or *Rome*, or *Jerusalem*, and he using his utmost Diligence not to mistake his Way, yet notwithstanding, meeting often with such Places where the Road is divided into several Ways, whereof every one is as likely to be true, and as likely to be false as any other, should at length mistake and go out of the Way, would not any Man say, that I were an impotent, foolish, and unjust Master,

¹ *Contra Parmen. l. 5. in Prin.*

if I should be offended with him for so doing? And shall we not tremble to impute that to God, which we would take in foul Scorn if it were imputed to our selves? Certainly, I, for my part, fear I should not love God, if I should think so strangely of him.

105. Again, when you say, *That unlearned and ignorant Men cannot understand Scripture*, I would desire you to come out of the Clouds, and tell us what you mean: Whether, that they cannot understand all Scripture, or that they cannot understand any Scripture, or that they cannot understand so much as is sufficient for their Direction to Heaven. If the first, I believe the Learned are in the same Case. If the second, every Man's Experience will confute you; for, who is there that is not capable of a sufficient Understanding of the Story, the Precepts, the Promises, and the Threats of the Gospel? If the third, that they may understand something, but not enough for their Salvations: I ask you, first, Why then doth St. Paul say to Timothy, *The Scriptures are able to make him wise unto Salvation?* Why doth St. Austin say, *Ea quæ manifestè posita sunt in sacris Scripturis, omnia continent quæ pertinent ad Fidem, Moreque vivendi?* Why does every one of the four Evangelists intitle their Boook, *The Gospel*, if any necessary and essential Part of the Gospel were left out of it? Can we imagine, that either they omitted something necessary out of Ignorance, not knowing it to be necessary? Or, knowing it to be so, maliciously concealed it? Or, out of Negligence, did the Work they have undertaken by halves? If none of these Things can without Blasphemy be imputed to them, considering they were assisted by the Holy Ghost in this Work, then certainly it most evidently follows, that every one of them writ the whole Gospel of Christ, I mean, all the essential and necessary Parts of it. So that if we had no other Book of Scripture, but one of them alone, we should not want any thing necessary to Salvation. And what one of them hath more than another, it is only profitable, and not necessary: Necessary indeed to be believed, because revealed; but not therefore revealed, because necessary to be believed.

106. Neither did they write only for the Learned, but for all Men. This being one special Means of the preaching of the Gospel, which was commanded to be preached not only to learned Men, but to *all Men*. And therefore, unless we will imagine the Holy Ghost and them to have been wilfully wanting to their own Desire and Purpose, we must conceive, that they intended to speak plain, even to the Capacity of the Simplest; at least, touching all things necessary to be published by them, and believed by us.

107. And whereas you pretend it is *so easy, and obvious both for the Learned and the Ignorant, both to know, which is the Church, and what are the Decrees of the Church, and what is the Sense of the Decrees*; I say, this is a vain Pretence.

108. For first, how shall an unlearned Man whom you have supposed now ignorant of Scripture, how shall he know which of all the Societies of Christians is indeed the Church? You will say perhaps, *He must examine them by the Notes of the Church, which are perpetual Visibility, Succession, Conformity with the Ancient Church, &c.* But how shall he know, first, that these are the Notes of the Church, unless by Scripture, which, you say, he understands not? You may say perhaps, he may be told so. But seeing Men may deceive, and be deceived, and their Words are no Demonstrations, how shall he be assured, that what they say is true? So that at the first he meets with an impregnable Difficulty, and cannot know the Church but by such Notes, which whether they be the Notes of the Church he cannot possibly know. But let us suppose this *Isthmus* digged through, and that he is assured, these are the Notes of the true Church: How can he possibly be a competent Judge, which Society of Christians hath Title to these Notes, and which hath not? seeing this Trial of necessity requires a great Sufficiency of Knowledge of the Monuments of Christian Antiquity, which no unlearned Man can have, because he that hath it cannot be unlearned. As for example, how shall he possibly be able to know whether

* Unlearned can ——— Oxf.

CHAP. II. *whereby to judge of Controversies.* 111

the Church of *Rome* hath had a perpetual Succession of visible Professors, which held always the same Doctrine which they now hold, without holding any Thing to the contrary; unless he hath first examined, what was the Doctrine of the Church in the first Age, what in the second, and so forth? And whether this be not a more difficult Work, than to stay at the first Age, and to examine the Church by the Conformity of her Doctrine with the Doctrine of the first Age, every Man of ordinary Understanding may judge.

Let us imagine him advanced a Step further, and to know which is the Church; how shall he know what the Church hath decreed, seeing the Church hath not been so careful in keeping her Decrees, but that many are lost, and many corrupted? Besides, when even the Learned among you are not agreed concerning divers Things, whether they be *De fide*, or not, how shall the Unlearned do? Then for the Sense of the Decrees, how can he be more capable of the understanding of them, than of plain Texts of Scripture, which you will not suffer him to understand? especially seeing the Decrees of divers Popes and Councils are conceived so obscurely, that the Learned cannot agree about the Sense of them: And then they are written all in such Languages, which the Ignorant understand not, and therefore must of necessity rely herein upon the uncertain and fallible Authority of some particular Men, who inform them, that there is such a Decree. And if the Decrees were translated into vulgar Languages, why the Translators should not be as fallible as you say the Translators of Scripture are, who can possibly imagine?

109. Lastly, how shall an unlearned Man, or indeed any Man, be assured of the Certainty of that Decree, the Certainty whereof depends upon Suppositions, which are impossible to be known whether they be true or no? For it is not the Decree of a Council, unless it be confirmed by a true Pope. Now the Pope cannot be a true Pope, if he came in by Simony; which whether he did or no, who can answer me? He cannot be a true Pope, unless he were baptized; and baptized he was not, unless the Minister had due Intention. So likewise he cannot be a true Pope, unless he were rightly ordained Priest, and that again depends upon the Ordainer's secret Intention, and also upon his having the Episcopal Character. All which Things, as I have formerly proved, depend upon so many uncertain Suppositions, that no human Judgment can possibly be resolved in them. I conclude therefore, that not the learnedst Man amongst you all, no not the Pope himself, can, according to the Grounds you go upon, have any Certainty, that any Decree of any Council is good and valid, and, consequently, not any Assurance, that it is indeed the Decree of a Council.

110. *Ad. §. 20.* If by a *private Spirit*, you mean a particular Persuasion, that a Doctrine is true, which some Men pretend, but cannot prove to come from the Spirit of God: I say, to refer Controversies to Scripture, is not to refer them to this Kind of private Spirit. For is there not a manifest Difference between saying, *The Spirit of God tells me, that this is the Meaning of such a Text* (which no Man can possibly know to be true, it being a secret Thing) and between saying, *These and these Reasons I have to shew, that this or that Doctrine, or that this or that is the Meaning of such a Scripture?* Reason being a publick and certain Thing, and exposed to all Mens Trial and Examination. But now, if by *private Spirit* you understand every Man's particular Reason, then your first and second Inconvenience will presently be reduced to one, and shortly to none at all.

111. *Ad. §. 20.* And does not also giving the Office of Judicature to the Church, come to confer it upon every particular Man? For, before any Man believes the Church infallible, must he not have Reason to induce him to believe it to be so? And, must he not judge of those Reasons, whether they be indeed good and firm, or captious and sophistical? Or, would you have all Men believe all your Doctrine upon the Church's Infallibility, and the Church's Infallibility they know not why?

112. Secondly, supposing they are to be guided by the Church, they must use their own particular Reason to find out which is the Church. And to that purpose, you your selves give a great many Notes, which you pretend first to be certain Notes of the Church, and then to be peculiar to your Church, and agreeable to none else; but you do not so much as pretend, that either of those Pretences is evident of it self, and therefore you go about to prove them both by Reasons; and those Reasons, I hope every particular Man is to judge of, whether they do indeed conclude and convince that which they are alledged for; that is, that these Marks are indeed certain Notes of the Church; and then, that your Church hath them, and no other.

113. One of these Notes, indeed the only Note of a true and uncorrupted Church, is Conformity with Antiquity; I mean, the most ancient Church of all, that is the Primitive and Apostolick. Now, how is it possible any Man should examine your Church by this Note, but he must by his own particular Judgment find out what was the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, and what is the Doctrine of the Present Church, and be able to answer all these Arguments which are brought to prove Repugnance between them? Otherwise, he shall but pretend to make use of this Note for the finding the true Church, but indeed make no use of it, but receive the Church at a venture, as the most of you do, not One in a Hundred being able to give any tolerable Reason for it. So that instead of reducing Men to particular Reasons, you reduce them to none at all, but to Chance, and Passion, and Prejudice, and such other Ways, which if they lead one to the Truth, they lead Hundreds, nay Thousands, to Falshood. But it is a pretty thing to consider, how these Men can blow hot and cold out of the same Mouth to serve several Purposes. Is there Hope of gaining a Profelyte? Then they will tell you, God hath given every Man Reason to follow; and if the Blind lead the Blind, both shall fall into the Ditch: That it is no good Reason for a Man's Religion, that he was born and brought up in it; for then a Turk should have as much Reason to be a Turk, as a Christian to be a Christian: That every Man hath a Judgment of Discretion; which if they will make use of, they shall easily find, that the true Church hath always such and such Marks, and that their Church hath them, and no others but theirs. But then if any of theirs be persuaded to a sincere and sufficient Trial of their Church, even by their own Notes of it, and to try whether they be indeed so conformable to Antiquity as they pretend, then their Note is changed. You must not use your own Reason, nor your Judgment, but refer all to the Church, and believe her to be conformable to Antiquity, though they have no Reason for it, nay, though they have evident Reason to the contrary. For my part, I am certain, that God hath given us our Reason, to discern between Truth and Falshood; and he that makes not this use of it, but believes Things he knows not why; I say, it is by Chance that he believes the Truth, and not by Choice; and that I cannot but fear, that God will not accept of this *Sacrifice of Fools*.

