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A PAPIST

Mis-represented and Represented:

OR,

A twofold Character of POPERY.

The INTRODUCTION.

The Father of Lies is the Author of Mis-representing. He first made the Experiment of this Black Art in Paradise; having no surer way of bringing God's Precept into Contempt, and making our First Parents transgress, than by misrepresenting the Command, which their Maker had laid upon them. And so unhappily successful he was in this his first attempt, that this has been his chief stratagem ever since, in all business of difficulty and concern: esteeming that his best Means for preserving and propagating Wickedness among Men, by which he first won them to lose their Innocence. And therefore there has nothing of Good yet come into the World, nothing been sent from Heaven, but what has met with this Opposition; the Common Enemy having employ'd all his Endeavours of bringing it into discreditt, and rendring it Infamous, by Mis-representing it. Of this there are frequent Instances in the Old Law, and more in the New. The truth of it was experience'd on the Person of Christ himself, who, tho' he was the Son of God, the Immaculate Lamb, yet was he not out of the reach of Calumnies, and exempt from being Mis-represented. See how he was painted by malicious Men, the Sons of Belial, Ministers of Satan; a prophane and wicked Man, a breaker of the Sabbath, a Glutton, a Friend and Companion of Publicans and Sinners, a Fool, a Conjurer, a Traitor, a Seducer, a Tumultuous Person, a Samaritan, full of the Devil; he hath Belzebub, and by the Prince of the Devils, cast him out Devils, (Mark 3. 22.) There being no other way of frightening the People from embracing the Truth, and following the Son of God, but by thus disfiguring him to the Multitude, reporting light to be darkness, and God to be the Devil. The Disciples of Christ everywhere met with the like Encounters. Stephen had the People stirred up against him, because they heard he had spoke Blasphemous words against Moses and against God, (Acts 6. 11.) Paul also and Silas, for exceedingly troubling the City, (Acts 16. 20.) Jason also with them, because he had turned the World upside down, and did contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, (Acts 17. 6. 7.) Paul again, because
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cause he did teach all Men every where against the People, and polluted the holy place, (Acts 21. 28.) And because he was a pestilent fellow, and a mover of Sedition among all the Jews throughout the World: to which the Jews also assented, saying that these things were so, (Acts 24. 5, 9.) Neither did these Calumnies, these wicked Misrepresentations stop here; he that laid, The Disciple is not above his Master; if they have called the Master of the House Bezebub, how much more shall they call them of his Household? did not only foretell what was to happen to his Followers then present, but also to the Faithful that were to succeed them, and to his Church in future Ages, they being all to expect the like Fate; that tho' they should be never so just to God and their Neighbour, upright in their Ways, and live in the Fear of God, and the observance of his Laws; yet must they certainly be reviled and hated by the World, made a by-word to the People, and have the repute of Lectors, Seducers, and be a scandal to all Nations. And has not this been verify'd in all Ages? See what was the State of Christians in the Primitive times, when as yet Vice had not corrupted the purity of the Gospel. It is almost impossible to believe in what Contempt they were, and how utterly abominated. Tertullian, who was a sharer of a great part, gives us so lamentable an account of the Christians in his time, that it is able to move compassion in Stones. He tells us, so many malicious slanders were dispers'd abroad, concerning the manner of their Worship; and their whole Doctrine describ'd, not only to be folly, and meer toys, but also to be grounded on most holie Principles, and to be so full of Impieties, that the Heathens believe'd a man could not make profession of Christianity, without being tainted with all sorts of Crimes; without being an enemy to the Gods.
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... But because none can relate it so to the life, as (d) Tertullian has done, I'll let it down in his own words, as translated (d) Apo. c. 3, by (e) Dr. Howel, in his History of the World, **Is it not strange** (fays he) that the hatred whereof this name is pursued, in such manner blinds the minds of most Men, that when they witness the probity of a Christian, they mix in their Discourse as a reproach, that he hath embraced this Religion. One Faith; Truly, He of whom you speak is an Honest Man, if be were not a Christian, and his life would be free from blame. Another; Do you know such a one, who had the reputation of a Wife and Discreet Man? He is lately turn'd Christian. (Again) These People, by an extreme blindness of hatred, speak to the advantage of the name Christian, when they strive to render it Odious. For, say they, How pleasaunt, and of what a good humour, was that Woman? How sociable and jovial was that Man? 'Tis pity they should be Christians. So they impute the amendment of their lives, to the Profession of Christianity. Some of them also purchafe the aversion they carry against the name Christian, which we bear, with the price of what is most precious to them; rather desiring to lose the sweetness of life, tranquility of mind, and all sorts of Commodities, than to see in their House's That which they hate. A Man, who heretofore had his mind full of Jealousie, can no longer endure the company of his Wife, what assurance ever he has of her Chastity, after once he perceives her to be turn'd Christian; and parts from her now, when her allions full of Modesty have extinguish'd all suspicions, wherewith he was heretofore mov'd. A Father, who of a long time endure'd the disobedience of his Heathenish Son, resolves to take from him the hope of succeeding him in his Inheritance, for turning Christian, when at the same time, executing his Commands without murmuring. A Master that used his Slave gently, when his Carriage gave him some cause of distrust, now puts him far from him, for being a Christian, when he hath most assurance of his Fidelity. 'Tis committing a Crime to correct the disorders of a Man's Life, by the motions of a Holy Conversion to the Christian Faith; and the good which is produc'd by so happy a Change, works not so powerfully in the minds of Men, as the hatred they have conceiv'd against us. Indeed this hatred is strange; and when I consider, that the Name of Christian only, makes it be so, I would willingly know, how a name can be Criminal, and how a simple word can be Accused? Thus was Christianity wholly Infamous amongst the Heathens, contemn'd and detested by all; and where Lies were in credit, Calumnies and Slanders confirm'd and back'd by Authority, there was no other Crime but Truth. And 'twas these Calumnies, these false Accusations (invented to cry down the Christian Religion,) oblig'd Tertullian to write his Apology, wherein he declar'd to the World, that Christianity was nothing like that, which the Heathens imagin'd it to be: That Idolatry, Superstition, Impiety, Cruelty, Treachery, Conspiracies, &c. was none of their Doctrine, but Condemn'd and Decried by them; that these Crimes were only the malicious inventions of the Heathenish Priests, who finding themselves unable to withfand the force of Christianity, had no other way to preserve themselves in Repute, and the People in their Error, than by forming an ugly, odious, and most horrid Visor, a damnable Scheme of Religion, then holding this for the World, and crying out, This is the Religion of the Christians, these are their Principles; Behold their ignorance, their Stupidity, their Prophecies; Behold their Insolence, their Villanies; a People unsufferable in a Commonwealth, Enemies to their Country and their Prince: And thus Representing it as Monsieur, as they pleas'd, they brought an odium upon as many as own'd that name, and condemn'd them for Follies and Crimes, that were no where, but in their own Imagination.
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Imagination. And 'twas not only in Tertullian's time, that Christianity lay under this scandal, but also in after Ages: And therefore, as for the Vindication of the Christian Profession, he was forc'd to Apologize for his time; so did after him St. Cyprian, Arnobius, and many other Ecclesiastical Writers; nay, and under Christian Emperors, the Calumnies of the Heathens yet being urg'd with much vigour and confidence, Orosius was oblig'd to write his History, and St. Augustine his City of God, in defence of the Faith and Doctrine of Christ. And now, when by the propagation of Christianity, and the laborious endeavours of her Professors, Heathenism was pretty well extinct; yet was not the mouth of Malice stop'd; the same Calumnies, which had been invented by the Infidels, being taken up by evil Christians. No one going out from the Communion of the Church of Christ, but what did, by reviving old Scandals, (and the addition of fresh ones,) endeavour to make her Infamous, and blacken her with such Crimes, as could be thought most convenient for rendring her Odious to all. It being look'd upon by as many as ever went out of her, the best means to justify their Separation, and to gain to themselves the credit of Orthodox Christians, to paint her out in all the Antichristian Colours, and represent her as Hellish, as wickednesse could make her. 'Tis strange how much the suffer'd in this Point from the Manichees, and from the Donatists, and how much pains it cost Saint Augustine, to prove their Accusations to be meer Calumnies, principally intended to raise prejudices in the minds of the People against her; that so being convinced by these Hellish Artifices, of her teaching unfound and prophanse Doctrine, wicked Principles, and base Inventions instead of Faith, might never think of going to her, to learn the Truth; nor even so much as suspect her to be the Church of Christ. This, Saint Augustine complains, was the chief cause of his continuing in the Error of the Manichees so long; and that he impugn'd with so much violence this Church. And therefore, after he was come to the knowledge of the Truth, he discover'd this to the World for the undeceiving others, who were caught in the same snare, making it part of his Confessions, (Confess. i. 6. c. 3. p. 1.) When I came to discover, says he, that——I mingled joy and blushes, and was ashamed, that I had now for so many years been barking and railing, not against the Catholick Faith, but only against the fictions of my carnal conceits. For so temerarious and impious was I, that those things which I ought first to have learned from them by enquiry, I first charg'd upon them by Accusation; readiness to impose Falsities, than to be inform'd of the Truth.——And thus I did blindly accus'd the Catholick Church; now sufficiently clear'd to me that she taught not the Opinion I so vehemently persecuted. And this he did, deluded and deceiv'd by the Manichees. And now since 'tis certain, that this has not been the case of Saint Augustine alone, but of as many almost, as have given ear to the Deferters of this Church; nay, is at this day the case of infinite Numbers, who following that Great Father, when as yet in his Errors, do not enquire, how this thing is believ'd or understand'd by her, but insulting oppose all; as if so understand'd, as they imagine; nor making any difference betwixt that which the Catholick Church teaches, and what they think she teaches, and so believing her to be guilty of as many Absurdities, Follies, Impieties, &c. as the Heathens did of Old: 'Tis evident, there's as much need now of Apologies, as ever there was in Tertullian's, or Saint Augustin's time: Not Apologies to vindicate what is really her Faith and Doctrine; but rather to clear her from such Superstitions, Prophaneness, and Wicked Principles, as are maliciously or ignorantly charg'd upon her. And tho' the number of Calumnies, the inofficiery of Adveraries, the obstinacy of a byas'd Education render a performance in this kind, a just Task for a Tertullian's,
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or St. Augustin's hand; yet because I find no such eminent Pen engag'd in this design at present; and the shewing the true Religion in its own Colours, seems a Duty incumbent on every one that's a Lover of Truth; I'll endeavour to pull off the Vizor from suffering Christianity, and Apologize for the Catholic Faith; that Faith I mean, maintained by those Primitive Fathers, with so much Vigour and Zeal; which being first planted in the Head City of the World by St. Peter, hath been propagated throughout the Universe, and derived down to us by many Christian Nations, in Communion with that See, under the Protection of the Holy Ghost, and the charge of A Chief Pastor; which beginning in that great Apostle, has continued in a Visible Succession to these our days. This Faith it is, for which at present I design to make an Apology, which having been in all ages violently oppos'd, does at this time most wrongfully suffer, under Calumnies and false Imputations. I'll endeavour therefore to separate these Calumnies and Scandals from what is really the Faith and Doctrine of that Church; I'll take off the Black and Dirt, which has been thrown upon her; and setting her forth in her genuine Complexion, let the World see how much fairer she is, than she's painted; and how much she's unlike that Monster, which is shown for her. And because the Members of this Church are commonly known by the name of Papists; I think I cannot take a more sincere, open, and compendious way, in order to the compleating this design, than by drawing forth a double Character of a Papist: The one expressing a Papist in those very colours as he is painted in the imagination of the Vulgar, Foul, Black and Antichristian; with the chief Articles of his imagined Belief, and reputed Principles of his Profession. The other representing a Papist, whose Faith and exercise of his Religion, is according to the Direction and Command of his Church. That so, these two being thus set together, their difference and disproportion may be clearly discerned, and a discovery made, how unlike Calumny is from Truth; and how different a Papist really is, from what he's said to be. The former Character is of a Papist Mis-represented; the other of a Papist Represented. The former is a Papist so deform'd and monstrous, that it justly deserves the hatred of as many as own Christianity: 'Tis a Papist, that has disturb'd this Nation now above an hundred years with Fears and Jealousies; threatening it continually with Fire and Massacres, and whose whole design has been, to rob the Sovereign of his Crown, and the Subject of his Liberty and Property. 'Tis a Papist, that is so abominable, so malicious, so unsufferable in any Civil Government, that, for my part, I detest him from my heart; I conceive'd an hatred against him, and all his, from my Education, when as yet a Protestant; and now, being a Roman Catholic, I am not in the least reconcili'd to him, nor his Principles, but hate him yet worse. I am so far from thinking the Laws too severe against such Papish Recusants, that I could with a far greater severity were executed against them, their Favours, and all such as make men so fictitious Religious. And if to be a Protestant, nothing more be requisite, than to protest against such Popery, to hate and detest it; I think myself, and all Roman Catholicks, as good Protestants, as any whatsoever throughout his Majesties Dominions. And I dare engage, that not only as many Roman Catholicks, as under the name of Papists have severely smarted in this Nation, for being the Professors of such kind of Popery, but also that all Roman Catholick Nations in the World shall subscribe to the condemnation of all such Popish Principles and Doctrines, shall join with all good Protestants for the extinguishing it, with all that Profess or Practise it, and utter rooting it out from his Majesties three Kingdoms, and the whole Universe. The other Papist is one, that lives and believes according to what is
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is prescribing in the Council of Trent, in Catechisms set forth by Catholicks, and other Spiritual Books, for the Direction and Instruction of all in their Communion, whose Faith and Doctrine I have here set down, with some Grounds and Reasons of it, and will so leave it to Apologize for it self. In drawing out the Character of the former, I have quoted no Authors, but have describ'd him exactly according to the Apprehension I had of a Papist, fram'd by me when I was a Protestant; with the addition only of some few points, which have been violently charg'd against Me by some intimate Friends of late, to shew the unreasonableness of my choice, after the quitting of that Communion. The latter is wholly copied out from the Papist that I am now; being the Sum of what I was taught, when reconcil'd to the Church of Rome, and which after sixteen years conversation with Men of that Communion, in hearing their Sermons, in being present at their Catechising, in reading their Books, and discoursing with them, I have found to be their Doctrine. I have done both, I hope, with Sincerity and Truth, and without Passion. For as my endeavours have been, that my Religion should lose nothing by Lies, so neither do I desire it should gain by them; And did I but know of any thing in the following Papers, that has any relation to that unchristian Artifice, I would strike it out immediately. And do here oblige my self, upon information, either from Friend or Adversary, to acknowledge the mistake, as it shall be made appear, and make a publick Recantation. But it is time, we should see what these Papists are.
A PAPIST Mis-represented and Represented.

I. Of Praying to Images.

Papist Mis-represented, Worships Stocks and Stones for Gods. He takes no notice of the Second Commandment, but setting up Pictures, and Images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and other his Saints; He Prays to Them, and puts his Trust & Confidence in them, much like as the Heathens did in their Wooden Gods, Jupiter, Mars, Venus, &c. And for this reason, He erects stately Monuments to Them in his Churches, adorns them sumptuously, burns Candles, offers Incense, and frequently falls down prostrate before them, and with his Eyes fix'd on them, cries out, Help me Mary, assist me Anthony, remember me Ignatius.

Papist Represented, believes it damnable, to Worship Stocks and Stones for Gods, to Pray to Pictures or Images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, or any other Saints; as also, to put any Trust or Confidence in them. He keeps them by him indeed, to preserve in his mind the memory of the things Represented by them; as People are wont to preserve the memory of their deceased Friends by keeping their Picture. He is taught to use them, by casting his eye upon the Picture or Images, and thence to raise his heart to the Prototypes, and there to implant in Meditation, Love, Thanksgivings, Imitation, &c. as the Object requires. As many good Christians, placing a Death-bed before them; from the sight of it, take occasion to reflect often upon their last end, in order to their better preparing for it; or by seeing Old Time painted with his Fore-lock, Hour-Glows and Scythe, turn their thoughts upon the Swiftness of Time, and that whoever neglects the present, is in danger of beginning then to lay hold, when there's no more to come. These Pictures or Images having this advantage, that they inform the mind by one glance, of what in reading requires a Chapter, and sometimes a Volume. There being no other difference between them, then that Reading represents leisurely, and by degrees; and a Picture all at once. Hence he finds a convenience in saying his Prayers with some devout Pictures before him; he being no sooner distractions, but the sight of these, recals his wandering thoughts to the right Object; and as certainly brings something good into his mind, as an improper Picture disturbs his heart with naughtiness. And because he is sensible, that these holy Pictures and Images represent and bring to his mind such Objects, which in his heart he loves, honours, and venerates; he cannot, but upon that account, love, honour, and respect the Images themselves. As whosoever loves their Husband, Child, or Friend, cannot but have some love and respect for their Pictures; and whosoever loves and honours his King, will have B
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He makes Gods of Dead Men, such as are departed hence, and now are no more able to hear, or see, or understand his necessities. And tho' God be so good as to invite all to come unto him, and to apply themselves to their only and Infinite Mediator Jesus Christ: Yet so stupid is He, that neglecting, and, as it were, passing by both God and his only Son, and all their Mercies, he betakes himself to his Saints, and there pouring forth his Prayers, he confides in them as his Mediators and Redeemers, and expects no Blessing from the Church.

He believes there's only one God, and that 'tis a most damnable Idolatry to make Gods of Men, either living or dead. His Church teaches him indeed, and he believes, That it is good and profitable to desire the Intercession of the Saints, reigning with Christ in Heaven; but that they are Gods, or his Redeemers, he is no where taught; but detests all such Doctrine. He confesses, That we are all redeem'd by the Blood of Christ alone, and that he is our only Mediator of Redemption: But as for Mediators of Intercession, (that is, such as we may desire lawfully to pray for us) he does not doubt, but 'tis acceptable to God, we should have many. Moses was such a Mediator for the Israelites; Job for his three Friends; Stephen for his Persecutors. The Romans were thus defir'd by St. Paul to be his Mediators; so were the Corinthians, so the Ephesians; so almost every sick man defires the Congregation to be
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Sing, but what is to come to him by their Merits, and through their hands: And thus, without scruple or remorse, robs God of his Honour.

be his Mediators; that is, to be remember'd in their Prayers. And so he defires the Blessed in Heaven to be his Mediators; that is, that they would Pray to God for him. And in this, he does not at all neglect coming to God, or rob him of his Honour; but directing all his Prayers up to him, and making him the ultimate Object of all his Petitions, he only defires sometimes the Full on Earth, sometimes those in Heaven, to join their Prayers to his, that so the number of Petitioners being increas'd, the Petition may find better acceptance in the sight of God. And this is not to make them Gods, but only Petitioners to God; 'tis not to make them his Redeemers, but only Intercessors to his Redeemer; he having no hopes of obtaining anything, but of God alone, by, and through the Merits of Christ; for which he defires the Saints in Heaven, and good men on Earth, to offer up their Prayers with his; the Prayers of the Full availing much before God. But now, how the Saints in Heaven know the Prayers and Necessities of such, who address themselves to them, whether by the Ministering of Angels, or in the Vision of God, or by some particular Revelation, 'tis no part of his Faith, nor is it much his concern it should be determin'd. For his part he does not doubt, but that God, who acquainted the Prophets with the knowledge of things, that were yet to come many hundred years after; That inform'd Elijah of the King of Syria's Council, tho' private, resolv'd on in his Bed-chamber, and, at a distance; (2 Kings 6. 12.) can never want means of letting the Saints know the defires of those who beg their Intercession here on Earth: Especially since our Saviour tells, That Abraham heard the Petitions of Dives who was yet at a greater distance, even in Hell; and told him likewise the manner of his living, while as yet on Earth. Nay, since 'tis generally allow'd, that even the very Devils hear those desperate wretches, who call on them: Why should he doubt, that Saints want this Privilege, in some manner granted to sinful Men, and to wicked Spirits; who, (tho' departed this life) are not so properly dead, as translated from a mortal life, to an immortal one; where, enjoying God Almighty, they lose no Perfections which they enjoy'd, while on Earth, but possess all in a more eminent manner; having more Charity, more Love, and being more acceptable to God than ever; becoming like Angels: And as these offered up their Prayers for Jerusalem, and the Cities of Judah, (Zach. 1. 12.) so undoubtedly they likewise fall down before the Lamb, having every one of them Harps, and golden Vials full of Odours, which are the Prayers of the Saints, Apoc. 5. 8.

3. Of Addressing more Supplications to the Virgin Mary than to Christ.

He believes the Virgin Mary to be much more powerful in Heaven than Christ, and that she can command him to do what she thinks good: And for this reason he honours her much more than he does her Son, and all the has of Excellency or Bliss, is the Gift of God proceeding.
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or God the Father; For one Prayer he says to God, saying ten to the Holy Virgin.

proceeding from his meer Goodness. Neither does he at any time say even so much as one Prayer to her, but what is directed more Principally to God; because offered up as a Thankful Memorial of Christ's Incarnation, and an acknowledgment of the Blessedness of Jesus the Fruit of her Womb. And this without imagining that there's any more dishonouring of God in his reciting the Angelical Salutation, than in the first pronouncing it by the Angel Gabriel and Elizabeth: Or that his frequent Repetition of it is any more an idle Superstition, than it was in David to repeat the same words over twenty six times in the 136 Psalm.

IV. Of paying Divine Worship to Relics.

He believes a kind of Divinity to remain in the Relics of his reputed Saints, and therefore Adores their Rotten Bones, their corrupted flesh, their old Rags, with Divine Honour; Kneeling down to them, kissing them, and going in Pilgrimage to their Shrines & Sepulchres. And he is so far posses'd with a conceited Deity lying hid in those senseless Remains, that he foolishly believes they work greater Miracles, and raise more to life, than ever Christ himself did.

He believes it damnable to think there's any Divinity in the Relics of Saints, or to Adore them with Divine Honour, or to Pray to their rotten Bones, old Rags, or Shrines, or that they can work any strange Cures or Miracles, by any hidden Power of their own. But he believes it good and lawful to keep them with a Veneration, and give them a Religious honour and respect. And this he thinks due to them, in as much as knowing himself oblig'd to respect and honour God Almighty from his heart; he looks upon himself also oblig'd to respect and honour every thing that has any particular Relation to him: But this with an inferior honour; as the Jews did to the Ark, to the Tables of the Law, to Moses's Rod, to the Temple, to the Priests: So we generally allow to the Bible, because it contains God's Word; to the Church, because it is God's House; to Holy Men and Priests, because they are God's Servants. And so he does to Relicks, because they appertain to God's Favourites; and, being insensible things, are yet very sensible Pledges, and lively Memorials of Christ's Servants dead indeed to us, but alive with him in Glory. And more especially, because God himself has been pleas'd to honour them, by making them Instruments of many evident Miracles he has visibly work'd by them; as is manifest upon undeniable Record. And this he believes as easy for God Almighty now, and as much redounding to the honour of his Holy Name, as it was in the Old Law, to work such Miraculous effects by Moses's Rod, by Gideon's Trumpets, by Elias's Mantle, after he was taken up into Heaven. (2 Kings 2.14.) Elihu's Bones, (2 Kings 13.21.) and infinite other such like insensible Things: And also in the New Law, by the Hem of his own Garment.
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He believes it lawful to commit Idolatry, and makes it his daily practice to Worship and Adore a Breaden God, giving Divine Honour to those Poor, empty Elements of Bread and Wine. Of these he asks Pardon for his sins; of these he desires Grace and Salvation; These he acknowledges to have been his Redeemer & Saviour, and hopes for no good but what is to come to him by means of these household Gods. And then for his Apology, he alludes such gross contradictions, so contrary to all sense and reason, that whatsoever will be a Papist, must be no Man: Fondly believing, that what he adores, is no Bread or Wine, but Chrift really present under those appearances; and thus makes as many Christs, as many Redeemers, as there are Churches, Altars or Priests. When, according to Gods Infallible Word, there is but one Chrift, and He not on
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Earth, but at the right hand of his Father in Heaven.

Thus, with this Faith he believes that what descended upon our Saviour at his Baptism in Jordan, was really the Holy Ghost, though Senses or Reason could discover it to be nothing but a Dove: With this Faith he believes, that the Man that Moses saw standing over against him with his Sword drawn (Exod. 3. 13.) and the three Men that Abraham entertain'd in the Plains of Mambre, (Gen. 18.) were really and substantially no Men; and that notwithstanding all the information and evidence of Sense from their Colour, Features, Proportion, Talking, Eating, and many others, of their being Men; yet, without any discredit to his Senses, he really believes they were no such thing, because God's Word has assured him of the contrary: And with this Faith he believes Christ's Holy and Blood to be really present in the Blessed Sacrament, though, to all appearance, there's nothing more than Bread and Wine: Thus, not at all hearkening to his Senses in a matter where God speaks, he unfeignedly confesses, That he that made the World of nothing by his sole word: That cured Diseases by his Word, That raised the Dead by his Word: That expell'd Devils: That commanded the Winds and Seas: That multiplied Bread: That changed Water into Wine by his Word, and Sinners into Just-Men, cannot want Power to change Bread and Wine into his own Body and Blood by his sole Word. And this without danger of multiplying his Body, of making as many Christs as Altars, or leaving the right hand of his Father. But only by giving to his Body a supernatural manner of Existence; by which, being left without extension of parts, and rendered independent of place, it may be one and the same in many places at once, and whole in every part of the Symbols, and not obnoxious to any corporeal Contingencies. And this kind of Existence is no more, than what in a manner he bestows upon every Glorified Body: Than what his own Body had, when born without the least Violation of his Mothers Virginal Integrity: When he arose from the Dead, out of the Sepulchre, without removing the Stone: When he entred amongst his Disciples, the Doors being shut. And though he cannot understand how this is done, yet he undoubtedly believes, That God is able to do more then He is able to understand.

VI. Of Merits and Good Works.

He believes Christ's Death & Passion to be ineffectual, and insignificant, and that he has no dependance upon the Merits of his Sufferings, or the Mercy of God for the obtaining Salvation; but that he is to be sav'd by his own Merits. And, for this reason he is very zealously busy in

He believes it damnable to say that Christ's Death and Passion is ineffectual and insignificant: And that 'tis the Doctrine of Devils to believe, That he has no dependance for his Salvation upon the Merits of Christ's Sufferings, or the Mercy of God; but only upon his own Merits and good Works. 'Tis his Faith to believe, That of our selves we are not sufficient, so much as to think a good thought, that the Grace by which we are justified, is given us purely gratis upon the account of Christ's Merits.
Fasting, in Whipping himself; in Watching, in going in Procession, in wearing Hair-shirts, and using a thousand such like Mortifications: And having done this, he thinks himself not at all beholding to God for his Salvation, and that to give him Heaven, will be no favour: It being now his due, upon the account of his own Meritorious Achievements, without any God-mercy to Christ's Passion, or his Makers Godness.

and Election sure. And in following this against the fulness of the Merits of Christ's, or God's Mercy, than the Apostle does in giving it.

VII. Of Confession.

He believes it part of his Religion to make Gods of Men; foolishly thinking that these have power to forgive sins. And therefore as often as he finds his Conscience oppressed with the guilt of his Offences; he calls for one of his Priests, who are commonly more wicked than himself; and falling at his feet, he unfolds to him the whole state of his Soul; and having run over a Catalogue of his sins, he asks of him Pardon and Forgiveness. And what moreover, that no man, how just soever, can Merit any thing, either in this life, or in that to come, independent on the Merits and Passion of Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, that through the Merits of Christ, the Good Works of a Just Man proceeding from Grace, are so acceptable to God, that through his Goodness and Promise, they are truly Meritorious of Eternal Life. And this he has learned from the Apostle, (2 Tim. 4.8.) where he is taught, that there is a Crown of Justice, which our Lord, a just Judge, will render at the last day, not only to Saint Paul, but also to all those, that shall have fought a good fight, and consummated their course, kept the Faith, and lov'd his coming. Knowing therefore that at the day of Judgment, he is to receive according to his works: He endeavours by good Works to make his Vocation Council, he thinks he no more offends
is most absurd of all, he is so sillie-
ly stupid as to believe, That, if
his Ghostly Father, after he has
heard all his Villanies in his Ear,
does but pronounce three or four
Latin words, making the sign
of a Cross with two fingers and a
thumb over his head, his sins are
forthwith forgiven him, although
he had never any thoughts of a-
endment, or intention to for-
sake his wickedness.

VIII. Of Indulgences.

H e believes, that his Holy
Father the Pope, can give
him leave to commit what sins he
pleaseth; Especially, if he can
make him a present of a round
Sum of Money, he never need
doubt of an Indulgence or Par-
don for himself and his Heirs
forever, for all sorts of Crimes or
Wickedness, he, or any of his Pos-
terity may have convenience of
falling into. And having this
Commission in his Pocket, under
the Pope’s Broad-Seal, he may be
confident that Christ will confirm,
and stand to all that his Vicar
upon Earth has granted, and not
call him to any account for any
thing he has done, although he
his sins, with a firm purpose of ame-
ndment, and a hearty Resolution of turn-
ing from his evil ways, may from them
receive Abolition, by the Authority gi-
ven them from Heaven, and not doubt
but God ratifies above, the sentence pro-
nounced in that Tribunal; Loosing in Heaven
whatsoever is thus loosed by them one Earth.
And that, whatsoever comes without the
due Preparation, without a Repentance
from the bottom of his heart, and real
intention of forsaking his sins, receives
no benefit by the Abolition; but
adds sin to sin, by a high contempt
of God’s Mercy, and abuse of his Sa-
craments.

He believes it damnable to hold, that
the Pope, or any other Power in
Heaven or Earth, can give him leave to
commit any sins whatsoever; Or, that for
any Sum of Money he can obtain an In-
dulgence or Pardon for sins that are to be
committed by him, or his Heirs, hereafter.
He firmly believes that no sins can be
forgiven, but by a true and hearty Repen-
tance; But that still, there is a Power in
the Church, of granting Indulgences, which
concern not at all the Remission of sins either
Mortal or Venial; but only of some Temp-
oral Punishments remaining due after the
Guilt is remitted. So that they are
nothing else, but a Mitigation or Relaxa-
tion upon just causes, of Canonical Pen-
nances, which are, or may be join’d by
the Passers, of the Church, on Penitent
sinners, according to their several degrees of
demerit. And this he is taught to be
grounded, on the judiciary Power, left
by Christ in his Church, of binding and
loosing; whereby Authority was given
to erect a Court of Conscience, to assign
Penalties, or release them, as circumstan-
ces should require. And this Authority
IX. Of Satisfaction.

He believes it damnable, to think injuriously of Christ's Passion. Nevertheless he believes, that the condition of Satisfaction for the Guilt of Sin, and the pain Eternal due to it, be proper only to Christ our Saviour; yet that Penitent Sinners being Redeem'd by Christ, and made his Members, may in some measure satisfy by Prayer, Fasting, Alms, &c. for the Temporal Pain, which by order of God's Justice, sometimes remains due, after the Guilt, and the Eternal Pain are remitted. So that trusting in Christ as his Redeemer, he yet does not think that by Christ's Sufferings, every Christian is discharge'd of his particular Sufferings; but that every one is to suffer something for himself, as Saint Paul did, who by tribulation and in suffering in his own flesh, did accomplish those things, that were of the Passions of Christ; and this not only for himself, but for the whole Church, (Col. i. 24.) and this he finds every where in Scripture, viz. People admonish'd of the greatness of their sins, doing Penance in Fasting, Sackcloth and Ashes, and by voluntary austerities, endeavouring to satisfy the Divine Justice. And these Personal, 

he knows Saint Paul plainly, own'd; (2 Cor. ii. 6.) where he decreed a Penance; sufficient (says he) to such a man, is this punishment: And, (2 Cor. ii. 10.) where he released one; For your sake (speaking of the Penance injoy'd the Incestuous Corinthian,) I forgive it in the Person of Christ. And what Money there is given at any time on this account, concerns not at all the Pope's Coiffers, but is by every one given as they please, either to the Poor, to the Sick, to Prisoners, &c. wherefore they judge it most Charity. And tho' he acknowledges many abuses have been committed in Granting and Gaining Indulgences, through the default of some particular Persons; yet he cannot imagine, how these can in Justice be charg'd upon the Church, to the prejudice of her Faith and Doctrine; especially, since she has been so careful in the retrenching them: As may be seen by what was done in the Council of Trent. Dec. de Indulg. cum potestate.
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informs him, that is, a meer

Wooden one.

Hence it is part of his Duty to think meanly of the VVord of God, to speak irreverently of the Scripture; to do what he is able, to lessen the repute of it, and bring it into disgrace. And for this end, he says it is obscure, full of ambiguous expressions, plain contradictions, not fit to be read by the Vulgar, nor fit to be Translated into Vulgar Languages: And without respect to Christ, or his Apostles, prophaneely Preaches, that no Ten Books in the World have done so much mischief to Christianity as this one; And under a vain pretence of preventing farther inconveniences, en-

He believes it damnable in any one to think, speak, or do any thing irreverently toward the Scripture, or by any means whatsoever to bring it into disrepute or disgrace. He holds it in the highest Veneration of all Men living, he professtes it to be the Dew of Heaven, Oracles of God, Fountain of Eternal Life; that to prophan it, is to incur the guilt of Damnation: And that we are rather bound to lose our lives, than commit any ways to its profanation. 'Tis true, he does not think it fit, to be read generally by all, without Licence, or in the Vulgar-Tongues: Not for any dis-respect to it; But, 1. Because he understands, that private interpretation is not proper for the Scripture, 2 Pet. 1. 20. II. Because that in the Epistles of Saint Paul are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unfaire deprave, (as also the rest of the Scriptures,) to their own perdition. III. Because God hath given only some to be Apostles, some Prophets, others some Evangelists, and others some Pastors and Doctors, Eph. 4: 11. For these Reasons he is taught, That "tis not convenient for the Scripture to be read indiscriminately to all Men, but only such as have express Licence, and good testimony from
deavor to deprive all of this Spiritual comfort, of this Divine Food, of this Heavenly Light; that so being kept in darkness, they may be also preserved in ignorance, and Damned Eternally.

refer all to the Arbitrement of the Church, which hath appointed Pastors and Doctors: Never presuming to contend, controil, teach, or talk of their own Sense and Phanse in deep Questions of Divinity, and high Mysteries of Faith; but expecting the Sense from the Lips of the Priest, who shall keep Knowledge, and from whose mouth they shall require the Law, Mal. 2. 7. And this Caution is used, lest that the Scripture coming into the hands of a presuming sort of proud, curious, and contentious People, be abused and perverted; who make it their business to enquire into Dogmatical, Mythical, High and Hidden secrets of God's Counsels, into Predestination, Reprobation, Election, Pre-science, and other such incomprehensible Mysteries; and upon the presumption of I know not what Spirit, immediately become Teachers, Controllers and Judges of Doctors. Church, Scripture and all; and acknowledging no Authority left by Christ to which they are to submit; under pretence of Scripture and God's Word, make way for all sorts of Prophaneness, Irreligion and Atheism. So that this not for the preserving Ignorance, he allows a restraint upon the reading the Scripture, but for the preventing a blind ignorant Presumption. And that it may be done to edification, and not to destruction, and without casting the holy to dogs, or pearls to swine.

XI. Of Apocryphal Books.

HE believes it lawful to make what Additions to Scripture his Party thinks good; and therefore takes no notice of the antient Canon approved by the Apostles, and Primitive Christians; but allows equal Authority to the Books of Toby, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, Macchabees, to be Canonical; because the Church of Christ has declared them such; not only in these latter Ages, but even in the Primitive times. St. Gregory Nazianzen, (Orat. de SS. Macch.) who lived in the year 354. Also St. Ambrose, (lib. de Fado, & vit. beat.) An. 370. Innocent I. (Ep. ad Exup.) They were also received by the Third Council of Carthage, Anno 419. which approved all these Books as Canonical, Can. 47. and was subcriv'd by St. Augustine, and confirm'd in the Sixth General Synod. Aug.
were always rejected by the Jews, never extant in the Hebrew Copy, and expressly condemnd by St. Jerome, as not Canonical, and never admitted by the Church, but only of late years, in some of their Synods, which made these Innovations contrary to the sense of their Ancestors.

gust. lib. 2. Dom. Christ. cap. 8. So that to him 'tis of little concern, whether they were ever in the Hebrew Copy; the Canon of the Church of Christ being of much more Authority with him, than the Canon of the Jews: He having no other assurance that the Books of Moses, and the four Gospels, are the true Word of God, but by the Authority and Canon of the Church. And this he has learn'd from that great Doctor St. Augustine, who declares his mind plainly in this case, saying, That he would not believe the Gospels, except the Authority of the Catholic Church mov'd him thereunto. (Contra Ep. Fundam. c. 4.) Now he is well satisfied, that many doubted whether these Books were Canonical or no; and amongst others, St. Jerome; because the Church had not declared them so: But since the Church's Declaration, no Catholic ever doubted; no more than of other Books, viz. of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of St. James, the second of St. Peter, the second and third of St. John, St. Jude's Epistle, and the Apocalypse: All which were for many years after the Apostles time doubted of; but afterwards declared and receiv'd as Canonical. This he finds St. Jerome expressly confessing of himself, viz. That for some time the Book of Judith seemed to him Apocryphal; to wit, till the Council of Nice declar'd it otherwise, Pref. in Judith. The like he affirms of St. James's Epistle; that it was doubted of by many, for several years; Paul. in tempore procedente meruit authoritatem: By little and little in process of time it gain'd Authority. De viris illust. verb. Jacobus. For this reason he matters not what Books have been reputed Apocryphal by some, and for some years: But only what Books are Receiv'd and Declar'd by the Church, Canonical, in what year, and at what time forever. For believing the same Spirit of Truth affixes her in all Ages; he looks upon himself equally oblig'd to receive her Definitions of the Year 419. as of any of the precedent years: It not being possible for Christ to fail of his Promise, or the Holy Ghost to err or misguide the Church in that year more than in any other.