114. But you that would not have Men follow their Reason, what would you have them follow? their Passions? or pluck out their Eyes, and go blind-fold? No, you say, *you would have them follow Authority*. On God's Name let them; we also would have them follow Authority; for it is upon the Authority of Universal Tradition, that we would have them believe Scripture. But then as for the Authority which you would have them follow, you will let them see Reason why they should follow it. And is not this to go a little about? To leave Reason for a short Turn, and then to come to it again, and to do that which you condemn in others? It being indeed a plain Impossibility for any Man to submit his Reason but to Reason; for he that doth it to Authority, must of necessity think himself to have greater Reason to believe that Authority. Therefore the Confession cited by * *Breerly*, you need not think to have been

* *Breerly*, and the rest, you need not think to have been extorted from *Luther*. It came, &c. Oxf.

extorted from *Luther* and the rest. It came very freely from them, and what they say, you practise as much as they.

115. And whereas you say, that a *Protestant admits of Fathers, Councils, Church, as far as they agree with Scripture, which upon the matter is himself*: I say, you admit neither of them, nor the Scripture it self, but only so far as it agrees with your Church; and your Church you admit, because you think you have Reason to do so; so that by you as well as Protestants all is finally resolved into your own Reason.

116. Nor do Hereticks only, but *Romish* Catholicks also, set up as many Judges as there are Men and Women in the Christian World. For do not your Men and Women judge your Religion to be true, before they believe it, as well as the Men and Women of other Religions? Oh, but you say, *They receive it, not because they think it agreeable to Scripture, but because the Church tells them so.* But then, I hope, they believe the Church, because their own Reason tells them they are to do so. So that the Difference between a Papist and a Protestant is this, not that the one judges, and the other does not judge, but that the one judges his Guide to be infallible, the other his Way to be manifest. *This same pernicious Doctrine is taught by Brentius, Zanchius, Cartwright, and others.* It is so in very Deed: But it is taught also by some others, whom you little think of: It is taught by *St. Paul*, where he says, *Try all Things; hold fast that which is good*: It is taught by *St. John*, in these Words, *Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits, whether they be of God or no*: It is taught by *St. Peter*, in these, *Be ye ready to render a Reason of the Hope that is in you*: Lastly, this very pernicious Doctrine is taught by our Saviour, in these Words, *If the Blind lead the Blind, both shall fall into the Ditch*; and, *Why of your selves judge you not what is right*? All which Speeches, if they do not advise Men to make use of their Reason for the Choice of their Religion, I must confess my self to understand nothing. Lastly, not to be infinite, it is taught by *Mr. Knot* himself, not in one Page only, or Chapter of his *Book*, but all his Book over; the very Writing and Publishing whereof, supposes this for certain, that the Readers are to be Judges, whether his Reasons which he brings, be strong and convincing, of which sort we have hitherto met with none; or else captious, or Impertinencies, as indifferent Men shall (as I suppose) have cause to judge them.

117. But you demand, *What good Statesmen would they be, who should ideate, or fancy such a Commonwealth, as these Men have framed to themselves a Church*? Truly if this be all the Fault they have, that they say, *Every Man is to use his own Judgment in the Choice of his Religion, and not to believe this or that Sense of Scripture, upon the bare Authority of any learned Man or Men, when he conceives he hath Reasons to the contrary, which are of more weight than their Authority*; I know no Reason but, notwithstanding all this, they might be as good Statesmen as any of the Society. But what hath this to do with Commonwealths, where Men are bound only to external Obedience unto the Laws and Judgment of Courts, but not to an internal Approbation of them, no nor to conceal their Judgment of them, if they disapprove them? As if I conceived I had reason to dislike the Law of punishing simple Theft with Death, as *Sir Thomas Moore* did, I might profess lawfully my Judgment; and represent my Reasons to the King or Commonwealth in a Parliament, as *Sir Thomas Moore* did, without committing any Fault, or fearing any Punishment.

118. To the Place of *St. Austin*, wherewith this Paragraph is concluded, I shall need give no other Reply, but only to desire you to speak like an honest Man, and to say, whether it be all one for a Man to allow and disallow in every Scripture what he pleases? which is either to dash out of Scripture such Texts or such Chapters, because they cross his Opinion: Or to say (which is worse) *Though they be Scripture, they are not true*? Whether, I say, for a Man thus to allow and disallow in Scripture what he pleases, be all one, and no greater Fault, than to allow that Sense of Scripture which he conceives to be true and genuine, and deduced out of the Words, and to disallow the contrary? For God's sake, Sir, tell me plainly: In those Texts of Scripture, which you alledge for the Infallibility of your Church, do not you allow what Sense you think true, and

disallow the contrary? And do you not this, by the Direction of your private Reason? If you do, why do you condemn it in others? If you do not, I pray you tell me what Direction you follow, or whether you follow none at all? If none at all, this is like drawing Lots, or throwing the Dice, for the Choice of a Religion: If any other, I beseech you tell me what it is. Perhaps you will say, the *Church's Authority*; and that will be to dance finely in a Round thus, to believe the Church's infallible Authority, because the Scriptures avouch it; and to believe, that Scriptures say and mean so, because they are so expounded by the Church. Is not this for a Father to beget his Son, and the Son to beget his Father? For a Foundation to support the House, and the House to support the Foundation? Would not *Campian* have cried out at it, *Ecce quos gyros, quos Mæandros!* And to what End was this going about, when you might as well at first have concluded the Church infallible, because she says so, as thus to put in Scripture for a meer Stale, and to say the Church is infallible, because the Scripture says so, and the Scripture means so, because the Church says so, which is infallible? Is it not most evident therefore to every intelligent Man, that you are enforced of necessity to do that your self, which so tragically you declaim against in others? The Church you say is infallible; I am very doubtful of it: How shall I know it? The Scripture, you say, affirms it, as in the *LIXth of Esay*, *My Spirit that is in thee*, &c. Well, I confess I find there these Words, but I am still doubtful whether they be spoken of the Church of Christ; and if they be, whether they mean as you pretend. You say, the Church says so, which is infallible. Yea, but that is the Question, and therefore not to be begged, but proved: Neither is it so evident, as to need no Proof; otherwise, why brought you this Text to prove it? Nor is it of such a strange Quality, above all other Propositions, as to be able to prove it self. What then remains, but that you say, Reasons drawn out of the Circumstances of the Text will evince, that this is the Sense of it. Perhaps they will: But Reasons cannot convince me, unless I judge of them by my Reason; and for every Man or Woman to rely on that, in the Choice of their Religion, and in the Interpreting of Scripture, you say, is a horrible Absurdity; and therefore must neither make use of your own in this Matter, nor desire me to make use of it.

119. But *Universal Tradition* (you say, and so do I too) *is of it self credible; and that hath, in all Ages, taught the Church's Infallibility with full Consent.* If it have, I am ready to believe it; but that it hath, I hope you would not have me take upon your Word; for that were to build my self upon the Church, and the Church upon you. Let then the Tradition appear; for a secret Tradition is somewhat like a silent Thunder. You will perhaps produce, for the Confirmation of it, some Sayings of some Fathers, who in every Age taught this Doctrine; (as *Gualterius* in his Chronology undertakes to do, but with so ill Success, that I heard an able Man of your Religion profess, that *in the first three Centuries, there was not one Authority pertinent*): But how will you warrant that none of them teach the contrary? Again, how shall I be assured, that the Places have indeed this Sense in them, seeing there is not one Father for 500 Years after Christ, that does say in plain Terms, *The Church of Rome is infallible*? What, shall we believe your Church, that this is their Meaning? But this will be again to go into the Circle, which made us giddy before; to prove this Church infallible, because Tradition says so; Tradition to say so, because the Fathers say so; the Fathers to say so, because the Church says so, which is infallible: Yea, but Reason will shew this to be the Meaning of them. Yes, if we may use our Reason, and rely upon it: Otherwise, as Light shews nothing to the Blind, or to him that uses not his Eyes, so Reason cannot prove any thing to him, that either hath not, or useth not his Reason to judge of them.

120. Thus you have excluded your self from all Proof of your Church's Infallibility from Scripture or Tradition: And if you fly, lastly, to Reason it self for Succour, may it not justly say to you as *Jephthe* said to his Brethren, *Ye have cast me out, and banished me, and do you now come to me for Succour*? But if there

be no Certainty in Reason, how shall I be assured of the Certainty of those which you alledge for this Purpose? Either I may judge of them, or not; if not, why do you propose them? If I may, why do you say I may not, and make it such a monstrous Absurdity, that Men in the Choice of their Religion should make use of their Reason? which yet, without all question, none but unreasonable Men can deny, to have been the chiefest End why Reason was given them.

121. *Ad. §. 22. An Heretick he is (saith D. Potter) who opposeth any Truth, which to be a divine Revelation he is convinced in Conscience by any Means whatsoever: Be it by a Preacher or Layman; be it by reading Scriptures, or hearing them read. And from hence you infer, that he makes all these safe Propounders of Faith. A most strange and illogical Deduction! For, may not a private Man by evident Reason convince another Man, that such or such a Doctrine is divine Revelation; and yet though he be a true Propounder in this Point, yet propound another Thing falsely, and without Proof, and, consequently, not to be a safe Propounder in every Point? Your Preachers in their Sermons, do they not propose to Men divine Revelations? and do they not sometimes convince Men in Conscience, by evident Proof from Scripture, that the Things they speak are divine Revelations? And whosoever, being thus convinced, should oppose this divine Revelation, should he not be an Heretick, according to your own Grounds, for calling God's own Truth into question? And would you think your self well dealt with, if I should collect from hence, that you make every Preacher a safe, that is, an infallible Propounder of Faith? Be the Means of Proposal what it will, sufficient or insufficient, worthy of Credit, or not worthy; though it were, if it were possible, the Barking of a Dog, or the Chirping of a Bird; or were it the Discourse of the Devil himself, yet if I be, I will not say convinced, but persuaded, though falsely, that it is a divine Revelation, and shall deny to believe it, I shall be a formal, though not a material, Heretick. For he that believes, though falsely, any thing to be divine Revelation, and yet will not believe it to be true, must of necessity believe God to be false; which, according to your own Doctrine, is the Formality of an Heretick.*

122. And how it can be any way advantagious to Civil Government, that Men without warrant from God should usurp a Tyranny over other Mens Consciences, and prescribe unto them, without Reason, and sometime against Reason, what they shall believe, you must shew us plainer, if you desire we should believe. For to say, *Verily I do not see but it must be so*, is no good Demonstration: For whereas you say, *That a Man may be a passionate and seditious Creature*; from whence you would have us infer, that he may make use of his Interpretation to satisfy his Passion, and raise Sedition: There were some colour in this Consequence, if we (as you do) made private Men infallible Interpreters for others; for then indeed they might lead Disciples after them, and use them as Instruments for their vile Purposes. But when we say, they can only interpret for themselves, what harm they can do by their passionate or seditious Interpretations, but only endanger both their temporal and eternal Happiness, I cannot imagine: For though we deny the Pope or Church of Rome to be an infallible Judge, yet we do not deny, but that there are Judges which may proceed with Certainty enough against all seditious Persons, such as draw Men to Disobedience either against Church or State, as well as against Rebels, and Traitors, and Thieves, and Murderers.

123. *Ad. §. 23. The next § in the Beginning argues thus: For many Ages there was no Scripture in the World; and for many more, there was none in many Places of the World; yet Men wanted not then and there some certain Direction what to believe: Therefore there was then an infallible Judge.* Just as if I should say, *York is not my Way from Oxford to London, therefore Bristol is*: Or a Dog is not a Horse, therefore he is a Man: As if God had no other Ways of revealing himself to Men, but only by Scripture and an infallible Church. y St.

^y See Chrysost. Hom. 1. in Mat. Isid. r. Pelag. l. 3. ep. 100. and also Basil in Pjul. xxviii. and then you shall confess, that by other Means besides these, God did communicate himself unto Men, and made them receive and understand his Laws: See also to the same purpose, Heb. i. 1.

Chrysostom and *Isidorus Pelusiota* conceived, he might use other Means. And *St. Paul* telleth us, that the γνωστόν τῷ Θεῷ, might be known by his Works; and that they had the Law written in their Hearts. Either of these Ways might make some faithful Men, without either Necessity of Scripture or Church.

124. But *D. Potter* says, you say, *In the Jewish Church there was a living Judge, indowed with an absolute infallible Direction in Cases of moment; as all Points belonging to divine Faith are.* And where was that infallible Direction in the Jewish Church, when they should have received Christ for there *Messias*, and refused him? Or, perhaps this was not a Case of moment. *Dr. Potter* indeed might say very well, not that the High Priest was infallible (for certainly he was not); but that his Determination was to be of necessity obeyed; though for the Justice of it there was no necessity that it should be believed. Besides; it is one thing to say, that the living Judge in the Jewish Church had an infallible Direction; another, that he was necessitated to follow this Direction. This is the Privilege which you challenge. But it is that, not this, which the Doctor attributes to the *Jews*. As a Man may truly say, the Wise Men had an infallible Direction to Christ, without saying or thinking that they were constrained to follow it, and could not do otherwise.

125. But either the Church retains still her Infallibility, or it was divested of it upon the Receiving of Holy Scripture, which is absurd: An Argument methinks like this; either you have Horns, or you have lost them; but you never lost them, therefore you have them still. If you say you never had Horns; so say I, for ought appears by your Reasons, the Church never had Infallibility.

126. But some Scriptures were received in some Places and not in others: Therefore if Scriptures were the Judge of Controversies, some Churches had one Judge, and some another. And what great Inconvenience is there in that, that one Part of England should have one Judge, and another another; especially seeing the Books of Scripture, which were received by those that received fewest, had as much of the Doctrine of Christianity in them, as they all had which were received by any; all the necessary Parts of the Gospel being contained in every one of the four Gospels, as I have proved? So that they which had all the Books of the New Testament, had nothing superfluous; for it was not superfluous, but profitable, that the same Thing should be said divers times, and be testified by divers Witnesses; and they that had but one of the four Gospels, wanted nothing necessary: And therefore it is vainly inferred by you, that with Months and Years, as new canonical Scriptures grew to be published, the Church altered her Rule of Faith, and Judge of Controversies.

127. Heresies, you say, would arise after the Apostles Time, and after the Writing of Scriptures: These cannot be discovered, condemned, and avoided, unless the Church be infallible; therefore there must be a Church infallible. But I pray tell me, why cannot Heresies be sufficiently discovered, condemned, and avoided by them which believe Scripture to be the Rule of Faith? If Scripture be sufficient to inform us what is the Faith, it must of necessity be also sufficient to teach us what is Heresy; seeing Heresy is nothing but a manifest Deviation from, and an Opposition to the Faith. That which is streight will plainly teach us what is crooked; and one contrary cannot but manifest the other. If any one should deny, that there is a God; that this God is Omnipotent, Omniscient, Good, Just, True, Merciful, a Rewarder of them that seek him, a Punisher of them that obstinately offend him; that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and the Saviour of the World; that it is He, by Obedience to whom Men must look to be saved: If any Man should deny either his Birth, or Passion, or Resurrection, or Ascension, or Sitting at the right Hand of God; His having all Power given him in Heaven and Earth: That it is He whom God hath appointed to be Judge of the Quick and Dead; that all Men shall rise again at the last Day; that they which believe and repent shall be saved; that they which do not believe^z and repent shall be damned: If a Man should hold, that either the

^z Or repent ——— Oxf.

Keeping of the *Mosaical* Law is necessary to Salvation ; or that good Works are not necessary to Salvation : In a word, if any Man should obstinately contradict the Truth of any thing plainly delivered in Scripture, who does not see that every one which believes the Scripture, hath a sufficient Means to discover, and condemn, and avoid that Heresy without any need of an infallible Guide ? If you say, that *the obscure Places of Scripture contain Matters of Faith* : I answer, that it is a Matter of Faith to believe, that the Sense of them, whatsoever it is, which was intended by God, is true ; for he that doth not so, calls God's Truth into question. But to believe this or that to be the true Sense of them, or, to believe the true Sense of them, and to avoid the false, is not necessary either to Faith or Salvation. For if God would have had his Meaning in these Places certainly known, how could it stand with his Wisdom, to be so wanting to his own Will and End, as to speak obscurely ? Or how can it consist with his Justice, to require of Men to know certainly the Meaning of those Words, which he himself hath not revealed ? Suppose there were an absolute Monarch, that in his own Absence from one of his Kingdoms, had written Laws for the Government of it, some very plainly, and some very ambiguously, and obscurely, and his Subjects should keep those that were plainly written with all Exactness, and for those that were obscure, use their best Diligence to find his meaning in them, and obey them according to the Sense of them which they conceived ; should this King either with Justice or Wisdom be offended with these Subjects, if by reason of the obscurity of them they mistook the Sense of them ; and failed of performance, by reason of their Error ?

128. *But it is more useful and fit, you say, for the deciding of Controversies, to have, besides an infallible Rule to go by, a living infallible Judge to determine them : and from hence you conclude, that certainly there is such a Judge.* But why then may not another say, that it is yet more useful for many excellent Purposes, that all the Patriarchs should be infallible, than that the Pope only should ? Another, that it would be yet more useful that all the Archbishops of every Province should be so, than that the Patriarchs only should be so. Another, that it would be yet more useful, if all the Bishops of every Diocese were so. Another, that it would be yet more available, that all the Parsons of every Parish should be so. Another, that it would be yet more excellent, if all the Fathers of Families were so. And lastly, another, that it were much more to be desired, that every Man and every Woman were so ; just as much as the Prevention of Controversies is better than the Decision of them ; and the Prevention of Heresies better than the Condemnation of them ; and upon this ground conclude, by your own very Consequence, that not only a General Council, nor only the Pope, but all the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, Pastors, Fathers, nay, all the Men in the World are infallible ; if you say, now, as I am sure you will, that this Conclusion is most gross and absurd, against Sense and Experience, then must also the Ground be false from which it evidently and undeniably follows, *viz.* That that Course of dealing with Men seems always more fit to Divine Providence, which seems most fit to Humane Reason.