XII. Of the Vulgar Edition of the Bible.

H e makes no Conscience of abusing the Scripture, and perverting, for the maintenance of his Errors and Superstitions. And therefore, though he dares not altogether lay it by; left he should, by so doing, lose all claim to Christianity: Yet he utterly disapproves it, as it is in

He believes it a damnable sin, to abuse the Scripture, or any ways to pervert it, for the maintenance of Errors or Superstitions, and thinks himself oblig'd, rather to lay down his life, than concur to, or approve of any such Falsifications or Corruptions, prejudicial to Faith or Good Manners. For this reason, being conscious, that in all Ages, there has been several Copies of this Sacred Volume, quite different from the Originals in many places, either through the miflake of
its genuine Truth and Purity, and as allow'd in the Church of England; and crying this down, he believes it unlawful to be read by any of his Communion. And then puts in to their hands another Volume, which in its Frontis-piece bears the Title indeed of the Word of God, with the names of the Books and Chapters; but in the context of it, is so every where full of Corruptions, Falsifications, and intolerable Abuses, that it almost every where belies its Title, and is unfit for any one, who professes himself a Christian.

of the Transcribers, or mali of others, endeavouring by this means to gain credit to their new Doctrines: He is command not to receive all Books indifferently for the Word of God, that wear that Title; but only such as are approved by the Church, and recommended by her Legitimate. And such is that, he daily uses commonly known by the name of the Vulgar Translation; which has been the principal of all other Latin Copies in all ages, since the Primitive times; much recommended by Saint Augustine; and never altered in any thing, but once heretofore by the Holy Studies of St. Hierome: And twice or thrice since, being reviewed by Authority, and purged of such mistakes, as in length of time, had crept in by Transcribers, or Printers faults. And that this Translation is most pure and incorrupt, as to any thing concerning matter of belief, or differences in Religion, is not only the Doctrine of his Church; but also the Sentiment of many Learned Men of the Reformation, who approve this Version, and prefer it before any other Latin one whatsoever. Beza in his Preface to the New Testament, Anno 1559, blames Erasmus for rejecting it, Paulus Fagius cries out against all that disallow it, (Cap. 4 Verf. Lit. Paraph. Chal. Ludovicus de Die, with admiration, confesses it to be most Faithful, (in Not. ad Evang. Pref.) Grotius prefers it before the Greeks Text now in use; and acknowledges that it agrees with the Ancient Manuscripts, (in Not. ad Evang. & Ast.) Grotius professes to the World, that he highly esteems it, for it contains no erroneous Opinions, and is very Learned: (nulla dogmata infalubria continent, & multum habet in se eruditionis, Pref. Annot. in vet. Test.) And for this reason, he refers his Annotations generally to this Translation, as he declares himself. So that, seeing this Version is deliver'd to him with the approbation of his whole Church, and is commended by most Learned Adversaries; he thinks he has great reason to receive it, and that he may peruse it, without any danger that can come to him, from any Corruptions or Falsifications. And because he has not the like assurance of the English Translation allowed by Protestants, or any other made since the Reformation, by any of that Persuasion; but sees, that there has been almost as many different Translations made and publish'd by these, as there had been Men of different Humours, different Spirits, and different Interests; whereof none have ever approv'd the Versions of any of the rest; but cry'd out against, and Condemn'd them, of many Alterations, Additions, Detractions, and Forgeries; Bucer, and the Osandrians exclaiming against Luther, Luther against Münster; Beza against Castaleo; Castaleo against Beza; Calvin against Servetus; Ilyricus against Calvin and Beza. Our English Ministers against Tindal and his Fellows: And this, not upon the account of some overlights, or light mistakes, or the following of different Copies; but accusing one another of being Ab-
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Surd and senseless, in their Translations of obscuring and perverting the meaning of the Holy Ghost, of Omifitions and Additions, of perverting the Text in eight hundred forty and eight places; of corrupt and false Translations; all which in express Terms, has been charg'd by great Abettors of the Reformation against a Bible yet us'd in England, and ordered to be read in all Churches by Queen Elizabeth, and to be seen in the Abridgment of a Book deliver'd by certain Ministers to King James, pag. 11. 12. In Mr. Burge's Apology, Sect. 6, Mr. Broughton's Advertisement to the Bishops. And in Doctor Rynold's refusing before the King at Hampron-Court, to subcribe to the Communion-Book, because it warranted a corrupt and false Translation of the Bible. For these, and such other reasons, he is commanded not to read any of these Translations; but only that, which is recommended to him by the Church.

XIII. Of the Scripture as a Rule of Faith.

He believes it lawful; nay, that it is his obligation to undervalue the Scripture, and take from it that Authority, which Christ gave it. For whereas Christ left this to the World, as the Rule of Faith, and as a Sacred Oracle, from whence all his Followers might be instructed in the Precepts of a good life, learn all the Mysteries of their Faith, and be resolved in all difficult and doubtful Points of Religion: He is taught flatly to deny all this; and to believe that the Scripture is not capable of desisting any one point of Controversie, or reconciling the different Sentiments of Men in Religion: And thus demeans himself towards the Word of God, in a manner most unbecoming a Christian.

He believes it damnable to undervalue the Scripture, or take from it the Authority given it by Christ. He gives it all respect due to the Word of God; he owns it to be of greatest Authority upon Earth, and that it is capable of leading a Man to all Truth, whenever it is rightly understood. But to any one that misunderstands it, and takes it in any other sense, than what was intended by the Holy Ghost; he believes it to fluch a one, to be no Scripture, no Word of God; that to such a one, it is no Rule of Faith, nor Judge of Controversies. And that what he thinks to be the Doctrine of Christ, and Command of Heaven, is nothing but his own Imagination and the Suggestion of the Devil. And since, by the experience of to many thousand Heresies since our Saviour's time, all pretending to be grounded on Scripture, he finds that almost every Text of the Bible, and even those that concern the most Essential and Fundamental Points of the Christian Religion, may be interpreted several ways; and made to signify things contrary to one another; and that while thus contrary meanings are by several Persons drawn from the same Words; the Scripture is altogether silent without discovering, which of all those senses is that intended by the Holy Ghost, and leading to Truth, and which are Erroneous and
and Antichristian: He is taught to believe that the Scripture alone can be no Rule of Faith to any Private or Particular person; not that there is any thing wanting on the Scripture-fide: but because no private person can be certain, whether amongst all the several meanings every Text is obnoxious to, that which he understands, it in, is the Right, or no. And without this certainty of Truth, and security from Error, he knows, there's nothing capable of being a Rule.

XIV. Of the Interpretations of Scripture.

He believes that his Church, which he calls Catholic, is above the Scripture; and prophetically, allows to her an uncontrollable authority of being Judge of the Word of God, and being fondly abused, into a distrust of the Scriptures and that he can be certain of nothing, even of the Fundamentals of Christianity, from what is deliver'd in them, though they speak never so plainly; he is taught to rely wholly upon this Church, and not to believe one word the Scripture says, unless his Church says it too.

He believes, that the Church is not above the Scripture; but only allows that Order between them, as is between the Judge and the Law. And is no other than what generally every Private Member of the Reformation challenges to himself, as often as he pretends to decide any doubt of his own, or his Neighbours in Religion, by interpreting the Scriptures. Neither is he taught at all to distrust the Scripture, or not to rely on it; but only to distrust his own private Interpretation of it, and not to rely on his own Judgment in the Resolution of any doubt concerning Faith or Religion, though he can produce several Texts in favour of his Opinion. But in all such cases he is commanded to recur to the Church; and having learnt from her the sense of all such Texts; how they have been understood by the whole Community of Christians; in all Ages since the Apostles; and what has been their Received Doctrine, in such doubtful and difficult Points; he is oblig'd to submit to this, and never presume on his own Private Sentiments, however seemingly grounded on Reason and Scripture, to Believe or Preach any New Doctrine opposite to the Belief of the Church; But as he receives from her the Book, so also to receive from her the sense of the Book: With a Holy Confidence, that the that did not cheat him in delivering a False Book for the True one, will not cheat him in delivering a False and Erroneous sense for the True one; her Authority, which is sufficient in the one, being not less in the other: And his own Private Judgement, which was insufficient in the one, that is, in finding out the True Scripture, and discerning it from all other Books; being as incapable and insufficient in the other; that is, in certainly discovering the meaning of the Holy Ghost, and avoiding all other Heterodox and Mistaken Interpretations.

XV. Of
He believes the Scripture not to be imperfect, nor to want Humane Ordinations, or Traditions of Men, for the supplying any defects in it: Neither does he allow the same Authority to these, as to the Word of God; or give them equal credit; or exact it of others, that desire to be admitted into the Communion of his Church. He believes no Divine Faith ought to be given to any thing, but what is of Divine Revelation; and that nothing is to have place in his Creed, but what was taught by Christ, and his Apostles, and has been believ’d and taught in all Ages by the Church of God, the Congregations of all True Believers; and has been to deliver’d down to him through all Ages. But now, whether that which has been to deliver’d down to him, as the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, has been by Word of Mouth or Writing, is altogether indifferent to him; he being ready to follow, in this point, as in all others, the command of St. Paul, that is, To stand fast, and hold the Traditions he has learn’d, whether by Word, or by Epistles; 2 Thess. 2, 15: And to look upon any one as Anathema, That shall preach otherwise than he has (thus) receiv’d, Gal. 1, 9. So that as he undoubtedly holds the Scripture to be the Word of God, penn’d by Prophets and Apostles, and inspir’d by the Holy Ghost, because in all Ages, from Moses to Christ and from Christ to this time, it has been to Taught, Preach’d, Believ’d and Deli-

ver’d successively by the Faithful; and never scruples the least of the truth of it; nor sticks to assent to it, with a stedfast and Divine Faith; altho’ they are not nor have not at any time been able to prove what they have thus taught, and deliver’d with one Text of Scripture. In the like manner, he is ready to receive and believe, all that this same Congregation has, together with the Bible, in all Ages successively, without Interruption, Taught, Preach’d, Believ’d and Deliver’d as the Divine Faith of Christ and his Apostles and assent to it with Divine Faith; just as he does to the Bible; and esteems any one Anathema, that shall Preach otherwise than he has thus receiv’d. And although some may seriously endeavour to convince him, but several Points of Faith, and other Religious Practices, which he has thus receiv’d, and
and believes, are not the Doctrine of Christ, nor Apostolical Institutions, but rather Inventions of Men, and Lessons of Antichrist, and should produce several Texts of Scripture for the proving it: He is not anything surpriz’d at: As well knowing, that he that follows not this Rule, of Believing all to be of Christ, that has been universally taught and believ’d as such, by the Church of Christ; and of understanding the Scripture in the same sense, in which it has in all Ages been understood by the same Church; may very easily frame as many Creeds as he pleases, and make Christ and his Apostles speak what shall be most agreeable to his Humour, and suit best with his Interest, and find plain proofs for all: And make no more difficulty in producing Scripture against Christ’s Doctrine, than the Jews and the Devil did against Christ’s Person, who never wanted their Scriptures: (It is written;) when ’twas necessary to carry on their designs. And if there were any thing in these sort of Arguments, to make him doubt of the truth of any Point of Doctrine, thus receiv’d; he thinks it might make him call in question the Truth of the Scripture, and the Bible it self, as soon as any thing else. They all standing upon the same foundation of the Church’s Tradition, which, if it fail in one, leaves no security in any.

XVI. Of Councils.

He believes that the Faith of his Church may receive new Additions every day: And that he is not only oblig’d to believe what Christ taught, and his Apostles; but also every Definition or Decree, of any General Council assembled by the Command of the Pope. So that as often as any thing is issued out by the Authority of any of these Church Parliaments, and ordered to be believ’d; he thinks himself under pain of Damnation, immediately bound to receive it; and having added it to his Creed, to assent to it with as Firm, Stedfast and Divine a Faith, as if it had been Commanded by Christ himself, and he believes that the Faith of his Church can receive no Additions; and that he is oblig’d to believe nothing, besides that which Christ taught, and his Apostles; and if any thing contrary to this should be defin’d and commanded to be believ’d, even by Ten thousand Councils, he believes it damnable in any one to receive it, and by such Decrees, to make Additions to his Creed. However, he maintains the Necessity and Right of General Councils lawfully assembled; whose business it is, not to coin new Articles of Faith, or devise Fresh Tenets; but only, as often as any Point of Receiv’d Doctrine is impugned or call’d in question, to debate the matter; and examine, what has been the Belief of all Nations (who are there present in their Prelates) in that Point. And this being agreed on, to publish and make known to the World, which is the Catholick Doctrine, left by Christ and his Apostles; and which the neebroid’d Error. And by this means to prevent the loss of infinite number of Souls, which might otherwise be deluded and carried away after new inventions; not being capable by their own knowledge and abilities, to distinguish betwixt Truth and
Decreed, in the Consistory of Heaven. And by this means he never comes to understand his Religion, or know what he is to believe; but by the continual Alterations, Additions, Diminutions, Interpretations of these Councils he is perserv'd in a necessary Confusion; and tho' he changes often, yet he fondly thinks himself always the same.

and Falsehood, and discover the subtilties of every crafty Deceiver. And in this case he believes that he is oblig'd to submit, and receive the Decrees of such a Council; the Pastors and Prelates there present being by Christ and his Apostles appointed for the decision of such Controversies. They having the care of that flock committed to them, over which the Holy Ghost has made them Overseers, to feed the Church of God, Acts 20. 28. and to watch against those Men, who should arise from among themselves, speaking perverse things to draw Disciples after them. 1b. ver. 30. And be having receiv'd Command, as likewise the whole Flock of Christ, to obey their Prelates, and to be subject to them, who watch,

and are to render an account for their Souls, Heb. 13. 17. with an assurance, That, He that heareth them, heareth Christ; and be that despiseth them, despiseth Christ, Luk. 10. 16.

And withal being taught, that as this way of the Antients of the Church, and Prelates meeting, in cafe of any danger threatening their Flock, or any new Doctrine arising, was the means instituted by Christ, and practis'd by the Apostles, in the first planting of the Church, for the preventing Schisms, and preserving Unity among the Faithful, and that they should speak and think the same things, and be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and same judgement, 1 Cor. 1. 10. So it ought to be the means in all succeeding Ages, for the preventing Divisions, and conferring Unity among the Faithful. And that therefore, as that Controversie concerning the necessity of Circumcision, (Acts. c. 15.) arising in the Apostles time, was not decided by any private Person, nor even by Paul and Barnabas, who nevertheless, had received the Holy Ghost; and one would have thought, might have pretended to the Spirit, and a Heavenly Light; but by a General Meeting of the Apostles and Elders of the Church at Jerusalem, who were consul'd by Paul and Barnabas about this Question. So all other Disputes and Difficulties of Religion arising in succeeding Ages, ought to be refer'd to the Successors of the Apostles (whole Charge, Dignity and Office is to continue to the end of the World, tho' they are dead in Person) who are to consider of the matter, (Acts 25. 6.) as the Apostles did; while all the Multitude keeps silence, ver. 12. without any one presuming on any Learning, Gift, Virtue, Prayers or Inspiration, to intermeddle in the Dispute, or put an end to the Question: This being none of their business or obligation, but only with all Patience and Humility to expect the Determination of their Prelates and Elders, and receive it with the same expressions, as those Good Chriftians did heretofore, who rejoiced for the consolation, (Acts. 15. 31.) And unless this that the Apostles did, and their Objeuctive Flock, be taken as a Pattern in all Ages, for the ending such-like difficulties; he believes 'tis impossible that Believers should stand fast in one Spirit, with one Mind, (Phil. 1. 27.) and be not carried away with divers and Strange Doctrines (Heb. 13. 9.)
XVII. Of Infallibility in the Church.

He believes that the Pastors and Prelates of his Church are Infallible, and that like so many Divine Oracles, or petty Familiar Deities, they are exempt from Errours and cannot deceive. But this, especially when they are met together in a General Council, It being a main part of his Faith, That then they are secure from all mistakes; and that it is as impossible for them to decline either to the right hand or to the left, in any of their Definitions and Decrees, as it is for God to leave Heaven, and become the Author of lies. Thus fondly believing these to be assisted with a necessary Infallibility, like Gods, amongst their Ignorance, ill Example, and Debauch'd Lives, to a true Considerer, scarce speak to be Men. As if God Almighty did so blindly throw his Benefits and Graces among his Creatures, that none should have a more powerful assistance of God's Truth and Infallible Spirit, than those in whom there was least of God to be found.

He believes that the Pastors and Prelates of his Church are Fallible; that there is none of them, but may fall into Errours, Heresies and Schism, and consequently are subject to mistakes. But that the whole Church can fail, or be deceive'd in any one Point of Faith, this he believes impossible; knowing it to be built on better promises, such as secure her from all Error, and danger of Precipitation. Her Foundation being laid by Christ, against which the Gates of Hell shall not prevail, (Matt. 16. 18.) The Power that protects her, being Christ himself; Behold I am with you all days, (Matt. 28. 20.) The Spirit that Guides and Teaches her, being the comforter of the Holy Ghost; who shall teach her all things, and suggest to her all things that Christ hath said to her, (John. 14. 26.) The time that she is to be thus protected, taught, and assisted, being not only while the Apostles live, or for the first three, four, or five hundred years next after; but for ever, to the end of the World; Behold I am with you all days, (Matt. 28. 20.) He will give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, (John. 14. 16.) And the thing, that she is to be thus taught to the end of the World, being all truth: He shall teach you all truth, (John. 16. 13.) Now being assured by the Promises, that the Church of Christ shall be taught all Truth by the special assistance of the Holy Ghost, to the end of the World; he has Faith to believe, that Christ will make his Words good; and that his Church shall never fail, nor be corrupted with Antichristian Doctrine, nor be the Mistress of Errours; but shall be taught all Truth, and shall teach all Truth to the confirmation of things; and that whoever despises her, despises Christ; And whoever despises Christ; and ought to be esteemed as an Heathen or a Publican, (Matt. 13. 17.) The like assistance of the Holy Ghost, which is the Church-representative: (as the
A Papist Mis-represented and Represented.

Parliament is the Representative of the Nation,) by which they are especially protected from all Error, in all Definitions and Declarations in matters of Faith. So that what the Apostles pronounc'd concerning the Result of their Council; (Acts 15. 28.) it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us; He does not doubt, may be perf'd, to all the Determinations in Point of Faith, revolvd on, by any General Council Lawfully Assembled since that time, or to be held to the Worlds end. The Affiance being to extend as far as the Promise. And tho"'tis possible that severall of the Prelates and Pastors in such an Assembly, (as also many others in Communion with the Church of Christ) should at other times, either through Pride or Ignorance, prevaricate, make Innovations in Faith, teach Erroneous Doctrines, andendeavour to draw numbers after them; yet he is taught, that this does not at all argue a Fallibility in the Church; nor prejudice her Faith, but only the Persons, that thus unhappily fall into these Errors, and cut themselves off from being Members of the Mystical Body of Christ upon Earth: Whilst the Belief of the Church remains pure and untainted; and experiences the Truth of what St. Paul foretold, That Grievous Wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the Flock: Also of your own selves shall Men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away Disciples after them, (Acts 20. v. 29. 30.) which, as it proved true even in the Apostles time by the fall of Nicholas and his followers, as also of several others: So it has been verified in all Ages since, by turbulent and Prefuming Spirits, broaching new Doctrines, and making S'rations and Schisms: But this without casting any more aspersion on the Church or Congregation of the Faithful, than the fall of Judas did on the Apostles; or the Rebellion of Lucifer on the Hierarchy of Angels; which was no more than that such wicked and Prefuming Spirits, went out from amongst them, and were expelled their Communion, as unworthy. Neither does it reflect at all on the Churches Authority, or make the truth of her Doctrine questionable to him; that many of her Eminent Members, Doctors, Prelates, and Leading Men, have been, or are great enormous Sinners, infamous for their Pride, Covetousness, or other Vices, whatsoever: The Promises of God's continual and un-interrupted assistance to his Church, being not to be frustrated by the wickedness of such particular Men, tho' in great Dignities. These Promises being made furer to her, than ever the Jewish Church: Which nevertheles stood firm in her Authority, and the Delivery of Truth, notwithstanding the frequent Idolatry of the People, Nadab and Abira's (Confecrated Priests) offering Strange Fire: Corah, Dathan and Abiram's making a great Schism, and the sins of Moses and Aaron, and other High-Priests in all her succeeding Ages. Nay, tho' all things touching Religion and Virtue, were in a manner run to decay, in our Saviour's time, both in Priests and People; yet did he maintain the Authority of the Jewish Church; and commanded all to be Obedient, and submit to those who had the superiority, without calling in question their Authority, or doubting of the reaonableness of their Commands. The Scribes and Pharisees, (lays he, Matt. 23. 2.) fit in Moses's Chair: All therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do: But do ye not after their works. If therefore God's special assistance, was never wanting to the Church of the Jews, so as to let it fail in the Truth of its Doctrine, or its Authority; notwithstanding the Pride, Covetousness, Cruelty, Impiety, Idolatry, of many of her Levites, Elders, Priests and High-Priests. Why should not he believe the same of the Church of Christ, which, (as St. Paul lays) is built on better promises: and that it remains entire in the Truth of her Doctrine, and her Authority, notwithstanding the viciousness of many of her Governours. Especially, since he's in a manner confident, that there has been nothing so infamous asled by any Priests, Prelates Popes or others, since Christ's time, but what may be follow'd; Nay, was out-done by the Priests of the Jews.
XVIII. Of the POPE.

H E believes the Pope to be his great God, and to be far above all the Angels. That Christ is no longer Head of the Church, but that this Holy Father hath taken his place; and that whatsoever he Orders, Decrees or Commands, is to be received by his Flock, with the same respect, submission and awe, as if Christ had spoken it by his own mouth. For that his Holiness (having once received the Triple-Crown on his Head,) is now no more to be looked upon as Man, but as Christ's Vicar, whose Office it is to Constitute and Ordain such things as Christ forgot, when he was upon Earth, not thoroughly considering, what would be the Exigencies of his Flock in future Ages. And for this intent, he is assisted with a certain Mysterious Infallibility; such as hides it self, when he is upon his own Private Concerns, exposes him to all the Designs, Cheats, Malice, and Machinations of his Enemies, and lets him be as easily over-seen, as imprudent, as silly as his Neighbours. But when he comes into his Chair to hear any Publick Business,
then it begins to appear, and protects him from all Mistakes and Errors; and he becomes immediately full of the Holy Ghost, though he had the Devil and all of Wickedness in him just before.

his charge, not for any consideration of his Person, but merely for the Office he bears: It being the Duty of a good Son to Obey his Father, and of a Loyal Subject his King, and never to question their Authority, or disrespect them in their Office, tho' for some particular Vices, they may have little respect for their persons. In this manner is he ready to behave himself towards his chief Pastor, with all Reverence and Submission, never scrupling to receive his Decrees, and Definitions, such as are issued forth by his Authority, with all their due circumstances, and according to the law, in the concern of the whole Flock. And this, whether he has the assurance of a Divine Infallibility, or no: Which, tho' some allow him, without being in a General Council, yet he is satisfied, 'tis only their Opinion, and not their Faith, there being no Obligation from the Church, of assenting to any such Doctrine. And therefore, as in any civil Government, the Sentence of the supreme Judge or Highest Tribunal, is to be Obeyed, tho' there be no assurance of infallibility, or Divine Protection from Error or Mistake; So is he taught, should be done to the Orders of the Supreme Pastors, whether he be Infallible or no.

XIX. Of Dispensation.

He believes, that the Pope has no Authority to dispense with the Laws of God; and that there's no Power upon Earth can absolve any one from the Obligation of keeping the Commandments; or give leave to Lie or Forswear; or make, that the breaking of any of the least Divine Precept, shall not be accountable for at the day of Judgment. He is taught by his Church in all Books of Direction, in all Catechisms, in all Sermons, that every Lie is a Sin; that to call God to witness to an Untruth is Damnable; that it ought not be done to save the whole World; that whoever does it, either for his own Personal account, or for the Interest of Church or Pope, or whatsoever else, must of necessity answer for it at the last-day, and expect his portion with the Devil and his Angels, if un-repentent; And that no one can give leave for Lying, Perjury, or committing any Sin; or even pretend

privilege of his Office, uttering a Truth which he himself never meant. With such like helping Grace, he doubts not, but God generally afflicts the Pastors of the New-Law, and more especially the High-Priests, for the Good of the whole Flock. And therefore, tho' he were as wicked as Caiphas, yet he is ready to tender him all respect due to his Function, and obey him in every thing concerning the Exercise of
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prepar'd for him in Heaven, as a recompence of his good Intentions and Heroick Achievements. And if at any time he should chance to be catch'd in the management of any of these Publick and Church-concerns, and being obnoxious to Penal Laws, should have Sentence of Death pass'd on him; he has liberty at his last hour on the Scaffold or Ladder, to make a Publick Detestation of all such Crimes, to make Protestations of his Innocence; to call God to witness, that he dies unjustly; and that as he is immediately to appear before the Supreme Judge, he knows no more of any such designs, and is as clear from the guilt of them as the Child unborn. And this, tho' the Evidence against him be as clear as noon-day, tho' the Jury be never so Impartial, and the Judge never so Conscientious. For that he having taken the Sacrament and Oath of Secrecy, and receiv'd Absolution, or a Dispensation from the Pope, may then Lie, Swear, Forswear, and Protest all that he pleases without scruple, with a good Conscience, Christian-like, Holy and Canonically.

pretend to it, unless it be the Devil himself, or some devilish Ministers, of his such as he detests in his heart, and utterly abominates. And in consequence to this he believes, That whosoever at the hour of his death denies any Crime, of which he is guilty, and protests himself to be innocent, when he is not so; can have no hope of mercy: but departing out of this World, an enemy to God, and the Truth, shall infallibly be receiv'd as such in the next; and dying with a Lie in his mouth, can expect no reward, but from the Father of Lies. And this, whatsoever his Crime was, whether incur'd by an undertaking for Mother-Church, or no; and whatsoever his Pretences for the denial of the Truth were, whether Absolutions, Dispensations, the Sacrament, or Oath of Secrecy, or whatsoever else: nothing of these being capable of excusing him in Lies or Perjury, or making them to be Innocent, and not displeasing to God. Nor indeed did he ever hear of these so much talk'd on Dispensations and Absolutions, from any Priest of his Church; either in Sermons or Confessions; he never read of them in his Books and Catechisms; he never saw the Practice of them in any of his Communion; it having been their Custom ever since Oaths were first devis'd against them, rather to suffer the loss of their Goods, Banishments, Imprisonments, Torments, and Death itself, than Forswear themselves, or protest the least Untruth. And 'tis not out of the memory of Man, that several might have sav'd their Estates, and Lives too, would they have subscrib'd to, and own'd but one Lie; and yet refused it; choosing rather to die Infamously, than prejudice their Conscience with an Untruth. So that it seems a great Mystery to him, that those of his Profession, should have Leave and Dispensations to Lie and Forswear themselves at pleasure, and yet that they should need nothing else but Lying and Perjury, for the quiet enjoy-

ment of their Estates, for the saving their
Command, and greatest Dignity; such as would be extraordinarily advantageous for their Cause, and the interest of their Church. And yet that they should generally chuse rather to forego all these so considerable Conveniences, than once Lie or For-swear themselves. And is it not another great Mystery, that these Dispensations for Lying and Swearing should according to the Receiv'd Doctrine of his Church; and yet that he, or any of his Communion, were never instructed nor inform'd of any such Diabolical Point? nay, had never come to the knowledge of it, had it not been for the Information receiv'd from some Zealous Adveraries, such as relate either merely upon Trust, or else such as have receiv'd a Denunciation of Lying from the Devil, that they might charge the like Doctrine on the Church of Rome, and the Pope.

XX. Of the Deposing Power.

He believes, that the Pope has Authority to dispense with his Allegiance to his Prince; and that he needs no longer be a Loyal Subject, and maintain the Rights, Priviledges and Authority of his King, than the Pope will give him leave. And that if this Mighty Father think fit to thunder out an Excommunication against him, then he shall be deem'd the best Subject, and Most Christian, that can first shed his Prince's Blood, and make him a Sacrifice to Rome: and he's but ill rewarded for his pains, who, after so Glorious an Achievement, has not his Name plac'd in the Kalender, and be Canoniz'd for a Saint. So that there can be no greater Danger to a King, than to have Papish Subjects, he holding his Life amongst them, only at the Pope's pleasure.

Tis no part of his Faith to believe, that the Pope has Authority to dispense with his Allegiance to his Sovereign, or that he can Depose Princes upon any account whatsoever; giving leave to their Subjects to take up Arms against them, and endeavour their ruin. He knows that Depositing and King-killing Power has been maintain'd by some Canoniz'd, and Divines of his Church, and that it is in their Opinion lawful, and annex'd to the Papal Chair. He knows likewise that some Popes have endeavour'd to act according to this Power. But that this Doctrine, appertains to the Faith of his Church, and is to be believe'd by all of that Communion, is a malicious Calumny a down-right Falacy. And for the truth of this, it seems to him a sufficient Argument, that for the few Authors that are Abettors of this Doctrine, there are of his Communion three times the number, that publicly difown all such Authority; besides several Universities, and whole Bodies that have solemnly condemn'd it; without being in the least suspect'd of their Religion, or of denying any Article of their Faith. Those other Authors therefore Publish their own Opinions in their Books, and those Popes acted according to what they judge'd lawful; and all this amounts to no more, than that this Doctrine has been, or is an Opinion amongst some of his Church; but to raise it to an Article of Faith upon these grounds,
grounds, is impossible. Let his Church therefore answer for no more, than what he delivers for Faith; let Prelates answer for their Actions, and Authors for their own Opinions; otherwife more Churches must be charg'd with Deposing and King-killings Doctrine, besides that of Rome: The University of Oxford having found other Authors of pernicious Books, and Damnable Doctrines, destructive to the Sacred Persons of Princes, their State and Government, besides Jesuits, as may be seen in their Decree, publish'd in the London Gazette, July 25. 1683. In which they condemn'd twenty seven false, impious, sedulous Propositions, fited to stir up Tumults, overthrow States and Kingdoms, to lead to Rebellion, Murder of Princes, and Atheism it self. Of which number, only three or four were ascrib'd to the Jesuits: the rest having men of another Communion for their Fathers. And this Doctrine was not first condemn'd by Oxford; What they did here in the Year 1683, having been solemnly done in Paris in 1626. Where the whole Collidge of Sorbon gave Sentence against this Proposition of Sandarellus; (viz.) That the Pope, for Heretick and Schism, might depose Princes, and exempt the Subjects from their Obedience; the like was done by the Universities of Caen, Rheimes, Poitiers, Valence, Bourdeaux, Bourges, and the Condemnation subscrib'd by the Jesuits. And Mariana's Book was committed publickly to the Flames, by a Provincial Council of his own Order, for the discoursing the Point of King-killings Doctrine problematically. Why therefore should this disloyal Doctrine be laid to his Church, when as it has been writ against by several hundred single Authors in her Communion, and disown'd, and solemnly condemn'd by so many famous Universities? And why should the Actions of some few Popes, with the Private Opinions of some Speculative Doctors, be so often and vehemently urg'd for the just charging this Doctrine upon the Faith of the Church of Rome? which, to a Serious, Impartial Considerer, are only meer Fallacies, capable of Libelling all Societies in the World, of overthrowing all States and Kingdoms, and only fit Arguments for Knaves to cheat Fools withal: There being no Government in the World which might not be easily proved Tyrannical; No Religion, Persecution, or Society, which might not plausibly be indicted of Atheism; If the Actions, Pretences, Claims, and Endeavour of some few of their Governors, and Leading Men; the Opinions, Writings, Phantaisies of some Authors, be allow'd as sufficient Evidence, for the bringing in the Verdict of Guilty upon the whole. When Malice therefore and Envy have done their worst in this point, to render the Papists bloody and barbarous to the World; yet 'tis certain, after all, that Papish Princes sit as safe in their Thrones, enjoy as much Peace and Security, as any other Princes whatsoever; And that the Papists in England can give as good proofs of their Loyalty, as the best of those that clamour so loud against them. They can bid defiance to their Adversaries, to shew any one Person of Honour and Estate amongst them, or even four of any condition whatsoever, that bore Arms against Charles the First, during the whole time of his Troubles. They can make good that there was scarce any amongst them, that did not assist his Majesty either with Person or Purse, or both. And they can say, that Charles the First was murder'd in cold blood by his Protestant Subjects, after many hundred Papists had loft their Lives for the preventing that Butchery, and that Charles the Second, being pursued by the same Subjects for his Life, fay'd it amongst the Papists.

XXI. Of Communion in one kind.

He believes, that he is no longer oblig'd to obey all the commands of Christ; and that neither his Church, nor any other Power
Christ's Commands than his Church will give him leave. And that therefore, tho' Christ instituted the Sacrament under both kinds, and commanded it to be receiv'd so by all; yet he thinks it is not necessary, for any to do so now, but Priests; because his Church, forsooth, hath forbidden the Cup to the Laity; And put a stop to the Precept of Christ, who said, Drink ye all of this, (Mat. 26. In submission to which Church-Prohibition, all the poor people of his Communion contentedly rest, while they see themselves defrauded of great part of that benefit which Christ left them, as his Last Will and Testament; for the comfort of their poor Souls, and the Remedy of their Infirmities.

1. 49, de Conf. Evang.) And that this was the Custom of the Primitive Christians, to give it under one kind, to Children, to the Sick, and that men on a Journey us'd so to carry it with them, is attested by all antient Writers, and modern Historians. Nay, he finds, that this was the practice of the Church, to Communicate under one kind only, or else under both, as every one thought good, especially in all Private Communions, for the first four hundred years after Christ; and that the first Precept of Receiving under both kinds, was given to the Faithful by Pope Leo I. in the year 443, and Confirm'd by Pope Gelasius in 496, not for the correcting any Abuse, that had crept into the Church, but for the discovering the Manichees, (who being of opinion, that Christ had no true Blood, and that Wine was the Blood of the Devil,) us'd to lurk among the Christians, and receiving under the form of Bread only, as the rest did, remain'd undistinguifh'd, till by this Obligation of all Receiving the Cup, (which they judg'd unlawful and abominable) they were all detected. And, now, if a thing (till that time indifferent,) was for these Motives determin'd by an Eclesiastical Precept, and so observ'd for many hundred years, without scruple or questioning the Authority; why should he doubt to submit to the same Authority, when (upon different Motives and Circumstances) they issue forth another Precept? Few doubt of this, in the matter of Eating Strangled Meats and Blood; which, tho' forbid by the Apostles,
HE believes an insufficiency in the Sacrifice made by Christ upon the Cross: And that his Death will little avail us in order to our Redemption, unless we, by daily Sacrificing him to his Father, perfect what he began. And therefore little taking notice of St. Paul's words to the Hebrews, (Chap. 10. 14.) where he says, that Christ our High-Priest by one Oblation hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified: he thinks he shall never be sanctified, but by the Offering made by his Mass-Priests upon their Altars, when they say Mass; and thus wholly relying upon this Superstition, (an Invention of some crafty Pope, for the deceiving Widows and Credulous Women) he is taught to neglect the Passion of Christ, and to put no hopes in his Merits, and the Work of our Redemption.