129. And so likewise, that there should Men succeed the Apostles, which could shew themselves to be their Successors, by doing of Miracles, by speaking all Kinds of Languages, by delivering Men to Satan, as St. *Paul* did *Hymenæus*, and the incestuous *Corinthian* ; it is manifest in humane Reason, it were incomparably more fit and useful for the decision of Controversies, than that the Successor of the Apostles should have none of these Gifts, and for want of the signs of Apostleship, be justly questionable, whether he be his Successor or no : And will you now conclude, that the Popes have the Gift of doing Miracles as well as the Apostles had ?

130. It were in all reason very useful and requisite that the Pope should, by the assistance of God's Spirit, be freed from the Vices and Passions of Men, lest otherwise, the Authority given him for the good of the Church, he might employ (as divers Popes you well know have done) to the disturbance and oppression,

sion, and mischief of it. And will you conclude from hence, that Popes are not subject to the Sins and Passions of other Men? that there never have been ambitious, covetous, lustful, tyrannous Popes?

131. Who sees not that for Mens Direction it were much more beneficial for the Church, that Infallibility should be settled in the Pope's Person, than in a General Council; that so the Means of deciding Controversies might be speedy, easy, and perpetual; whereas that of General Councils is not so. And will you hence infer, that not the Church representative, but the Pope is indeed the infallible Judge of Controversies? Certainly, if you should, the *Sorbon* Doctors would not think this a good Conclusion.

132. It had been very commodious (one would think) that seeing either God's Pleasure was, the Scripture should be translated, or else in his Providence he knew it would be so, that he had appointed some Men for this Business, and by his Spirit assisted them in it, that so we might have Translations as authentic as the Original; yet you see God did not think fit to do so.

133. It had been very commodious (one would think) that the Scripture should have been, at least for all Things necessary, a Rule, plain and perfect; and yet you say, it is both imperfect and obscure, even in Things necessary.

134. It had been most requisite (one would think) that the Copies of the Bibles should have been preserved free from Variety of Readings, which makes Men very uncertain in many Places, which is the Word of God, and which is the Error or Presumption of Man; and yet we see God hath not thought fit so to provide for us.

135. Who can conceive, but that an apostolick Interpretation of all the difficult Places of Scripture, would have been strangely beneficial to the Church, especially there being such Danger in mistaking the Sense of them, as is by you pretended, and God in his Providence foreseeing that the greatest Part of Christians would not accept of the Pope for the Judge of Controversies? And yet we see God hath not so ordered the matter.

136. Who doth not see, that supposing the Bishop of *Rome* had been appointed Head of the Church and Judge of Controversies, that it would have been infinitely beneficial to the Church, perhaps as much as all the rest of the Bible, that in some Book of Scripture, which was to be undoubtedly received, this one Proposition had been set down in Terms, *The Bishops of Rome shall be always Monarchs of the Church, and they either alone, or with their Adherents, the Guides of Faith, and the Judges of Controversies that shall arise amongst Christians?* This, if you deal ingenuously, you cannot but acknowledge; for then all true Christians would have submitted to him, as willingly as to Christ himself; neither needed you and your Fellows have troubled your self to invent so many Sophisms for the proof of it. There would have been no more doubt of it among Christians, than there is of the Nativity, Passion, Resurrection, or Ascension of Christ. You were best now rub your Forehead hard, and conclude upon us, that because this would have been so useful to have been done, therefore it is done. Or if you be (as I know you are) too ingenuous to say so, then must you acknowledge, that the Ground of your Argument, which is the very Ground of all these Absurdities, is most absurd; and that it is our Duty to be humbly thankful for those sufficient, nay abundant Means of Salvation, which God hath of his own Goodness granted us; and not conclude he hath done that which he hath not done, because, forsooth, in our vain Judgments, it seems convenient he should have done so.

137. But you demand, *What Repugnance there is between Infallibility in the Church, and Existence of Scripture, that the Production of the one must be the Destruction of the other?* Out of which Words I can frame no other Argument for you than this; *There is no Repugnance between the Scriptures Existence and the Church's Infallibility, therefore the Church is infallible.* Which Consequence will then be good, when you can shew, that nothing can be untrue, but that only which is impossible; that whatsoever may be done, that also is done. Which if
it

it were true, would conclude both you and me to be infallible, as well as either your Church or Pope; in as much as there is no more repugnance between the Scripture's Existence and our Infallibility, than there is between theirs.

138. *But if Protestants will have the Scripture alone for their Judge, let them first produce some Scripture, affirming, that by the Entering thereof, Infallibility went out of the Church.* This Argument put in form, runs thus: No Scripture affirms, that by the Entering thereof, Infallibility went out of the Church; therefore there is an infallible Church, and therefore the Scripture alone is not Judge, that is, the Rule to judge by. But as no Scripture affirms, that by the Entering of it, Infallibility went out of the Church; so neither do we, neither have we any need to do so. But we say, that it continued in the Church even together with the Scriptures, so long as Christ and his Apostles were living, and then departed; God in his Providence having provided a plain and infallible Rule, to supply the Defect of living and infallible Guides. Certainly, if your Cause were good, so great a Wit as your's is, would devise better Arguments to maintain it. We can shew no Scripture affirming Infallibility to have gone out of the Church, therefore it is infallible. Somewhat like his Discourse that said, It could not be proved out of Scripture, that the King of Sweden was dead, therefore he is still living. Methinks, in all reason, you that challenge Privileges, and Exemption from the Condition of Men, which is to be subject to Error; you, that by virtue of this Privilege, usurp Authority over Men's Consciences, should produce your Letters Patents from the King of Heaven, and shew some express Warrant for this Authority you take upon you; otherwise you know the Rule is, *Ubi contrarium non manifeste probatur, presumitur pro libertate.*

139. *But Dr. Potter may remember what himself teacheth, That the Church is still endued with Infallibility in Points fundamental, and consequently, that Infallibility in the Church doth well agree with the Truth, the Sanctity, yea, with the Sufficiency of Scripture, for all Matters necessary to Salvation.* Still your Discourse is so far from hitting the White, that it roves quite besides the Butt. You conclude, that the Infallibility of the Church may well agree with the Truth, the Sanctity, the Sufficiency of Scripture. But what is this, but to abuse your Reader with the Proof of that which no Man denies? The Question is not, Whether an infallible Church might agree with Scripture; but whether there be an infallible Church? *Jam dic, Posthume, de tribus Capellis.* Besides, you must know, there is a wide Difference between *being infallible in Fundamentals*, and being an *infallible Guide even in Fundamentals*. Dr. Potter says, that the Church is the former, that is, there shall be some Men in the World, while the World lasts, which err not in Fundamentals; for otherwise there should be no Church. For to say, the Church, while it is the Church, may err in Fundamentals, implies a Contradiction, and is all one as to say, the Church while it is the Church, may not be the Church. So that to say, that the Church is infallible in Fundamentals, signifies no more but this, There shall be a Church in the World for ever. But we utterly deny the Church to be the latter; for to say so, were to oblige our selves to find some certain Society of Men, of whom we might be certain, that they neither do, nor can err in Fundamentals, nor in declaring what is fundamental, what is not fundamental: And consequently, to make any Church an infallible Guide in Fundamentals, would be to make it infallible in all things which she proposes and requires to be believed. This therefore we deny both to your and all other Churches of any one denomination, as the *Greek*, the *Roman*, the *Abyssine*; that is indeed, we deny it simply to any Church: For no Church can possibly be fit to be a Guide, but only a Church of some certain denomination: For otherwise no Man can possibly know which is the true Church, but by a Pre-examination of the Doctrine controverted, and that were not to be guided by the Church to the true Doctrine, but by the true Doctrine to the Church. Hereafter therefore, when you hear Protestants say, the Church is infallible in Fundamentals, you must not conceive them as if they meant as you do, that some Society of Christians, which may be known by adhering to
some

some one Head, for example, the Pope, or the Bishop of *Constantinople*, is infallible in these Things; but only thus, that true Religion shall never be so far driven out of the World, but that it shall always, some where or other, some that believe and profess it, in all Things necessary to Salvation.

140. But, *you would therefore gladly know out of what Text he imagines that the Church, by the coming of Scripture, was deprived of Infallibility in some Points, and not in others?* And I also would gladly know, why you do thus frame to your self vain Imaginations, and then father them upon others? We yield unto you, that there shall be a Church which never erreth in some Points, because (as we conceive) God hath promised so much; but not that there shall be such a Church, which doth or can err in no Points, because we find not, that God hath promised such a Church; and therefore may not promise such a one to our selves. But, for the Church's being deprived by the Scripture of Infallibility in some Points, and not in others, that is a wild Notion of your own, which we have nothing to do with.

141. But he affirmeth, *That the Jewish Church retained Infallibility in her self: and therefore it is unjustly and unworthily done of him to deprive the Church of Christ of it.* That the Jews had sometimes an infallible miraculous Direction from God in some Cases of moment, he doth affirm, and had good warrant; but that the Synagogue was absolutely infallible, he no where affirms; and therefore it is unjustly and unworthily done of you to obtrude it upon him. And indeed, how can the Infallibility of the Synagogue be conceived, but only by settling it in the High Priest, and the Company adhering and subordinate unto him? And whether the High Priest was infallible, when he believed not Christ to be the Messiah, but condemned and excommunicated them that so professed, and caused him to be crucified for saying so, I leave it to Christians to judge. But then suppose God had been so pleased to do as he did not, to appoint the Synagogue an infallible Guide; could you by your Rules of Logick constrain him to appoint such an one to Christians also; or say unto him, that in Wisdom he could not do otherwise? Vain Man, that will be thus always tying God to your Imaginations! It is well for us that he leaves us not without Directions to him; but if he will do this sometimes by living Guides, sometimes by written Rules, what is that to you? May not he do what he will with his own?

142. *And whereas you say, for the further enforcing of this Argument, that there is greater reason to think the Church should be infallible than the Synagogue; because to the Synagogue all Laws and Ceremonies, &c. were more particularly and minutely delivered than in the New Testament is done, our Saviour leaving Particulars to the determination of the Church.* But I pray walk not thus in Generality, but tell us, what Particulars? If you mean particular Rites and Ceremonies, and Orders for Government, we grant it, and you know we do so. Our Saviour only hath left a general Injunction by St. Paul, *Let all Things be done decently and in order.* But what Order is fittest, *i. e.* what Time, what Place, what Manner, &c. is fittest? That he hath left to the Discretion of the Governours of the Church. But if you mean, that he hath only concerning Matters of Faith, the Subject in question, prescribed in general, that we are to hear the Church, and left it to the Church to determine what Particulars we are to believe, the Church being nothing else but an Aggregation of Believers: This in effect is to say, he hath left it to all Believers to determine what Particulars they are to believe. Besides, it is so apparently false, that I wonder how you could content your self, or think we should be contented, with a bare Saying, without any Shew or Pretence of Proof.

143. As for D. Potter's Objection against this Argument, *That as well you might infer, that Christians must have all one King, because the Jews had so.* For ought I can perceive, notwithstanding any thing answered by you, it may stand still in Force; though the Truth is, it is urged by him not against the Infallibility, but the Monarchy of the Church. For whereas you say, the Disparity is very clear: He that should urge this Argument for one Monarch over the whole

World,

World, would say, that this is to deny the Conclusion, and reply unto you, that there is Disparity as Matters are now ordered, but that there should not be so. For that there was no more reason to believe that the Ecclesiastical Government of the Jews was a Pattern for the Ecclesiastical Government of Christians, than the Civil of the Jews for the Civil of the Christians. He would tell you, that the Church of Christ, and all Christian Commonwealths, and Kingdoms, are one and the same thing : And therefore he sees no reason why the Synagogue should be a Type and Figure of the Church, and not of the Commonwealth. He would tell you, that as the Church succeeded the Jewish Synagogue, so Christian Princes should succeed the Jewish Magistrates; that is, the temporal Governors of the Church should be Christians. He would tell you, that as the Church is compared to a House, a Kingdom, an Army, a Body, so all distinct Kingdoms might and should be one Army, one Family, &c. and that it is not so, is the thing he complains of. And therefore you ought not to think it enough to say, it is not so; but you should shew, why it should not be so; and why this Argument will not follow, The Jews had one King, therefore all Christians ought to have; as well as this, the Jews had one High Priest over them all, therefore all Christians also ought to have. He might tell you moreover, that the Church may have one Master, one General, one Head, one King, and yet he not be the Pope, but Christ. He might tell you, that you beg the Question, in saying without Proof, that it is necessary to Salvation, that all (whether Christians or Churches) have recourse to one Church, if you mean by one Church, one particular Church which is to govern and direct all others: And, that unless you mean so, you say nothing to the purpose. And besides, he might tell you, and that very truly, that it may seem altogether as available for the temporal Good of Christians to be under one temporal Prince, or Commonwealth, as for their Salvation, to be subordinate to one visible Head: I say, as necessary, both for the Prevention of the Effusion of the Blood of Christians by Christians, and for the Defence of Christendom from the hostile Invasions of Turks and Pagans. And from all this he might infer, that though now, by the Fault of Men, there were in several Kingdoms several Laws, Governments, and Powers; yet that it were much more expedient, that there were but one: Nay, not only expedient, but necessary, if once your Ground be settled for a general Rule, That what Kind of Government the Jews had, that the Christians must have. And, if you limit the Generality of this Proposition, and frame the Argument thus: What Kind of Ecclesiastical Government the *Jews* had, that the Christians must have: But they were governed by one High Priest, therefore these must be so: He will say, that the first Proposition of this Syllogism is altogether as doubtful as the Conclusion; and therefore neither fit nor sufficient to prove it, until it self be proved. And then besides, that there is as great reason to believe this, that what Kind of Civil Government the *Jews* had, that the Christians must have. And so Dr. *Potter's* Objection remains still unanswered: That there is as much reason to conclude a Necessity of one King over all Christian Kingdoms, from the *Jews* having one King; as one Bishop over all Churches, from their being under one High Priest.

144. *Ad. §. 24.* Neither is this Discourse confirmed by ^a *Irenæus* at all, whether by this Discourse you mean that immediately foregoing, of the Analogy between the Church and the Synagogue, to which this Speech of *Irenæus* alledged by you is utterly and plainly impertinent; or whether by this Discourse, you mean (as I think you do) not your Discourse, but your Conclusion which you discourse on, that is, that *Your Church is the infallible Judge in Controversies*. For neither hath *Irenæus* one Syllable to this purpose; neither can it be deduced out of what he says, with any colour of Consequence. For, first in saying, *What if the Apostles had not left Scripture, ought we not to have followed the Order of Tradition?* And in saying, *That to this Order many Nations yield assent, who believe in Christ, having Salvation written in their Hearts by the Spirit of GOD,*

^a *Irenæus*, l. iii. c. 3.

without Letters or Ink, and diligently keeping ancient Tradition : Doth he not plainly shew, that the Tradition he speaks of is nothing else, but the very same that is written ; nothing but to believe in Christ ? To which, whether Scripture alone, to them that believe it, be not a sufficient Guide, I leave it to you to judge. And are not his Words just as if a Man should say, if God had not given us the Light of the Sun, we must have made use of Candles and Torches : If we had no Eyes, we must have felt out our Way : If we had no Legs, we must have used Crutches. And doth not this in effect import, that while we have the Sun we need no Candles ? While we have our Eyes, we need not feel out our Way ? While we enjoy our Legs, we need not Crutches ? And, by like Reason, *Irenæus* in saying, *If we had no Scripture, we must have followed Tradition ; and they that have none, do well to do so* ; doth he not plainly import, that to them that have Scripture and believe it, Tradition is unnecessary ? Which could not be, if the Scripture did not contain evidently the whole Tradition. Which, whether *Irenæus* believed or no, these Words of his may inform you, *Non enim per alios, &c. we have received the Disposition of our Salvation from no others, but from them by whom the Gospel came unto us. Which Gospel truly the Apostles first preached, and afterwards by the Will of God delivered in Writing to us, to be the Pillar and Foundation of our Faith.* Upon which Place *Bellarmino's* two Observations, and his Acknowledgment ensuing upon them are very considerable ; and as I conceive, as home to my Purpose, as I could wish them. His first *Notandum* is, *That in the Christian Doctrine, some Things are simply necessary for the Salvation of all Men ; as the Knowledge of the Articles of the Apostles Creed ; and besides the Knowledge of the Ten Commandments, and some of the Sacraments. Other Things are not so necessary, but that a Man may be saved without the explicate Knowledge, and Belief, and Profession of them.* His second Note is, *that those Things, which were simply necessary, the Apostles were wont to preach to all Men ; but of other Things not all to all, but some Things to all, to wit, those Things which were profitable for all, other Things only to Prelates and Priests.* These Things premised, he acknowledgeth, *That all these Things were written by the Apostles which are necessary for all, and which they were wont to preach to all ; but that other Things were not all written ; and therefore, when Irenæus says, that the Apostles wrote what they preached in the World, it is true, saith he, and not against Tradition, because they preached not to the People all Things, but only those Things which were necessary and profitable for them.*

145. So that at the most, you can infer from hence but only a suppositive Necessity of having an infallible Guide, and that grounded upon a false Supposition, in case we had no Scripture ; but an absolute Necessity hereof, and to them who have and believe the Scripture, which is your Assumption, cannot with any colour from hence be concluded, but rather the contrary.

146. Neither because (as he says) it was *then easy to receive the Truth from God's Church* ; then in the Age next after the Apostles, then when all the ancient and apostolick Churches were at an Agreement about the Fundamentals of Faith : Will it therefore follow, that now 1600 Years after, when the ancient Churches are divided almost into as many Religions as there are Churches, every one being the Church to it self, and Heretical to all other, that it is as easy, but extremely difficult, or rather impossible, to find the Church first independently of the true Doctrine, and then to find the Truth by the Church ?