XXII. Of the MASS.

HE believes that the Sacrifice made by Christ upon the Cross was altogether sufficient: That by it he saved and redeemed us, paying the Debt of Sin, and satisfying the Infinite Justice of his Father: That by it he procur'd means for our Salvation; which means are Faith and Good Works, and most honourable to God, is the Offering a Sacrifice. And as Christ's Worshipping of God, Christ's Fasting, Christ's Praying and Suffering for us, does not hinder or evacuate our Worshipping of God, our Fasting, our Suffering, our Praying for our selves. So neither did his Sacrifice hinder or evacuate all Sacrifices for ever. But as he instituted Fasting, Praying, and Suffering for his Followers, that by so doing, they might apply what he did, to themselves; so also he instituted a Sacrifice, that by it they might apply the merits of his Sacrifice, and make it beneficial to their Souls. So that though he firmly believes, that Christ offered Sacrifice for our Redemption, and by one only Offering, (spoken of by St. Paul) perfected by way of Redemption the Sanctification of all those that are Sanctified: Yet he also believes, that to receive the benefit of this Offering we must also do our parts, by our Good Works concurring, with Christ, so becoming Labourers together with God. 1 Cor. 3. 9. and in some manner purifying our own selves. 1 Joh. 3. 3 and therefore not omit the best of all Works, which is Sacrifice, proper to none but God: Which our Saviour Jesus Christ instituted at his last Supper, when leaving unto us his Body and Blood under two distinct Species of Bread and Wine, he bequeath'd as a Legacy to his Apostles, not only a Sacrament, but also a Sacrifice: A Commemorative Sacrifice, lively Representing in an unbloody manner, the bloody Sacrifice, which was offered for us upon
HE believes, (contrary to all Reason, the Word of God, and all Antiquity) that (besides Heaven and Hell) there is a third Place, which his Church is pleas’d to call Purgatory; a Place intended purely for those of his Communion, where they may easily have admittance after this Life, without danger of falling into Hell; For, that though Hell was designed first, for the punishment of Sinners; yet (that now, since the blest discovery of Purgatory) Hell may easily be skipp’d over, and an Eternal Damnation avoided, for an exchange of some short Penalty undergone in this Pope’s Prison, where he never need fear to be detained long; for that, if he has but a Friend left behind him, that will but say a few Hail-Maries for his Soul, or in his
Testament did but remember to order a small Sum to be presented to some Mass-Priest, he never need doubt of being soon Released: For that a Golden Key will as infallibly open the Gates of Purgatory, as of any other Prison whatsoever.

neither in the World to come. By which words Christ evidently supposes, that (though these shall not) yet some sins are forgiven in the World to come: Which since it cannot be in Heaven, where no sin enters: nor in Hell, whence there is no Redemption; it must necessarily be some Middle State: And in this sense it was understood by St. Augustine nigh twelve hundred Years ago, as is manifest in his Works, (Civ. Del. 1. 21. c. 13. & 24. & lib. 6. contr. Julian. 14.) Also by St. Gregory the Great, (L. 4. Dist. 39.) so by St. Bernard against the Hereticks of his time. In the same manner does St. Augustine understand those words of St. Paul, (1 Cor. 3. 15.) He himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire. Where he thinks him to speak of a purging fire, (Aug. in Psal. 37.) So the same Father understands that Purgion of which St. Peter speaks, (1 Pet. 1. 19.) to be some place of Temporal Chastisement, (Aug. Ep. 99.) And if this great Doctor of the Church in those Purer times, found so often in the Bible, a Place of Pains, after the Life, from whence there was Release; how can any one say, without great presumption, that the Being of a third place, is contrary to the Word of God? Neither can the Antiquity of this Doctrine be more justly called in question, of which is found so early mention, not only by this Holy Father; but even by others his Predecessors, the Disciples of the Apostles, and the best Witnesses of their Doctrine, (Dionys. de Eccl. Hier. c. 7. In Adv. SS. Perpet. & Felicit. mention'd and approved by S. Aug. 1. l. de Animis ejus Orig. c. 10. l. 3. c. 9. & l. 4. c. 18. Terrul. l. de Cor. Mil. s. 3. Cypri. Ep. 66. ad Cler. Arnob. l. 4. cont. Gen. pug. uti. and many others quoted at length by the Learned Natalis Alexander, Tom. 9. Hift. Eccl. dist. 41.) And as for the Reason of this Tenet, he is bound to think it does not want it, since he finds it abetted by such Virtuous, Learned and Considering Men, whom he dares not reckon Fools; never hearing, that these us'd to Believe, but upon very good Grounds and Substantial Reasons. And he thinks he is able to give some himself, by what he has learn'd from the Scriptures, and these Fathers. For having been taught by these: First, That when a sinner is reconcil'd to God, though the Eternal Punishment due to his sins is always remitted, yet there sometimes remains a Temporal Penalty to be undergone. As in the case of the Israelites, (Num. 14.) who by Moses's Prayers obtain'd Pardon for their Murmuring, and yet were excluded the Land of Canaan. As in the Case of David, (2 Sam. 12.) who was punish'd in the loss of his Child, after his sin was forgiven. Secondly, That there are some sins, which of their own nature are Light and Venial, such as cool the fervour of Charity, but do not extinguish it, from which even Holy Men are not exempt, and of which it is said, that the Just Man falls seven times; (Augustin. Enchir. c. 70. & lib. Quaest. Off. tr. 9. 26.) Thirdly, That to all sins, whether great or small, some Penalty is due to the justice of God; who as he has Mercy to forgive, has also Justice to punish: so that as St. Augustine says, (in Enarr. in Psal. 50.)Whoever seeks to God for Mercy, must remember that he is just, and that his sin shall not pass unpunished. Fourthly, That generally speaking
Speaking, few Men depart out of this life; but either with the guilt of some light offences and venial sins, or else obnoxious to some Temporal Punishment due to former sins forgiven. From these Heads, Discourse leads him immediately to the Necessity of some Third Place. For since the Infinite Goodness of God can admit nothing into Heaven, which is not clean, and pure from all sin both great and small: And his Infinite Justice can permit none to receive the Reward of Bliss, who as yet are not out of debt, but have something in Justice to suffer: There must of necessity be some Place or State, where Souls, departing this life, pardon’d as to the Eternal Guilt or Pain, yet obnoxious to some Temporal Penalty, or with the guilt of some venial faults, are Purg’d and Purify’d before their Admittance into Heaven. And this is what he is taught concerning Purgatory. Which, though he knows not where it is, of what nature the Pains are, or how long each Soul is destined there; yet he believes, that those, that are in this Place, being the Living Members of Jesus Christ, are relieved by the Prayers of their Fellow-Members here on Earth, and that the Charitable Works performed upon their Death-bed, and the Alms disposed on in their Last Will, are very available afterwards in order to their speedy release.

XXIV. Of Praying in an Unknown Tongue.

He is counsel’d by his Church, to be present at Sermons, but never permitted to hear any he is able to understand: they being all deliver’d in an unknown Tongue. He is taught to Pray, but it must be in Latin. He is commanded to assist at the Church-Service, and to hear Mass; but it must be without understanding a Word; it being all performed in a Language, of which he is altogether ignorant. And thus is miserably deprived of all the comfortable Benefits of Christianity: Hearing, but without Understanding; Praying, but without reaping Fruit; assisting at Publick Assemblies, but like a Stock or a Stone, without feeling, or any the least sense of Devotion.

He is counsel’d by his Church to be present at Sermons, such as he is able to understand, they being always deliver’d in the Vulgar Language of every Country: in France, French; in Spain, Spanish; in Italy, Italian; in England, (if permitted) English. They being purely intended for the good instruction of the Congregation present. He is taught to Pray, and always provided of such Books of Devotion as he is capable of understanding; every Nation being well furnished with such helps, extant in the Language proper to the Country. He is commanded to assist at the Church-Service, and to hear Mass; and in this he is instructed, not to understand the Words, but to know what is done. For the Mass being a Sacrifice, wherein is daily commemorated the Death and Passion of Christ, by an Oblation, made by the Priest of the Body and Blood of the Immaculate Lamb, under the Symbols of Bread and Wine, according to his own Institution: 'tis not the blemish of the Congregation present, to employ their Ears in attending to the Words, but their Hearts in contemplation of the Divine Mystery, by raising up fervent affections of Love, Thanksgiving, Compassion, Hope, Sorrow for sins, Resolutions of amendment, &c. That thus having their Heart and Intention united
united with the Priests, they may be partakers of his Prayers, and of the Sacrifice he is then offering; than which, he believes nothing is more acceptable to God, or beneficial to true Believers. And for the raising of these affections in his Soul, and filling his Heart with the eftatjes of Love and Devotion, he thinks in this cafe there’s little need of Words; a true Faith, without thefie, is all-sufficient. Who could but have burst forth into Tears of Love and Thanksgiving, if he had been present while our Saviour was tyed to the Pillar, Scourd and Tormented, though he open’d not his mouth to the By-fstanders, nor fpake a word? Who would have needed a Sermon to have been fill’d with Grief and Compassion, if he had seen his Saviour expos’d to the scorn of the Jews, when he was made a bloody spectacle by Pilate, with, Ecce homo, Lo the Man? Who could have stood cold and fenfeless, upon Mount Calvary, under the Cross, when his Redeemer was hanging on it, though he had heard, or not understood a word that he fpoke? Does any one think that thofe Holy Women, who follow’d their Lord, in thofe sad Paffages, and were Witness of his Sufferings, wanted Holy Affections in their Souls, because he fpoke not; or were they scandaliz’d at his silence? Was not their Faith in him that suffered, by which they believ’d him to be Christ Jesus, true God and Man, laying down his life for the Redemption of Man, fufficient to excite in their Souls all the Paffions due from a fiful Creature, to his bleeding Redeemer, to his Crucified Jesus? The like Faith also is fufficient to fill him with Devotion, when he is present at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mafs: For believing, that Christ is there really present before him, under the Species of Bread and Wine, and that He that lies upon the Altar, is the Lamb of God that takes away the fins of the World; What need of more, to quicken in his Soul all the Affections of a Devout Lover? Can he behold his Redeemer before him, and not break forth into Love and Thanksgiving? Can he fee him, that gives flight to the Blind, health to the Sick, and life to the Dead, and yet fand still fenfeless and un-mov’d, without putting any Petition to him, without asking any thing, for his blind, fick and fiful Soul? Can he believe that he that gives his life for the World, and died for our fins, is there before him, and not be touch’d with forrow and contrition for his Offence? Can he fee commemorated every doleful Paffage of his Saviour’s Sufferings, in the feveral Mafheries of the Mafs, and yet not be fill’d with grief and compafion? Is not Jesus welcome to a devout Soul, although he come in silence? Is not the Presence of Christ, a more forcine motive to a Christian, than any Human Words could be? And if he muft needs have Words, let him behold with the eye of Faith the gaping Wounds of his Redeemer, and fee if thofe fpeak nothing to his Soul. If they do not, ‘tis because he wants Faith. It nothing therefore concerns his Devotion, that the Mafs is faid in Latin: If the Church has order’d it thus, fo to prefervete Unity; as in Faith, fo in the External Worship of God, and to prevent alterations and changes, which it would be expos’d to, if in Vulgar Languages, and other good Reason; What’s that to him? He should receive but little advantage, if it were in his Mother Tongue. For besides, that the greatest part is faid in fo I am a voice, that it is not poftible he should hear it; the Words do not belong to him. That’s only the Priests Office; and the Ouligation is, to accompany the Priest in Prayer, and Spirit, to be a joint Offerer with him, to contemplate the Mafheries there repreffent, and to excite in his Soul Devotions according to the exigency of every Paffage: According to the Directions he finds in his English Prayer-Books, of which there are extant great variety, let forth for the help of the Ignorant; by which they are taught the meaning of every Part and Ceremony of the Mafs, and how to apply their Devotions accordingly. And if at any time he be preffent at another public Devotions, as the Church-Offices, the Litanies, Solemn Thanksgivings, Exe- ques,
He is kept in Ignorance, as to an Essential part of his Duty towards God; never being permitted to know the Commandments, but by halves. For in the Books deliver'd to him for his Instruction, (such are Catechisms and Manuals) the Second Commandment is wholly left out; and he, by this means, is taught to fall into all sorts of Superstitious Worship, and down-right Idolatry. And then the Commandments he does learn, are in such disorder, by a confusion of the two first into one, and a cutting the last into Two, by putting only Three in the first Table, and Seven in the second: that no Reason can be able to justify this mangling and chopping.

He is instructed in his whole Duty towards God, and most especially in the Ten Commandments. He is taught to understand them all and every one: that there's an Obligation of observing them, under pain of eternal Damnation; and that whoever breaks any one of them, loses the Favour of God, and as certainly hazards the loss of his Soul, as if he broke them all. And though in the short Catechisms and Manuals, in which the whole Christian Doctrine is deliver'd in the most compendious and easy method, in condescendence to weak Capacities; the Second Commandment (as 'tis reckon'd by some) be wholly omitted: Yet is it to be seen at length in other Catechisms, and Doctrinal Books, to be met with everywhere in great plenty. And if any one should chance not to see any of these, yet would he be out of all danger of falling into any Superstitious Worship or Idolatry: for that having read his First Commandment, Thou shalt have no other Gods before me; he is taught, that by this, he is commanded to Serve, Love, Adore and Worship one only True, Living and Eternal God, and no more: That 'tis forbidden him, to Worship any Creature for a God, or to give it the
in opposition to all Authority and Antiquity.

He is taught to keep Faith with any that are reputed Heretics by his Church; and that whatsoever Promises he has made, tho' never so positive and firm, with this sort of People, he may lawfully break, and cheat and cozen them without any scruple. And tho' he must not do this by down-right Lying, and telling Untruths; for that would be a Sin; yet he may make use of any indirect ways, such as Difimulation, Equivocations, and Mental Reservations; and by these means draw them into his Snares: and this without fear of offending God, who is well pleas'd the honour due to God; and that whatsoever Worships any Idols, Images, Pictures, or any graven thing (whatever the Object be, whether in Heaven above, in the Earth beneath, or in the Waters under the Earth) for God, breaks the Commandment, by committing Idolatry, and stands guilty of an inexcusable and most damnable sin. Now having been taught, that this is the intent of the first Precept of the Decalogue, he thinks there can be but little danger of his becoming Superstitious in his Worship, or an Idolator, for want of the Second; there being nothing in this, but what he is fully and expressly instructed in, by having learn'd the First: it being rather an Explication of this, than any New and Distinct Precept: And for this reason he finds them in his Books, put together as One, or rather as the first Commandment, with its explication; by which means it comes about, that there are only Three in the first Table, teaching him his Duty towards God; and seven in the latter, concerning his Duty to his Neighbour; which is the Division assign'd by St. Augustine. And tho' St. Hierom observes not this method, but divides them into Four and Six; yet there being no direction in Scripture concerning the Number of the Commandments, to be assign'd to each Table; nor to let us know, which is the first, which the second, which the third Commandment, or which the last. He is taught, that 'tis but an unnecessary trouble, to concern himself about the Number of them, or Division, when as his whole business ought to be, the Observance of them in his Life and Conversation.

XXVI. Of Mental Reservations.

He is taught, to keep Faith with all sorts of People, of whatsoever Judgement or Persuasion they be, whether in Communion with his Church, or no; he is taught to stand to his Word, and observe his Promise given, or made to any whatsoever: and that he cannot cheat or cozen, whether by dissembling, equivocations, or mental reservations, without defiance of his own Conscience, and the violation of God's Law. This is the Instruction he receives from the Pulpit, the Confessionary, and his Books of Direction. The holy Francis Sales, in his Introduction to a Devout Life, (p. 3. c. 30.) tells him plainly, Let your Talk be courteous, frank, sincere, plain and faithful, without double dealing, subtility or dissembling: This he is taught to observe and practice, and that without this, 'tis not possible to please God. In the Catechism of Parecos, compiled by order of the Council of Trent, and recommended to all Parish-Priests for the instruction of the Faithful, he is taught, that by the Eighth Commandment he is forbidden all

dissimulation,
with these kind of Pious Crafts, allows of these Holy Cheats.

what is in the mind, is abominable and wicked. That no man shall bear false witness against his Neighbour, whether he be Friend or Enemy. And Pope Innocent XI, in a Decree issued forth the Second of March, Anno 1679. has strictly commanded all the Faithful in virtue of his holy Obedience, and under pain of incurring the Divine Vengeance, that they never Swear equivocally, or with any mental reservation, upon no account or pretended convenience whatsoever: And that if any presume either publicly or privately to teach or maintain the Doctrine of Swearing with equivocations or mental reservations, that they defacto incur Excommunication, and cannot be abolv'd by any, but the Pope himself, excepting at the hour of death. He is taught therefore to speak plainly and sincerely, without disimulations, equivocations, mental reservations, or any such like Artifices, which cannot be but very injurious to all Society, and displeasing to the First Truth. And now if any Authors in communion with his Church, be produced as Patrons of inward Reserves, and grand Abettors of these mental Fuggles, let them hold up their hands, and answer for themselves: Their Church has declar'd for no such Doctrine, and is no more to be charg'd with their extravagant Opinions, than with the unexemplar lives of other her Members, whose irregularities are not at all deriv'd from their Religion, but from the neglect of their own corrupt Inclinations, and giving way to the temptations of their Enemy.

XXVII. Of a Death-Bed Repentance.

HE is bred up in a total neglect of the Service of God, of all Virtue and Devotion, while he is well, and in good health; upon presumption of a Death-bed Repentance, and a confidence, that all his Sins will be certainly forgiven, if he can but once say, Lord have mercy upon me, at the last hour. And 'tis a sufficient Encouragement to him, to rely wholly upon this, to see that there is no such profligate Villain, none that has liv'd, tho' to the height of Wickedness and Debauchery, of his Communion, but at his death he shall be assisted by a Priest, and shall

HE is bred up in the Service and Love of God, taught to work his Salvation in fear and trembling, to provide in health-time against the last hour, and by no means to rely upon a Death-bed Repentance; for that Men, (generally speaking:) as they live, so they die; and 'tis to be fear'd greatly, that those, who neglect God Almighty, and forswear him all their life-time, will never find him at their death. So that, (with St. Augustine:) he doubts the Salvation of as many as defer their Conversion till that hour, and has no encouragement at all to do it. However, if any are found, that have been so neglectful of their Duty, as to put off this great business of Eternity to the last moment: He is taught, that, in Charity, they ought to have all instance possible, to put them in mind of their condition, to excite them to a hearty detestation of all their Offences: To let them know, that tho' they deserve Hell-fire in punishment of their wickedness, yet that they ought
receive an Absolution from all his Sins, with an absolute Promise of being soon admitted to Bliss, and Reigning with Christ, if he can but once say, he is sorry; or, if his Voice fail him, signify as much by a Nod of his Head, or the Motion of a Finger.

the like circumstances, he thinks there's but little danger; especially since there's nothing so often repeated in Books, no more common Subjects for Sermons, than the displaying the manifold perils of delaying ones Conversion, and putting off Repentance till the last hour.

XXVIII. Of Fasting.

He is contented with the appearance of Devotion; and looking not beyond the name of Mortification, he sits down well satisfied with the shadow, without ever taking care for the substance. And this, being a great Pretender to Fasting, and the Deny al of himself, he thinks he has sufficiently complied with his Duty in this Point, and made good his claim; if he has but abstained from Flesh; And tho at the same time, he Regales himself at Noon, with all variety of the choicest Fish, and stuffs himself at Night with the best Conerves, and delicatest Junkets, and drinks all day the pleasantest Wines, and other Liquors: yet he persuades himself, that he is a truly Morti-
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ed Man, that he has most Christian-like commemorated the bitter Death and Passion of his Redeemer, and done a work of great force, in order to the suppressing his corrupt Inclinations, and satisfying for the Offences of his Life past. Nay, he has such a preposterous conceit of things, that he believes it a greater sin to eat the least bit of Flesh on a Fasting-Day, than to be down-right Drunk, or commit any other Excess, as having less scruple of breaking the Commandments of God, than of violating any Ordinance of the Pope, or any Law of his Church.

Church-precept, by which they are bound (if able) to eat but one Meal in a day, and that not of flesh. And now if some are so inconsiderate and careless, as to be scrupulously observant of one of these Commands, and wholly negligent of the other; it’s not because their Religion teaches them to do so, (which detests and condemns all such scandalous partiality, and complying with their Duty by halves) but because they shut their ears to all good Instructio, and choose rather to follow their own corrupt Appetites, than the wholesome Doctrine of their Church.

XXIX. Of Divisions and Schisms in the Church.

He is of a Religion, in which there are as many Schisms as Families: And they are so divided in their Opinions, that commonly, as many as meet in company, so many several Tenets are maintain’d. Hence arise their infinite and endless Disputes; and the disagreement of their Di-

on this as a most Damming sin; and yet at the same time, have little scruple of Swearing, Cursing, Lying, or revelling the greatest part of the day. Which is not, because they have more liberty for these, than the former; they being all most wicked Offences; but because they that do thus are but Christians by halves, who with a kind of Pharisaical and Partial Obedience, seem to bear some of the Commandments most zealously in their Hearts, while others they trample under their feet; scrupling many times at a Meal, and on other occasions, pining by a Beam undiscern’d: For which their Church is not to be accountable, but They themselves, as being guilty of a wilful blindness, and a most unchristian negligence. This is the real case of such of his Communion, who, on days of Humiliation, while they abstain from Flesh, yet give scandal by their Intemperance. They have a Command of God, by which they are oblig’d on all days to live soberly, and to avoid all Gluttony and Drunkenness; and on Fasting-days besides this Command of God, they have a

H E is of a Religion, in which there are no Schisms or Separations; all the Members of it (however spread through the World) agreeing like one man, in every Article of their Faith, by an equal submission to the Determinations of their Church. And no one of them, tho’ most Learned and Wise, ever following any other Rule in their Faith besides this, of assenting to all, that the Church of God, planned by Christ, assisted and protected by the Holy Ghost, proposed to the Faithful to be believ’d, as the Doctrine of the Apostles, and receiv’d
vines, who pretend to give a true and solid explication of the Mysteries of the Christian Faith, and yet differ in as many Points as they write of. Besides, what variety of Judgments are there in their Religious Houses and Cloisters, none agreeing with another, in their Foundation, Institution, and Profession? This being of the Religion of St. Dominick, That of St. Francis, a Third of St. Bernard, Others of St. Benedict; and so without number; so that as many Orders, as many Religions. And yet they pretend to Christian Unity, amidst this diversity growing upon them every day.

Discipline, others of a more Gentle and Moderate. Some spending more time in Praying, others more in Watching, others more in fasting; some being intended for the Catechizing, and breeding up of Youth; others for taking care of Hospitals, and looking after the Sick; others for going amongst Infidels, and Preaching to them the Gospel of Christ, and for such like Pious and Christian Designs, to the greater Glory and Honour of God. Which differences make no other difference in the several Professors, than there was between Mary and Martha, who express'd their Love and Service to their Lord in a very different Manner; but both commendably, and without any danger of prejudicing the Unity of their Faith.

XXX. Of Fryars and Nuns.

He is taught to have a high esteem for all those of his Communion, who cloistering themselves up, become Fryars and Nuns; a sort of People, who call themselves Religious, and are nothing but a Religious Cheat; under the cloak of Piety, and pretend to give a true and solid explication of the Mysteries of the Christian Faith, and yet differ in as many Points as they write of. Besides, what variety of Judgments are there in their Religious Houses and Cloisters, none agreeing with another, in their Foundation, Institution, and Profession? This being of the Religion of St. Dominick, That of St. Francis, a Third of St. Bernard, Others of St. Benedict; and so without number; so that as many Orders, as many Religions. And yet they pretend to Christian Unity, amidst this diversity growing upon them every day.

Discipline, others of a more Gentle and Moderate. Some spending more time in Praying, others more in Watching, others more in Fasting; some being intended for the Catechizing, and breeding up of Youth; others for taking care of Hospitals, and looking after the Sick; others for going amongst Infidels, and Preaching to them the Gospel of Christ, and for such like Pious and Christian Designs, to the greater Glory and Honour of God. Which differences make no other difference in the several Professors, than there was between Mary and Martha, who express'd their Love and Service to their Lord in a very different Manner; but both commendably, and without any danger of prejudicing the Unity of their Faith.
tence to Devotion, deceiving the World; and living to the height of Wickedness, under the notion of Saints. They vow Chastity, Poverty and Obedience, and observe nothing less; but live in all respects so irregular and scandalous, that were there to be taken a compendious draught of all the Luxury, Pride, Covetousness, Irreligion, and other Vices, through the whole World, it might be modell'd according to what is affixed between any of these 4 Walls, in which these Recluses live, without danger of omitting any thing, that is wicked and unchristian.

Prayer their business, the Service of God their whole imployn, and the Salvation of their Souls their only design. And now, if in these Retirements, where every thing is order'd as it may be most advantageous for the promoting Virtue and Devotion, nothing permitted that is likely to prove a disturbance to Godliness, or allurements to Evil, yet some live scandalously, and give ill example to the World: What can be said, but that no State can secure any Man; and that no such provision can be made in order to a Holy Life, but it may be abused? But yet he does not think that such abuses, and the viciousness of some, can be argument enough to any just and reasonable Man, to condemn the whole, and the Institution itself. Is not Marriage abused an infinite number of ways, and many for'd to embrace this state, or at least to accept of such particular Perons contrary to their own choice and liking? Is there any State in this World, any Condition, Trade, Calling Profession, Degree, or Dignity whatsoever, which is not abused by some? Are Churches exempt from abuses? Are not Bibles and the Word of God abused? Is not Christianity itself abused, and even the Mercy of God abused? If therefore there is nothing so Sacred and Divine in the whole World, which wicked and malicious Men do not pervert to their ill designs, to the high dishonour of God, and their own Damnation: How can any one upon the mere consideration of some abuses pass Sentence of Condemnation against a thing, which otherwise is Good and Holy? 'Tis an undeniable truth, that to embrace a Life exempt, as much as can be, from the turmoils of the World; and in a quiet retirement to Dedicate ones elf to the Service of God, and spend ones days in Prayer and Contemplation, is a most commendable undertaking, and very becoming a Christian. And yet, if some, who enter such a course of life as this, fall short of what they pretend, and instead of becoming eminent in Virtue and Godliness, by their un-exemplar lives, prove a Scandal to their Profession:
XXXI. Of Wicked Principles and Practices.

He is Member of a Church which is called Holy; but in her Doctrine and Practices so Foul and Abominable, that whoever admires her for Sanctity, may upon the same grounds do homage to Vice itself. Has ever any Society since Christ's time, appeared in the World so black and deform'd with Hellish Crimes as she? Has not she out done even the most Barbarous Nations and Infidels, with her Impieties, and drawn a scandal upon the Name of Christian, by her unparallel'd Vices? Take but a view of the horrid Practices she has been engag'd in of late years; consider the French and Irish Massacres, the Murders of Henry III. and IV. Kings of France, the Holy League, the Gunpowder-Treason, the Cruelty of Queen Mary, the Firing of London, the late Plot in the Year 1678, to subvert the Government, and destroy His Majesty; the death of Sir Edmundbury Godfrey; and an infinite number of other such-like Devilish Contrivances; And then He is a Member of a Church, which, according to the 9th Article of the Apostles Creed, he believes to be Holy; and this not only in Name, but also in Doctrine; and for witness of her Sanctity, he Appeals to her Councils, Catechisms, Pulpits, and Spiritual Books of Direction; in which the main design is, to imprint in the hearts of the Faithful, this comprehensive Maxim of Christianity: That they ought to love God above all things with their whole Heart and Soul; and their Neighbour as themselves. And that none flatter themselves, with a confidence to be fav'd by Faith alone, without living Seriously, Faithfully, and Piably; as 'tis in the Council of Trent, Sect. 6. c. 11. So that he doubts not at all, but that as many as live according to the Direction of his Church, and in observance of her Doctrine, live Holiy in the Service of, and Fear of God; and with an humble confidence in the Merits and Passion of their Redeemer, may hope to be receiv'd after this Life, into Eternal Bliss. But that all in Communion with his Church do not live thus Holy, and in the fear of God, he knows 'tis too, too evident; there being many in all places, wholly forgetful of their Duty, giving themselves up to all sorts of Vice, and guilty of most horrid Crimes. And tho' he is not bound to believe all to be Truth, that is charg'd upon them by Atheists; there being no Narrative of any such Devilish Contrivances and Practices laid to them, wherein Passion and Fury have not made great Additions; wherein things Dubious, are not improv'd into certainties, Sufficient into Realities, Fears and Jealousies, into Substantial Plots, and down-right Lists, and Recorded Perjuries into Pulpits, nay Gospel-Truth. Yet really thinks, that there has been Men of his Profession of.
tell me, whether that Church, which has been the Author and Promoter of such Barbarous Designs, ought to be esteem’d Holy, and respected for Piety and Religion, or rather be condemn’d for the Mystery of Iniquity, the Whore of Babylon, which hath polluted the Earth with her Wickedness, and taught nothing but the Doctrine of Devils? And let never so many Pretences be made; yet ’tis evident, that all these execrable Practices have been done according to the known Principles of this Holy Church, and that her greatest Patrons, the most Learned of her Divines, her most Eminent Bishops, her Prelates, Cardinals, and even the Popes themselves, have been the chief Managers of these Hellish Contrivances. And what more convincing Argument that they are all well approved, and conform to the Religion taught by their Church.

he murdered his Wife and his Son. And the Religion of Theodosius be mark’d out for Atheism, because, by his Order, seven Thousand Theophisians, were Treacherously Maffacred in three hours’ space, without distinction of Sex or Age, or the Innocent from the Guilty. A confident Undertaker would find no difficulty in proving all this; especially if he had but the Gift of exaggerating some things, mis-representing others, of finding Authorities and Texts for every idle Story, of charging the extravagant Opinions of every single Author, upon the Religion they profess, of raking together all the Wickedness, Cruelties, Treacheries, Plots, Conspiracies, at any time committed, by any ambitious Desperado’s, or wicked Villains: And then positively asserting, that what these did, was according to the Doctrine of that Church of which they were Members; and that the true measures of the Sanctity and God-
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nefs of the Church in whose Communion these Men were, may be justly taken from the Behaviour of such Offenders. But certainly no Man of Reason and Conscience can allow of such Proceedings. No sober Man would ever go to Tyburn, and Whe-}

stones-Park, to know what is the Religion professed in England according to Law; 

Nor would look into all the Sinks, Lakes, Dung-hills, Common-shores about Town, 

from such a Prospect to give a true Description of the City. Why therefore shou'd 

the Character of the Church of Rome and her Doctrine be taken only from the loose 

Behaviour and wicked Crimes of such, who, tho' in Communion with her, yet live 

not according to her Direction? She teaches Holiness of Life, Mercy to the Poor, 

Loyalty and Obedience to Princes, and the necessity of keeping the Commandments, 

(witness the many Books of Devotion and Direction, made English for Publick ben-

efit, written originally by Papists,) and great numbers there are (God be prais'd) 

who practice this in their Lives. And now if there be many also, who fpop their Ears 

to good Instruction, and following the Suggestion of their own ungovern'd appetites, 

of Pride, Ambition, Covetousness, Luxury, &c. fo lay aside all concern of Salvation, 

and become unchristian both to God and their Neighbour, that they are a shame 

to their Profession: Why should the Church be represented according to the Wicked-

ness of those that neglect her Doctrine; and not rather by the Piety and Exemplar 

Lives of such as follow it? Is not this to deal by her, (if we may use such a Compari-

fon) as 'tis generally done by the Sion of St. Dunfan, near Temple-Bar, (on which, 

tho' the Saint be drawn almost in the full proportion, and there's no more of the 

Devil on it, besides the reeking towards him with a pair of Tongs ;) yet 'tis describ'd 

only by the name of the Devil-Tavern, without the least mention of the Saint? And 

is not this partiality unjust, and therefore piece-meal Descriptions unreasonable? Let the 

Character of the Church be given according to what she teaches, and not according to 

the Writings of every positive Opiniator, and the Practices of every wicked Liver, and 

then there's no fear of its coming out so ugly and deform'd. Neither let any one pre-

tend to demonstrate the Faith and Principles of the Papists, by the Works of every 

Divine in that Communion; or by the Actions of every Bishop, Cardinal, or Pope; For 

they extend not their Faith beyond the Declarations of General Councils; And stand-

ing fast to these, they yet own, that many of their Writers are too loose in their Opini-

ons, that all Bishops and Cardinals are not so edifying as becomes their State; and 

that Popes may have their failings too. A Pope is a Temporal Prince, keeps a Court, 

has variety of Officers about him. And if he has Flatterers, and Mis-informers too, 

'tis nothing but what all Princes are sensible of, but cannot remedy. And hence he 

doubts not, but 'tis possible that he may be engag'd in unlawful undertakings, and 

invite others to the like. And are not all other Princes subject to this too? But what 

then? These Actions of Popes concern not the Faith of those who are in Communion 

with them; they may throw a scandal indeed upon the Religion, but they can never 

alter its Creed. But what need any other return to the numerous Clamours made 

daily against the wickedness of the Papists? 'Tis a sufficient vindication of their Chief 

Pashors and Popes, (to use the words of a Person of Quality) that among two hundred 

and fifty, that have now Successively bore that Charge, there are not above ten or 

twelve, against whom, their most malicious Adverfaries can find occasion of spitting 

their Venom; and that a Chal lance may be made to the whole World, to shew 

but the fifth part of so many Successive Governors, since the Creation, of which there 

have not been far more that have abused their Power. And as for their Flock and 

People owning this Authority, 'tis true, many wicked things have been done by some 

of them; and too many like, Libertines, neglect the care of their Souls: But how-

ever the Generality of them live like Christians; few come to them, but with their 

G

Religion
XXXII. Of Miracles.

He is so given up to the belief of idle Stories and ridiculous Inventions in favour of his Saints, which he calls Miracles, that nothing can be related so every way absurd, foolish, and almost impossible, but it gains credit with him; and he is so credulously confident of the truth of them, that there's no difference, to him, betwixt these Tales, and what he reads in Scripture. 'Tis a pretty Romance, to see what is recounted of St. Francis's Cord, the Scapular, St. Anthony, St. Bridget, and other such Favourites of Heaven. He that has but read the Achievements of these may excuse the perusal of Bevis of Southampton, the Seven Champions, or Quevedo's Dreams: For these are nothing to compare to the former, either for the rare invention, wonderful surprises, or performance of impossibilities.

He is not oblig'd to believe any one Miracle, besides what is in the Scripture; and for all others, he may give the credit, which in prudence he thinks they deserve; considering the Honesty of the Relator, the Authority of the Witnesses, and such other circumstances, which on the like occasions use to gain his affent. And if upon the account of meer History, and the content of Authors, few make any doubt; but that there was such a one as Caesar, Alexander, Maimon, Luther, &c. Why should he doubt of the truth of many Miracles, which have not only the like consent of Authors and History, but also are attested by great numbers of Eye-witnesses, e'mind'd by Authority, and found upon Record, with all the formalities due to such a Process? St. Augustine relates many Miracles done in his time, so does St. Jerome, and other Faders; and if they doubted nothing of them, then, Why should he question the truth of them now? He finds, that in the time of the Old Law, God favour'd many of his Servants, working Miracles by their hands; and he thinks now that God's hand is not shortned; that the Disciples of Christ are no less Favourites of Heaven, than those of Moses; and that the new Law may be very well allow'd to be as Glorious, and as particularly priviledg'd as the Old; especially since Christ promised that his Apostles should do greater Miracles than ever He himself had done. And what if some Miracles (recounted by Authors.) are so wonderfully strange, to some they seem Ridiculous and Absurd? are they the less true upon this account? Is not every thing Ridiculous to Unbelievers? The whole Doctrine of Christ is a Scandal to the Jews, and Folly to the Gentiles. And what more Absurd to one that wants Faith, than the Miracles recounted in the Old Testament? Might not such a one turn them all into Ridicule and Buffoonry? Take but Faith away, and see what becomes of Balaam.
Balzam and his Ais, Sampson and his Raw-bone, Elias and his Fiery-Chariot, Eliahs's Mantle, Ax-head, and Dead-bones, Gideon's Pitchers, Lamps and Trumpets in demolishing the Walls of Jericho, Moses and his Burning-Bush, his holding up his hands for the Victory over his Enemies, his parting of the Red-Sea, and Josuah's commanding the Sun to stand still, &c. Might not thefe, and all the reft be painted out as Ridiculous, as any supposed to be done since Chrift's time, and be put in the fame Lift with the History of Bavis, or Guy of Warwick? A little incredulity, accompanied with a presumption of measuring God's Works by humane Wifdom, will really make the greatest part of them pafs for Follies, and Abfurd Impossibilities. And though he is fo far from giving equal affent to the Miracles related in Scripture, and the others wrought fince, that the former he believes with a Divine Faith, and the reft with an inferiour kind of affent, according to the Grounds and Authority there is in favour of them, like as he does in Prophane History: Yet the Strangenes of these, never makes him in the leaft doubt of the Truth of them, fince 'tis evident to him, that all the Works of Heaven far surpass all his reafoning, and that while he endeavours but to look even into the very ordinary things daily wrought by God Almighty, the Motion of the Sun, Moon and Stars, the Flowing of the Sea, the Growing of an Ear of Corn, the Light of a Candle, the Artifice of the Bees, &c. he quite lofes himself, and is bound to confefs his own Ignorance and Folly, and that God is wonderful in all his Works, a God surpassing all our knowledge. Whatfoever therefore is related upon good grounds, as done by the extraordinary Power of God, he is ready to affent to it, although he fees neither the how, the why, nor the wherefore; being ready to attribute all to the Honour and Praise of his maker, to whose Omnifotent Hand most of poor Man's impoffibles, are none.