147. As for the last Clause of the Sentence, it will not any whit advantage, but rather prejudice your Assertion. Neither will I seek to avoid the Pressure of it, by saying that he speaks of *small Questions*, and therefore not of Questions touching Things necessary to Salvation, which can hardly be called small Questions ; but I will favour you so far as to suppose, that saying this of small Questions, it is probable he would have said it much more of the Great ; but I will answer that which is most certain and evident, and which I am confident you your self, were you as impudent as I believe you modest, would not deny, that the ancient Apostolick Churches are not now as they were in *Irenæus's* his Time ; when they were all at Unity about Matters of Faith, which Unity was a good Assurance

Assurance that what they so agreed in, came from some one common Fountain, and that no other than of Apostolick Preaching. And this is the very Ground of *Tertullian's* so often mistaken *Prescription against Hereticks*: *Variasse debuerat Error Ecclesiarum; quod autem apud multos unum est, non est erratum sed traditum*: If the Churches had erred, they could not but have varied; but that which is among so many, came not by Error but Tradition. But now the Case is altered, and the Mischief is, that these ancient Churches are divided among themselves; and if we have recourse to them, one of them will say, this is the Way to Heaven, another that. So that now in place of receiving from them certain and clear Truths, we must expect nothing but certain and clear Contradictions.

148. Neither will the *Apostles depositing with the Church all Things belonging to the Truth*, be any Proof that the Church shall certainly keep this *Depositum* entire and sincere, without adding to it, or taking from it; for this whole *Depositum* was committed to every particular Church, nay, to every particular Man which the Apostles converted. And yet no Man I think will say that there was any Certainty, that it should be kept whole and inviolate by every Man, and every Church. It is apparent out of Scripture it was committed to *Timothy*, and by him consign'd to other faithful Men; and yet *St. Paul* thought it not superfluous, earnestly to exhort him to the careful keeping of it: Which Exhortation you must grant had been vain and superfluous, if the not keeping had been impossible. And therefore though *Irenæus* says, *The Apostles fully deposited in the Church all Truth*, yet he says not, neither can we infer from what he says, that the Church should always infallibly keep this *Depositum* entire, without the Loss of any Truth, and sincere, without the Mixture of any Falshood.

146. *Ad §. 25.* But you proceed and tell us, *That besides all this, the Doctrine of Protestants is destructive of it self. For either they have certain and infallible Means not to err in interpreting, or not. If not, Scripture to them cannot be a sufficient Ground for infallible Faith: If they have, and so cannot err in interpreting Scripture, then they are able with Infallibility to hear and determine all Controversies of Faith; and so they may be, and are Judges of Controversies, although they use the Scripture as a Rule. And thus against their own Doctrine, they constitute another Judge of Controversies beside Scripture alone.* And may not we with as much reason substitute Church and Papists instead of Scripture and Protestants, and say unto you, besides all this, the Doctrine of Papists is destructive of it self? For either they have certain and infallible Means not to err in the choice of the Church, and interpreting her Decrees, or they have not; if not, then the Church to them cannot be a sufficient (but meerly a fantastical) Ground for infallible Faith, nor a meet Judge of Controversies: (For unless I be infallibly sure that the Church is infallible, how can I be upon her Authority infallibly sure, that any Thing she says is infallible?) If they have certain infallible Means, and so cannot err in the choice of their Church, and interpreting her Decrees, then they are able with Infallibility to hear, examine and determine all Controversies of Faith, although they pretend to make the Church their Guide. And thus against their own Doctrine, they constitute another Judge of Controversies besides the Church alone. Nay, every one makes himself a Chuser of his own Religion, and of his own Sense of the Church's Decrees, which very Thing in Protestants they so highly condemn; and so in judging others, condemn themselves.

150. Neither in saying thus have I only cried Quittance with you; but that you may see how much you are in my Debt, I will shew unto you, that for your Sophism against our Way, I have given you a Demonstration against yours. First, I say, your Argument against us is a transparent Fallacy. The first part of it lies thus; Protestants have no Means to interpret, without Error, obscure and ambiguous Places of Scripture; therefore plain Places of Scripture cannot be to them a sufficient Ground of Faith. But though we pretend not to certain Means of not erring in interpreting all Scripture, particularly such Places as are obscure and ambiguous, yet this, methinks, should be no Impediment, but that we may have certain Means of not erring in and about the Sense of those Places.

which

which are so plain and clear, that they need no Interpreters ; and in such we say our Faith is contained. If you ask me how I can be sure that I know the true Meaning of these Places? I ask you again, Can you be sure, that you understand what I, or any Man else says? They that heard our Saviour and the Apostles preach, could they have sufficient assurance, that they understood at any Time what they would have them do? If not, to what end did they hear them? If they could, why may we not be as well assured that we understand sufficiently what we conceive plain in their Writings?

151. Again, I pray tell us, whether you do certainly know the Sense of these Scriptures, with which you pretend you are led to the Knowledge of your Church? If you do not, how know you that there is any Church infallible, and that these are the Notes of it, and that this is the Church that hath these Notes? If you do, then give us leave to have the same Means, and the same Abilities to know other plain Places, which you have to know these. For, if all Scripture be obscure, how come you to know the Sense of these Places? If some Places of it be plain, why should we stay here?

152. And now to come to the other Part of your Dilemma. In saying, *If they have certain Means, and so cannot err*, methinks you forget your self very much, and seem to make no difference between having certain Means to do a Thing, and the actual doing of it. As if you should conclude, because all Men have certain Means of Salvation, therefore all Men certainly must be saved, and cannot do otherwise ; as if, whosoever had a Horse must presently get up and ride ; whosoever had Means to find out a Way, could not neglect those Means, and so mistake it. God be thanked, that we have sufficient Means to be certain enough of the Truth of our Faith ! But the Privilege of not being in Possibility of erring, that we challenge not, because we have as little reason as you to do so ; and you have none at all. If you ask, seeing we may possibly err, How can we be assured we do not? I ask you again, seeing your Eye-sight may deceive you, How can you be sure you see the Sun when you do see it? Perhaps you may be in a Dream, and perhaps you, and all the Men in the World have been so, when they thought they were awake, and then only awake, when they thought they dreamt. But this I am sure of, as sure as that God is good, that he will require no Impossibilities of us ; not an infallible, nor a certainly unerring Belief, unless he hath given us certain Means to avoid Error ; and, if we use those which we have, he will never require of us, that we use that which we have not.

153. Now from this mistaken Ground, That it is all one to have Means of avoiding Error, and to be in no Danger, nor Possibility of Error, you infer upon us an absurd Conclusion, *That we make our selves able to determine Controversies of Faith without Infallibility, and Judges of Controversies*. For the latter part of this Inference, we acknowledge and embrace it : We do make our selves Judges of Controversies, that is, we do make use of our own Understanding in the choice of our Religion. But this, if it be a Crime, is common to us with you (as I have proved above) ; and the Difference is, not that we are Chusers, and you not Chusers ; but that we, as we conceive, chuse wisely ; but you being wilfully blind, chuse to follow those that are so too, not remembering what our Saviour hath told you, *When the Blind lead the Blind, both shall fall into the Ditch*. But then again I must tell you, you have done ill to confound together *Judges*, and *infallible Judges* ; unless you will say, either that we have no Judges in our Courts of Civil Judicature, or that they are all infallible.

154. Thus have we cast off your *Dilemma*, and broken both the Horns of it. But now my Retortion lies heavy upon you, and will not be turned off. For first you content not your selves with a moral Certainty of the Things you believe, nor with such a degree of assurance of them, as is sufficient to produce Obedience to the Condition of the New Covenant, which is all that we require. God's Spirit, if he please, may work more, a Certainty of Adherence beyond a Certainty of Evidence : But neither God doth, nor Man may, require of us as our Duty, to
give
I.

give a greater Assent to the Conclusion, than the Premises deserve; to build an infallible Faith upon Motives that are only highly credible, and not infallible, as it were a great and heavy Building upon a Foundation that hath not Strength proportionable. But though God require not of us such unreasonable Things, You do; and tell Men they cannot be saved, unless they believe your Proposals with an infallible Faith. To which End they must believe also your Propounder, your Church, to be simply infallible. Now how is it possible for them to give a rational Assent to the Church's Infallibility, unless they have some infallible Means to know that she is infallible? Neither can they infallibly know the Infallibility of this Means, but by some other, and so on for ever; unless they can dig so deep as to come at length to the Rock, that is, *to settle all upon something evident of it self*, which is not so much as pretended. But the last Resolution of all is into Motives, which indeed upon Examination, will scarce appear probable; but are not so much as vouched to be any more than very credible. For Example, if I ask you, Why you do believe Transubstantiation? What can you answer, but because it is a Revelation of the prime Verity. I demand again, How can you assure your self or me of that, being ready to embrace it if it may appear to be so? And what can you say, but that you know it to be so, because the Church says so, which is infallible? If I ask, what mean you by your Church? You can tell me nothing but the Company of Christians which adhere to the *Pope*. I demand then^b further, Why should I believe this Company to be the infallible Propounder of divine Revelation? And then you tell me, that there are many Motives to induce a Man to this Belief. But are these Motives lastly infallible? No, say you, but very credible. Well, let them pass for such, because now we have not Leisure to examine them. Yet methinks seeing the Motives to believe the Church's Infallibility are only very credible, it should also be but as credible that your Church is infallible; and as credible, and no more; perhaps somewhat less, that her Proposals, particularly Transubstantiation, are divine Revelations. And methinks you should require only a moral, and modest Assent to them, and not a divine, as you call it, and infallible Faith. But then of these Motives to the Church's Infallibility, I hope you will give us leave to consider, and judge, whether they be indeed Motives, and sufficient; or whether they be not Motives at all, or not sufficient; or whether these Motives or Inducements to your Church be not impeached, and opposed with Compulsives and Enforcements from it; or lastly, Whether these Motives which You use, be not indeed only Motives to Christianity, and not to *Popery*; give me leave for Distinction-sake to call your Religion so. If we may not judge of these Things, How can my Judgment be moved with that which comes not within its Cognizance? If I may, then at least I am to be a Judge of all these Controversies.