XXXIII. Of Holy Water.

He highly approves the Suppcfitious use of many inanimate things, and attributes wonderful effects to fuch Creatures, which are but in a very inferiour rank, and able to do no fuch things. Holy Water is in great esteem with him, fo are Bleffed Candles, Holy Oyl, and Holy Bread, in which he puts fo much confidence, that by the Power of these, he thinks himself secure from all Witchcraft, Inchantment, and all the Power of the Devil; nay, that by the help of these feneless Mediators, he

H utterly disapproves all farts of Superfition. And yet is taught to have an esteem for Holy-Water, Bleffed Candles, Holy Oyl, and Holy Bread; not doubting, but that as fuch Men, who have Confecrated themselves to the Service of God, in the Preaching the Gospel and Administration of the Sacraments, have a particular repect due to them, above the Laity: As Churches Dedicated to God, are otherwife to be look'd on, than other Dwelling Houses: So likewise these other Creatures, which are particularly depoited by the Prayers and Bleffing of the Priest, to certain ufefs for God's own Glory, and the Spiritual and corporal good of Christians, ought to be refpecred in a degree above other things. And what Superfitions in the ufe of them? Has not God himfelf prefcrib'd fuch inanimate things, and Holy Men made ufe of them, for an intent above their natural Power; and this without any Superfition?
may obtain Remission of his venial or lighter Sins. And in the use of these things, he is taught by his Church to be so obstinately positive, as if he had the Authority of Fathers and Scripture to back it, when as there is not the least grain of Reason, no hint of Antiquity, no Text throughout the Word of God, for the defence, command, or even permission of it.

Promises, That God would hear the Prayers of the Faithful, Why therefore should he doubt, but that these Creatures, on which the Blessing of God is solemnly implor'd by the Word of God, and the Prayers of the Priest and People, for their sanctification, are really sanctified, according to the assurance of the Apostle, and the Promises of God? St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who liv'd in the Third Century, made no question, but that, as those things, which are offer'd to Idols, tho' pure in their own nature, are made impure by the Invocation of Devils: So on the contrary, simple Water is made Holy, and gets a Sanctity, by virtue receiv'd from the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, Christ our Lord, and his eternal Father, (Cyr. Catech. 3.) St. Augustine was of the same Judgment, touching the Benediction of Bread; affirming, that the Bread which the Catechumens did take, tho' it was not Christ's Body, yet it was holy; yes, and more holy than the Meat wherewith we are nourish'd, (Aug. Tom. 7. l. 2. de Pecc. Mer. & Remi. c. 25.) The like is to be seen in the Epistle of St. Alexander, who govern'd the Church but fifty years after St. Peter; where he declares the Custom even at that time of blessing Water, and confirms the Author's of it by his Command. And that Water thus blest, was capable by virtue receiv'd from Heaven, of working effects above its own Nature, was the Sentiment of Christians in the primitive times: Epiphanius makes early mention, (Tom. 2. l. 1. cont. her. 30.) where he relations a passage at length, how that Water being blest in the Name of Jesus, and sprinkled upon Fire, which by witchcraft was made unactive, and hindred from burning, immediately the Enchantment ceased, and the Fire burn'd. As also that a Poss'd person being besprinkled with blest Water, the Party was immediately cured. Theodoret, has the like Narration of the Devil hindring fire from burning, and how that he was chas'd away, and the Charm dissolv'd by blest Water being thrown on it, (lib. 5. Eccl. hist. c. 21.) And does not St. Hierom (in vit. Hilariun, p. 325. Paris print.) make this relation, how that Jaleus took Water from blest Hilariun, and cast it upon his bewitched Horaces, on his Chariot, and the Barriers from whence he us'd to run, and that the Charm or Witchery did cease upon the sprinkling this Water; so that all cryed out Marnas vittas ejus a Christo; Christ has conquered Marnas, (the Idol.) And now, there's no jeyer and Ridiculating these things, will ever make them look like idle Superstitions; to one that considers seriously, how much they are grounded upon Reason, the Word of God, Antiquity, and the Authority and Practice of the Catholic Church; which though it approves the use of them; yet it teaches plainly, that there is no Confidence to be put in any thing, but only in jesus Christ; and what power these things have, they have not of themselves, but only from Heaven, and by the invocation of the Name of Jesus; who, as by his heavenly
XXXIV. Of Breeding up People in Ignorance.

He has all the liberty, encouragement, and convenience of becoming learned, of any People or Persuasion whatsoever. And none that has ever look'd over any Library, but found that the greatest numbers and choicest Books of all Sciences, have men of his Communion for their Authors: None that in his Travels, has taken a thorough view of the Universities in Papsb Countries, of the Sorbon Louvain, Salamanca, Bologna, &c. and considered their laborious studies, in Philo-

He is train'd up in Ignorance; and tis the chief means made use of by his Church for preserving Men in that Communion, to hide from them her manifold Mysteries of Iniquity, her foolish Superstitions, her unchristian Doctrines, by performing all in unknown Tongues, and not permitting the poor misled People to look into, or understand any thing that they Believe or Profess. And by this blindness they are persuaded to embrace such infinite numbers of gross Errors, that were but the Vail taken from their Eyes, but for one half hour, and they but permitted to have one fair Prospect of their Religion, thousands and thousands would daily desert her, and come over to the Truth.

must be very negligent, or else very meanly parted, who do not arrive to a sufficient knowledge of their Obligation in every respect. And whosoever has seen the great pains and care some Good Men take abroad, in Explicating (on Sundays and Holy-days in their Churches, and on Weekdays in the Streets,) the Christian Doctrine to the crowds of the ignorant and meaner sort of people, not omitting to reward such as answer well, with some small gifts, to encourage Youth, and provoke them to a commendable emulation; will never say, that the Papsb keep the poor people in Ignorance, and hide from them their Religion; but rather that they use all means for instructing the Ignorant, and omit nothing that can any ways conduce to the breeding up of Youth, in
in the knowledge of their Faith, and letting them see into the Religion they are to profess. Neither does it seem to him, even so much as probable, that if the Church-Offices and Service, &c. were perform'd in the Vulgar-Tongue, that upon this the non-ignorant and blinded people, would immediately discover so many idle Superstitions, senseless Devotions, and gross Errors, that they would in great numbers upon the sight become deserters of that Communion, in which now they are profess'd Members. For since there is nothing done but in a Language, which the Learned, Judicious and Leading Men of all Nations do every where understand, and yet these are, as, no such Ridiculofities, which fright them from their Faith: but notwithstanding the seeing all through and through, they yet admire all for solid, holy and Apostolical, and remain fixed in their Profession: how can it be imagined, that the vulgar, weak and unlearned fort (did they but understand all as well as they,) would not apprehend any such Errors and Superstitions, which these others, with all their Learning and Judgment cannot discover? No, he thinks there’s no reason to fear that what passes the Test among the Wise and Learned, can be groundedly call’d in question by the Multitude.

XXXV. Of the Uncharitableness of the Papists.

His Church teaches him to be very uncharitable; it being her constant Doctrine, that none out of her Communion can be saved. So that let a Man be never so honest in his Dealing, never so just to his Neighbour, never so charitable to the Poor, and constant in his Devotion to his Maker; yet all this shall avail him nothing, if he be not a Member of his Church. 'Tis not enough for him to believe in Jesus Christ, to confess him his Redeemer, to believe that he died for our Sins, that he rose again, and ascended into Heaven; unless he believes and affents to every Article and Tenet declar’d by any of his General Councils; for that obstinately to deny any one of those, does as certainly place him at the Left Hand of the Judge, as if...
A Papist Mis-represented and Represented.

he perversely stood out against the Truth of Christianity, and denied Jesus Christ to be God. And by this means; as many as by his Church are marked out for Schismatics or Heretics, are to expect nothing but Damnation; or rather are condemned already.

Divines of Devils. In these words plainly letting him understand, that though these Men would not deny Christ, yet that their falso Doctrine in thòse two other Points were enough to make them Seducers, Deferrers of Christ, and Leaders to the Devil, And does not he as expressly in his 2d Epistle to Timothy, (c. 2. v. 16, 17, 18.) condemn Hymenæus and Philetus, for prophane and vain blasters, increasers of Ungodliness, and overthrows of the Faith, who concerning the Truth erred only in one Point, saying, that the Resurrection is past already? By which 'tis manifest to him, that the Doctrine now taught him by his Church, is nothing but what he has learnt from St. Paul, and the rest of the Apostles; it being deliver'd by them that he is a Lyer, who denies that Jesus is the Christ. (1 Tho. 2. 22.) And that every spirit that confesses not, that Jesus Christ, is come in the flesh, is not of God, (ib. c. 4. v. 3.) And not only this, but likewise A man that is an Heretic, after the first and second admonition reject; knowing that he that is such, is subverted and sinner, being condemned of himself, (Tit. 3. 10, 11.) With this weighty advice to the Brethren, in which they are commanded in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to speak all the same thing, that there be no divisions among them but that they be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment, (1 Cor. 1. 10.) For that having strife and divisions among them, they will themselves to be Carnal, and to walk as Men, (ib. c. 3. v. 3.) That therefore there being but one Body, and one Spirit, one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism, they should endeavour to keep the Unity of the Spirit, in the Bond of Peace, and not be tossed to and fro like Children, and carried about with every Wind of Doctrine, by the fléight of men, and cunning Craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive, (Ephes. c. 4. v. 3, 4, 5, 14.) Who transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ, are false Apostles, deceitful Workers, (2 Cor. 11. 13.) But certainly assured, for that troubling the Faithful, they would pervert the Gospel of Christ, and preach another Gospel, than that which had been preach'd by the Apostles. (Gal. 1. 7, 8.) And this is the Sum of the Doctrine of his Church, which believing that Faith is necessary to Salvation, it being impossible without Faith to please God. (Heb. 11. 6.) teaches likewise, that the Faithful ought to hold fast the profession of their Faith without wavering, for that not only they lose it, who deny Jesus Christ to be God, as some have done: but also all those, who endeavour to pervert the Gospel of Christ, and in any point of Faith obstinately deny, or teach otherwise than was taught by Christ and his Apostles, as Hymenæus and Philetus did; so that, that Christian makes but a very imperfect and lame profession of his Faith, who can only say, I believe that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, and that he is God and Man, the Redeemer of the world: unless he can with truth add this likewise, I also believe the whole Gospel that he preach'd, and every point of Faith, that he has taught and deliver'd to us by his Apostles: there being the same Obligation to obey his Precepts, and hearken to his Words, as to acknowledge
knowledg the Divinity of his Person; and it being a sin of the same blackness, obstinately to oppose any point of his Doctrine, as to deny the truth of his Person. 'Tis not therefore any uncharitableness in his Church, to declare plainly this miserable unhappy state of all such who willfully oppose and separate from the Doctrine of Christ, delivered by the Apostles, and continued in the Catholic Church; and of such who disobey and separate from the Government of the same Church, which Christ has Commanded all to hear and obey: But 'tis her Zeal so to do, and the same solicitude for the salvation of Souls, which mov'd the Apostles heretofore, to Preach the like Doctrine to their Flock; as also the Primitive Christians to expel their Communion, and Anathematize all such, who by broaching erroneous Tenets, contrary to any point of Receive'd Doctrine, or by disobedience, did willfully divide themselves from the Belief or Discipline of the Catholic Church: Such as were Marcion, Basilides and Bardesanes, who were Condemn'd in the First Age, for opposing that Article of our Faith, in which we believe the Resurrection of the Dead; such the Archbishops, Condemn'd likewise for denying the necessity of Baptism: Such Tatianus, &c. for Preaching Marriage to be unlawful. Such the Millenniums, for maintaining a thousand Years Reign of Christ upon Earth, with his Saints in festal pleasures. And so in all Ages others were condemn'd upon the like account. It having been always, a received Cultum, even in the purest time of the Gospel, for the Elders and Prelates, to who charge Christ committed the care of his Flock, to oppose all those that by new Doctrine, or by making Schisms and Dissensions, did disturb its peace; and not to permit any that by such like means did endeavour to destroy his Unity, so much desired and recommended by the Apostles. So that they were equally declar'd Enemies of Christianity, who denied Christ; and they, who confessing Christ, did yet contradict and reject any part of his Doctrine. And this upon the Principle, that Christian Faith ought to be entire. For that every Article, Mystery and Point of it being deliver'd by the same hands, and recommended by the same Authority; whatsoever did oppose any one Point of it, was immediately judg'd guilty of all, in discrediting the Authority, on which the whole stood equally grounded. And this is that great Truth proclaimed above thirteen hundred years ago, and now every where read in St. Athanasius's Creed. Whosoever will be saved; before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith. Which Faith, except every one do keep Whole and undefiled; without doubt, he shall perish everlastingly. By which words was made known to the Christian World, the Senie and Doctrine of the then pure and unspotted Church, as receiv'd from Christ and his Apostles. That it is in vain for any one to hope for Salvation, unless he first believe the Catholic Faith; and that whatsoever does not believe it Whole and undefiled, shall certainly perish everlastingly. Which is a Doctrine like that deliver'd by the Apostle, concerning the observance of the Laws of God; that as whosoever fails, in one, is made guilty of all; so also, whosoever disbelieves one Article of the Catholic Faith, does in a manner disbelieve all. There being no more hopes of Salvation for one that denies obstinately any one Point of the Catholic Faith, tho' he believes all the rest; than there is for one, who keeps Nine of the Commandments; with the Breach of the Tenth. An obstinate opposition against one Point of Faith, and a sin against one Commandment being as certainly damnable, as if 'twere against all. There being the same reason, and an equal necessity that the Observance of God's Law, and the Assent to the Catholic Faith be alike entire and whole. And now being convin'd, that none can believe to Salvation, but he that embraces the Catholic Faith thus wholly and entirely, by an equal submission to all the Mysteries contain'd in it, without opposition to any. And being likewise convin'd, that no one can arrive to the true knowledge of this Faith, with an assurance of
His Church, upon the pre-
sumption of being Apo-
stolical and Commissioned by
Christ, has brought in such an
infinite number of unnecessary
Superstitions Ceremonies, that
the whole Exercise of her Reli-
gion consists in nothing but a vain
Pomp and empty Show. And
whereas Christians are command-

XXXVI. Of Ceremonies and Ordinances.

His Church has appointed a great
number and variety of Ceremo-

nies to be used in the Celebrating Divine
Service, in the Offices, and the Adminis-
tration of the Sacraments. She has likewise
many Observances, Ordinances, Conven-
tions appertaining to Discipline and the Go-
vernment of the Flock. And all these are
receive'd, approv'd or instituted by her,
every one in her Communion does em-
brace, admit and willingly submit to, with-
out opposition, exception, or calling any
into question. Because, although the Par-
ticulars thus appointed or commanded,
be not to be found in Scripture; yet there being in the Scripture, an express and absolute command given to the whole Flock of Christ, of following and being obedient to those that have thus order'd these things, in virtue of that command they voluntarily, and without constraint, accept all that is of their appointment: without excepting against any thing, unless it be manifestly sinful. And this they look on, as a Christian Duty belonging to all such, that are, by God's Pleasure, in subjection to the Higher Powers, or under charge. And therefore, as a Servant having receiv'd a Command from his Master, is oblig'd to comply with it, in case it be not sinful, although he cannot find the thing then particularly commanded, in Scripture; the general Precept of Servants being Obedience to Masters, being sufficient to let him know his obligation, and to remove all scruple. And as Children are in Duty, oblig'd to perform the Will of their Parents, upon the Command, Obey thy Father and thy Mother, whether the thing particularly willed, be in Scripture, or no, So they judge it the Duty of all Christian People to submit without contention to the Ordinances and Constitutions of their Pastors and Prelates, although the things particularly order'd by them, be not express'd in Scripture; it being a sufficient ground for this their Submission and Obedience, that God has given them a General Command; Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: For they watch for your Souls, as they that must give account. (Heb. 13. 7.) Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken to you the Word of God, whose Faith follow, (Heb. 13. 7.) So that to them it seems a very fallacious rule, leading to all confusion and unchristian contentions, viz. That the Higher Powers, our Superiors, Pastors and Prelates, are not to be obey'd, but only in such things as are express'd in Scripture; and as for any other particulars, whatsoever upon examination, cannot find what is commanded by them in
instituted by Pope Telesphorus, as the Fast of Lent: Some by Calixtus, as the Ember-days: Some by Pope Nicholas, as the Prohibition of Marriage: And so all the rest. And yet, forsooth, all these must be observed under pain of eternal Damnation, as if God and the Pope commanding were but all one, and had Heaven and Hell equally at their disposition.

and raising vain disputes, to take the Rule of the Flock out of the hands of those, to whom God had providentially deliver'd it, and place themselves Judges over the Church, their Elders Prelates and Pastors, whom God had commanded them to hear, and be in Subjection to. So that we never read, that they ever pretended to weigh the Ordinances of their Superiors by their own reasoning, or to bring them to the Test of the Word of God, before the acceptance; but always judg'd it conform to the Word of God, that their Governors should Rule, and they Obey. Thus when the Apostles observ'd the Sunday instead of the Sabbath, and met together at Pentecost; we don't read that the Faithful then began to turn over their Bibles, to find a Command for these particulars, but with a prompt Obedience readily followed them in the Observance. So when Abstinence from Bloud and Strangled Meats, was order'd by the Elders Assembled at Jerusalem; (Acts 15.) the multitude of Believers having heard the Decree, never murmur'd at it, or call'd it into question, however seemingly contrary to the intention of Christ, who in abrogating the Law of Moses, was thought to have cut off all these Obligations; but they all rejoiced for the Consolation, (ib. v. 31.) So when St. Paul gave orders to the Corinthians, (1. Cor. 11.) in what manner and posture, they were to behave themselves at Prayers in their Assemblies, both Men and Women; we don't hear, that he was challeng'd by any, to shew by what authority of Scripture he thus reprou'd and prescrib'd in these particulars, or by what they were oblig'd to receive his Prescriptions; but with a prompt submission accepted his Orders, not doubting, but since it was God's Will to place Rulers and Governors over them, it must be God's Will that they should be obedient to them, in following their Decrees, and observing their Constitutions. And with this Doctrin of Obedience, Humility and Submission all the Primitive Christians were train'd up by the Apostles, who zealously laboured by this means, to preserve them in peace and Unity; that so they might think all the same thing, and be of one mind and one judgment and without Divisions: inasmuch, that there is not any one thing fo often repeated in their Writings, as Exhortations to this Obedience and Submission: See, how, going through the cities, the deliver'd to them (the Faithful) the decrees for to keep, that were ordain'd by the Apostles and Elders which were at Jerusalem, (Acts 16. 4.) See how St. Paul commandsthe Thessalonians, to hold fast the traditions, they had been taught by word, or by Epistle, (2 Thess. 2.15.) See how he commands the Hebrews; Obey them, that have the rule over you. Remember them, which have the rule over you, (Heb. 13. 7. 17.) See with what earnestness St. John urges this; He that knoweth God heareth us, he that is not of God heareth us not, (1. Joh. 4. 6.)
by, know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error. And then again, does not St. Paul commend the Corinthians for their Obedience; Now I praise you, Brethren, that you remember me in all things, and keep the Ordinances, as I deliver’d them to you, (1 Cor. 11. 2.) And then, having given them directions as to their behaviour in their Assemblies, he adds; But if any man seem to be contentious, We have no such custom, neither the Churches of God, (1 Cor. 11. 16.) And now it being thus evident, that the Church of Christ in the Apostles time was founded, and preferv’d by a Submission and Obedience of the Flock to their Pastors; the Papists teach and believe; that, what was taught and commanded by the Apostles to the Faithful then living, ought to be receiv’d, as a Doctrine necessary for all succeeding Ages, and that Submission and Obedience ought so have been as much the Duty of Believers, ever since, as it was then; the Commands and Practice of that time, being undoubtedly the best, and only Pattern for the Faithful for all times, even to the End of the World. And they do not only teach this Doctrine of Submission in their Books and Sermons, but also observe it in their Lives, having in all Ages depended on their Elders and Prelates in all Matters touching the Discipline and Government of the Church; leaving Rule to those, whole Charge and Office it is to Rule and never believing, that they who are under Charge and Command expressly by St. Paul to Remember and Obey those who have the Rule over them, can upon any pretence whatsoever, nay, tho’ an Angel from Heaven should come and Preach otherwise, be discharg’d from this Christian Obligation and be exempted from Remembering and Obeying, whom thus by God, speaking by his Apostle, they are Commanded to Remember and Obey. And upon this ground it is, that in things concerning the Order to be observ’d in the Divine Service, in all Ceremonies, Holy Rites, Ecclesiastical Constitutions, and Ordinances, they have neither Null nor Will of their own; but always receive and think that the Best, which is Order’d and Appointed by those, to whom, by Divine Law, they owe this Submission and Obedience, and to whom the Ordering and Appointing these things appertain. And therefore if these appoint a Day of humiliation, for imploring God’s Mercy, or averting his Judgments, they never scruple to observe it; if a Day of Thanksgiving in memory of some signal Benefit, they likewise Obey. If these judge it fit, that on every Friday should be Commemorated the Death and Passion of our Redeemer in Fasting; and Command Lent to be observ’d, in remembrance and imitation of our Lord’s forty days Fasting in the Desert, they think it their obligation to do so. If these order such and such days to be set apart, and keep Holy in Remembrance and Thanksgiving for the Incarnation, Nativity, Circumcision, Reurrection and Ascension of Christ, and for other such like Intentions, they esteem it fitful to oppose it. If the Judge judges that the Faithful should bow at the Name of Jesus, and at the reading of the Gospel, prostrate or incline themselves at the Confession. If they appoint Tapers and Lamps to be used in Churches, to represent our Saviour, who came to enlighten the World; and Incense to be used, to mind the People, that their Hearts and Prayers should, like the Smoke, ascend directly toward Heaven. If in the Administration of the Sacraments, in Exorcisms, in the Offices, and the Celebration of the Mass, these determin several Rites and Ceremonies to be observ’d, for more Decency, greater Solennity, and that by such exterior helps, the minds of the Faithful may be mov’d to the contemplation of the Sacred Mysteries, and raise’d more sensibly to the apprehension of the Majesty of God, in whose Honour all is perform’d; they look upon themselves bound to allow and embrace all these things without reluctance or opposition; always thinking, that to be most proper, which is instituted by such, who have the Rule over them. And if any endeavour to raise Disputes, and be contentious concerning the Necessary of these Institutions, they have no such Custom, neither the Churches of God. One thing they know to be necessary, that is, that they should be
be Obedient; and that in the Service of God, they must not honour him as the Jews did, (Isa. 58. 13.) by doing their own ways, finding their own pleasure, and speaking their own words; but as Christians are Commanded, in a true Self-denyal, a sincere Humility and Obedience, submitting to those whom God has left to Rule and govern the Flock. Neither is there any danger of falling back into the Jewish Law, by approving the allow'd Ceremonies of the Church; it being certain, that in the Abrogation of the Old Law, all Ceremonies were not at the same time extinct; But only such as were meer Types and Figures, of things to come in the New Law, which are now fulfilled: Whilst others, fit for the raising Devotion, and expressing the affections of the Soul, and other such ends, are still commendably retained as lawful, and equally necessary now, as heretofore: such are, Kneeling, Fasting, lifting hands and Eyes to Heaven, Sighing, knocking the Breast, days of Humiliation, Thanksgiving, Watching, Hair-Clout, Singing, Impositions of Hands, Benedictions, using Oyl, Spittle, Breathing, &c. all which are as lawful, convenient and necessary for Christians, as they were for Jews: and no more to be neglected, because they were us'd in the Old Law, than Praying, meeting together, Reading the Law, Singing Psalms, Humility and Obedience, &c. are to be laid by and dismissed by Christians, because they were observed by the Jews. Especially since these, with many others, have been recommended to us by the Pracitce of Christ and his Apostles, and of all Primitive Christianity. Neither has the use of Holy Ceremonies been wholly dis-approved by those of the Reformation. The English Profession of Faith, Publish'd in the year 1562, allows them in the Thirty Fourth Article. The Bohemian Confession in the Fifteenth Article, Anno 1537. The Augustin, Tit. de Mis. An. 1530, as it was pen'd by Melanthon. So that since Ceremonies are generally look'd on as commendable and lawful amongst Christians; the Papists judge it proper to those, who have the Rule, to Order and Dispose of them, and declare to the Flock, how, when and where they are to be observed. And if they who govern, judg fit to oblige the Faithful to the observance of any in particular, they teach that it is the Duty of the Flock, to Obey. Things indifferent, after such Commands, being no longer of choice, but necessary; and no less obliging, than the Commands of a Father to his Child; where in case the thing be not apparently sinful, 'tis no persuasion of the the thing being superfluous, can excuse an obstinate denial from Disobedience. It being more safe and Christian-like, for all that are under any Government, whether Natural, Ecclesiastical or Civil, to perform and comply with such things, as they judg in their own private Sentiments, unnecessary, meerly upon the account of being Commanded; than upon such considerations, to disturb the order of Government, and fly in the Face of Lawful Authority: Than which nothing is more opposite to the Principles of Christianity, and destructive of all Human Society. And upon these grounds it is, that the Papists, founding themselves upon the sure foundation of Humility and Obedience, have in all Ages acknowledged Overseers and Rulers over them to watch and feed the Flock, to whom God hath given Power; there being no power but of God, and that whoever refists the Power, refists the Ordinance of God, and they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation, Rom. 13. 1, 2.

XXXVII. Of Innovations in Matters of Faith.

His Church has made several Innovations in Matters of Faith; and howsoever His Church has never made any Innovation in Matters of Faith; what she believes and teaches now, being the same that the Catholick Church believ'd and taught, in the first three or four Centuries.
she lays claim to Antiquity, with a pretence of having preserved the Doctrine of the Apostles inviolable and entire; yet tis evident to any serious Observer, that the greatest part of her Belief is meer Novelties, not bearing date from Christ or his Apostles, but only from some of her own more modern Synods. There scarce having pass’d any Age yet, where in there has not, in these Ecclesiastical Mints, been coin’d New Articles, which with the counterfeit stamp of Christ and his Apostles, are made to pass for Good and Current, amongst her credulous and undiscerning Retainers: And, besides these, what a great number of Errors have been introduc’d at other times? How many did Pope Gregory bring in? and how many the Ignorance of the Tenth Age? So that if we compare the Church of Rome now, with the Primitive times of the first three or four hundred years, there are no two things so unlike; she is a Garden now, but quite over-grown with Weeds; she is a Field, but where the Tares have perfectly choak’d up the Wheat, and has little, in her of Apostolical, besides the Name.

Centuries after the Apostles. And tho’ in most of her General Councils there has been several Decisions touching Points of Faith; yet can no one, without an injury to truth, say that in any of these has been coin’d new Articles, or Christians forced to the acceptance of Novelties, contrary to Scripture or antient Tradition. The’r have only trodden in the Apostles steps; as often as they have been in the like circumstances with them; doing exactly according to the Form and Example left to the Church, by those perfect Masters of Christianity. And therefore as the Apostles in their Assembly, (Acts 15.) determin’d the Controversie concerning the Circumcision; and proposed to the Faithful, what was the Doctrine of Christ in that point, of necessity to be believe’d; of which till that decision, there had been rais’d several Questions and doubts; but now no longer to be questioned, without the Shipwreck of Faith. So in all succeeding ages the Elders of the Church, to whom the Apostles left their Commision of watching over the Flock, in their Councils have never scrupled to determine all such Points, which had been controverted amongst the Brethren, and to propose to them, what of necessity they were to believe for the future; with Anathema pronounced against all such, as should presume to preach the contrary. Thus in the year 325, the first Nicene Council declar’d the Son of God to be Consubstantial to his Father; against the Arians; with an obligation on all to assent to this Doctrine, though never till then, propos’d or declar’d in that Form. Thus in the year 381. the Holy Ghost was declar’d to be God; against Macedonius and his Followers, in the first Constantinopolitan Council. And in the first Ephebian, Anno 431. Nestorius was condemned, who maintain’d two Persons in Christ, and that the blessed Virgin was not Mother of God; with a Declaration, that both these Tenets were contrary to the Catholic Faith. In the Second Nicene Council, Anno 787. Image-
Breakers were anathematiz'd. And so others at other times; and at last, in the Council of Trent, was declar'd the Real Presence, Transubstantiation, Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints, of keeping Holy Images, &c. against Luther, Calvin, Beza, &c. And now, though in all these, and the other General Councils, the Persons condemned took occasion, from these New Declarations, to cry out; Novelties, Novelties, to fright the People with the noise of new coin'd Articles, and that the Inventions of Men were impos'd on them, for Faith. Yet 'tis evident that these New Declarations contain'd nothing but the Ancient Faith; and that there had never been any such Declarations made, had not the Doctrine propos'd in them, being oppos'd and contradicted by some seducing Spirits, who going out from the Flock, endeavour'd by making Divisions, to draw numbers after them. So that the new Proposal of a Tenet, is but a fallacious proof of the Doctrine being lately invented; but a good Argument of its being lately oppos'd.'

'Tis certain from Scripture (Acts 15,) that the Apostles had never declar'd the non-necessity of Circumcision, had not certain men come down from Judea and taught the Brethren the contrary. And that the consubstantiality of the Son, had never been defin'd by the Nicene Fathers, had not Arius with his Followers, oppos'd this Catholic Doctrine. And ascertained it is, that the Council of Trent had been altogether silent has to Transubstantiation. Praying to Saints, Purgatory, &c. had not Luther, Calvin and their Disciples, once Professors of this Doctrine, gone out from the Flock, and upon the Premise of a New Light, endeavour'd to persuade the Faithful, that these Tenets, then believ'd by the whole Christian World, were no longer to be own'd; but to be quite thrown by, as Anicchristian and diabolical. 'Twas this oblig'd the Pastors to watch and take care of their Flock; and therefore not lying away, as the Hirpling does, when the Wolf catcheth, and scattereth the Sheep, they assembled together into a Body, and declar'd to all, under their charge; that they ought not to follow strangers; that howsoever these came pretending to the Shepherd's voice: yet since they came not by the door into the Sheepfold; but climbing up some other way, they were no shepherds; but thieves and robbers; such whose buffets was not to feed; but to steal, kill and destroy. 'Twas this made them encourage all under their care, not to waver; but to stand fast, and hold the profession of their Faith, and notwithstanding all pretences; by no means to suffer themselves to be deluded, and led away with strange Doctrine; and that they might the better secure them from falling into Errors, they gave them a Draught of their Christian Doctrine; especially of all those points, which the modern self commissiated Apostles did preach against, and endeavour to undermine; particularly declaring to them, the Faith they had been bred up in, which they had receiv'd from their Forefathers, and been deriv'd even from the Apostles. Securing them, that whatsoever was contrary to this, was Novelty and Error. And now in the Pastors declaring this to the Faithful, where was the Innovation? The Council did nothing but propouse fully and explicately, what, before their meeting, was the Doctrine of all Christianendom, and had been so amongst the Primitive Fathers. 'Twas they made Inovation, who preach'd contrary to the Doctrine thus believ'd and receiv'd; which Luther was not alham'd to own himself guilty of, plainly acknowledging, that he separat'd from the whole World...

But it seems that the whole World was then corrupted, and the Religion then every where Profess'd, was overgrown with Superstitions, Errors and Abominaions; such as had crept into the Church, some five Hundred Years before, some nine Hundred, and some a Thousand; and 'twas from these Luther separat'd, intending to Reform Christianity, and bring it to the purity of the Primitive times, of the first three Hundred Years. And was it not very strange now, that so many gross Fooleries,
ries, idle Superstitions, and even down-right Idolatry, should creep into a Church, and spreading itself through all Nations, infect the whole World, becoming the publick Profession of Christendom for so many hundred Years, and be confirm'd and established by the Laws of every Kingdom; and that no body should take notice of any such thing, either at its first Rise, or in all its Progress of so many Years: Insomuch, that had not Luther made the Discovery, 'tis likely we should never have come to the knowledge of these Thousand Years Errors and Corruptions: No thinking Men certainly, but judges it impossible, that the very Fundamentals of Christianity should be shaken, and the Religion planted by the Apostles turned into Idolatry; and yet that no Learned Man should any-where appear to contradict these Abominations, no Zealous Pastors to withstand them, no Pious Princes to oppose them? History sufficiently satisfies any Curious Reader; that from the first planting of the Church, there has been in no Age, any Man yet that has Preach'd any Heterodox and Erroneous Tenets, and by introducing Novelities, has endeavour'd to infect the minds of the Faithful with Heresie and Superstition; but immediately have stood up Vertuous and Learned Men, in defence of the Truth; in their Writings and Sermons publicly confuting and condemning the Errors, and giving an alarm to the World, to beware of such Deceivers, and their wicked Doctrine; withal, never omitting, to Record their names to Posterity; with an account of the Year when they began to Preach; under what Emperors, and what was the occasion of their Revolt. Was not all this, and even more done against Arius? How many appear'd against the Marcionites? How many against the Donatists? against the Novatians, against the Macedonians, the Nestorians, the Euchyrians, the Pelagians, the Berengarians, &c. So that never any thing has made so much noise in the World, so many commotions, so many commotions; nothing has been so impossible to be carried on with secrecy and silence, as the broaching any new Heresie, the making a Schism, the alteration of Religion, the starting up of some new Society and Pretenders to Reformation. What Tumults did all the fore-mentioned Apollites raise, in Preaching their New Gospel? How was the Peace of Christendom disturb'd at the Doctrine of Mahomet, and the crying up the Alcoran? What Stirs and Commotions at the Reformation of Church and Faith, pretended by Luther, Zwinglius and Calvin? How then can it be judge'd in the least probable, that great variety of erroneous Tenets and Antichristian Doctrine should be introduc'd by the Papists, contrary to the sense and belief of all Christianity, either in the fourth, fifth, sixth or tenth Century; and yet that there should not be the least disturbance occasion'd by it, no tumults or opposition; but all done with so much quietness, in such a profound Peace and Silence, that had it not been for the News brought, some Ages after, we had never suspected the Alteration? And is this possible? Is it possible, that the whole Christian World should change their Religion, both as to the internal Belief, and external Profession and exercise of it; and no body be sensible of the change, so as to withstand the Abomination, or to transmit to Posterity, even so much as the least Word of its beginning or propagation? Let any man upon some consideration, tell me, whether it be possible, that this one little Kingdom of England should fall from this pure Apostolical Doctrine it now professes, into downright Popery, (or any other way alter the whole Scheme of its Religion) and have the Alteration confirm'd by several Acts of Parliament, and continue in the publick Exercise of it for a thousand, five hundred, or even one hundred years, and yet no one in the Kingdom, or out of it, should be sensible of the Alteration; but all to be manage'd with such Policy and Craft, that the whole business should be a Secret for many Ages? And if this be scarce to be thought possible of this one Kingdom; what can be imagin'd, when 'tis affirm'd of many Nations
tions of the whole Christian World; Can any thing look more like a Fable or Romance? Or can any Rational Man, barely upon such a Report, condemn the Faith and Religion of his Ancestors, for Novelty and Human Inventions; and quite laying aside this, take him for the Rule of his Reformation, who thus, without Reason, Justice or Truth, has thrown such an Infamy upon all the Christians preceding him for a thousand years?

But not to infift on these reasonings, for the wiping off the scandal of Novelty from the Doctrine of the Church of Rome; 'twould not be amiss here, to look beyond the Tenth Century, as also beyond the time of Pope Gregory. And if in those earlier Christians, nothing can be found of that Faith and Profession, which is charged as Novelty and Error against the Church of Rome; all the Papists in the World shall joyn with their Adversaries; and condemning Pope Gregory for a Seducer, and all the Tenth Age for so many Ignoramus's, shall in one voice with them cry out against all such Doctrine, Novelty, Novelties, Error, Error. But if, on the contrary, every Point thus challenge'd of Novelty, shall appear to have been the Profession of the Faithful in the time of the Purity of the Gospel; if before Pope Gregory we find that Invocation of Saints, the Real Presence, Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Prayer for the Dead, the Use of Holy Images, Relicks, the Sign of the Cross, Procension, &c. were receiv'd Doctrine, and common Practice of Christians in those Primitive times: Then shall the Papists remain as they are, as being of the same Faith and Religion, with those Ancient Believers, without any Additions and Alterations; and all their Adversaries ought in justice to return again to their Communion, and making up one Quire, cry out with them; Blessed are they, who believe as our Fore-fathers believ'd, who receiv'd their Faith from the Apostles and their Successors; and Accurs'd be they, who separate from this Faith, and upon the noise of Novelty and Error make Divisions in the Church, and fall from her Communion, believing Lies rather than Truth.