1. Whether every one of these Motives be indeed a Motive to any Church?
2. If to some, whether to Yours?
3. If to Yours, whether sufficient, or insufficient?
4. Whether other Societies have not as many, and as great Motives to draw me to them?
5. Whether I have not greater Reason to believe you do err, than that you cannot?

And now, Sir, I pray let me trouble You with a few more Questions. Am I a sufficient Judge of these Controversies, or no? If of these, why shall I stay here, why not of others, why not of all? Nay, doth not the true examining of these few, contain and lay upon me the Examination of all? What other Motives to your Church have you, but your Notes of it? *Bellarmino* gives some 14 or 15. And one of these fifteen contains in it the Examination of all Controversies; and not only so, but of all uncontroverted Doctrines. For how shall I, or can I, *know the Church of Rome's Conformity with the ancient Church*, unless I know first what the ancient Church did hold, and then what the Church of *Rome* doth hold? And, lastly, whether they be conformable, or, if in my Judgment they seem not conformable, I am then to think the Church of *Rome* not to be the Church, for want of the Note, which she pretends is proper and

^b Lastly——Ox.

perpetual to it? So that, for ought I can see, Judges we are, and must be of all Sides, every one for himself, and God for us all.

155. *Ad* §. 26. I answer; This Assertion, that *Scripture alone is Judge of all Controversies in Faith*, if it be taken properly, is neither a fundamental nor unfundamental Point of Faith, nor no Point of Faith at all, but a plain Falshood. It is not a *Judge of Controversies*, but a *Rule to judge them by*; and that not an absolutely perfect Rule, but as perfect as a written Rule can be; which must always need something else, which is either evidently true, or evidently credible, to give Attestation to it, and that in this Case is universal Tradition. So that universal Tradition is the Rule to judge all Controversies by. But then because nothing besides Scripture comes to us with as full a Stream of Tradition as Scripture, Scripture alone, and no unwritten Doctrine, nor no Infallibility of any Church, having Attestation from Tradition truly universal; for this Reason we conceive, as the Apostles Persons, while they were living, were the only Judges of Controversies, so their Writings, now they are dead, are the only Rule for us to judge them by; there being nothing unwritten, which can go in upon half so fair Cards, for the title of apostolick Tradition, as these Things, which by the Confession of both Sides are not so; I mean *the Doctrine of the Millenaries*, and *of the Necessity of the Eucharist for Infants*.

156. Yet when we say, The Scripture is the only Rule to judge all Controversies by; methinks you should easily conceive, that we would be understood, of all those that are possible to be judged by Scripture, and of those that arise among such as believe the Scripture. For, if I had a Controversy with an Atheist, whether there was a God or no, I would not say, that the Scripture were a Rule to judge this by; seeing that, doubting whether there be a God or no, he must needs doubt whether the Scripture be the Word of God; or if he does not, he grants the Question, and is not the Man we speak of. So likewise, if I had a Controversy about the Truth of Christ with a Jew, it would be vainly done of me, should I press him with the Authority of the New Testament, which he believes not, till out of some Principles common to us both, I had perswaded him that it is the Word of God. The New Testament, therefore, while he remains a Jew, would not be a fit Rule to decide this Controversy; in as much as that which is doubted of it self, is not fit to determine other Doubts. So likewise, if there were any that believed the Christian Religion, and yet believed not the Bible to be the Word of God, though they believed the Matter of it to be true, (which is no impossible Supposition; for I may believe a Book of St. *Austin's* to contain nothing but the Truth of God, and yet not to have been inspired by God himself); against such Men therefore there were no disputing out of the Bible, because nothing in question can be a Proof to it self. When therefore we say, Scripture is a sufficient Means to determine all Controversies, we say not this, either to Atheists, Jews, Turks, or such Christians (if there be any such) as believe not Scripture to be the Word of God: But among such Men only, as are already agreed upon this, that *the Scripture is the Word of God*, we say, all Controversies that arise about Faith, are either not at all decidable, and consequently not necessary to be believed one way or other, or they may be determined by Scripture. In a word, that all Things necessary to be believed are evidently contained in Scripture, and what is not there evidently contained, cannot be necessary to be believed. And our Reason hereof is convincing, because nothing can challenge our Belief, but what hath descended to us from Christ by original and universal Tradition. Now nothing but Scripture hath thus descended to us, therefore nothing but Scripture can challenge our Belief. Now then to come up closer to you, and to answer to your Question, not as you put it, but as you should have put it: I say, that this Position, *Scripture alone is the Rule whereby they which believe it to be God's Word, are to judge all Controversies in Faith*, is no fundamental Point, though not for your Reasons: For, your first and strongest Reason, you see, is plainly voided and cut off by my Stating of the Question as I have

^c believed Christian Religion. O. L.

CHAP. II. *whereby to judge of Controversies.* 127

done, and supposing in it, that the Parties at variance are agreed about this, that the Scripture is the Word of God; and consequently that this is none of their Controversies. To your second, that *Controversies cannot be ended without some living Authority*; we have said already, that necessary Controversies may be and are decided: And, if they be not ended, this is not through Defect of the Rule, but through the Default of Men. And, for these that cannot thus be ended, it is not necessary they should be ended: For, if God did require the Ending of them, he would have provided some certain Means for the Ending of them. And to your Third, I say, that your Pretence of *using these Means*, is but hypocritical; for you use them with Prejudice, and with a settled Resolution not to believe any Thing which these Means happily may suggest into you, if it any way cross your pre-conceived Persuasion of your Church's Infallibility. You give not your selves Liberty of Judgment in the Use of them, nor suffer your selves to be led by them to the Truth, to which they would lead you, would you but be as willing to believe this Consequence, Our Church doth oppose Scripture, therefore it doth err, therefore it is not infallible; as you are resolute to believe this, The Church is infallible, therefore it doth not err, and therefore it doth not oppose Scripture, though it seem to do so never so plainly.

157. *You pray*, but it is not that God would bring you to the true Religion, but that he would confirm you in your own. *You confer Places*, but it is that you may confirm, or colour over with plausible Disguises your erroneous Doctrines; not that you may judge of them, and forsake them, if there be Reason for it. *You consult the Originals*, but you regard them not when they make against your Doctrine or Translation.

158. You add not only the Authority, but the Infallibility, not of God's Church, but of the *Roman*, a very corrupt and degenerate Part of it: Whereof Dr. *Potter* never confessed, that it cannot err damnably. And which being a Company made up of particular Men, can afford you no Help, but the Industry, Learning, and Wit of private Men: And, that these Helps may not help you out of your Error, tell you, that you must make use of none of all these to discover any Error in the Church, but only to maintain her Impossibility of Erring. And, lastly, D. *Potter* assures himself, that your Doctrine and Practices are damnable enough in themselves; only he hopes (and *spes est rei incertæ nominis*) he hopes, I say, that the Truths which you retain, especially the Necessity of Repentance and Faith in Christ, will be as an Antidote to you against the Errors which you maintain; and that your Superstition may burn, yet they amongst you, *qui sequuntur Absolonem in simplicitate cordis*, may be saved, *yet sô as by Fire*. Yet his thinking so is no Reason for you or me to think so, unless you suppose him infallible; and if you do, why do you write against him?