In order to this, I intended in this place to have given the Reader a fair prospect of the Doctrine and Belief of the Fathers, of the first five hundred years after Christ; but finding the Matter to encrease so much beyond expectation upon my hands, I have reserv'd them for another occasion. But however, upon confidence of what I am able to produce in that Point, I cannot omit to assure the Reader, that the chief and most material Points charg'd upon the Church of Rome for Novelty, the Primitive Fathers do so plainly own to have been the Faith and Profession of the Church in their days; and to have been deliver'd down and taught as the Doctrine of the Apostles; that an impartial Considerer need not take much time to conclude, whether are the greater Innovators, those that now believe and profess these Tenets and Practices; or they that disown or reject them. 'Tis evident, that every Point of that Doctrine, which is now decry'd for Popery, and basely stigmatiz'd with the note of Errors introduced of late, and of a modern invention, is by many Ages older than those, who are reputed to be the Authors; that every particular Article laid to the Ignorance of the Tenth Century, and to the contrivance of Pope Gregory, are as expressly and clearly own'd, and taught some Ages before, as now at this day. That those Great men were as down-right Papists in these Points, as we are now. And that any disturber of Christianity might have as well defam'd them for believers of Novelties and Errors, as we are now at this present. The Faith that they professed then, we profess now; and if any of our Doctrine be Novelty, 'tis a Novelty of above twelve hundred years standing: And who can question it not to be of an older date? If it was the publick belief of the Christian World, in the fourth Century, who can be better Witnesses of what was believ'd before them, even in the third Age, than They? They tell us that the Doctrine they maintain and deliver, is the Faith of the Catholic Church, receiv'd from their Fore-fathers.
and as it was taught by the Apostles; and we don't find that in any of these Points, they were challeng'd by any Authority, or opposed by the Pastors of the Church, or any Writers, either then living or succeeding them; but received always with great veneration; And upon what grounds can any challenge them now? Is it possible, that any living now, can give a better account of what was believ'd and practis'd in the third Age, than they that immediately follow'd them? Which will be more credible Witneffes of what was done in Forty Eights; those that shall be alive fifty years hence; or they that are not yet to come these thousand years? If therefore these Holy Men declare to us the Doctrine they believ'd; with an affurance, that it was the Faith of the Catholick Church, fo believ'd by their Ancestors, and as they had receiv'd it from the Apostles and their Successors; do not they deserve better credit than others, who, coming a thousand years after, cry out against all these several Points, that they are nothing but Novelty and Error? 'Tis evident therefore to him, that this noise of Novelty, was nothing but a stratagem for the introducing of Novelies; and that those that brought an Infamy upon these Points, by this asperion, might with as great approbate, and as easily have laid a scandal upon every other Article of the Christian Faith which they thought fit to retain, and have had them all exploded for Novelty. And this has been so far done already, that even three parts of that Doctrine, pick'd out by the first Reformers, for Apostolical, and conform to the Word of God, we have seen in our days clamour'd against for Novelty, and thrown by with a general Approbation, and as clear Evidence of the charge, as ever they laid by Transubstantiation and the Primary. The first Reformers cast off the Authority of the first Bishop, as being a Novelty; Others soon after cry'd down the Authority of all Bishops, for a Novelty. The first disown'd a great part of the Priestly Function, as being lately crept in; the Others disown'd all the rest, and even Ordination itself, as having all crept in together. The first threw out a great number of Ceremonies, as being not Apostolical, but of a modern Institution: The Others threw out even what they had retain'd, for being no more an Ordination of the Apostles, than the former. The first laid by five of the Sacraments; the Others laid by the other two. And thus Novelty was the Word, whensoever any receive'd Doctrine of Christianity was to be oust'd, and way to be made for a Novelty: And he does not doubt, but, that if the noise of Novelty continue long, to unhappily successful as of late, and the liberty be permitted to every presuming Spirit, to fix this scandal upon whatsoever Doctrine or Institution they shall think fit; that all Christianity is in a fair way of being thrown out of doors: and the Bible, Preaching, Catechizing, Christ's Incarnation and Passion, &c. are as likely to be cast off for a Novelty, as all the rest have been. Those that will but shew to the People, that even these things have been all receive'd from Rome, and that the Papists by their Mifionaries, spread these Doctrines over the World, may soon perfwade them, they are nothing but Popish Inventions, meer Novelies; that those that began the Reformation, did their business by halves, and that the World will never be thoroughly Reform'd, till all these Romish Superstitions, are laid by with the rest; they being all of the same date. He takes no notice therefore of all these clamours rais'd against several points of the receive'd Doctrine of his Church; his Faith is founded on better Principles, than to be shaken with such a Vulgar Engine. Novelty, Novelty, is a cry, that may fright unthinking Men from their Religion; but every serious Man will require better Motives than a Novel, before he forfaeke any point of his Faith; and 'tis impossible he should joyn with any in condemning such things for Novelies, which he finds the Profession of all Antiquity.
THE CONCLUSION.

These are the Characters of the Papist, as he is Mis-represented, and as Represented.

And as different as the One is from the Other, so different is the Papist, as receiv'd by his Maligners, from the Papist, as to what he is in himself. The One is so Absurd and Monstrous, that 'tis impossible for any one to be of that Profession, without first laying by all thoughts of Christianity, and his Reason. The Other is just contradictorily to this; and without any farther Apology, may be expos'd to the perusal of all Prudent and Unpassionate Considerers, to examine if there be any thing in it, that deserves the hatred of any Christian: And if it be not in every Point wholly conform to the Doctrine of Christ, and not in the least contrary to Reason. The Former is a Papist, as he is generally apprehended by those, who have a Protestant Education; such as Whengerwer reflected on, is conceiv'd to be a perverse, malicious sort of Creature, Superstitious, Idolatrous, Atheistical, Cruel, Bloody-minded, Barbarous, Treacherous, and so Prophane, and every way Unholy; that 'tis in some manner doubted, whether he be a Man, or no. The other, is a Papist, whose Faith is according to the Proposal of the Catholic Church; which by Christ's Command, he is oblig'd to believe and bear, and whose whole design in this World, is for the obtaining Salvation in the next. And is it not strange, that these two Characters so directly opposite, so wholly unlike one the other, that Heaven and Hell is not more, should agree to the same person: 'Tis certainly a strange piece of injustice, and yet not at all strange to those, who know, that they that follow Christ shall be hated by the World, that those who study the Wisdom of Heaven, shall have the repute of Fools; and that as many as send the Lamb, shall be painted in the Livery of Satan. Our Fore-fathers were so, before us; all the Primitive Christians, the Apostles, and even the Lamb himself, our Redeemer. Calumny ever follow'd them, Mis-representation seiz'd on them, and what wonder that Infamy was their constant Attendance? And now if the Orthodox Christians, have thus in all Ages had their double Character; one of Justice, exactly drawn from what they really believ'd and practis'd; the other of Malice, copied from them, as Mis-represented: 'Tis not at all strange, to find it so now in our days; when Calumny, Malice, Ignorance, &c. are as powerful as ever; who, though from the beginning of the World, that is above five thousand Years, they have made it their chief business to Paint, Copy and Represent Things and Persons; yet they never did it with so much Injury, so altogether unlike, as they do now to the Papists; there being scarce any one Point of their Faith and Profession, which they do not either blindly mistake, or basely disguise. The Papists believe 'tis convenient to pray before Holy Images, and give them an inferior or relative respect. These describe the Papists Praying to Images, and Worshipping them as Idols. The Papists believe 'tis good to defire the Prayers of the Saints, and Honour them as the Friends of God. These Paint our the Papists, as believing Saints to be their Redeemers, and Adoring them as Gods. The Papists believe, that Christ left a Power in the Priests of his Church, to Absolve all truly Penitent Sinners from their Offences, These Represent the Papists as believing, That the Priest can infallibly forgive all such as come to Confession, whether they Repent, or no. The Papists believe there's Power in the Supreme Pastor, upon the Motives of granting Indulgences; that is, of releasing to the Faithful such Temporal Penalties, as remain due to their past sins, already remitted as to their guilt; on condition they perform such Christian Duties as shall be assign'd them, i.e. humble themselves by Fasting, Confess their sins with a hearty Repentance, Receive Worthily, and...
give Alms to the Poor, &c. These make the Papists believe, That the Pope, for a sum of Money, can give them leave to commit what sins they shall think fit, with a certain Pardon for all Crimes already incurred; and that there can be no danger of Damnation to any, that can but make a large Present to Rome, at his death. The Papists believe, That by the Merits of Christ, the good Works of a just Man, are acceptable to God, and through his Goodness and Promeıse, meritorious of eternal happiness. These reports, That the Papists believe they can merit Heaven by their own Works, without any dependence on the work of our Redemption. The Papists worship Christ really present in the Sacrament true God and Man. These lay they fall down to, and worship a piece of Bread. Some Papists maintain the Deposing Power; These will have it to be an Article of their Faith, and that they are obliged to it by their Religion. Some Papists have been Traytors, Rebels, Conspirators, &c. These make these Villanies to be Meritorious among the Papists, and this is the Doctrine of their Church. And thus there is scarce any one thing belonging to their Faith and Exercise of their Religion, which is not wrought in the describing it, and injuriously Mis-represented. And if any be so curious, as to desire to be satisfied, how this comes about; let him but stand by any of the Undertakers, while they are taking the Copy of Popery, and observe their Method, and he may soon come to the bottom of the Mystery. He may see them seriously viewing some of their Tenets, and upon a short consideration, immediately to fall to the making Inferences, and deducing Consequences, then down go these for so many Articles of Popery. They go on, and see other of her Tenets, and these containing Mysteries, such as Reason cannot reach to, when Faith is not assistant; they are presently followed with variety of Absurdities, and seeming Contradictions: And down go these to the former, for so many Articles of Popery. They pass on to others, and these being not conform to the Principles of their Education; several Misconstructions are presently rais’d upon them, and down go these for so many Articles of Popery. They look forward, and seeing others, in the practice of which, many Abuses have been committed; then down go the Abuses for so many Articles of Popery. Hence they turn to the Court of Rome, and as many Disorders and Extravagancies as they find there, so many Articles of Popery. They enquire into the Actions and Lives of her Pastors and Prelates, and as many Vices, as many wicked Designs as they discover there, so many Articles of Popery. They examine the behaviour of her Professors, and whatsoever Villanies, whatsoever Treasons and Inhumanities, they find committed by any that own themselves Members of that Communion, down they all go for so many Articles of Popery. They bear the reports of such as have defected her Authority, and tho’ through their extravagancies and rashness, they deserve not credit even in a trifle; yet their whole Narrative shall be accepted, and all their idle Stories be summ’d up, for so many Articles of Popery. They peruse every scurrilous Pamphlet and abusive Libel; and such ridiculous Fables, as are only fit for a Chimney-corner, they borrow thence, and set them down for so many Articles of Popery. They turn over every Popish Author, and whatsoever light, louse or extravagant Opinions, whatsoever Discourses carried on either though Flattery, Disguft, or Faction, appear in any of them, they are all mark’d out for so many Articles of Popery. And by these and such like means is finisht at last a compleat draught of Popery, in which she is render’d so foul, monftrous and abominable, that there can be nothing raked from the very finks of Turfdom, nothing borrow’d from the wild Africans, or barbarous Americans, that can make her more odious, or add to her deformity. Why, and is not Popery then, such as ’tis thus generally painted? No ’tis no more like it, than Monarchy is to that which turbulent Republican Spirits shew for it; when displaying to the multitude some Misdaries of State, Frailties in Persons in Dignities, Abuses of Government, &c. they cry out, Behold this is Monarchy. By these means making it Infamous among the People, that they may more easily overthrow it. And are not the Papists such as they are commonly Represented? No: They are no more alike, than the Chrisrians
were of old under the Persecuting Emperors, to what they appear'd, when clothed with Lions and Bears Skins they were expos'd in the Amphitheatre to Wild Beasts; under those borrow'd Shapes to provoke their Savage opposites to greater fury; and that they might infallibly, and with more rage, be torn in pieces. Let Monarchy be shewn in its own colours; and the Christians be expos'd in their own form, and one will have but few Maligners, and the others will meet with a more tame behaviour, even from the wildest Beasts. Let any one but search into the Councils of the Church of Rome, even that of Trent, than which none can be more Papist; let them peruse her Catechisms, that, ad Parochos, or others set forth for Pastors to instruct their Flock, and for Children, Youth, and others to learn their Christian Doctrine, of which there is extant great variety in English. Let them examine Vernon's Rule of Faith, and that set forth by the Bishop of Condom. Let them look into the Spiritual Books of Direction: Those of the Bishop Sales, the Following of Christ, the Christian Rules, the Spiritual Combat, Granado's Works, and infinite others of this sort, which Papists generally keep by them for their Instruction: And then let them freely declare, whether the Papists are so ill principled, either as to their Faith or Morals, as they are generally made appear. A little diligence in this kind, with a serious inquiry into their conversation, their manner of living and dying; will easily discover, that that of Beast, with which they are commonly expos'd to publique, is not theirs, but only of the skin, that is thrown over them. The Papists own, that there are amongst them Men of very ill lives, and that if every corner be narrowly sifted, there may be found great abuses, even of the most sacred things; that some in great Dignities have been highly vicious, and carried on wicked Designs: That some Authors maintain and publish very absurd Opinions, and of ill consequence. But these things are nothing of their Religion, they are the Imperfections indeed, the Crimes, the Scandals of some in their Communion; but such they are so far from being oblig'd to approve, maintain, or imitate, that they wish with all their heart there had been never any such things; and desire in thee Points a through Reformation. Tho' the Imprudences therefore, the Failings; the Extravagances, the Vices, that may be pick'd up throughout the whole Society of Papists, are very numerous and great, and too too sufficient, if draw'n together, for the composing a most Deform'd Antichristian Monster; yet the Popyr of Roman-Catholicks is no such Monster, as it is painted. Those things which are commonly brought against them, being as much detested by them, as by the Persons that lay the charge in their disfavour; and having no more relation to them, than Weeds and Tares to the Corn amongst which it grows; or Chaff to the Wheat; with which it lies mix'd in one heap. A Papist therefore is no more than he is above Represented; and whosoever enters that Communion, has no obligation of believing otherwise, than as there specified. And though in each Particular; I have cited no Authorities; yet for the Truth and Excellency of the Character,' I appeal to the Council of Trent. And if in any Point it shall be found to disagree; I again promise, upon notice, publicly to own it. And as for the other Part, of the Papist Mis-represented; it contains such Tenets as are wrongfully charg'd upon the Papists; and in as many respects, as it is contrary to the other Character; in so many, it is contrary to the Faith of their Church; And so far, they are ready to disarm them, and subscribe to their Condemnation. And though any serious enquirer may be easily satisfied as to the truth of this; yet for a publick satisfaction, to shew that these Abominable Unchristian Doctrines are no part of their Belief; (however extravagant some men may be in their Opinions;) the Papists acknowledge that a Faith assenting to such Tenets, is wholly opposite to the Honour of God, and Destructive to the Gospel of Christ; and do publicly invoke God Almighty's Judgments upon that Church, which teaches either publicly or privately such a Faith. And since 'tis lawful for any Christian to answer Amen; to such Anathema's, as are pronounc'd against things apparently sinful; the Papists
pilts, to show to the World that they disown the following Tenets, commonly laid at their door; do here oblige themselves, that if the ensuing Curfes be added to those appointed to be read on the First day of Lent: They will seriously and heartily answer Amen to them all.

I. Curfed is he that commits Idolatry; that prays to Images or Relicks, or Worships them for God. R. Amen.

II. Curfes is every Goddes Worshiper, that believes the Virgin Mary to be any more than a creature; that Honours her, Worships her, or puts his Trust in her, more than in God; that believes her above her Son, or that she can in any thing command him. R. Amen.

III. Curfes is he that believes the Saints in Heaven to be his Redeemers, that prays to them as such, or that gives God's Honour to them, or to any creature whatsoever, R. Amen.

IV. Curfes is he that Worships any Breaden God, or makes Gods of the empty Elements of Bread and Wine. R. Amen.

V. Curfes is he that believes that Priests can forgive sins, whether the Sinner repents, or not; Or that there's any power in Earth or Heaven, that can forgive sins, without a hearty repentance, and serious purpose of amendment. R. Amen:

VI. Curfes is he that believes there's Authority in the Pope or any others that can give leave to commit Sins: Or that can forgive him his sins for a sum of Money. R. Amen.

VII. Curfes is he that believes, that Independent of the Merits and Passion of Christ, he can Merit Salvation by his own good Works; or make condign satisfaction for the guilt of his sins, or the pain Eternal due to them. R. Amen.

VIII. Curfes is he that contemns the Word of God, or hides it from the people, on design to keep them from the knowledge of their Duty, and to preserve them in Ignorance and Error. R. Amen.

IX. Curfes is he that undervalues the Word of God, or that forsaking the Scripture, chuses rather to follow Humane Traditions than it. R. Amen.

X. Curfes is he that leaves the Commandments of God, to observe the constitutions of Men. R. Amen.

XI. Curfes is he that omits any of the Ten Commandments; or keeps the people from the knowledge of any one of them, to the end they may not have occasion of discovering the Truth. R. Amen.

XII. Curfes is he that preaches to the people in unknown Tongues, such as they understand not; or uses any other means, to keep them in Ignorance. R. Amen.

XIII. Curfes is he that believes that the Pope can give to any, upon any account whatsoever, Dispensations to Lie, or Swear falsely: Or that 'tis lawful for any, at the last hour to prostitute himself Innocent in case he be Guilty. R. Amen.

XIV. Curfes is he that encourages sins, or teaches Men to deform the amendment of their lives, on presumption of their Death-Bed repentance. R. Amen.

XV. Curfes is he that teaches Men, that they may be Lawfully drunk on a Friday, or any other Fast day; tho' they must not taste the leaf bit of Flesh. R. Amen.

XVI. Curfes is he who places Religion in nothing but a pompous fhow consisting only in Ceremonies; and which teaches not the People to serve God in Spirit and Truth. R. Amen.

XVII. Curfes is he who loves or promotes cruelty, that teaches People to be Bloody-minded, and to lay aside the meekness of Jesus Christ. R. Amen.

XVIII. Curfes is he who teaches it Lawful to do any wicked thing, tho' it be for the
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the Interest and Good of Mother-Church: or that any Evil action may be done, that Good may come of it. R. Amen.

XIX. Curled are we, if amongst all those wicked Principles and Damnable Doctrines, commonly laid at our Doors, any one of them be the Faith of our Church: And Curled are we, if we do not as heartily detest all those Hellish Practices, as they that so vehemently urge them against us. R. Amen.

XX. Curled are we, if in answering, and saying Amen, to any of these Curses, we use any Equivocations, Mental Reservations; or do not assent to them in the common and obvious sense of the words. R. Amen.

And can the Papists then, thus seriously, and without check of Conference, say Amen to all these Curses? Yes they can, and are ready to it, whenever, and as often as it shall be requir'd of them. And what then is to be said of those, who either by Word or Writing, charge these Doctrines upon the Faith of the Church of Rome, Is a lying spirit in the mouth of all the Prophets? Are they all gone aside? Do they back-bite with their tongue, do evil to their Neighbour, and take up reproach against their Neighbour? I'll say no such thing, but leave the impartial Considerer to judge. One thing I can safely affirm, that the Papists are foully Mis-represented, and show in publick as much unlike what they are, as the Christians were of old by the Gentiles; that they lie under a great Calumny, and severely smart in good Name, Persons and Estates, for such things, which They as much and as heartily detest, as those who accuse them. But the comfort is, Christ has said to his Followers, Ye shall be hated of all men, (Matt. 10. 22.) and St. Paul, we are made a spectacle unto the World; and we don't doubt, that who bears this with patience, shall for every loss here, and content, receive a hundred fold in Heaven: For safe things of the World, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, 1 Cor. 1. 28.
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Roman-Catholic Principles, In Reference to GOD and the KING.

**PARAGRAPH I.**

Of the Catholic Faith, and Church in General.

I. **The** fruition of God and Remission of Sin is not attainable by Man, otherwise than (a) in and by the Merits of Jesus Christ, who (gratis) Purchas’d it for Us.

II. These Merits of Christ are not applied to Us otherwise than by a Right (b) Faith in Christ.

III. This Faith is but (c) one, Entire and Conformable to its Object, being Divine Revelations; to all which (d) Faith gives an undoubted assent.

IV. These Revelations contain many Mysteries (e) transcending the Natural Reach of Human Wit or Industry; Wherefore,

V. It became the Divine Wisdom and Goodness, to provide Man of some (f) Way or Means whereby he might Arrive to the Knowledge of these Mysteries; Means (g) Visible and Apparent to all, Means (h) proportionable to the Capacities of all; Means (i) Sure and Certain to all.

VI. This Way or Means is not the Reading of Scripture, Interpreted according to the **Private** (k) Reason or (l) Spirit of every Disjunctive Person, or Nation in particular; But,

VII. It is an Attention and (m) Sub**mission** to the Doctrine of the **Catholic** or Universal Church, established by Christ for the Instruction of all. (n) Spread for that end throughout all Nations, and visibly continued in the Succession of Pastors, and People throughout all Ages: From which Church(o) **Guided in Truth**, and secured from Error in Matters of Faith, by the (p) **promiss’d Assistance of the Holy Ghost**, 

---
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Ghost, every one may, and ought to (q) Learn both the Right Sense of the Scripture, and all other Christian Mysteries and Duties, respectively necessary to Salvation.

VIII. This Church, thus spread, thus guided, thus visibly continued, (r) in One Uniform Faith, and Subordination of Government, is that self-same which is term’d the Roman-Catholic Church, the Qualifications above-mentioned, viz. Unity, Indeficiency, Visibility, Succession, and Universality, being applicable to no other Church, or Assembly, whatever.

IX. From the Testimony and Authority of this Church, it is, that we receive, and believe the Scriptures to be God’s Word: And as she can (s) assuredly tell us, This or That Book is God’s Word, so can she with the like Assurance tell us also the True Sense and Meaning of it in Controverted Points of Faith; the same Spirit that Writ the Scripture, (t) Enlightning Her to understand, both it, and all matters necessary to Salvation. From these grounds it follows,

X. All, and only Divine Revelations deliver’d by God unto the Church, and proposed by her to be believ’d as such, are, and ought to be esteem’d Articles of Faith; and the contrary Opinions, Heresie. And,

XI. As an Obstinate Separation from the Unity of the Church, in known declare’d Matters of Faith, is Formal (u) Heresie: So a wilful Separation from the Visible Unity of the same Church, in matters of Subordination and Government, is Formal (x) Schism.

XII. The Church proposes unto us matters of Faith: First, and chiefly, by the (y) Holy Scripture, in Points plain and intelligible in it. Secondly, By (z) Definitions of General Councils, in points not sufficiently Explain’d in Scripture. Thirdly, By (a) Apostolical Traditions, deriv’d from Christ and his Apostles, to all Succeeding Ages. Fourthly, By her (b) Practice, Worship and Ceremonies, confirming her Doctrine.
I. General Councils (which are the Church of God Representative) have no Commission from Christ to Frame New Matters of Faith, (these being sole Divine Revelations,) but only, to (a) Explain and Adjust unto Us, what anciently was, and is Received and Retained, as of Faith in the Church, upon arising Debates and Controversies about them. The Definitions of which General Councils in Matters of Faith only, and propos'd as such, oblige, under pain of Heresie, all the Faithful, to a Submission of Judgment. But,

II. It is an Article of Faith to believe, That General Councils cannot Err, either in matters of Fact or Discipline, alterable by circumstances of Time and Place, or in matters of Speculation or Civil Policy, depending on mere humane Judgment or Testimony. Neither of these being Divine Revelations (b) deposited in the Catholic Church, in regard to which, alone, the hath the (c) promised Assistance of the Holy Ghost. Hence it is deduced,

III. If a General Council (much less a Papal Consistory) should undertake to depose a King, and absolve his Subjects from their Allegiance, no Catholic (as Catholic) is bound to submit to such a Decree. Hence also it follows,

IV. The Subjects of the King of England lawfully may, without the least breach of any Catholic Principle, Repentance, (even upon Oath,) the Teaching or Practising the Doctrine of depoing Kings Excommunicated for Heresie, by any Authority whatsoever, as repugnant to the fundamental Laws of the Nation, Injurious to Sovereign Power, Destructive to the Peace and Government; and by consequence, in His Majesties Subjects, Impious and Damnable: Yet not properly Heretical; taking the Word Heretical in that connatural, genuine sense, as it is usually understood in the Catholic Church; on account of which, and other Expressions, (no-wife appertaining to Loyalty,) it is, that Catholics of tender Consciences refuse the Oath commonly call'd the Oath of Allegiance.
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V. Catholicks believe, That the Bishop of Rome is the Successor of S. Peter, (d) Vicar of Jesus Christ upon Earth, and the Head of the whole Catholic Church; which Church is therefore fitly styled Roman-Catholic, being an universal Body (e) united under one visible Head. Nevertheless,

VI. It is no matter of Faith to believe, That the Pope is in himself Infallible, separated from a General Council, even in Expounding the Faith: By consequence Papal Definitions or Decrees, though ex Cathedra, as they term them, (taken exclusively from a General Council, or Universal Acceptance of the Church,) oblige none under Pain of Heresie, to an interior Assent.

VII. Nor do Catholicks (as Catholicks) believe that the Pope hath any direct, or indirect Authority over the Temporal Power and Jurisdiction of Princes. Hence, if the Pope should pretend to Absolve or Dispense with His Majesties Subjects from their Allegiance, upon account of Heresie or Schism, such Dispensation would be vain and null: and all Catholic Subjects (notwithstanding such Dispensation or Absolution,) would be still bound in Conscience to defend their King and Country, at the hazard of their Lives and Fortunes, even against the Pope himself, in case he should invade the Nation.

VIII. And as for the Problematical Disputes, or Errors of particular Divines, in this or any other matter whatsoever, the Catholic Church is no wise responsible for them: Nor, are Catholicks (as Catholicks,) justly punishable on their account. But,

IX. As for the King-killing Doctrine, or Murder of Princes, Excommunicated for Heresie; It is an Article of Faith in the Catholic Church, and expressly declar'd in the General Council of Constance, that such Doctrine is Damnable and Heretical, being contrary to the known Laws of God and Nature.

X. Personal Misdemeanors, of what Nature soever, ought not to be Imputed to the Catholic Church, when not Justifiable by the Tenents of her Faith and Doctrine: For which Reason, though the Stories of the Paris Massacre, the Irish Cruelties, or Powder-Plot, had been exactly true, (which yet for the most part are notoriously mis-related,) nevertheless Catholicks (as Catholicks,) ought not to suffer for such Offences, any more than the Eleven Apostles ought to have suff'red for Judas's Treachery.

XI. It
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XI. It is an Article of the Catholic Faith to believe, that no Power on Earth can authorize Men to Lie, Forswear, and Perjure themselves, to Massacre their Neighbours, or Destroy their Native Country, on pretence of promoting the Catholic Cause or Religion: Furthermore, all Pardons and Dispensations granted, or pretended to be granted, in order to any such Ends or Designs, have no other Validity or Effect, than to add Sacrilege and Blasphemy to the above mentioned Crimes.

XII. The Doctrine of Equivocation or Mental Reservation, however wrongfully imposed upon the Catholic Religion, is notwithstanding, neither taught, nor approved by the Church, as any part of her Belief. On the contrary, simplicity and Godly sincerity are constantly recommended by her as truly Christian Virtues, necessary to the conservation of Justice, Truth, and Common-security.

Sect. III.

Of some Particular controverted Points of Faith.

I. Every Catholic is obliged to believe, that when a Sinner (a) Repents him of his Sins from the bottom of his Heart, and (b) Acknowledges his Transgressions to God and his (c) Ministers, the Dispensers of the Mysteries of Christ, resolving to turn from his evil ways, (d) and bring forth Fruits worthy of Penance; there is (then, and no otherwise) an Authority left by Christ to Absolve such a Penitent Sinner from his Sins; which Authority Christ gave his (e) Apostles, and their Successors, the Bishops and Priests of the Catholic Church, in those words, when he said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose Sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven unto them, &c.

II. Though no Creature whatsoever can make (f) satisfaction, either for the Guilt of Sin, or the pain External due to it; (g) This satisfaction being proper to Christ our Saviour only; Yet penitent Sinners Redeemed by Christ, may, as Members of Christ, in some measure (h) satisfy by Prayer, Fasting, Alms-Deeds, and other Works of Piety, for the Temporal Pain, which by order of Divine Justice sometimes remains due, after the Guilt of Sin, and Pains

---

(a) Ez. 18. 21. 2 Cor. 7. 10. Pro. 32. 5
(b) Ps. 28. 13. (c) Acts. 19. 18. 1 Cor. 4. 1. Jam. 5. 16.
(c) Lu. 3. 8. (e) Joh. 20. 21. &c. Matth. 18. 18.
(d) Tit. 3. 5. (f) 2 Cor. 5. 3. Acts 26. 20. Jonas 3. 5. &c.
(e) Psal. 102. 9. &c.
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Pains Eternal are (gratis) remitted. These Penitential Works, are, notwithstanding, satisfactory no otherwise than asjoynd
and apply'd to that satisfaction which Jesus made upon
the Cross, in virtue of which alone, all our good Works find
a grateful (i.) acceptance in God's sight.

III. The Guilt of Sin, or Pain Eternal due to it, is never
remit by Indulgences; but only such (k) Temporal pu-
ishments as remain due after the Guilt is remitted; These
Indulgences being nothing else than (l) Mitigation or Re-
 laxation upon just causes, of Canonical Penances, enjoy'n'd
by the Pillars of the Church on Penitent Sinners, accor-
ding to their several Degrees of Demerit. And if any
abuses or mistakes be sometimes committed, in point ei-
ther of granting or gaining Indulgences, through the Re-
minisces or Ignorance of particular Persons, contrary to the
ancient Custom and Disciple of the Church; such abu-
ses or mistakes cannot rationally be charg'd on the Church,
not rendred matter of derision, in prejudice to her Faith
and doctrine.

IV. Catholics hold there is a Purgatory, that is to say,
place or State, where Souls departing this Life, with
Remission of their Sins, as to the Eternal Guilt or Pain, or
yet (m) Obnoxious to some temporal Punishment still re-
main'd due, or not perfectly freed from the Blemish of
some (n) Defects or Deordinations, (as idle Words, &c.
not liable to Damnation) are (o) purg'd before their ad-
mitance into Heaven, where nothing that is (p) defil'd
can enter. Furthermore,

V. Catholics also hold, That such Souls so detained in
Purgatory, being the Living Members of Christ Jesus, are
Reserved by the (q) Prayers and suffrages of their Fellow
members here on Earth: But where this place is? Of what
Nature or Quality the Pains are? How long each Soul is
detained there? After what manner the suffrages made in
their behalf, are apply'd? Whether by way of satisfaction
or Intercession, &c. are Questions superfluous, and imper-
tinent as to Faith.

VI. No Man, though just, (r) can Merit either an In-
crease of Sanctity or Happiness in this Life, or Eternal
Glory in the next, independent on the Merits and Passion of Christ Jesus, (s) the Good Works of a just Man,
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proceeding from Grace and Charity, are acceptable to God, so far forth as to be, through his goodness and Sacred Promise, truly meritorious of Eternal Life.

VII. It is an Article of the Catholick Faith, That in the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly and really contain’d the (t) Body of Christ, which was deliver’d for us, and his Blood, which was shed for the Remission of Sins; the substance of Bread and Wine being by the powerful Words of Christ chang’d into the substance of his Blessed Body and Blood, the Species or Accidents of Bread and Wine still remaining. Thus,

VIII. Christ is not present in this Sacrament, according to his Natural way of Existence, that is, with extention of parts, in order to place, &c. but after a supernatural manner, one and the same in many places, and whole in every part of the Symbols. This therefore is a real, substantial, yet Sacramental presence of Christ’s Body and Blood, not expos’d to the External Senses, or obnoxious to Corporal Contingences.

IX. Neither is the Body of Christ in this Holy Sacrament, separated from his Blood, or his Blood from his Body, or either of both disjoyn’d from his Soul and Divinity, but all and whole (w) living Jesus is entirely contain’d under either Species; so that whosoever receives under one kind, is truly partaker of the whole Sacrament, and no wise depriv’d either of the Body or Blood of Christ. True it is,

X. Our Saviour Jesus Christ, left unto us his Body and Blood, under two distinct Species or Kinds; in doing which, he instituted not only a Sacrament, but also a Sacrifice; (x) a Commemorative Sacrifice distinctly (y) showing his Death or Bloody Passion, until he come. For as the Sacrifice of the Cross was performed by a distinct Effusion of Blood, so is the same Sacrifice commemorated in that of the (z) Altar, by a distinction of the Symbols. Jesus therefore is here given, not only to us, but (a) for us; and the Church thereby enriched with a true, proper, and propitiatory (b) sacrifice, usually term’d Mass.

XI. Catholicks renounce all Divine Worship, and Adoration of Images or Pictures. (c) God alone we worship and adore; Nevertheless we make use of Pictures, and place them.
them in (d) Churches and Oratories, to reduce our wan-
dring thoughts, and enliven our Memories towards Hea-
venly things. And further, we allow a certain Honour and
Veneration to the Picture of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, &c.
beyond what is due to every profane Figure; not that we
believe any Divinity or Virtue in the Pictures themselves,
for which they ought to be Honour’d, but because the Ho-
nour given to Pictures is refer’d to the Prototype, or things
represented. In like manner,

XII. There is a kind of Honour and Veneration re-
spectively due to the Bible, to the Cross, to the Name of Je-
sus, to Churches, to the Sacraments, &c. as (e) things pecu-
arily appertaining to God; also to the (f) glorify’d Saints
in Heaven, as Domestic Friends of God; yea, (g) to Kings, Magistrates, and Superiours on Earth, as the
Vicegerents of God, to whom Honour is due, Honour
may be given, without any Derogation to the Majesty of
God, or that Divine Worship appropriate to him. Furth-
more,

XIII. Catholics believe, That the Blessed Saints in Hea-
ven replenish’d with Charity (h) pray for us their fellow-
members here on Earth; that they (i) Rejoice at our con-
version; that seeing God, they (j) see and know in him all
things suitable to their happy state; but God is inclinable to
hear their Requests made in our behalf, (l) and for their
sakes grants us many favours; That therefore it is good
and profitable to Desire their Intercession; And that this
manner of Invocation is no more injurious to Christ our
Mediator, or superabundant in itself, than it is for one Chri-
tian to beg the Prayers and assistance of (m) another in this
World. Notwithstanding all which, Catholics are not taught
so to rely on the Prayers of Others, as to neglect their own
(n) Duty to God; in Imploring his Divine mercy and Good-
ness, (o) in mortifying the Deeds of the flesh; in (p) De-
spising the World; in loving and (q) serving God and their
Neighbour; in following the footsteps of Christ our Lord, who
is the (r) Way, the Truth, and the Life: to whom be Ho-
nour and Glory for ever and ever, Amen.
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The Doctrine and Practices of the Church of Rome, truly Represented, &c.

An Answer to the Introduction.

The Introduction consists of two parts,

I. A general Complaint of the Papists being Misrepresented among us.
II. An Account of the Method he hath taken to clear them from these Misrepresentations.

I. As to the First; Whether it be just, or not, must be examined in the several Particulars. But here we must consider, whether it serves the End it is designed for in this place, which is, to gain the Reader's good Opinion of their Innocency: Not meerly because they complain so much of being injured, but because the best Men in all Times have been misrepresented; as he proves at large in this Introduction, from several Examples of the Old and New Testament, but especially of Christ and his Apostles, and the Primitive Christians. But it is observable, that when Bp Jewel began his excellent Apology for the Church of England, with a Complaint much of the same Nature, and produced the very same Examples, his Adversary would by no means allow it to have any Force, being, as he called it, Exordium Commune, which might be used on both sides, and therefore could be proper to neither. And although it be reasonable only for those to complain of being misrepresented, who having Truth on their side, do notwithstanding suffer under the Imputation of Error; yet it is possible for those who are very much mistaken, to complain of being misrepresented; and while they
they go about to remove the Misrepresentations of others, to make new Ones of their own. And as the best Men, and the best Things, have been misrepresented; so other Men have been as apt to complain of it; and the worst Things are as much misrepresented, when they are made to appear not so bad as they are. For Evil is as truly misrepresented under the appearance of Good, as Good under the appearance of Evil; and it is hard to determine whether hath done the greater Mischief.

So that if the Father of Lies be the Author of Misrepresenting, (as the Introduction begins) we must have a care of him both ways. For when he tried this black Art in Paradise, (as our Author speaks) it was both by misrepresenting the Command, and the Danger of transgressing it. He did not only make the Command appear otherwise than it was; but he did very much lessen the Punishment of Disobedience, and by that means deduced our first Parents into that Sin and Misery, under which their Posterity still suffers. Which ought to be a Caution to them, how dangerous it is to break the Law of God under the fairest Colour and Pretences; and that they should not be easily imposed upon by false Glosses, and plausible Representations, though made by such as therein pretend to be Angels of Light.

But although the Father of Lies be the Author of Misrepresenting: yet we have no reason to think, but that if he were to plead his own Cause to Mankind, he would very much complain of being misrepresented by them; and even in this respect, when they make him the Father of those Lies which are their own Inventions. And can that be a certain Argument of Truth, which may as well be used by the Father of Lies?

And the great Instruments he hath made use of in deceiving and corrupting Mankind, have been as forward as any, to complain of being misrepresented. The true Reason is, Because no great Evil can prevail in the World, unless it be represented otherwise than it is; and all Men are not competent Judges of the Colours of Good and Evil; therefore when the Designs of those who go about to deceive, begin to be laid open, they then betake themselves to the fairest Representations they can make of themselves, and hope that many will not see through their Pretences.
If I had a mind to follow our Author's Method, I could make as long a Deduction of Instances of this kind. But I shall content my self with some few Examples of those who are allowed on both sides to have been guilty of great Errors and Corruptions.