159. Notwithstanding, though not for these Reasons, yet for others, I conceive this Doctrine not fundamental; because, if a Man should believe Christian Religion wholly, and entirely, and live according to it, such a Man, though he should not know or not believe the Scripture to be a Rule of Faith, no nor to be the Word of God, my Opinion is, he may be saved; and my Reason is, because he performs the entire Condition of the New Covenant, which is, that we believe the Matter of the Gospel, and not that it is contained in these or these Books. So that the Books of Scripture are not so much the Objects of our Faith, as the Instruments of conveying it to our Understanding; and not so much of the Being of the Christian Doctrine, as requisite to the Well-being of it. *Irenæus* tells us (as M. K. acknowledgeth) of some barbarous Nations, that *believed the Doctrines of Christ, and yet believed not the Scripture to be the Word of God; for they never heard of it, and Faith comes by hearing*. But these barbarous People might be saved: Therefore Men might be saved without believing the Scripture to be the Word of God; much more without believing it to be a Rule, and a perfect Rule of Faith. Neither doubt I, but if the Books of Scripture had been proposed to them by the other Parts of the Church, where they had been before received, and had been doubted of, or even rejected by those barbarous Nations, but still by the

bare Belief and Practice of Christianity, they might be saved ; God requiring of us, under pain of Damnation, only to believe the Verities therein contained, and not the divine Authority of the Books wherein they are contained. Not but that it were now very strange and unreasonable, if a Man should believe the Matter of these Books, and not the Authority of the Books : And therefore, if a Man should profess the not-believing of These, I should have Reason to fear he did not believe that. But there is not always an equal Necessity for the Belief of those Things, for the Belief whereof there is an equal Reason. We have, I believe, as great Reason to believe there was such a Man as *Henry the Eighth King of England*, as that *Jesus Christ* suffered under *Pontius Pilate* : Yet this is necessary to be believed, and that is not so. So that if any Man should doubt of or disbelieve that, it were most unreasonably done of him, yet it were no mortal Sin, nor no Sin at all ; God having no where commanded Men under pain of Damnation to believe all which Reason induceth them to believe. Therefore as an Executor, that should perform the whole Will of the Dead, should fully satisfy the Law, though he did not believe that Parchment to be his written Will which indeed is so ; so I believe, that he, who believes all the particular Doctrines which integrate Christianity, and lives according to them, should be saved, though he neither believed nor knew that the Gospels were written by the Evangelists, or the Epistles by the Apostles.

160. This Discourse, whether it be rational, and concluding or no, I submit to better Judgment ; but sure I am, that the Corollary, which you draw from this Position, *that this Point is not fundamental*, is very inconsequent ; that is, *that we are uncertain of the Truth of it*, because we say, the whole Church, much more particular Churches and private Men, may err in Points not fundamental. A pretty Sophism, depending upon this Principle, that whosoever possibly may err, he cannot be certain that he doth not err ! And upon this Ground, what shall hinder me from concluding, that seeing you also hold, that neither particular Churches, nor private Men are infallible even in Fundamentals, that even the Fundamentals of Christianity remain to you uncertain ? A Judge may possibly err in Judgment ; can he therefore never have Assurance that he hath judged right ? A Traveller may possibly mistake his Way ; must I therefore be doubtful whether I am in the right Way from my Hall to my Chamber ? Or can our *London* Carrier have no Certainty, in the middle of the Day, when he is sober and in his Wits, that he is in the Way to *London* ? These you see are right worthy Consequences, and yet they are as like your own, as an Egg to an Egg, or Milk to Milk.

161. And, *for the self same Reason* (you say) *we are not certain, that the Church is not Judge of Controversies*. But now this self-same appears to be no Reason ; and therefore, for all this, we may be certain enough that the Church is no Judge of Controversies. The Ground of this Sophism is very like the former, *viz.* that we can be certain of the Falshood of no Propositions, but these only, which are damnable Errors. But I pray, good Sir, give me your Opinion of these : The Snow is black, the Fire is cold, that *M. Knot* is Archbishop of *Toledo*, that the Whole is not greater than a Part of the Whole, that twice Two make not Four : In your Opinion, good Sir, are these damnable Heresies, or, because they are not so, have we no Certainty of the Falshood of them ? I beseech you, Sir, to consider seriously, with what strange Captions you have gone about to delude your King and your Country ; and if you be convinced they are so, give Glory to God, and let the World know it by your deserting that Religion, which stands upon such deceitful Foundations.

162. Besides (you say) *among publick Conclusions defended in Oxford the Year 1663, to the Questions, Whether the Church have Authority to determine Controversies of Faith? and to interpret holy Scripture? The Answer to both is affirmative*. But what now if I should tell you, that in the Year 1632, among publick Conclusions defended in *Doway*, one was, *That God predeterminates Men to all their Actions, good, bad, and indifferent?* Will you think your self obliged to be of this

this Opinion? If you will, say so: If not, do as you would be done by. Again, methinks so subtil a Man as you are, should easily apprehend a wide Difference between Authority to do a Thing, and Infallibility in doing it: And again, between a conditional Infallibility, and an Absolute. The former, the Doctor, together with the Article of the Church of *England*, attributeth to the Church, nay to particular Churches, and I subscribe to his Opinion; that is, An Authority of determining Controversies of Faith according to plain and evident Scripture and universal Tradition, and Infallibility, while they proceed according to this Rule. As if there should arise an Heretick, that should call in question Christ's Passion and Resurrection, the Church had Authority to decide this Controversy, and infallible Direction how to do it, and to excommunicate this Man, if he should persist in Error. I hope, you will not deny, but that the Judges have Authority to determine Criminal and Civil Controversies; and yet, I hope, you will not say, that they are absolutely infallible in their Determinations: Infallible while they proceed according to Law, and if they do so; but not infallibly certain that they shall ever do so. But that the Church should be infallibly assisted by God's Spirit to decide rightly all emergent Controversies, even such as might be held diversly of divers Men, *Salva compage fidei*, and that we might be absolutely certain that the Church should never fail to decree the Truth, whether she used Means or no, whether she proceed according to her Rule or not; or, lastly, that we might be absolutely certain, that she should never fail to proceed according to her Rule, this the Defender of these Conclusions said not: and therefore said no more to your Purpose, than you have all this while, that is, just nothing.

163. *Ad §. 27.* To the Place of St. *Austin*, alledged in this Paragraph, I answer, First, that in many Things you will not be tried by St. *Augustine's* Judgment, nor submit to his Authority; not concerning Appeals to *Rome*; not concerning Transubstantiation; not touching the Use and Worshipping of Images; not concerning the State of Saints Souls before the Day of Judgment; not touching the Virgin *Mary's* Freedom from actual and original Sin; not touching the Necessity of the Eucharist for Infants; not touching the damning Infants to Hell that die without Baptism; not touching the Knowledge of Saints departed; not touching Purgatory; not touching the Fallibility of Councils, even General Councils; not touching Perfection and Perspicuity in Scriptures in Matters necessary to Salvation; not touching Auricular Confession; not touching the Half-Communion; not touching Prayers in an unknown Tongue: In these Things, I say, you will not stand to St. *Austin's* Judgment, and therefore can with no Reason or Equity require us to do so in this Matter. To St. *Augustine*, in Heat of Disputation against the Donatists, and ransacking all Places for Arguments against them, we oppose St. *Austin* out of this Heat, delivering the Doctrine of Christianity calmly and moderately; where he says, *In iis quæ apertè posita sunt in sacris Scripturis, omnia ea reperiuntur quæ continent fidem, moresque vivendi.* 3. We say, he speaks not of the *Roman*, but the Catholick Church, of far greater Extent, and therefore of far greater Credit and Authority than the *Roman* Church. 4. He speaks of a Point not expressed, but yet not contradicted by Scripture. 5. He says not, that Christ hath recommended the Church to us for an infallible Definer of all emergent Controversies, but for a credible Witness of ancient Tradition. Whosoever therefore refuseth to follow the Practice of the Church (understand of all Places and Ages) though he be thought to resist our Saviour, what is that to us, who cast off no Practices of the Church, but such as are evidently post-nate to the Time of the Apostles, and plainly contrary to the Practice of former and purer Times. Lastly, it is evident, and even to Impudence it self undeniable, that upon this Ground, of believing all Things taught by the present Church as taught by Christ, Error was held; for Example, the Necessity of the Eucharist for Infants, and that in St. *Austin's* Time, and that by St. *Austin* himself: And therefore without Controversy this is no certain Ground for Truth, which may support Falshood as well as Truth.

164. To the Argument wherewith you conclude, I answer, that though the visible Church shall always without fail propose so much of God's Revelation, as is sufficient to bring Men to Heaven, for otherwise it will not be the visible Church; yet it may sometimes add to this Revelation Things superfluous, nay, hurtful, nay, in themselves damnable, though not unpardonable; and sometimes take from it Things very expedient and profitable; and therefore it is possible, without Sin, to resist in some Things the visible Church of Christ. But you press us farther, and demand, *What visible Church was extant when Luther began, whether it were the Roman or Protestant Church?* As if, it must of necessity either be Protestant or *Roman*, or *Roman* of necessity, if it were not Protestant. Yet this is the most usual Fallacy of all your Disputers, by some specious Arguments to persuade weak Men, that the Church of Protestants cannot be the true Church; and thence to infer, that without doubt it must be the *Roman*. But why may not the *Roman* be content to be a Part of it, and the *Grecian* another? And if one must be the Whole, why not the *Greek* Church as well as the *Roman*? There being not one Note of your Church which agrees not to her as well as to your own, unless it be, that she is poor and oppressed by the *Turk*, and you are in Glory and Splendour.

165. Neither is it so easy to be determined as you pretend, *That Luther and other Protestants opposed the whole visible Church in Matters of Faith*; neither is it so evident, that *the visible Church may not fall into such a State, wherein she may be justly opposed*. And, lastly, for calling the Distinction of Points into *Fundamental and not Fundamental*, an Evasion, I believe, you will find it easier to call it so than to prove it so. But that shall be the Issue of the Controversy in the next Chapter.