The Arrians pleaded they were misrepresented, when they were taken for Enemies to Christ's Divinity; for all that they contended for, was only such a Moment of Time, as would make good the Relation between Father and Son.

The Pelagians, with great Success for some time (and even at Rome) complained that they were very much misrepresented, as Enemies to God's Grace; whereas they owned and asserted the manifold Grace of God; and were only Enemies to Mens Idlenes, and neglect of their Duties.

The Nestorians gave out, that they never intended to make two Persons in Christ, as their Adversaries charged them; but all their design was to avoid Blasphemy, in calling the Blessed Virgin the Mother of God; and whatever went beyond this, was their Adversaries Misrepresentations, and not their own Opinions.

The Eutychians thought themselves very hardly dealt with, for saying, there was but one Nature in Christ; they did not mean thereby (as they said) to destroy the Properties of the Humane Nature, but only to assert that its Subsistence was swallowed up by the Divine; and of all Persons, those have no reason to blame them, who suppose the Properties of one Substance may be united to another.

Even the Gentile Idolaters, when they were charged by the Christians, that they worshipped Stocks and Stones, complained, they were misrepresented; for they were not such Ideots, to take things for Gods, which had neither Life, nor Sense, nor Motion in them. And when they were charged with worshipping other Gods as they did the Supreme; they desired their Sense might not be taken from common Prejudices, or vulgar Practices, but from the Doctrine of their Philosophers; and they owned a Soveraign Worship due to him that was Chief; and a subordinate and Relative to some Celestial Beings, whom they made Application to as Mediators between him and them. Must all these Complaints now be taken for granted? what then becomes of the Reputation of General Councils, or the Primiti-
tive Christians? But as, if it were enough to be Accused, none would be Innocent; so none would be Guilty, if it were en-
nough to complain of being misrepresented.

Therefore in all Complaints of this Nature, it is necessary to
come to Particulars; and to examine with Care and Diligence
the Matters complained of, and then to give Judgment in the
Case. I am glad to find our Author professing so much Sincere-
ity and Truth without Passion; and I do assure him I shall follow
what he professes: For the Cause of our Church is such, as
needs neither Tricks nor Passion to defend it; and therefore I
shall endeavour to state the Matters in Difference, with all the
clearness and calmness that may be; and I shall keep close to
his Method and Representations, without Digressions, or pro-
voking Reflections.

II. But I must declare myself very much unsatisfied with the
Method he hath taken to clear his Party from these Misrepre-
sentations. For,

1. He takes upon him to draw a double Character of a Pa-
pist; and in the one he pretends to follow a certain Rule, but
not in the other, which is not fair and ingenuous.

As to the one, he faith, He follows the Council of Trent, and
their allowed Spiritual Books and Catechisms: and we find no fault
with this. But why must the other Part then be drawn by
Fancy, or common Prejudices, or ignorant Mistakes? Have
we no Rule, whereby the Judgment of our Church is to be ta-
ten? Are not our Articles as easy to be had and understood,
as the Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent? I will not
ask, How the Council of Trent comes to be the Rule and Mea-
sure of Doctrine to any here, where it was never received?
But I hope I may, why our Representations are not to be ta-
ten from the Sense of our Church, as their's from the Coun-
cil of Trent? If he faith, his Design was to remove common Pre-
judices, and vulgar Mistakes; it is easy to answer, if they are
contrary to the Doctrine of our Church, we utterly disown
them. We know very well there are Persons, who have so
false a Notion of Popery, that they charge the Rites and Cu-
toms of our Church with it: but we pity their Weakness and
Folly, and are far from defending such Misrepresentations.
But that which we adhere to, is the Doctrine and Sense of our
Church,
Church, as it is by Law established; and what Representations are made agreeable thereto, I undertake to defend, and no other. But if a Person take the liberty to lay on what Colours he pleases on one side, it will be no hard matter to take them off in the other, and then to say, How much fairer is our Church than she is painted! It is an easy, but not so allowable a way of disputing, for the same Person to make the Objections and Answers too; for he may so model and frame the Arguments by a little Art, that the Answers may appear very full and sufficient; whereas if they had been truly represented, they would be found very lame and defective.

2. He pretends to give an Account why he quotes no Authors for his Misrepresentations, which is very unsatisfactory, viz. That he hath described the Papists therein, exactly according to the apprehension he had of him when he was a Protestant. But how can we tell what sort of Protestant he was; nor how well he was instructed in his Religion? And must the Character now supposed to be common to Protestants, be taken from his ignorant, or childish, or wilful Mistakes? Did ever any Protestant that understands himself, say, That Papists are never permitted to hear Sermons which they are able to understand? (p. 58.) Or, that they held it lawful to commit Idolatry? (p. 9.) Or, that a Papist believes the Pope to be his great God, and to be far above all Angels? &c. Yet these are some of his Misrepresentations, (pag. 40.) Did he in earnest think so himself? If he did, he gives no good account of himself: if he did not, he gives a worse; for then how shall we believe him in other things, when he faith, He hath drawn his Misrepresentations exactly according to his own apprehensions? It is true, he faith, he added some few Points, which were violently charged on him by his Friends: but we dare be bold to say, these were none of them. But let us suppose it true, that he had such Apprehensions himself. Are these fit to be printed as the Character of a Party? What would they say to us, if a Spanish Convert should give a Character of Protestants according to the common Opinion the People there have of them; and set down in one Column their monstrous Misrepresentations,
tations, and in another, what he found them to be since his coming hither; and that in good Truth he saw they were just like other Men? But suppose he had false Apprehensions before he went among them; why did he not take care to inform himself better before he changed? Had he no Friends, no Books, no Means to rectify his Mistakes? Must he needs leave one Church, and go to another, before he understood either? If this be a true Account of himself, it is but a bad Account of the Reasons of his Change.

3. The Account he gives of the other Part of his Character, affords as little Satisfaction: For although in the general, it be well that he pretends to keep to a Rule; yet,

(1.) He shews no Authority he hath to interpret that Rule in his own Sense. Now several of his Representations, depend upon his own private Sense and Opinions, against the Doctrine of many others as zealous for their Church as himself; and what reason have we to adhere to his Representations, rather than to theirs? As for instance, he saith, *The Pope's personal Infallibility is no Matter of Faith* (p. 42.) But there are others say it is, and is grounded on the same Promises which makes him Head of the Church. Why now must we take his Representation rather than theirs? And so as to the Deposing Power, he grants, *it hath been the Opinion of several Popes* (and Councils too) *but that it is no Matter of Faith* (p. 47.) But whose Judgment are we to take in this Matter, according to the Principles of their Church? A private Man's, of no Name, no Authority; or of those Popes and Councils who have declared it, and acted by it? And can any Man of their Church justify our relying upon his Word, against the Declaration of Popes and Councils? But suppose the Question be about the Sense of his own Rule, *the Council of Trent*: what Authority hath he to declare it, when the Pope hath expressly forbidden all Prelates to do it, and reserved it to the Apostolical See?

(2.) He leaves out, in the several Particulars, an essential part of the Character of a *Papist* since the Council of Trent;
Trent; which is, that he doth not only believe the Doctrines there defined to be true, but to be necessary to Salvation. And there is not a word of this in his Representation of the Points of Doctrine, but the whole is managed as though there were nothing but a difference about some particular Opinions; whereas in Truth, the Necessity of holding those Doctrines, in order to Salvation, is the main Point in difference. If Men have no mind to believe their own Senses, we know not how to help it; but we think it is very hard to be told, we cannot be saved unless we renounce them too. And this now appears to be the true State of the Case, since Pius the 4th drew up and published a Confession of Faith, according to the Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent, wherein Men are not only required to believe their Traditions as firmly as the Bible, the Seven Sacraments, Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, worshipping of Images, Indulgences, Supremacy, &c. but they must believe, that without believing these things, there is no Salvation to be had in the ordinary Way: for after the enumeration of those Points, it follows, Hanc veram Catholicam fidem extra quam nemo solus esse potest, &c. This is the true Catholic Faith, without which no Man can be saved; i.e. The belief of these things is thereby declared as necessary to Salvation, as of any other Articles of the Creed. But it may be objected, the subscribing this Profession of Faith, is not required of all Members of that Church. To which I answer, That to make a Man a Member of it, he must declare that he holds the same Faith which the Church of Rome holds: And this is as much the Faith of the Roman Church, as the Pope and Council of Trent could make it. And it is now printed in the Roman Ritual at Paris, set forth by Paul the 5th, as the Confession of Faith owned by the Church of Rome. And therefore this ought to have been a part of the true Representation, as to the Doctrinal Points; but when he comes to the 35th Head, he then owns, That unless Men do believe every Article of the Roman Faith, they cannot be saved, (p. 96.) and he that disbelieves one, does in a manner disbelieve all, (p. 97.) Which may as well reach those who disown the
the Deposing Power, and the Pope's personal Infallibility, as Ul, since those are accounted Articles of Faith by the ruling part of their Church, to whom it chiefly belongs to declare them; and the former hath been defined both by Popes and Councils.

(3.) He never sets down what it is which makes any Doctrine to become a Doctrine of their Church. We are often blamed for charging particular Opinions upon their Church: but we desire to know what it is which makes a Doctrine of their Church; i.e. whether frequent and publick Declaration, by the Heads and Guides of their Church, be sufficient or not to that End? Our Author seems to imply the Necessity of some Conditions to be observed; for besides the Pope's Authority, he requires due Circumstances, and proceeding according to Law, (p. 42.) But who is to be Judge of these Circumstances and legal Proceeding? And he never tells what these Circumstances are. And yet after all, he faith, The Orders of the Supream Pastor are to be obey'd, whether he be infallible or not. And this now brings the Matter home; The Popes, he confesses, have owned the Deposing Doctrine, and acted according to it: And others are bound to obey their Orders, whether infallible or not; and consequently they are bound by the Doctrine of their Church to act, when the Popes shall require it, according to the Deposing Power. But he seems to say, in this Case, that a Doctrine of their Church is to be judged by the Number; for, faith he, There are greater Numbers that disown this Doctrine, (p. 47.) I will not at present dispute it; but I desire to be informed, Whether the Doctrines of their Church go by majority of Votes, or not? I had thought the Authority of the Guides of the Church, ought to have over-balled any Number of Dissenters. For, what are those who refuse to submit to the Dictates of Popes and Councils, but Dissenters from the Church of Rome? The distinction of the Court and Church of Rome, is wholly impertinent in this Case. For, we here consider not the meer Temporal Power which makes the Court, but the Spiritual Capacity of Teaching the Church: and if Popes and Councils may err in Teaching this Doctrine, why not in any other? I know
there are some that say, *Universal Tradition is necessary to make a Doctrine of their Church.* But then no subscription can be required to any Doctrine in that Church, till the Universal Tradition of it, in all Times, and in all Parts of the Christian Church, be proved. And we need to desire no better Terms than these, as to all Points of Pope Pius the 4th his Creed, which are in dispute between us and them.

(4.) He makes use of the Authority of some particular Divines, as delivering the Sense of their Church, when there are so many of greater Authority against them. Whereas, if we proceed by his own Rule, the greater Number is to carry it. Therefore we cannot be thought to misrepresent them, if we charge them with such things as are owned, either by the general and allowed Practices of their Church, or their Publick Offices, or the generality of their Divines and Casuists; or in case of a Contest, with that side which is owned by the Guides of their Church, when the other is censured; or which was approved by their Canonized Saints, or declared by their Popes and Councils, whose Decrees they are bound to follow. And by these Measures I intend to proceed, having no design to misrepresent them, as indeed we need not.

And so much in Answer to the *Introduction.*
I. Of Praying to Images.

In this, and the other Particulars, where it is necessary, I shall observe this method;

1. To give a clear and impartial Account of the State of the Controversy in as few Words as I can.

2. To make some Reflections on what he faith, in order to the clearing them from Misrepresentations.

As to the State of the Controversy, as it stands, since the Council of Trent, we are to consider.

1. We must distinguish between what Persons do in their own Opinion, and what they do according to the Sense of the Divine Law. It is possible that Men may intend one thing, and the Law give another Sense of it: as is often seen in the Case of Treason; although the Persons plead never so much they had no intention to commit Treason; yet if the Law makes their Act to be so, their disavowing it doth not excuse them. So it is in the present Case; Men may have real and serious Intentions, to refer their final, ultimate, and Soveraign Worship only to God; but if the Law of God strictly and severely prohibits this particular Manner of Worship by Images, in as full, plain, and clear Words as may be, and gives a Denomination to such Acts, taken from the immediate Object of it; no particular Intention of the Persons can alter that Denomination, or make the Guilt to be less than the Law makes it.

2. There can be no Misrepresenting as to the lawfulness of many External Acts of Worship, with Respect to Images, which are owned by them. But it doth not look fairly to put the Title, Of Praying to Images; for the Question is, about the Worship of Images: whereas this Title would insinuate, as though we did directly charge them with Praying to their Images, without any farther Respect. Which we are so far from charging them with, that I do not know of any People in the World, who are not like Stones and Stocks them-
themselves, who are liable to that Charge. The P.E.N.
DETS, in the East-Indies are fully cleared from it, by
Thevenot, as well as Bernier. And it would be hard we
should not allow the same to our Fellow-Christians. I do
therefore grant what our Author faith, viz. That all the Va-
neration they express before Images, whether by kneeling, praying,
lifting up the Eyes, burning Candles, Incense, &c. is not at all
done for the Image, but is wholly refer'd to the things repre-

tended, which he intends to honour by these Actions. But I hope Pag. 3.
now, it is no Misrepresenting for us to say, that they do
kneel, pray, lift up their Eyes, burn Candles, Incense, &c.
before their Images; which is all I charge them with at
present.

3. To perform these Acts before Images, without a de-
sign to worship the Images by them, is declared, by great
Divines of the Church of Rome, to be next to Heresy.
The Case was this; There were before the Council of
Trent, several Persons who lived in Communion of that
Church, but by no means approved the Worship of Im-
eges, such as Durandus, Holcot, Picus Mirandula, and others.
Now these Persons thought fit to comply in these Exter-
nal Acts, but declared they intended not to worship the
Images, but the Objects before them. Since the Council
of Trent decreed Images were to be worshipped, this Case
hath been debated by the Divines and Casuists of greatest
Reputation among them; And Suarez faith, This way of
Durandus is dangerous, rash, and favours of Heresy: and he
faith further from Medina, That it was Victoria's Opinion,
thus it was Heretical; but he adds, that his own Opinion,
that Images were truly and properly to be Worshipped, was ge-
nerally received by their Divines: and therefore I need name
no more.

4. It is granted by their Divines and Casuists, that the
People in the Worship of Images may easily fall into Ido-
latr. 

(1.) If the Worship do not pass from the Image to the
Thing represented. And so Aquinas himself determines,
That no Irrational Creature is capable of Worship, but
as it hath Respect to a Rational Being. But here lies the
Difficulty,
Difficulty, how an Extravagant Relation to an Object of Worship, where the Thing is confessed to deserve none, can give any Reason for its being properly worshipped. But they all grant, if the Worship stop at the Inanimate part, it can be no other than the Worship of Stocks and Stones.

(2.) If the Worship be given to the Image, which is proper to God alone. This Bellarmin is forced to grant, because the Evidence is so clear in Antiquity, that the Gnosticks were condemned for some Worship which they performed to the Image of Christ. Now, we cannot think that these Gnosticks were such Sots, as to take the Image of Christ to be Christ himself; and therefore whatever Worship it was, it must be Relative, i.e. given to the Image for the sake of Christ represented by it.

(3.) If the People believe any Divinity to be in the Images, or put any Trust or Confidence in them; then the Council of Trent it self owns such to be like the Heathen Idolaters. Now, how shall it be known when the People believe Divinity to be in Images, but by some more than ordinary Presence or Operation in or by them? by their having a greater Opinion of one Image than of another of the same Person? by their going long Pilgrimages to certain Images in hopes of Relief, when they might easily cause Images to represent at home?

And that such are no extravagant Imaginations, is known to all who have heard of Loretto, or Compostella, or other Places nearer home. I need not mention the Complaints of Polydore Virgil, Cassander, or Wicelius to this purpose, who all died in the Communion of the Church of Rome; for the same is very lately complained of by a Considerable Person in that Communion, who faith, The greatest part of the Devotion of the People of Italy, Spain, and Portugal, consists in prostrating themselves before Images, and going in Pilgrimage to them, and hoping for Remission of their Sins by so doing. And another very lately yields, That to avoid the peril of Idolatry, to which (he faith) the People is evidently exposed by the use of Images, it would be necessary to take them away from the Altars, and by no means to have them allowed for the Objects of Religious Worship.
The Question now is, Whether the Council of Trent hath taken any effectual Course to prevent these Abuses? If not, what Misrepresenting is it to charge the Abuses upon the Doctrines and Practices allowed by it?

The Remedies prescribed by the Council, are these;

1. Declaring that there is no Divinity or Virtue in them for which they should be worshipped; and that nothing is to be desired of them, nor any Trust or Confidence to be put in them.

2. Expressing their earnest desire, that if any Abuses have crept in, they may be removed.

But in the mean time the Council decrees, the Images not only to be useful to be set up in Churches, but to have due Honour and Worship given them there, for the sake of those they represent; as not only putting off the Hat, but falling down before them. And the Roman Catechism declares, That this Worship is very beneficial to the People, and so much is to be told them; and that Images are to be in Churches, not merely for Instruction, but that they may be worshipped.

But what could the Council do more, than to desire all Abuses may be taken away; and is it not then the fault of others, and not of the Council, if they be not?

I grant, the Council doth desire Abuses may be taken away, if any such be; but then it enumerates those Abuses, in Heterodox Images, in making Gain of Images, in painting them too wantonly: but besides, it doth say, that all Superstition be removed in the Sacred Use of Images; but it doth not say in the Worship of them; and so it may relate to Magick and Divination. But that the Council could not prevent, or design to prevent the Abuses mention'd in the Worship of Images, will appear by these things.

1. The Council of Trent allows the highest Relative Worship to be given to them; it setting no bounds to it, so it be for the sake of the Prototypes.

2. It allows a Worship to be given to the Images themselves too; for it confirms the second Council of Nice, which decreed an inferior Adoration to be given to them.
It disapproves no Customs then practised among them in the Worship of Images; which were all known, and by many complained of, both as Pilgrimages to them, and the carrying of them about in Procession, and the solemn Consecration of them; the Form whereof is not only inserted, but enlarged in the new Pontifical since the Council of Trent. And it is to be observed, that in the old Pontifical, A.D. 1511, there is no Form for consecrating an Image; in that of Paul the 3d, it is inserted, but out of Durandus; but in that of Clement the 8th, it is put in more largely, and as authentically as if it had been always there. And is not this the way to reform the Worship of Images?

To come now to our Author’s Reflections on the Misrepresentation he faith hath been made as to this Point:

1. A Papist represented, believes it damnable to worship Stocks and Stones for Gods; to pray to Pictures or Images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, or any other Saints.

These Expressions are capable of a double Sense, and therefore this is not fair Representing.

(1.) To worship Stocks or Stones for Gods, may signify two things. (1.) To believe the very Stocks and Stones to be Gods. And this we do not charge them with. (2.) To give to Images made of Wood and Stone, the Worship due only to God; and so by construction of the Fact, to make them Gods, by giving them Divine Worship. And if they will clear themselves of this, they must either prove that External Adoration is no part of Divine Worship, (notwithstanding the Scripture makes it so, and all the rest of Mankind look upon it as such, even Jews, Turks, and Infidels;) or that their external Adoration hath no respect to the Images (which is contrary to the Council of Trent;) or that Divine Worship being due to the Being Represented, it may be likewise given to the Image. And how then could the Gnosticks be condemned for giving Divine Worship to the Image of Christ, which Bellarmine confesses; and is affirmed by Irenæus, Epiphanius, S. Augustine, and Damascen?

(2.) To pray to Images of Christ, or the Blessed Virgin, may likewise be taken in two senses. (1.) To pray to them,
them, so as to expect to be heard by the meer Images, and so we do not charge them with it. (2.) To pray to them, so as to expect to be rather heard by themselves for praying to them by their Images. And if this be not so; to what end are the Prayers made in the Consecration of Images, for those that shall pray before them? To what purpose do so many go in long Pilgrimages to certain Images, if they do not hope to be better heard for praying there?

But he goes on; 2. He keeps them by him indeed, to keep in his mind the memory of the things represented by them. And is this all in good Truth? We will never quarrel with them, if this be true representning. No, that he dares not say.

But, 3. He is taught to use them, p. 2. But how? by casting his Eye upon the Pictures or Images, and thence to raise his Heart to the Prototypes. And is this all yet? No.

But, 4. He finds a double conveyancy in the use of them. (1.) They represent at one glance; and Men may easily make good Reflections, as upon the sight of a Death’s Head, or old Time painted with his Fore-lock, Hour-glass, and Syph. And will he undertake that Images shall be used in Churches for no other end? Was the Picture of old Time ever Consecrated, or placed upon the Altar, or elsewhere, that it might be worshipped? as the Roman Catechism speaks of their Images. (2.) They cure Difractions; for they call back his wandring Thoughts to the Right Object. What is this Right Object? the Image, or the Person represented? And that must be either a Creature, or God himself. If it be a Creature, doth not this imply that it is made a Right Object of Worship? If God himself; how doth an Image cure our Difraction, in the Worship of an Infinite Invisible Being; when the very Image is most apt to distract our Thoughts, by drawing them down from his Divine and Adorable Perfections, to the gros and mean Representations of an Image? But are we yet come to the utmost use of them? No.

But, 5. He cannot but love, honour, and respect the Images themselves, for the sake of those they represent. Will this content them, and will he promise to go no further? It is hard to part upon Terms of meer Respect and Decent Regard, where there is no encroachment upon Divine Worship. And here we are at a stand.
But he goes further. 6. And so he is come at last, to Veneration before Images. And is this all? Dares he deny Veneration to Images, when the Council of Trent hath determined it? Eisq, venerationem impartiendam? What, is this Veneration before Images only? Bellarmine hath a Chapter on purpose to prove, that true and proper Worship is to be given to Images. And was he a Misrepresenter? Suarez, faith, It is an Article of Faith, that Worship is to be given to them. But if the Veneration be only before them, why are they Consecrated, and set up in Places proper for Adoration?

But, 7. To satisfy any one that he is far from making Gods of his Images, he is ready to break them into a thousand pieces. What, a Consecrated Image? Dares he take a Crucifix from the Altar and tear it in pieces? This doth not look like the Love, Honour, and Respect he mentioned before, not to name Veneration. And I am afraid this is a Strain beyond true Representing: Yet at length he hath found some pretty Parallels for the Veneration of Images themselves; and so we are come at last to the main Point. But this is not directly owned; yet in the way of his Representing, it is fairly insinuated by his Parallels.

1. A Christian loves and honours his Neighbour, because he bears the Image of God in his Soul. But doth he therefore take him and set him before him when he kneels at his Devotion, to raise his Mind, and cure his Distractions? Would he set him upon the Altar, and burn Incense before him, because of the Image of God in him? Is there no difference between the Object of Christian Love, and of Divine Worship? Nor between a Spiritual Invisible Divine Image in the Souls of Men, and a Material and Corporeal Representation?

2. We may kiss and esteem the Bible, because it contains and represents to Us God's Word. But when we kiss and esteem the Bible, we remember the second Commandment is in it; and we dare not break his Law, when we pretend to honour his Word. But we think there is some difference between Reverence and Respect to the Bible, and falling down before an Image. The Circumstances of the one declare it to be meer Respect, and a Religious Decency; and if the other be not External Adoration, we know not what it is.
3. A good Preacher is loved, because he minds Men of their Duty. But what should we say to him that should therefore kneel down and say his Prayers, and burn Candles and Incense before him, out of a respect to his good Doctrine? Did S. Peter, or S. Paul like this, when Men would have worshipped them? A good Preacher would tell them of their Duty, as they did; and take Men off from the Worship of any Creature, animate or inanimate, and direct them to worship God alone, who made Heaven and Earth.

II. Of Worshipping Saints.

For the clear stating this Controversy, these things are to be premised.

1. We do not charge them, that they make Gods of dead Men, i.e. that they believe the Saints to be Independent Deities. For this our Author confesses were a most damnable Idolatry.

2. We do not say, that the State of the Church of Rome, with respect to the Worship of dead Men, is as bad as Heathenism. For we acknowledge the true Saints and Martyrs to have been, not only Good and Vertuous, but Extraordinary Persons, in great Favour with God, and highly deserving our Esteem and Reverence, as well as Imitation; whereas the Heathen Deified Men, were vile and wicked Men, and deserved not the common Esteem of Mankind, according to the Accounts themselves give of them. And we own the common Doctrine and Advantages of Christianity to be preserved in the Church of Rome.

3. We do not deny, that they do allow some external Acts of Worship to be so proper to God alone, that they ought to be given to none else besides him. And this they call Latria; and we shall never dispute with them about the proper signification of a Word, when the Sense is agreed, unless they draw Inferences from it, which ought not to be allowed. To this Latria, they refer not only Sacrifice, but all.
all that relates to it, as Temples, Altars, and Priests: so that by their own Confession, to make these immediately and properly to the Honour of any Saint, is to make a God of that Saint, and to commit Idolatry.

4. They confess, that to pray to Saints to beflow Spiritual or Temporal Gifts upon us, were to give to them the Worship proper to God, who is the only giver of all good Things. For else I do not understand, why they should take so much pains to let us know, that whatever the Forms of their Prayers and Hymns are, yet the Intention and Spirit of the Church, is only to desire them to pray for us, and to obtain things for us by their Intercession with God.

But two things cannot be denied by them.

1. That they do use solemn Invocation of Saints in Places of Divine Worship, at the same time they make their Address to God himself, with all the Circumstances of External Adoration, with bended Knees, and Eyes lifted up to Heaven; and that this Practice is according to the Council of Trent, which not only decrees an humble Invocation of them, but declares it to be impiety to condemn mental and vocal Supplication to the Saints in Heaven.

2. That they do own making the Saints in Heaven to be their Mediators of Intercession, but not of Redemption; although Christ be our Mediator in both senses.

And upon these two Points this Controversy depends.

Let us now see what our Representor faith to them.

1. His Church teaches him indeed, and he believes that it is good and profitable, to desire the Intercession of the Saints reigning with Christ in Heaven; but that they are either Gods, or his Redeemers, he is nowhere taught, but detests all such Doctrine.

There are two ways of desiring the Intercession of others for us.

1. By way of Friendly Request, as an Act of mutual Charity; and so, no doubt, we may desire others here on Earth to pray for us.
2. By way of Humble Supplication, with all the external Acts of Adoration: and we cannot think S. Peter, or S. Paul, who refused any thing like Adoration from Men, would have been pleased to have seen Men fall down upon their Knees before them; and in the same posture of Devotion in which they were praying to Almighty God, to put their Names into the middle of their Litanies, and to pray them then to pray for them.

But how are we sure that their Church teaches no more than this? I have read over and over the Council of Trent, and the Roman Catechism about it, and I can find no such limitation of their sense there, where, if any where, it ought to be found. The Council of Trent mentions both the Prayers, and the Help and Assistance of the Saints which they are to fly to. If this Help and Assistance be no more than their Prayers, why is it mentioned as distinct? Why is their reigning together with Christ in Heaven spoken of, but to let us understand they have a Power to Help and Assist? For what is their Reigning to their Praying for us? But I have a further Argument to prove the Council meant more, viz. the Council knew the common Practices and Forms of Invocation then used and allowed, and the general Opinion, that the Saints had power to Help and Assist those who prayed to them. If the Council did not approve this, why did it insert the very words upon which that Practice was grounded? They likewise very well knew the Complaints which had been made of these things; and some of their own Communion cried shame upon some of their Hymns. Wicelius faith, one of them, Salve Regina, &c. is full of downright Impiety, and horrible Superstition, and that others are wholly inexcusable. Lud. Vives had said, He found little difference in the Peoples Opinion of their Saints in many things, from what the Heathens had of their Gods. These things were known; and it was in their Power to have redressed them, by declaring what the Sense of the Council was, and that whatever Forms were used, no more was to be understood by them, but praying to them to pray for them. Besides, the Council of Trent, in the very same Session, took care about reforming the Missal and Breviary; why was no care taken to reform
reform these Prayers and Hymns, which they say are not to be construed by the Sense of the Words, but by the Sense of the Church? There was time enough taken for doing it; for the Reformed Missal was not published till six Years after the Council, nor the Breviary till four. In all that time, the Prayers and Hymns might easily have been altered to the Sense of the Church, if that were truly so. But instead of that, a very late French Writer cries out of the necessity of Reforming the Breviaries as to these things; wherein he confesles, Many Hymns are still remaining, wherein those things are asked of Saints, which ought to be asked of God alone; as being delivered from the Chains of our Sins, being preferred from spiritual Maladies, and Hell Fire; being inflamed with Charity, and made fit for Heaven. In good Con-science, faith he, is not this joining the Saints with God himself, to ask those things of them which God alone can give? And whatever Men talk of the Sense of the Church, he confesles, the very Forms, and natural Sense of the Words, do raise another Idea in Mens Minds; which ought to be prevented.

But doth not the Roman Catechism explain this to be the Sense of the Church? I have examined that too, with all the care I could, about this Matter. And I cannot find any necessity from thence of putting this Sense upon them. I grant in one place, where it explains the difference of the Invocation of God and Saints, it faith, We are to pray to God as the Giver, and to Saints that they would obtain things of God for us; and then it adds, the Forms differ, that to God is, Miferere Nobis, and Audi Nos; that to Saints is, Ora pro Nobis. Very well! And is there then no other Form owned or allowed in the Church of Rome to Saints besides this? Hold a little, faith the Catechism, for it is lawful to make use of another Form; and that is, we may pray to Saints too, Ut nosiri misere-cantur. And how doth this now differ from that to God, but only in Number? But it adds, that the Saints are very pi-tiful; then surely we are encouraged to pray to them for help and pity. Yes, faith the Catechism, we may pray to them, that being moved with pity toward us, they would help us with their Favour and Intercession with God. But yet this doth not clear the Matter; for elsewhere the Roman Catechism at-
attributes more to Saints than mere Intercession; and we may pray to them for what is in their Power: For where it undertakes to give an exact Account of the Reason of Invocation of Saints and Angels; it there parallels them with Magistrates under a King; and faith, they are God's Ministers in governing the Church; Invocandi itaque sunt quod & perpetuo Denunientur, & Patrocinium Salutis nostra libentissime sustinunt. What is this Patrocinium Salutis nostra? Is it only Praying and Intercession with God? That cannot be, for it instances presently in deliverances by Angels, and Jacob's praying to the Angel to bless him, and not merely to intercede for him. But though this is spoken of Angels, yet from hence it infers the Invocation of Saints too. But what need we insist more on this, since they do own the Ministry of Saints as well as Angels, with respect to the Church; and do Cano-
nize Saints for particular Countries, as lately S. Rosa for Fenn. And where there is such a particular Protection supposed, what incongruity is it to interpret the Form of their Prayers, according to a Doctrine so received and allowed? But of this more under the next Head.

2. He confesses that we are all redeemed by the Blood of Christ alone, and that he is our only Mediator of Redemption; but as for Mediators of Intercession, he doth not doubt but it is acceptable with God we should have many.

I would ask, concerning this Distinction, the Question which Christ asked concerning John's Baptism, Is it from Heaven, or of Man? No doubt there may be such a Distinction of Mediators, if God please to make them. But who hath Authority to appoint Mediators with him besides himself? Is it not usurping his Prerogative, to appoint the great Officers of his Kingdom for him? Would any Prince upon Earth allow this, viz. when he hath absolutely declared his Pleasure, that his own Son should present Petitions to him, that others shall take upon them to set up Masters of Requests themselves? Can any thing be plainer in the New Testament, than that God hath appointed the Mediator of Redemption, to be our Mediator of Intercession? And that his Intercession is founded upon his Redemption. As the High
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Priest's going into the Holy of Holies to intercede for the People, was upon the Blood of the Sacrifice of Expiation, which he carried in with him. If there were no Revelation in this Matter, there might be some reason for it. But since the Revelation is so clear in it, this distinction looks just like the Socinians Distinction of a God by Nature, and a God by Office; which was framed on purpose to avoid the plain Texts of Scripture which called Christ God. So doth this look as if it were intended to avoid that clear Text, which faith, There is one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus. Which is presently answered with this Distinction; although there be not the least ground in that or any other Text for it.

Yes, faith our Author, Moses was such a Mediator for the Israelites; Job for his three Friends; Stephen for his Persecutors: The Romans were desired by S. Paul to be his Mediator, and the Corinthians and Ephesians; so almost every sick Person desires the Congregation to be his Mediator, that is, to be remembered in their Prayers. P. 4. 5.

But is there no difference between Men praying for one another, and desiring others to pray for them here on Earth, and an humble Invocation of the Saints in Heaven to be our Mediators of Intercession with God there?

There is a threefold disparity in the Case.

1. Here upon Earth we converse with one another as Fellow Creatures, and there is no danger of our having an Opinion thereby, that we are able to assist one another any other way than by our Prayers. But the Case is very different as to the Saints in Heaven, who by being addressed there by such solemn Invocation, may too easily be conceived to have the Power of bestowing such Blessings upon those who call upon them.

2. Heaven is looked on by all Mankind, who direct their Devotions thither, as the particular Throne of God, where he dwells, and discovers himself after another manner than he doth upon the Earth. And we are directed to pray to our Father in Heaven; where he is represented as infinitely above all his Creatures: and the great Concernment of Religion
gion is, to keep up the apprehension of this distance between him and them. Now it is hardly possible to keep it up, if in the Publick Offices of Religion, in the solemnest postures of Devotion, with Eyes lifted up to Heaven, they do make Addresses, both to God and to his Creatures.

3. Men are sure, when they pray to others on Earth to pray for them, that they do no more than they can justify in point of Discretion, when they speak or write to those that can understand what their desire is: But no Man on Earth can be certain that the Saints in Heaven can do it: For it is agreed they cannot do it without Revelation; and no Man can be assurred there is a Revelation; and it is not reasonable to expect it: for they pray to Saints to pray to God for them; and they cannot tell what they pray for, unless God to whom they are to pray, reveal to them what it is they must pray to him for. Is it not then the better, the safer, the wiser way, to make our Prayers to him, who we are sure is able to hear and help us; and hath promised to grant what we ask in his Son's Name? But there is no other Name, either under Heaven, or in Heaven, whereby we can be saved, or our Prayers accepted, but his alone.

But our Author faith, It is no part of his Faith, how the Saints in Heaven know the Prayers and Necessities of such who address themselves to them. P. 5.

But how comes it to be any part of his Faith, that they know them? However he doth not doubt but God can never want means of letting the Saints know them. P. 6. And is this a sufficient Ground for solemn Invocation of Saints? God doth not want Means to let the Emperor of Japan know a Request any one here hath to make to him; but is this a reasonable Ground, for him at this distance to make it to him? God doth not want Means to let the Pope know what a mighty Service it would be to the Christian World, to make a wise and truly Christian-Reformation in the Church; but would this be a ground sufficient for me at this Distance, to make a Speech to him about it? I knew a Man who understood not a word of Latin, but yet would needs go to hear a Latin Sermon: some asked him afterwards, what he meant by it? and the chief Reason he gave was much like this,
this, God did not want Means to let him know what the Preacher mean.

But after all, Suppose God should make known to the Saints what is desired of them; I ask, Whether this be sufficient Ground for solemn Invocation? When Socinus was not able to defend the Invocation of Christ himself, supposing that he could know our Hearts only by Revelation: And he had nothing material to say, but only that there was a Command for it; which can never be so much as pretended in this Case.

As to what he alleadges of the Elders falling down before the Lamb, having Vials full of Odours, which are the Prayers of the Saints, Apoc. 5. 8. It must be strained hard to be brought to this purpose, when both Ancient and Modern Interpreters take it for a Representation of what was done upon Earth, and not in Heaven. And if it were in Heaven, Prophetical Visions were never intended for a Measure of our Duties. *If the Angels do pray for Mankind, Zech. 1. 12.* Doth it therefore follow we must pray to them? But we say as the Angel did to S. John, Revel. 19. 10. in a like Case; *See thou do it not: worship God.*

III. Of Addressing more Supplications to the Virgin Mary, than to Christ.

Here is no need of further stating the Question; this only relating to the extraordinary Service of the blessed Virgin. And therefore we are presently to attend his Motions.

He believes it damnable to think the Virgin Mary more powerful in Heaven than Christ, or that she can in anything command him. P. 6.

But in good earnest, Is it not damnable, unless a Man thinks the Blessed Virgin more powerful than Christ? Suppose one should think her to have an equal share of Power with Christ; Is this damnable, or not? Is it not setting up a Creature equal with God?

But
But what thinks he then of those who have attributed an universal Dominion to her, over Angels, Men, and Devils? What thinks he not only of Psalms, but of a Creed, Litany, and all the Hymns of Scripture being applied to her? All which was done by a Canonized Saint in their Church; and the Books printed out of the Vatican Manuscripts, and dedicated to the Pope. And there we find something more than an Ora pro nobis in the Litany; for there is Parce nobis, Domina; Spare us, good Lady: and, Ab omni malo, libera nos, Domina; From all Evil, Good Lady, deliver us.

What thinks he of another Canonized Saint, who said, these two Propositions are both true, All things are subject to God's Command, even the Virgin; and all things are subject to the Command of the Virgin, even God. Was this damnable in a Canonized Saint?

What thinks he of the noted Hymn?

O felix Puerpera nostra piae scelera
Jure Matris impera Redemptori!

Was not this damnable? And I have not only seen it in the old Paris Missal, but Balinghem a Jesuit, faith, it was in the Balinghem. Missals of Tournay, Liege, Amiens, Artois, and the old Roman. Parnass. Marian. I could produce many other Passages cited by him out of the old Offices to the same purpose; but I forbear.

But I cannot omit the Approbation given to the blasphemous saying of S. Bernardin by Mendoza, (who endeavours to prove the blessed Virgin's Kingdom, not to be a Metaphorical, but a true and real Kingdom). And by Salazar, another noted Jesuit, who faith, Her Kingdom is as large as her Son's. And we have lately seen how far this Divinity is spread, for not many Years since, this Proposition was sent from Mexico,

Filius non tantum tenetur audire Matrem, sed & obedire;

The Son is bound not only to hear, but to obey his Mother. And is it still damnable for to say, he commands him? But
But our Author faith, What-ever esteem they have for her, They own her still as a Creature. Is he sure of that? What thinks he of another Saying, which Mendoza approves of, viz. of Christ's saying to his Mother, As thou hast communicated Humanity to me, I will communicate my Deity to thee.

But it may be said, We are by no means to judg the sense of a Church by some Mens extravagant sayings.

I grant it. But I have something considerable to reply; viz. That we may easily judg which way the Guides of that Church incline, by this following passage: About ten Years since a Gentleman of that Communion published a Book, called, Wholsome Advice to the Worshippers of the blessed Virgin; and the whole design of it, being printed in Latin and French, was to bring the People of that Church to a bare Ora pro nobis to the blessed Virgin. But this was so far from being approved, that the Book was condemned at Rome, and vehemently opposed by the Jesuits in France; and a whole Volume published against it.

Here I have reason to enquire, Whether the Virgin Mary then, according to the sense of the Church of Rome, be only a Mediatrix of Intercession or not, since so large Power and Dominion is attributed to her? And why should not her Suppliants go beyond an Ora pro nobis, if this Doctrine be received; as it must be, if the contrary cannot be endured? For that Author allowed her Intercession, and Prayer to her on that account; but he found fault with those who said, she had a Kingdom divided with her Son; that she was the Mother of Mercy, or was a Co-Saviour, or Co-Redemptrix; or that she was to be worshipped with Latria; or that Men were to be Slaves to her. Now, if these things must not be touched without Censure, and no Censure passe on the other Books; is it not easy to judge, which is more agreeable to the Spirit of the Guides of that Church?

But we have a fresh Instance of this kind at home, in a Book very lately published; Permissu Superiorum. There we are told in the Epistle, That not only the blessed Virgin is the Empress of Seraphims—the most exact Original of Practical Perfection which the Omnipotency of God ever drew; but that
that by innumerable Titles she claims the utmost Duty of every Christian, as a proper Homage to her Greatness. What can Pag. 4.
be said more of the Son of God in our Nature? In the Book it self she is said to be Queen of Angels, Patroness of
the Church, Advocate of Sinners; that the Power of Mary in
the Kingdom of Jesus, is suitable to her Maternity, and other
Privileges of Grace; and therefore by it she justly claims a Ser-
vitude from all pious Creatures: But wherein doth this special
Devotion to her consist? He names several Particulars.

1. In having an inward, cordial and passionate value of the
Maternity of Mary, and all other Excellencies proper to, and
inseparable from the Mother of God:

2. In External Acts of Worship, of eminent Servitude to-
wards her, by reason of the Amplitude of her Power in the Em-
pire of Jesus. And can we imagine these should go no far-
ther, than a poor Ora pro nobis? He instances in these Ex-
ternal Acts of her Worship. (1.) Frequent visiting holy
Places dedicated to her Honour. And are not those her Tem-

cles then? which Bellarmine confesses to be a peculiar part
of the Worship due to God. And the Distinction of Baf-

cile cannot hold here: because he believes the Assumption
of the Blessed Virgin; and he will not pretend to her Ho-
nour is only for Distinction. (2.) A special Reverence

towards Images representing her Person. (3.) Performing some
daily Devotions containing her Praises, congratulating her Ex-
cellency, or imploring her Mediation; and by oft calling upon
the Sacred Name of holy Mary, &c.

(3.) In having a firm and unshaken Confidence in her Patro-
nage amidst the greatest of our inward Conflicts, and outward
Tribulations; through a strong Judgment of her eminent Power
within the Empire of Jesus, grounded upon the singular Preroga-
tive of her Divine Maternity. I have not Patience to tran-
scribe more, but refer the Reader to the Book it self; only
the eighth Particular of special Devotion is so remarkable,
that it ought not to be passed over, viz. Entring a solemn Pag. 12.
Covenant with Holy Mary, to be for ever her Servant, Client
and Devote under some special Rule, Society or Form of Life,
and thereby dedicating our Persons, Concerns, Actions, and all
the Moments and Events of our Life to Jesus, under the Protec-
tion
lection of his Divine Mother, choosing her to be our Adoptive Mother, Patroness and Advocate; and intrusting her with what we are, have, do or hope, in Life, Death, and through all Eternity. And is all this no more than an Ora pro nobis? And it follows, Put your self wholly under her Protection. What a pitiful thing was the old Collyridian Cake, in comparison of these special Acts of Devotion to her! But there are some extraordinary strains of Devotion afterwards, which it is pity to pass over. As, I will ever observe thee as my Soveraign Lady, Adoptive Mother, and most powerful Patroness; relying on thy Bowels of Mercy, in all my Wants, Petitions, and Tribulations of Body and Mind. Could any thing greater be said to the Eternal Son of God? And in the Praise:

Vers. Open my Lips, O Mother of Jesus.
Resp. And my Soul shall speak forth thy Praise.
Vers. Divine Lady, be intent to my Aid.
Resp. Graciously make haste to help me.
Vers. Glory be to Jesus and Mary.
Resp. As it was, is, and ever shall be.

Then follows the Eighth Psalm, applied thus to her.

Mary, Mother of Jesus, how wonderful is thy Name, even unto the Ends of the Earth!

All Magnificence be given to Mary, and let her be exalted above the Stars and Angels.

Reign on high as Queen of Seraphims and Saints; and be thou crowned with Honour, and Glory, &c.

Glory be to Jesus and Mary, &c.

In the next Page, follows a Cantique in imitation of the Te Deum.

Let us praise thee, O Mother of Jesus? Let us acknowledg thee our Soveraign Lady.

Let Men and Angels give Honour to thee, the first conceived of all pure Creatures, &c.
I think I need mention no more; only three things I shall observe, (1.) That this is now printed Permissu Superiorum; and we thank them for the seasonableness of it, in helping us in true Representing, what their allowed Doctrines and Practices are. (2.) That this is published in English, that our People, as well as theirs, may be convinced how far we have been from unjust charging them as to such things as these. (3.) That at the same time they plead for keeping the Bible out of the hands of the People; wherein their Discretion is so far to be commended, since the Scripture, and this new Scheme of Devotion, can never stand together. There being not one word in the Bible towards it, but very much against it; and the Psalms and Hymns must be burlesqued to found that way.

But what faith our Author to their Rosaries, wherein there are ten Ave Marias to one Pater nostre; which is accounted a special piece of Devotion; and great things are said of the Effects of it by Alanus de Rupe, and many others?

1. As to the Ave Marias, he faith, there is no more Dishonour to God in reciting the Angelical Salutation, than in the Pag. 7. first pronouncing it by the Angel Gabriel and Elizabeth. But it may not be altogether so pertinent. But doth he really think they said the whole Ave Maria, as it is used among them? Did the Angel and Elizabeth say, Suntia Maria, Mater Dei, ora pro nobis peccatoribus, nunc & in hora mortis nostre? If not, to what purpose are they mentioned here?

2. As to the Repetition; that, he faith, is no more an idle Superstition, than David’s repeating the same words 26 times in the 136 Psalm. But what is this to the Question, why more Supplications to the blessed Virgin, than to Christ? And not one word of Answer is given to it. But Alanus de Rupe answers it roundly, because the blessed Virgin is our Mediator, the Mother of Mercy, and the special Patroness of Sinners. This is indeed true representing.
IV. Of paying Divine Worship to Reliques.

For the right understanding this controversy, we are to consider,

1. That there is a due Veneration to the Bodies of Saints and Martyrs, allowed on both sides; and there is an undue Worship of them, which is disowned on both sides. The due Veneration is, a Religious Decency to be observed towards them; which lies in avoiding any thing like Contempt or Dishonour to them, and using all such Testimonies of Respect and Decency, which becomes the Remains of Excellent Persons; provided we are satisfied of their sincerity, without having recourse to Divine Omnipotency to prove them: which Ferrandus the Jesuit runs so much to, to prove the Truth of many Reliques, worshipped in the Church of Rome in many places at once. But that it is possible to exceed in the Worship of true Reliques, even Bellarmin confesseth, who says, that God took away the Body of Moses, lest the People should give Divine Worship to it. And St. Jerom, as hot as he was against Vigilantius, yet he utterly denied giving any Adoration to the Reliques of Martyrs. It seems then it is very possible to exceed that way.

2. The Question then is, Whether those Acts of Worship which are allowed in the Church of Rome, do not go beyond due Veneration? For it is unreasonable to suppose those who give it, to believe those Reliques to be Gods; and therefore it must be such a Worship as is given to them, supposing them to be only Reliques of such Persons. The Council of Trent decrees Honour and Veneration to be given to them, but never determines what is due, and what not: it forbids all Excesses in drinking and eating, in the visiting of Reliques; but not a word of Excesses in worshipping of them, unless it be comprehended under the name of Superstition. But Superstition lies in something forbidden, according to their notion of it: therefore, if there be no Prohibition
bition by the Church, there can be no Superstition in the Worship of them. And if they had thought there had been any in the known Practices of the Church, they would certainly have mentioned them; and because they did not, we ought in Reason to look on them as allowed. And yet not only Cassander complains of the great Superstition about them; but even the Wallenbergii lately confess, that the Abuses therein, have not only been offensive to us, but to themselves too.

But what faith our Representers to them?

He believes it damnable to think there's any Divinity in the Reliques of Saints, or to adore them with Divine Honour. P. 7. But what is this adoring them with Divine Honour? A true Representers ought to have told us what he meant by it, when the whole Controversy depends upon it. Is it only paying Masses to Reliques, or believing them to be Gods? Is there no giving Divine Honour by Prostration, burning of Incense, & c. Nothing in expecting help from them? Yes, If it be from any hidden Power of their own. But here is a very hard Question: If a Man doth not believe it to be an intrinsick Power in the Reliques, may a Man safely go to them, Opis impetranda causa, as the Council of Trent faith, in hopes of Relief from them? Is it not possible for the Devil to appear with Samuel's true Body, and make use of the Relique of a Saint to a very bad end? Then, say I, no Reliques can secure Men against the Imposture of Evil Spirits, who, by God's Perimission, may do strange things with the very Reliques of Saints.

But God hath visibly worked by them, faith our Author, by making them Instruments of many Miracles; and it is as easie for him to do it now. P. 8, 9. This is the force of all he faith. To which I answer,

1. It is a very bold thing to call in God's Omnipotency, where God himself hath never declared he will use his Power; for it is under his own Command, and not ours. But there is no Reason to deduce the Consequence of using it now, because he hath done it formerly. And that they may not think this is cavilling in us, I desire them to read Rabat. Joy de Pere Annas Answer to the Jansenists pretended Miracle at Jansenfils, A.D. 1655.
Tort Royal, viz. of the Cure wrought by one of our Saviour's Thorns. There he gives another account of such Miracles than would be taken from us. But where he saith, *It is as much for the Honour of God's Name to work such Miracles now;* their own Authors will tell him the contrary; and that there is no such Reason now, as in former times, when Religion was to be confirmed by them; and when Martyrs suffered upon the sole account of the Truth of it; and therefore their Reputation had a great Influence upon converting the unbelieving World.

2. Suppose it be granted, yet it proves not any Religious Worship to be given to them. For I shall seriously ask an important Question: Whether they do really believe, any greater Miracles have ever been done by Reliques, than were done by the Brazen Serpent? And yet, although that was set up by God's own Appointment, when it began to be worshipped after an undue manner; it was thought fit by Hezekiah to be broken in pieces. What now was the undue Worship they gave to it? Did they believe the Serpent, which could neither move nor understand, was it self a God? *But they did burn Incense to it.* And did that make a God of it? Suppose Men burn Incense to Reliques; what then, are they made Gods presently? Suppose they do not, but place them upon Altars, carry them in Procession, fall down before them, with intention to shew the Honour they do them; are not these as much as burning a little Incense, which could not signify so much Honour as the other do? and it is hard then to make the one unlawful, and not the other.

V. Of the Eucharist.

There are two material Points under this Head which are to be examined, because he endeavours to set them off with all the advantage he can, viz. Adoration of the Host, and Transubstantiation.

I. Of
I. Of the Adoration of the Host.

1. The Question is far enough from being, Whether it be lawful to commit Idolatry? as our Representer puts it. For the Misrepresenter faith, That a Papist believes it lawful to commit Idolatry: and to clear this, our Author gravely faith, He believes it unlawful to commit Idolatry, pag. 9. As though any Men ever owned it to be lawful: Which is, as if the Question were, Whether such a Man committed Adultery, and he should think to clear himself by saying, he believed it unlawful to commit Adultery.

2. The Question is not, Whether Christ may be lawfully adored by us in the Celebration of the Eucharist; which we are so far from denying, that our Church requires our receiving it in the posture of Adoration.

3. The true Question is, Whether the Body of Christ, being supposed to be present in the Host by Transubstantiation, be a sufficient Ground to give the same Adoration to the Host, which they would do to the Person of Christ?

And that this is the true state of the Question, will appear by these things.

1. The Council of Trent first defined Transubstantiation, and from thence inferred Adoration of the Host; as is most evident to any one that will read the fourth and fifth Decrees of the Thirteenth Session: Nulla itaque dubitandi locus, &c. i.e. If Transubstantiation be true, then Adoration follows. It’s true, the sixth Canon only speaks of Christ being there worshipped; but that ought to be compared with the first, second, and fourth Canons, where the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is fully set down, as the Foundation of that Adoration.

2. The Adoration is not fixed on the Person of Christ, as separate from the Host, but as making one Object of Worship together with it. And so the Council of Trent declares in the sixth Decree; when it faith, The Sacrament is never the less to be adored, because it was instituted to be received. This cannot be otherwise understood, than as relating to the Sacrament: and so that what ever it be, must be granted to
be the Object of Adoration. 'By the Sacrament, faith Cardinal Pallavicini, is understood the Object made up of the Body of Christ, and the Accidents. The Worship then being confessed to be Adoration, which is due to God alone, and that Adoration directed to the Sacrament as its proper Object; the Question now is, Whether such a Supposition in the Sacrament, doth justify that Adoration?

Our Author saith, He accounteth it most damnable to worship or adore any breaden God, or to give Divine Honour to any Elements of Bread and Wine. p. 9.

Then, I say, by his own confession, if it be only Bread, he commits Idolatry; for the Adoration he cannot deny. But our Representer loves ambiguous Expressions, which to the People found very well, but have no sincere meaning: for what is it he understands by his breaden God? If it be that he worships a God which himself supposes to be nothing but Bread, we do not charge him with it; but if it be what we beleive it to be, the Substance of Bread, but himself believes to be turned into the Body of Christ, then he cannot deny his Adoration to be given to it.

All that can excuse them is, the Supposition; and whether that will or not, is now to be consider'd.

1. If it be not true, themselves grant it to be Idolatry.

The Testimonies of Bishop Fisher, and Costerus, are so well known to this purpose, that I shall not repeat them. And Catharinus, a Divine of Note in the Council of Trent, confesses it is Idolatry to worship an unconfecrated Host, although the Person, through a Mistake, believes it Consecrated. And he quotes St. Thomas and Paludanus for his Opinion; and gives this Reason for it; because Christ is not worshipped simply in the Sacrament, but as he is under the Species; and therefore if he be not so present, a Creature hath Divine Worship given it. As those were guilty of Idolatry, who worshipped any Creatures of old, supposing God to be there, as that he was the Soul of the World. They were not excused, faith he, that they thought they worshipped but one God; because they worshipped him as present in such a manner, as he was not. And this Book of his, he faith, in the Review of it, was seen and approved by the Pope's Order, by their Divines at Paris.

2. If
2. If the Bread were taken to be God, our Author doth not deny it would be Idolatry, for that were to worship a breaden God. Yet here would be a Mistake, and a gross one; yet this Mistake would not excuse the Persons committing it from most damnable Idolatry, as he confesses: Why then should the other Mistake excuse them, when they suppose the Substance of the Bread not to be there, but the Body of Christ to be under the Species? Yes, say they, then no Creature is supposed to be the Object of Worship. But when the Bread is supposed to be God, it must be supposed not to be a Creature. There is no Answer to be given in this Case, but that the Bread really is a Creature, whatsoever they imagined; and if this Mistake did not excuse, neither can the other.

II. Of Transubstantiation.

Three Things our Author goes upon, with respect to this.

1. He supposes Christ's words to be clear for it.
2. He shews the possibility of it, from God's Omnipotency.
3. He argues against the Testimony or Evidence of Sense or Reason in this Case, from some parallel Instances, as he thinks.

1. He believes Jesus Christ made his Words good, pronounced at his last Supper, really giving his Body and Blood to his Apostles; the Substance of Bread and Wine being, by his powerful Words, changed into his own Body and Blood; the Species only, or Accidents of the Bread and Wine, remaining as before. The same he believes of the Eucharist consecrated now by Priests.

This is a very easy way, of taking it for granted that the words are clear for Transubstantiation. And from no better Ground, to fly to God's Omnipotency to make it good, is as if one should suppose Christ really to be turned into a Rock, a Vine, a Door; because the words are every jot as clear, and then call in God's Omnipotency, which is as effectual to make them good. I confess, these words are so far from being clear to me for Transubstantiation, that if I had
had never heard of it, I should never have thought of it, from these or any other words of Scripture, i.e. not barely considering the sound of words, but the Eastern Idioms of speaking; the Circumstances of our Saviour's real Body at that time when he spake them; the uncouth way of feeding on Christ's real Body, without any Objection made against it by his Disciples; the Key our Saviour elsewhere gives for understanding the manner of eating his Flesh; and withal, if these words be literally and strictly understood, they must make the Substance of Bread to be Christ's Body; for that is unavoidably the literal sense of the words. For can any Men take This to be any thing but this Bread, who attend to the common sense and meaning of Words, and the strict Rules of Interpretation? Yet this sense will by no means be allow'd; for then all that can be inferred from these words is, that when Christ spake these words, The Bread was his Body. But either Christ meant the Bread by This, or he did not; if he did, the former Proposition is unavoidable in the literal Sense; if he did not, then by virtue of these words, the Bread could never be turned into the Body of Christ. For that only could be made the Body of Christ which was meant, when Christ said, This is my Body. This seems to me to be as plain and convincing as any Demonstration in Euclid. Which hath often made me wonder at those who talk so confidently of the plain Letter of Scripture, being for this Doctrine of Transubstantiation. But several Divines of the Church of Rome, understood themselves better, and have confessed, That this Doctrine could not be drawn out of the literal sense of these words; as it were easy to shew, if it had not been lately done already. It is enough here to observe, that Vasquez confesseth it of Scotus, Durandus, Pelusianus, Ockam, Cameracensis; and himself yields that they do not, and cannot signify expressly the Change of the Bread and Wine into the Body of Christ. For how can, This is my Body, literally signify, this is changed into my Body? If that Proposition were literally true, This is my Body, it overthrows the change; For how can a thing be changed into that which it is already?

2. He believes Christ being equal to his Father in Truth and Omnipotency, can make his Words good. We do not in the least dispute
dispute Christ's Omnipotency, but we may their familiar way of making use of it to help them out, when Sense and Reason fail them. And therefore Cajetan well said; 'We ought not to dispute about God's Absolute Power in the Doctrine of the Sacraments, being things of such constant use; and that it is a foolish thing to attribute to the Sacrament all that God can do.

But we must consider what he faith against Sense and Reason. For the believing this Mystery, he does not at all think it meet for any Christian to appeal from Christ's Words, to his own Senses or Reason, for the examining the Truth of what he hath said, but rather to submit his Senses and Reason to Christ's Words in the obsequiousness of Faith. What! whether we know this to be the meaning of Christ's Words, or not? And thus we shall be bound to submit to every absurd Interpretation of Scripture, because we must not use our Senses or Reason for examining the Truth of what is said there. Can any thing be plainer said in Scripture, than that God hath Eyes, and Ears, and Hands? Must now every Man yield to this in the obsequiousness of Faith, without examining it by Principles of Common Reason? And we think we are therefore bound to put another Sense upon those Expressions, because they imply a Repugnancy to the Divine Perfections. Why not then where something is implied which is repugnant to the Nature of Christ's Body, as well as to our Senses? But the Question about judging in this Matter by our Senses, is not, as our Author is willing to suppose, viz. Whether our Senses are to be believed, against a clear and express Divine Revelation; but whether the Judgment of our Senses and Reason is not to be made use of for finding out the true Sense of this Revelation? And we think there is great reason for it.

(1.) Because we have no more certain way of judging the Substance of a Body, than by our Senses. We do not say our Senses go beyond the Accidents; but we say, our Senses, by those Accidents, do assure us of the bodily Substance, or else it were impossible for us to know there is any such thing in the World.

(2.) Because Christ did himself appeal to the Judgment of his Disciples Senses concerning the Truth of his own Body
S. Luk. 24.39. Body after the Resurrection; Behold my Hands and my Feet, that it is my self: handle and see, for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones, as ye see me have. Now we think we have reason to allow the same Criterion which Christ himself did about the very same Body. Unless he had then told his Disciples, that there was to be another supernatural manner of Existence of the same Body, concerning which their Senses were not to be Judges.

(3.) Some of the most important Articles of the Christian Faith do suppose the Judgment of our Senses to be true. As about the Truth of Christ's Body; whether he had really a Body, or only the outward Accidents and Appearance of a Body? if he had not, he did not really suffer upon the Cross, and so the Sacrifice of Propitiation there offered up to the Father for the Sins of Mankind, is lost. There was a great Controversy in St. John's time, and afterwards, Whether Christ had any real Body? Those who denied it, brought Revelation for it; those who asserted it, proved it by their Senses, as S. John himself, That which we have seen, and heard, and our hands have handled, &c. He doth not tell Men, they must submit their Sense and Reason to the pretence of Revelation; but they ought to adhere to the Judgment of their Senses concerning the Reality of Christ's Body. Since therefore Christ himself appealed to it, the Apostles made use of it, without any Caution or Limitation, we have great reason to rely still on the Judgment of our Senses concerning the same Object, viz. the Body of Christ.

3. But we must now consider his Instances to overthrow the Judgment of our Senses and Reason in this Point.

1. He believes Christ to be God, though to Senses he seemed nothing but Man. Do we ever pretend to judge of Christ's Divinity by our Senses? How then can this be pertinent, when our only Dispute is about judging his Body, and the Substance of Bread and Wine by them? And yet the Senses were of great use as to the proof of his Divinity by the Miracles which he wrought? which if they had been like the pretended Miracles in Transubstantiation, could have convinced no Man, because they could never see them.

2. He believes the Holy Ghost descended on our Saviour, the Senses or Reason could discover it to be nothing but a Dove. If there
there were no reason to judge otherwise, the Judgment of
Sense were to be followed: but since the Scripture declares
it was the Holy Ghost descending as a Dove, we have no
reason to question that Revelation. For we do not pretend
that our Senses are so far Judges of Divine Appearances, as
to exclude the possibility of God’s assuming the shape and
figure of his Creature when he pleases, by moulding the sub-
stance of a real Body into such a Representation. Thus we
do not deny the possibility of an appearance of the Holy
Ghost under Bread and Wine, if God thought fit, any more
than under a Dove; and in this Case we do not pretend
that our Senses can exclude the presence of a Spirit under
the Elements; but that is very different from the present
Case, for here the Substance is supposed to be gone, and
nothing but Accidents remaining; and no spiritual Presence
of Christ is denied, but that of his Body, the very same Bo-
dy which suffered on the Cross.

3. He believes the Man who appeared to Joshua, (ch. 5. 13.)
and the three Men to Abraham, (Gen. 18,) were really and sub-
stantially no Men, notwithstanding all the Information and Evi-
dence of Sense to the contrary, from their Colour, Features, Pro-
portion, Talking, Eating, and many others. And what follows
from hence, but that Spiritual Invisible Substances may be
under the appearance of Bodies, and that our Senses cannot
be Judges of them? Which is not our Question, but, Whe-
ther Bodies can be so present after the manner of Spirits, as
to lose all the natural Properties of Bodies? and whether a
Material Substance can be left, under all the Accidents pro-
per to it, so as our Senses cannot be proper Judges of one
by the other?

But our Author seems to grant this, in a natural way of
the Existence of a Body: but he faith, Christ gives to his Bo-
dy a supernatural manner of Existence, by which being left without
extension of Parts, and rendered independent of Place, it may be
one and the same in many Places at once, and whole in every part
of the Symbols, and not obnoxious to any corporeal contingencies.

This is to me a Mystery beyond all comprehension by Sense
or Reason; and there is certainly a great difference between
governing our Understandings, and giving them up, as we
must do if this Doctrine hold good; for it overthrows any

fixed
fixed Principles of Reason in Mankind concerning the Nature and Properties of Bodies.

For, 1. We must still suppose the Body of Christ to be the very same individual Body which suffered upon the Cross; but if it had no extension of Parts, and be reckoned independent upon Place, it ceaseth to be a Body. It is granted, that after a natural way of Existence, a Body cannot be in more Places than one: but let the way of Existence be what it will, if it be a Body, it must be finite; if finite, it must be limited and circumscribed; if it be circumscribed within one place, it cannot be in more places, for that is to make it circumscribed, and not circumscribed; undivided from it self, and divided from it self at the same time. Which is a manifest Contradiction, which doth not depend only on Quantity or Extension, but upon the essential Unity of a Body.

2. If it be possible for a Body to be in several places by a supernatural Existence; why may not the same Body be in several Places by a Natural Existence? Is it not because Extension and Circumscription are so necessary to it, that in a natural Way it can be but in one Place? Then it follows that these are essential Properties of Bodies; so that no true Body can be conceived without them.

3. This Supernatural Existence doth not hinder the Body's being individually present in one Place: My meaning is this; A Priest Consecrates an Host at London, and another at York: is the Body of Christ at London, so present there by virtue of Consecration, as to be present at York too, by this Supernatural Existence? What then doth the Consecration at York produce? If it be not, then its Presence is limited to the Host, where the Consecration is made; and if it be so limited, then this Supernatural Existence cannot take off its Relation to Place.

4. The same Body would be liable to the greatest Contradictions imaginable: For the same Body after this supernatural way of Existence, may not only be above and below, within and without, near and far off from itself: but it may be hot and cold, dead and alive; yea, in Heaven and Hell at once.

5. What is it that makes it still a Body after this supernatural way of Existence, &c. if it lose extension and dependence
dency on place? If it be only an aptitude to extension, when that supernatural Existence is taken off, then it must either be without quantity, or with it. If it be without quantity, how can it be a Body? if with quantity, how is it possible to be without Extension?

6. This confounds all the differences of Greater and Less, as well as of Distance and Nearness. For upon this Supposition, a thing really greater may be contained within a less: for the whole Organical Body of Christ, with all its Parts, may be brought within the compass of a Wafer; and the whole be in every part without any distance between Head and Feet.

7. This makes Christ to have but one Body, and yet to have as many Bodies as there are consecrated Hosts. No, faith our Author, This supernatural manner of Existence is without danger of multiplying his Body, or making as many Christs as Altars. P. 11. But how this can be, is past all human Understanding: For every Consecration hath its Effect, which is supposed to be the Conversion of the Substance of the Bread into the Body of Christ. Now, when a Priest at London converts the Bread into the Body of Christ there, he doth it not into the Body of Christ at York, but the Priest there doth it; therefore the Body of Christ at London, is different from that at York; or else the Conversion at London would be into the Body, as at York. But if not, what is the substantial Term of this substantial Change, where nothing but an accidental Mode doth follow? If there be any such Term, whether that must not be a Production of something which was not before; and if it be so, Christ must have as many new Bodies, as there are Consecrations.

8. This makes that which hath no particular Subsistence of its own, to be the Subject of a substantial Change; for this is the condition of Christ’s Body, whatever its manner of Existence be, after the Hypostatical Union to the Divine Nature. For, when Bellarmin, Petavius, and others of their greatest Divines, undertake, against Nestorius, to explain the Hypostatical Union, they tell us it consists in this, that the Human Nature loseth it proper Subsistence, and is assumed into the Subsistence of the Divine Nature. 

Bellarm. de Incarnatione. p. 6. 

From
From whence I infer, That the Body of Christ, having no proper Subsistence of its own, there can be no substantial Change into that which hath no proper Subsistence, but into that which hath; and consequently the Change must be into the Divine Nature principally; from whence it will follow, the Elements losing their Subsistence, upon Consecration the Divinity must be united hypothetically to them, as to the Human Nature; and so there will be as many Hypothetical Unions, as there are Consecrations. And so this Doctrine not only confounds Sense and Reason, but the Mysteries of Christ's Incarnation too: Which I think is sufficient for this Head.

VI. Of Merits and Good Works.

For the true stating this Controversy, we are to observe;

1. That we do not charge those of the Church of Rome, that they believe Christ's Death and Passion to be ineffectual and insignificant, and that they have no dependence on the Merits of his Sufferings, or the Mercy of God for attaining Salvation; but that they are to be saved only by their own Merits and Good Works; as the Misrepresenter faith, Pag. 12.

2. We do not charge them with denying the necessity of Divine Grace in order to Merit; or with asserting that they can merit independently thereupon.

3. We do by no means dispute about the Necessity of Good Works, in order to the Reward of another Life; or assert that Christ's Merits will save Men without working out their own Salvation; but do firmly believe, that God will judge Men according to their Works.

The Question then is, Whether the Goods Works of a just Man, as our Author expresseth it, are truly meritorious of Eternal Life? Which he affirms, but qualifies with saying, That they proceed from Grace, and that through God's Goodness and Promise, they are truly meritorious. But the Council of Trent denounces an Anathema against those who deny the S. II. 6. Can. 32. Good Works of justified Persons, to be truly meritorious of the increase of Grace, and of Eternal Life.
Here then lie the Points in difference, (1.) Whether such Good Works can be said to be truly meritorious? (2.) Whether those who deny it, deserve an Anathema for so doing? As to what relates to God's Acceptance and Allowance, and his Goodness and Promise, we freely own all that he faith about it; and if no more be meant, what need an Anathema about this matter? There must therefore be something beyond this, when Good Works are not only said to be truly meritorious, but we are cursed if we do not say the same.

To make any thing truly meritorious, we must suppose these Conditions requisite.

1. That what we pretend to merit by, be our own free Act.
2. That it be not defective.
3. That there be an Equality between it, and the Reward due to it.
4. That there be an Obligation in point of Justice, to give that Reward to him that doth it.

And from these Considerations, we deny that Good Works, even of justified Persons, can be truly meritorious.

1. It is granted by themselves, That what is truly meritorious, must be a free Act of the Person who doth it. Now the Good Works of justified Persons cannot be said to be their own free Acts, if the Power of doing them depend upon Divine Assistance, and there was an antecedent Obligation upon them to perform them: So that they can do nothing but what they are bound to, as God's Creatures; and their very Power of doing it is from the Grace of God. If Men pretended to merit at another's hands by what God gives, there were some colour for it; but to merit from God himself by what he gives us, seems very incongruous. If I owe a Man an 100 l. and another knowing me unable to pay it, gives me so much to pay the Debt, this is no more than what may be called strict Payment, as to the Creditor; but if the Creditor himself gives me this 100 l. to pay himself with, will any Man call this strict Payment? He may call it so himself, if he pleases, but that only shews his Kindness
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nefs and Favour; but it doth not look very modestly or gratefully, for the Debtor to insist upon it as true legal Payment. Just so it is in Good Works done by the Power of God's Grace, which we could never have done without it; and therefore such cannot be truly meritorious.

2. What is truly meritorious must not be defective; because the Proportion is to be equal between the Act, and the Reward due to it; which being perfect, requires that there be no Defect in the Acts which merit it. But this can never be said of Good Works of justified Persons, that they have no Defects in them. We do not say, they are not Good Works, but they are not exact and perfect: for altho' the Grace of God, as it comes from him, be a perfect Gift; yet as it acts upon Mens Minds, it doth not raise them to such a degree, but that they have Imperfections in their best Actions. And whatever is defective, is faulty; whatever is faulty, must be forgiven; whatever needs forgiveness, cannot be truly meritorious. But not only their Good Works are defective; but if they would merit, they ought to have none but Good Works, whereas the mixture of others renders the good incapable of being meritorious, because there is so much to be pardoned, as takes away all claim of Merit in the good they perform. And themselves do not pretend, that Men can merit the Grace of Remission; but it is very strange that those who cannot deserve to be forgiven, should deserve to have an infinite Reward bestowed upon them.

3. There must be an exact Proportion between the Act and the Recompence: for to merit, is to pay a Price for a thing; and in such Acts of commutative Justice, there must be an Equality of one thing with another. But what Equality can there be between the imperfect Good Works of the best Men, and the most perfect Happiness of another World, especially when that consists in the fruition of the Beatific Vision? For what Proportion can there be between our Acts towards God, and God's Acts towards the Blessed in Heaven? Let the Acts be of what Person soever, or of what Nature soever, or from what Principle soever; as long as they are the Acts of finite imperfect Creatures, it is impossible there should be any Equality, or exact Proportion
portion between them and the Eternal Favour of God, which is the Reward promised.

4. Where Acts are truly meritorious, there follows an Obligation of strict Justice, to pay the Recompence due to them. But what strict Justice can there be between the Creator and his Creatures, to recompence the Service they are bound to perform; when their very Being, Power to act, Assistance in acting, and Recompence for it, are all from his Bounty and Goodness? But our Author would avoid all this, by saying, that though Good Works are truly meritorious; yet it is through the Merits of Christ, and as they proceed from Grace, and through his Goodness and Promise that they are so; i.e. they are truly meritorious, because it appears from all these things they neither are, nor can be meritorious. For,

(1.) How come the Merits of Christ to make Good Works truly meritorious? Are the Merits of Christ imputed to those Good Works? Then those Good Works must be as meritorious as Christ's own Works; which I suppose he will not assert. Or, is it that Christ hath merited the Grace whereby we may merit? But even this will not make our personal Acts truly meritorious; and the nature of Merit relates to the Acts, and not to the Power.

(2.) How comes the Power of Grace to make them truly meritorious; when the Power of Grace doth so much increase the Obligation on our side? If it be said, That the state of Grace puts Men into a Capacity to merit: we might more reasonably infer the contrary, that it puts them out of a Capacity of merit; because the Remission of Sins, and the Favour of God, are things for which we can never make him any Recompence.

(3.) How comes a Divine Promise to make Acts truly meritorious? For God's Promise is an Act of mere Kindness, which is very different from strict Justice: and although by the Promise God binds himself to performance; yet how come those Acts to be more meritorious of Heaven, than the Acts of Repentance are of Remission of Sins? Yet none will now say, that there can be any Acts meritorious of that. Yet certainly there is as clear a promise of Pardon upon Repentance, as there is of Heaven upon Good Works: And
if the Promise in the other case doth not make Repentance meritorious of Pardon; how can it make Good Works truly meritorious of Eternal Life? But notwithstanding, we do not deny God's Fidelity to his Promise may be called Justice; and so God, as a Righteous Judge, may give a Crown of Righteousness to all that follow St. Paul's Example, without making Good Works to be truly meritorious.

VII. Of Confession.

We do not charge the Church of Rome, that in the power of Absolving, they make Gods of Men, P. 14. as our Misrepresenter pretends.

2. We do not deny, That Christ gave to the Bishops and Priests of the Catholick Church, Authority to absolve any truly penitent Sinner from his Sins, (which he therefore needfully proves out of Scripture) and that such Absolution is ratified in Heaven.

3. We are glad to find that our Author declares, That no Man receives benefit by Absolution, without Repentance from the bottom of his Heart, and real Intention of forsaking his Sins; P. 15. by which we hope he means more than Repentance.

But yet there are some things which stick with us, as to the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome in this matter, which he takes no notice of.

1. That secret Confession of Sins to a Priest, is made so necessary to Salvation, that an Anathema is denounced against all that deny it, when they cannot deny that God doth forgive Sins upon true Contrition. For the Council of Trent doth say, That Contrition, with Charity, doth reconcile a Man to God before the Sacrament of Penance be actually received. But then it adds, That the desire of Confession is included in Contrition: Which is impossible to be proved by Scripture, Reason, or Antiquity. For so lately, as in the time of the Master of the Sentences, and Gratian (in the 12th Century) it was a very disputable Point, whether Confession to a Priest were necessary. And it is very hard for us to understand how that should become necessary to Salvation since, which was not then. Some of their own Writers confess, that some good Catholicks
licks did not believe the necessity of it. I suppose the old Canonists may pass for good Catholicks; and yet Maldonat faith, That all the Interpreters of the Decrees held, that there was no Divine Precept for Confession to a Priest; and of the fame Opinion he grants Scotus to have been. But he thinks it is now declared to be Heresy, or be wishes it were. And we think it is too much already, unless there were better ground for it.

2. That an Anathema is denounced against those who do not understand the words of Christ, Whose Sins ye remit, they are remitted, &c. of the Sacrament of Penance, so as to imply the necessity of Confession: Whereas there is no appearance in the words of any such Sense; and themselves grant, that in order to the Remission of Sins, by Baptism, (of which St. Matthew and St. Mark speak in the Apostles Commission) there is no necessity of Sacramental Confession, but a general Confession is sufficient. And from hence the Elder Jansenius concludes, That the Power of Remission of Sins here granted, doth not imply Sacramental Confession. Cajetan yields, There is no Command for Confession here. And Catharinus adds, That Cajetan would not allow any one Place of Scripture to prove Auricular Confession. And as to this particular, he denies that there is any Command for it; and he goes not about to prove it, but that Cajetan contradicts himself elsewhere, viz. when he wrote School-Divinity, before he set himself to the study of the Scriptures. Vasquez faith, That if these words may be understood of Baptism, none can infer from them the Necessity of Auricular Confession. But Gregory de Valentina evidently proves, that this place doth relate to Remission of Sins in Baptism; not only from the Comparison of Places, but from the Testimonies of S. Cyprian, S. Ambrose, and others.

3. That it is expressed in the fame Anathema’s that this hath been always the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholick Church from the beginning. We do not deny the ancient practice, either of Canonical Confession, as part of the Discipline of the Church for publick Offences; nor of Voluntary Confession, for case and satisfaction of the perplexed Minds of doubting or dejected Penitents; but that which we say was not owned nor practised by the Church from the Beginning, was this Sacramental Confession as necessary to the Remission of Sins before God. It is therefore to no pur-
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pose to produce out of Bellarmine, and others, a great number of Citations, to prove that which we never deny; but if they hold to the Council of Trent, they must prove from the Fathers, that Sins after Baptism cannot be forgiven without Confession to Men: which those who consider what they do, will never undertake, there being so many Testimonies of undoubted Antiquity against it. And it is observable, that Bonaventure grants, that before the Lateran Decree of Innocensius 3. it was no Heresy to deny the Necessity of Confession; and so he excuses those who in the time of Lombard and Gratian, held that Opinion. And all other Christians in the World besides those of the Church of Rome, do to this day reject the Necessity of Particular Confession to a Priest, in order to Remission, as the Writers of the Church of Rome themselves confess. So Godignus doth of the Abyssins; Philippus a SS. Trinitate, of the Jacobites; Clement Galanus of the Nestorians, who faith, They made a Decree against the use of Confession to any but to God alone. And Alexius Menes of the Christians of S. Thomas in the Indies. The Greeks believe Confession only to be of Positive and Ecclesiastical Institution, as the late Author of the Critical History of the Faith and Customs of the Eastern Nations, prove. And the very Form of their Absolution declares, that they do not think particular Confession of all known Sins, necessary to Pardon: for therein the Priest absolves the Penitent from the Sins he hath not confessed through forgetfulness, or shame. And now let any one prove this to have been a Catholick Tradition by Vincentius his Rules, viz. That it hath been always received, every where, and by All.

VIII. Of Indulgences.

1. They must be extreamly ignorant, who take the Power of Indulgences, to be a Leave from the Pope to commit what Sins they please; and that by virtue thereof, they shall escape Punishment for their Sins, without Repentance, in another World. Yet this is the Sense of the Misrepresentation, which, he faith, is made of it. And if he faith true in his Preface, That he hath described the Belief of a Papist, exactly according to the appre-
apprehension he had when he was a Protestant: He shews how
well he understood the Matters in difference, when I think no
other Person beside himself ever had such an apprehension
of it, who pretended to be any thing like a Scholar.

2. But now he believes it damnable to hold that the Pope, or
any other Power in Heaven or Earth, can give him leave to com-
mitt any Sins whatsoever; or that for any Sum of Mony, he can
obtain any Indulgence or Pardon for Sins that are to be committed
by him, or his Heirs hereafter. Very well! But what thinks he
of obtaining an Indulgence, or Pardon, after they are com-
mitted? Is no such thing to be obtained in the Court of Rome
for a Sum of Mony? He cannot but have heard of the Tax
of the Apostolick Chamber for several Sins, and what Sums
are there set upon them. Why did he not as freely speak a-
against this? This is published in the vast Collection of Traits of
Canon Law, set forth by the Pope's Authority, where there are
certain Rates for Perjury, Murder, Apostacy, &c. Now what
do these Sums of Mony mean? If they be small, it is so
much the better Bargain, for the Sins are very great. And
Esperiencee complains, that this Book was so far from being cal-
led in, that, he faith, the Pope's Legats renewed those Faculties,
and confirmed them. It seems then a Sum of Mony may be of
some consequence towards the obtaining Pardon for a Sin
past, tho not for a Licence to commit it. But what mighty
difference is there, whether a Man procures with Mony a
Dispensation, or a Pardon? For the Sin can hurt him no more,
than if he had Licence to commit it.

3. He doth believe there is a Power in the Church to grant In-
dulgences; which, he faith, concern not at all the Remission of
Sins, either Mortal or Venial, but only of some Temporal Punish-
ments remaining due after the Guilt is remitted. Here now arises
a Material Question, viz. Whether the Popes, or the Repre-
senter, be rather to be believed. If the Popes, who grant the
Indulgences are to be believed; then not only the bare Re-
mission of Sins is concerned in them, but the Plenary, and most
Plenary Remission of Sins is to be had by them. So Boniface the
8th, in his Bull of Jubilee granted, Non solum plenam & lar-
giorum, ino plenissimam veniam peccatorum. If these words had
no relation to remission of Sins, the People were horribly
cheated by the sound of them. In the Bull of Clement the 6th,
not extant in the Bullarium, but published out of the Utrecht Manuscript, not only a Plenary Absolution from all Sins is declared to all Persons who died in the Way to Rome; but he commands the Angels of Paradise to carry the Soul immediately to Heaven. And I suppose, whatever implies such an Absolution as carries a Soul to Heaven, doth concern Remission of Sins. Boniface IX, granted Indulgences, à Pàmba & à Culpa; and those certainly concerned Remission of Sins; being not barely from the Temporal Punishment, but from the Guilt itself. Clement the 8th, whom Bellarmine magnifies for his care in reforming Indulgences, in his Bull of Jubilee, grants a most Plenary Remission of Sins; and Urban the 8th, since him, not only a Relaxation of Penances, but Remission of Sins; and so lately as A.D. 1671. Clement the 10th published an Indulgence upon the Canonization of five new Saints, wherein he not only grants a Plenary Indulgence of Sins, but upon invocation of one of these Saints in the point of Death, a Plenary Indulgence of all his Sins. And what doth this signify in the point of Death, if it do not concern the Remission of Sins?

4. Indulgences, he faith, are nothing else but a Mitigation or Relaxation, upon just Causes, of Canonical Penances, which are or may be enjoyned by the Pastors of the Church on penitent Sinners, according to their several degrees of Demerits. If by Canonical Penances, they mean those enjoyned by the Penitential Canons, Greg. de Valentia saith, This Opinion differs not from that of the Hereticks, and makes Indulgences to bee useless and dangerous things. Bellarmine brings several Arguments against this Doctrine. (1.) There would be no need of the Treasure of the Church; which he had proved to be the Foundation of Indulgences. (2.) They would be rather hurtful than profitable, and the Church would deceive her Children by them. (3.) They could not be granted for the Dead. (4.) They who receive Indulgences, do undergo Canonical Penances. (5.) The Form of them doth express, that they do relate to God, and not only to the Church. And this, I think, is sufficient to shew how far he is from true Representing the Nature of Indulgences; for we do not dispute the Church's Power in relaxing Canonical Penances to Penitent Sinners upon just Causes.
IX. Of Satisfaction.

1. He believes it damnable to think any thing injuriously of Christ’s Passion: But then he distinguishes the Eternal and Temporal Pain due to Sin. As to the Guilt and Eternal Pain, the Satisfaction, he faith, is proper to Christ; but as to the Temporal Pain, which may remain due by God’s Justice, after the other are remitted, he faith, that Penitent Sinners may in some measure satisfy for that by Prayer, Fasting, Alms, &c. p. 17.

2. These Penitential Works, he faith, are no otherwise satisfactory, than as joined and applied to Christ’s Satisfaction, in virtue of which alone our good Works find a grateful acceptance in God’s sight. p. 19.

But for right apprehending the State of the Controversy, we must consider;

1. That they grant both Eternal and Temporal Pain due to Sin, to be remitted in Baptism; so that all the Satisfaction to be made, is for Sins committed after Baptism.

2. We distinguish between Satisfaction to the Church before Absolution, and Satisfaction to the Justice of God for some part of the punishment to Sin which is unremitted.

3. We do not deny that truly Penitential Works are pleasing to God, so as to avert his Displeasure; but we deny that there can be any Compensation in way of equivalency, between what we suffer, and what we deserve.

The Matter in Controversy therefore on this Head, consists in these things.

1. That after the total Remission of Sins in Baptism, they suppose a Temporal Punishment to remain, when the Eternal is forgiven; which the Penitent is to satisfy God’s Justice for; and without this being done in this Life, he must go into Purgatory for that End. Of which more under that Head.

2. That this Satisfaction may be made to the Justice of God, after Absolution is given by the Priest. So that altho’ the Penitent be admitted into God’s Favour, by the Power of the Keys, according to their own Doctrine; yet the Application of the Merits of Christ, together with the Saints
in the Sentence of Absolution (according to their Form) do not set him so free, but he either wants a new Supply from the Treasure of the Church, i.e. from the same Merits of Christ and the Saints; or else he is to satisfy for the Temporal Punishment by his own Penances.

3. That these Penitential Works are to be joined with the Merits of Christ, in the way of proper Satisfaction to Divine Justice. And however softly this may be expressed; the meaning is, that Christ hath merited, that we may merit, and by his Satisfaction, we are enabled to satisfy for our selves. And if the Satisfaction by way of Justice be taken away, the other will be a Controversy about Words.

4. That these Penitential Works may not only be sufficient for themselves, but they may be so over-done, that a great share may be taken from them to make up the Treasure of the Church, for the benefit of others who fall short, when they are duly applied to them in the way of Indulgences. And about these Points, we must desire greater Proof than we have ever yet seen.

X. Of reading the Holy Scripture.

1. He believes it damnable in any one, to think, speak, or do any thing irreverently towards the Scripture, or by any means whatsoever to bring it into disrepute or disgrace: but not being contented with this, he adds, That he holds it in the highest Veneration of all Men living. Now, here we must desire a little better Representation of this Matter. For certainly, those who derive its Authority from the Church; who set Traditions in equal esteem with it; who complain so much of its Obscurity, can never be said to hold it in equal Veneration with those who maintain its independent Authority, its Sufficiency, and Perspicuity. And these are known and material Points in Controversy between us and them: therefore let them not say, they hold it in the highest Veneration of all Men living; tho' those thought themselves through Catholicks, who have compared it to a Nose of Wax, to a Lesbian Rule, to a dead Letter, unsensed Characters, and to other things, not fit to be repeated. But we are well pleased to find
find them express such Veneration for it. Wherefore then are the People to be kept from reading it?

2. He faith, It is not out of disrespect to it. But why then? (1.) Because private Interpretation is not proper for the Scripture, (2 Pet. 1. 20.) One would think the Scripture were not kept only from the People, by such a Sense being put upon it; for any one that would but consider that place, will find it must relate to the Prophets themselves; and doth he think the Prophets were to be debarred from reading the Scriptures? But this is playing with Scripture, and not reasoning from it. (2.) Because in the Epistles of S. Paul are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable deprave, as also the rest of the Scriptures, to their own Perdition, (2 Pet. 3. 16.) Now in my Opinion, such Men deserve more to be debarred from medling with the Scripture, who make such perverse Inferences from it, than ordinary Readers. And if they use all other places, as they do this, they cannot be excused from depraving it. It is granted, there were then unlearned and unstable Men, who misunderstood, or misapplied the Writings of St. Paul, and other Scriptures. And what then? There are Men of all Ages, who abuse the best things in the World, even the Gospel itself, and the Grace of God. Doth it hence follow, that the Gospel must not be preached to them, or the Grace of God made known to them, for fear of Mens making all use of it? If this had been the just Consequence, would not St. Peter himself have thought of this? But he was so far from making it, that he adviseth those Persons he writes to, to have a mighty regard to the Scriptures, even to the Prophetical Writings, as to a Light shining in a dark place, 1 Pet. 1. 19. According to this way of deducing Consequences, S. Peter should have argued just contrary; The Prophetical Writings are dark, and obscure, therefore meddle not with them, but trust your Guides: Whereas the Apostle, after he had told them what the Apostles saw and heard, he adds, That they have a more sure Prophetical Word, as the Rhemists translate it. How could that be more sure to them, unless they were allowed to read, consider, and make use of it? (3.) Because God hath given only some to be Apostles, some Prophets, other some Evangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors, Ephes. 4. 11. Doth it hence follow that the People are not to read the Scriptures? In the
Universities, Tutors are appointed to interpret *Aristotle* to their Pupils; doth it hence follow that they are not to read *Aristotle* themselves? It is, no doubt, a mighty Advantage to have such Infallible Interpreters as the *Apostles and Prophets*; and all Christians are bound to follow their Sense, where they have delivered it. But suppose the Question be about the Sense of these Interpreters; must their Books not be looked into, because of the danger of Error? This Reason will still hold against those who go about to deliver their Sense; and so on, till by this Method of Reasoning, all sort of Books and Interpretations be rejected; unless any such can be found out, which is not liable to be abused or misunderstood. And if there be any such to be had, they are much to blame who do not discover it. But as yet we see no Remedy for two things in Mankind, a proneness to Sin, and to Mistake. But of all things, we ought not to take away from them one of the best Means to prevent both, viz. a diligent, and careful, and humble reading the Holy Scriptures.

But, 3. he denies that all Persons are forbid to read the Scriptures, but only such as have no License, and good Testimony from their Curats: and therefore their design is not to preserve Ignorance in the People, but to prevent a blind, ignorant presumption.

These are plausible Pretences to such as search no farther; but the Mystery of this Matter lies much deeper. It was, no doubt, the Design of the Church of Rome to keep the Bible wholly out of the hands of the People. But upon the Reformation they found it impossible; so many Translations being made into vulgar Languages, and therefore care was taken to have Translations made by some of their own Body; and since the People of better inclinations to Piety were not to be satisfied without the Bible; therefore they thought it the better way to permit certain Persons whom they could trust, to have a License to read it: And this was the true Reason of the Fourth Rule of the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum,* made in pursuance of the Order of the Council of Trent, and published by Pius IV. by which any one may see it was not an Original Permission out of any good Will to the Thing; but an Aftergame to get the Bible out of the Hands of the People again: And therefore Absolution was to be denied to those who would not deliver them to their Ordinaries when they were called for:
XI. Of Apocryphal Books.

1. We do not charge the Church of Rome with making what Additions to Scripture they think good, as the Misrepresenter faith, but we charge them with taking into the Canon of Scripture such Books as were not received for Canonical by the Christian Church; as those Books himself mentions, viz. Tobit, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and Maccabees.

2. We do not only charge them with this, but with Anathematizing all those who do not upon this Declaration believe them to be Canonical; since they cannot but know, that these Books never were in the Jewish Canon, and were left out by many Christian Writers. And if the Church cannot add to the Scripture, and our Author thinks it damnable to do it; how can it make any Books Canonical, which were not so received by the Church? For the Scripture in this sense is the Canon; and therefore if it add to the Canon, it adds to the Scripture; i.e. it makes it necessary to believe some Books to be of infallible Authority, which were not believed to be so, either by the Jewish or Christian Church, as appears by abundant Testimonies to that purpose produced by a Learned Bishop of this Church; which ought to have been considered by the Representer, that he might not have talked so crudely about this Matter.

But however, I must consider what he saith;

1. He produces the Testimony of Greg. Nazianzen, who is expressly against him, and declares but Twenty two Books in the Canon of the Old Testament; but how doth he prove
prove that he thought these Books Canonical? He quotes his
*Oration on the Maccabees*; where I can find nothing like it;
and instead of it he expressly follows, as he declares, the Book
of *Josephus*, of the Authority of Reason concerning them. So
that if this proves any thing, it proves *Josephus* his Book
Canonical, and not the *Maccabees*.

2. He adds the Testimony of St. *Ambrose*, who in the place
he refers to, enlarges on the Story of the *Maccabees*, but faith
nothing of the Authority of the Book. And even *Cossins*
Nazienzen, the Council of Laodicea, St. *Hierom*, *Ruffinus*, and
*Gregory* the Great, did not own the Book of *Maccabees* for
Canonical.

3. *Innocentius ad Exuperium* speaks more to his purpose.
And if that Decretal Epistle be allowed, against which Bishop
*Cossins* hath made considerable Objections; then it must be
granted, that these Books were then in the *Roman Canon*;
but that they were not received by the *Universal Church*,
appears evidently by the Canon of the Council of Laodicea,
c. 60. wherein these Books are left out; and this was re-
ceived in the Code of the Universal Church; which was as
clear a Proof of the Canon then generally received, as can be
expected. It is true, the Council of *Carthage* took them
in; and St. *Augustine* seems to be of the same Opinion, that
on the other side, they are left out by *Melito Bishop of Sardis*,
who lived near the Apostles times, *Origen*, *Athananius*, *S. Hi-
St. *Chrysostom*, and especially St. *Jerom*, who hath laboured in
this point so much, that no fewer than thirteen places are
produced out of him to this purpose, by the fore-mentioned
Learned Bishop of our Church, who clearly proves there
was no Tradition for the Canon of the Council of *Trent* in an-
yn Age of the Christian Church. But our Author goes on.

4. It is of little concern to him, whether these Books were ever in
the Hebrew Copy. I would only ask whether it be of any concern
to him, whether they were divinely inspired or not? He
faith, *It is damnable to add to the Scripture*; by the Scripture we
mean Books written by Divine Inspiration: Can the Church
make Books to be so written, which were not so written? If
not, then all it hath to do, is to deliver by Tradition what
was
was so, and what not. Whence should they have this Tradition, but from the Jews? and they owned no Divine Inspiration after the time of Malachi. How then should there be any Books so written after that time? And he that faith in this Matter, as he doth, *It is of little concern to him whether they were in the Hebrew Canon,* doth little concern himself what he ought to believe, and what not, in this matter.

5. Since the Churches Declaration, he faith, no Catholicks ever doubted. What doth he mean by the Churches Declaration, that of Innocent, and the Council of Carthage? Then the same Bishop hath shewed him, that since that time, there have been very many, both in the Greek and Latin Church, of another Opinion. And a little before the Council of Trent, Catharinus faith, *That a Friend of his, and a Brother in Christ, derided him as one that wanted Learning, for daring to assert these Books were within the Canon of Scripture;* and it is plain, Gard. Cajetan could never be persuaded of it: But if he means since the Council of Trent, then we are returned to our Difficulty, how such a Council can make any Books Canonical, which were not received for such by the Catholick Church before? For then they do not declare the Canon, but create it.

---

**XII. Of the Vulgar Edition of the Bible.**

1. *We do not dispute about the Vulgar Edition, whether it may not be preferr’d before modern Latin Editions, because of its great Antiquity in some parts of it, and its general Reception since the time of Gregory I.* But our dispute is, whether it be made so Authentic since the Council of Trent, that no Appeals are to be made to the Originals, *i.e.* whether that Council by its Authority could make a Version equal to the Originals out of which it was made? Especially since at the time of that Decree, the Vulgar Edition was confessed to be full of Errors and Corruptions by Sixtus V. who faith, he took infinite pains to correct them, and yet left very many behind, as appeared by Clement VIII. who corrected his Bibles in very many places, and grants some faults were left uncorrected still: Now, how was
was it possible for the Council of Trent to declare that Edition Authentick, which was afterwards so much corrected? And, whether was the correct Edition of Sixtus V. Authentick, or not, being made in pursuance of the Decree of the Council? If not, how comes Clement his Edition to be made Authentick, when the other was not, since there may be Corruptions found in that, as well as the other; and no one can tell, but it may be reviewed and corrected still; as some of their own Writers confess it stands in need of it?

2. Our Controversy is not so much about the Authority of the Vulgar Latin, above other Latin Versions to those who understand them; but whether none else but the Latin Version must be used by those who understand it not? And here our Representer faith, That he is commanded not to read any of these Translations (speaking of Tindal’s, and that in Q. Elizabeth’s time) but only that which is recommended to him by the Church. If this relate to the Vulgar Latin, then we are to seek, why the common People should have none to read, but what they cannot understand; if to Translations of their own, then we doubt not to make it appear, that our Translation allowed among us, is more exact and agreeable than any they can put into their hands.

XIII. Of the Scriptures as a Rule of Faith.

The only thing insisted on here is, That it is not the Words, but the Sense of Scripture is the Rule; and that this Sense is not to be taken from Men’s private Fancies, which are various and uncertain; and therefore where there is no security from Errors, there is nothing capable of being a Rule.

To clear this, we must consider,

1. That it is not necessary to the making of a Rule, to prevent any possibility of mistake, but that it be such that they cannot mistake without their own fault. For Certainty in it self, and Sufficiency for the use of others, are all the necessary Properties of a Rule; but after all, it’s possible for Men not to apply the Rule aright, and then they are to be blamed, and not the Rule.

2. If no Men can be certain of the right Sense of Scripture,
ture, then it is not plain in necessary things; which is con-
trary to the design of it, and to the clearest Testimonies of
Antiquity, and to the common sense of all Christians, who
never doubted or disputed the sense of some things revealed
therein; as the Unity of the Godhead, the making of the
World by him, the Deluge, the History of the Patriarchs,
the Captivity of the Jews, the coming of the Messiah, his
sending his Apostles, his coming again to Judgment, &c.
No Man who reads such things in Scripture, can have any
doubt about the sense and meaning of the Words.

3. Where the Sense is dubious, we do not allow any Man
to put what sense he pleases upon them; but we say, there are
certain means, whereby he may either attain to the true
sense, or not be damned if he do not. And the first thing
every Man is to regard, is not his security from being de-
ceived, but from being damned. For Truth is made known in
order to Salvation: If therefore I am sure to attain the chief
end, I am not so much concerned, as to the possibility of Er-
rors, as that I be not deceived by my own fault. We do not
therefore leave Men either to follow their own fancy, or to inter-
pret Scripture by it; but we say, They are bound upon pain of
Damnation to seek the Truth sincerely, and to use the best
means in order to it; and if they do this, they either will
not err, or their Errors will not be their Crime.

XIV. Of the Interpretation of Scripture.

1. The Question is not, Whether Men are not bound to
make use of the best means for the right Interpretation
of Scripture, by Reading, Meditation, Prayer, Advice,
a humble and teachable Temper, &c. i. e. all the proper
means fit for such an end? but whether after all these, there
be a necessity of submitting to some Infallible Judge, in order
to the attaining the certain Sense of Scripture?

2. The Question is not, Whether we ought not to have a
mighty regard to the Sense of the whole Christian Church in
all Ages since the Apostles, which we profess to have; but,
Whether the present Roman Church, as it stands divided from
other Communions, hath such a Right and Authority to inter-
pret
pret Scripture, that we are bound to believe that to be the Infallible Sense of Scripture which she delivers?

And here I cannot but take notice how strangely this matter is here misrepresented: for the Case is put,

1. As if every one who rejects their pretence of Infallibility, had nothing to guide him but his own private Fancy in the Interpretation of Scripture.

2. As if we rejected the Sense put upon Scripture by the whole Community of Christians in all Ages since the Apostles times. Whereas we appeal in the matters in difference between us, to this universal Sense of the Christian Church, and are verily persuaded they cannot make it out in any one Point wherein we differ from them. And themselves cannot deny, that in several we have plainly the consent of the first Ages, as far as appears by the Books remaining, on our side; as in the Worship of Images, Invocation of Saints, Papal Supremacy, Communion in both kinds, Prayer and Scripture in known Tongues; and I may safely add, the Sufficiency of the Scripture, Transubstantiation, Auricular Confession, Publick Communion, Solitary Mafles, to name no more.

But here lies the Artifice; We must not pretend to be capable of judging either of Scripture, or Tradition; but we must trust their Judgment what is the sense of Scripture, and what hath been the Practice of the Church in all Ages, altho their own Writers confess the contrary: which is very hard.

But he seems to argue for such a submission to the Church;

1. Because we receive the Book of Scripture from her; therefore from her we are to receive the sense of the Book. An admirable Argument! We receive the Old Testament from the Jews; therefore from them we are to receive the sense of the Old Testament, and so we are to reject the true Messiah.

But this is not all: If by the Church, they mean the Church of Rome in distinction from others, we deny it: if they mean the whole Christian Church, we grant it; but then the force of it is quite lost. But why is it not possible for the Church of Rome to keep these Writings, and deliver them to others, which make against her self? Do not Persons in Law-Suits often produce Deeds which make against them? But there is yet a farther Reason; it was not possible for the Church of Rome to make away these Writings, being so universally spread.

2. Be-
2. Because the Church puts the difference between true and false Books, therefore that must be trusted for the true sense of them. Which is just as if one should argue, The Clerks of the Rolls are to give an account to the Court of true Records, therefore they are to sit on the Bench, and to give Judgment in all Causes. The Church is only to declare what it finds as to Canonical Books; but hath no Power to make any Book Canonical which was not before received for such. But I confess Stapleton faith, the Church if it please may make Hermes his Pastor, and Clement his Constitutions Canonical: but I do not think our Author will therein follow him.

XV. Of Tradition.

1. The Question is not about Human Traditions supplying the Defects of Scripture, as he misrepresents it; but whether there be an unwritten word, which we are equally bound to receive with the Written word: Altho these things which pass under that Name, are really but Human Traditions; yet we do not deny that they pretend them to be of Divine Original.

2. We do not deny, but the Apostles might deliver such things by Word as well as by Epistle, which their Disciples were bound to believe and keep: but we think there is some difference to be made between what we certainly know they delivered in Writing, and what it is now impossible for us to know; viz., what they delivered by word without writing.

3. We see no ground why any one should believe any Doctrine with a steadfast and Divine Faith, which is not bottom'd on the Written word; for then his Faith must be built on the Testimony of the Church as Divine and Infallible, or else his Faith cannot be Divine. But it is impossible to prove it to be Divine and Infallible, but by the Written word; and therefore, as it is not reasonable that he should believe the Written word by such a Divine Testimony of the Church; so if any particular Doctrine may be received on the Authority of the Church without the Written word, then all Articles of Faith may, and so there would be no need of the Written word.

4. The
4. The Faith of Christians doth no otherwise stand upon the Foundation of the Churches Tradition, than as it delivers down to us the Books of Scripture; but we acknowledg the general Sense of the Christian Church to be a very great help for understanding the true Sense of Scripture; and we do not reject any thing so delivered; but what is all this to the Church of Rome? But this is still the way of true Representing.

XVI. Of Councils.

1. We are glad to find so good a Resolution as seems to be expressed in these words, viz. That he is obliged to believe nothing besides that which Christ taught, and his Apostles; and if any thing contrary to this should be defined, and commanded to be believed, even by Ten Thousand Councils, he believes it damnable in any one to receive it, and by such Decrees to make Additions to his Creed. This seems to be a very good saying, and it is pity any thing else should overthrow it. But here lies the Mifrepresenting; he will believe what Christ and his Apostles taught, from the Definitions of Councils, and so all this goodly Fabrick falls to nothing; for it is but as if one should say, If Aristotle should falsely deliver Plato's Sense, I will never believe him, but I am resolved to take Plato's Sense only from Aristotle's words. So here, he first declares he will take the Faith of Christ from the Church; and then he faith, if the Church Representative should contradic't the Faith of Christ, he would never believe it.

2. We dispute not with them, the Right and Necessity of General Councils, (upon great occasions) if they be truly so, rightfully called, lawfully assembled, and fairly managed; which have been, and may be of great use to the Christian world, for settling the Faith, healing the Breaches of Christendom, and reforming Abuses. And we farther say that the Decrees of such Councils ought to be submitted to, where they proceed upon certain Grounds of Faith, and not upon unwritten Traditions; Which was the fatal stumbling at the Threshold in the Council of Trent, and was not to be recovered afterwards, for their setting up Traditions equally with the written Word, made it easie for
for them to define, and as easy for all others to reject their definitions, in case there had not been so many other Objections against the Proceedings of that Council. And so all our Dispute concerning this matter is taken off from the general Notion, and runs into the particular Debate concerning the Qualifications and Proceedings of some which were called Free, General Councils; but were neither General, nor Free; and therefore could not deliver the sense of the Catholic Church, which our Author requires them to do.

XVII. Of Infallibility in the Church.

1 He doth not pretend this belongs to the Pastors and Prelates of his Church, who may fall, he faith, into Heresie and Schifm; but that the whole Church is secured by Divine Promises from all Error and Danger of Prevarication; which he proves from the Promises of the New Testament, Mat. 16.18—28. 20. John 14. 16, 26. But however the former seems to take away Infallibility from the Guides of the Church, yet that this is to be understood of them separately, appears by what follows.

2. The like Assistance of the Holy Ghost he believes to be in all General Councils, which is the Church Representative; by which they are specially protected from all Error in all definitions and declarations in matters of Faith.

Now here are two sorts of Infallibility tacked to one another by vertue of these general Promises, which ought more distinctly to be considered.

1. To preserve Christ's Church so as it shall never cease to be a Church, is one thing; to preserve it from all Error is another: The former answers the End of Christ's Promises as to the Duration of the Church; and the latter is not implied in them.

2. The promise of teaching them all Truth, Joh. 16. 13. is not made to the whole Church, but to the Apostles: And their case was so peculiar and extraordinary, that there can be no just inference from the assistance promised to them, of what the Church would enjoy in all Ages.

3. If the diffusive Church have no infallible Assistance promised, then no infallible Assistance can from thence be proved for
for the Church Representative; so that some particular Promises to the Guides of the Church as assembled together, are necessary to prove the Infallibility of Councils.

4. It by no means proves following Councils to be Infallible, because the Apostles said, Acts 15. 28. It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us. Our Author doth not doubt, but the same may be prefixed to all determinations in point of Faith, resolved on by any General Council lawfully assembled since that time, or to be held to the Worlds end. But what Reason he had for not doubting in this matter, I cannot see; the Assistance, he faith, being to extend as far as the Promise: But shall Assistance imply Infallibility? Then there must be good store, as long as the Promises of Divine Grace hold good: But this Assistance of Councils is very different from the Assistance of Grace, for the Church may subsist without Councils, but cannot without Grace: What General Council was there from the meeting, Acts 15. to the Council of Nice? Were not Christ's Promises fulfilled to his Church all that time, when it encreased in all parts against the most violent Opposition?

5. No Parity of Reason from the Jewish Church can be sufficient Proof for Infallibility in the Christian. But our Author argues thus, If God's special Assistance was never wanting to the Church of the Jews so as to let it fail in the truth of its Doctrine, or its Authority; Why should not be believe the same of the Church of Christ, which is built on better Promises? What special Assistance was it which Israel had, when it is said, that for a long time Israel had been without the true God, and without a teaching Priest, and without Law? And as to Judah, was there no failing in point of Doctrine in our Saviour's time? It is true they had the Law in-tire, and that was all that was good among them, for their Teachers had corrupted themselves and the People, and made the Law of no effect among them: If there were Infallibility any where, it must be in the high Priest and Sanhedrim; but is it possible for any Christian to think them Infallible when they were so grossly mistaken about the main Article of their Faith as to the Messias, and pronounced him worthy of death? Is not this a fine Argument for the Infallibility of the Guides of the Christian Church? But the Church of Christ hath better Promises: No
No doubt of it, greater Promises of Grace and Mercy in this World, and in that to come: but what is all this to Infallibility in Councils?

6. Christ's Command of Obedience to those who sat in Moses Chair, (Matt. 23. 2.) doth not prove the Infallibility of those who sat there. Yet this is alleged to that purpose; and that men ought not to doubt of the reasonableness of the Commands of their Superiors. But St. Chrysostom faith, our Saviour speaks of the things commanded by the Law of Moses. Per Cathedram Doctrinam Legis ostendit, faith St. Jerom: Not their own Doctrine, but that of Moses, faith Isidore; and so Hilary and Theophylact.

Malдонate confesseth, our Saviour's Words are to be understood, not of their own Doctrine, but of that of the Law; and therefore he yields the Obedience here required to be restrained to that; All things, faith Cajetan, which they teach out of Moses's Chair: Not all their Doctrines, but as far as they were conformable to the Law, faith Ferrus. Now can any one hence infer, that no men ought to dispute any Commands of Superiors, when it is supposed, that there is a Rule and Standard for them to speak according to; and our Saviour elsewhere doth suppose these very Men to teach things contrary to the Law; as in the Case of Corban. Would our Saviour contradict himself? or require a blind Obedience in things repugnant to the Law? We do not deny a due Submission to our Superiors in the Church; yea, we allow them a Power to determine things not forbidden; and think Obedience due in such things by virtue of their Authority; but yet this is far enough from Infallibility, or an unlimited implicit Obedience, which would overthrow the force of all our Saviours Reasonings against the Scribes and Pharisees, as to their misinterpreting the Law, and the Superstitious Practices they imposed upon the People.

---

**XVIII. Of the P O P E.**

We do not charge them with believing the Pope to be God; which it seems himself did, if we believe the Misrepresenter in his Preface; but there is some Reason to doubt whether
ther they do not at some times give him greater Honour than becomes a Man. I instance in the Adoration after his Election, when the new Pope is placed upon the Altar to receive the Submissions of the Cardinals: but the Altar, themselves do confess to be sacred to God alone: And there they profess to Worship Jesus Christ, as present in the Holt. This therefore looks too much like assuming the Place of Christ, and not becoming the Distance between God and Man.

2. The Question is, Whether Christ hath appointed the Pope or Bishop of Rome to be Pastor, Governor, and Head of his Church under him? This, he faith, he believes, and this he knows we deny, and therefore had Reason to expect some Proof of it. But instead thereof he tells us how they look on themselves as obliged to shew him the Respect due to his Place, which he knows is not the matter in Question. Two things however he faith, which seem to justify his Title.

1. He is the Successor of St. Peter, to whom Christ committed the care of his Flock. But how far is this from proving the Pope to be Head of the Church under Christ? For how doth it appear that Christ ever made St. Peter Head of the Church, or committed his Flock to him, in contradistinction to the rest of the Apostles? This is so far from being evident from Scripture, that the Learned Men of their Church are ashamed of the Places commonly produced for it; it being impossible ever to justify the sense of them according to their own Rules of interpreting Scripture, viz. by the unanimous consent of the Fathers. For, 1. Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, is interpreted by many of the Fathers both Greek and Latin, of S. Peter's Confeffion, and not of his Person; so by S. Chrysostom, S. Ambrose, S. Augustin, S. Basil of Selucia, S. Hilary, S. Gregory Nyffen, and Theodoret; all great and considerable Persons in the Christian Church, whose Words are plain and full to that purpose; and so they can never produce the unanimous consent of the Fathers for S. Peter's Supremacy out of these words. 2. And unto thee will I give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, are interpreted by the Fathers of S. Peter in common


with
with the other Apostles; so Origen, S. Cyprian, S. Hilary, S. Hieron, and S. Augustin, as they are all owned by some Members of the Roman Communion. And 3. For these Words, Feed thy flock, a late Learned Doctor of the Sorbon shews, that if they prove any thing peculiar to S. Peter, they must prove him sole Pastor of the Church, which was the thing S. Gregory d spured against so warmly. But that there was nothing peculiar to S. Peter, above or beyond the rest of the Apostles, he shews at large from S. Cyril, S. Cyril, S. Augustin, and others, to whom I refer the Reader, and to the former Authors. But suppose it were made to appear, that S. Peter was Head of the Church, How doth the Bishop of Rome's Succession in that Headship shew itself? To that he faith, 2. That there hath been a visible succession of above two hundred and fifty Bishops, acknowledged as such in all past Ages by the Christian World. As such: What is that? As Bishops of Rome? That is not of weight enough to put it upon Trial; as Heads of the Catholick Church? That he knows is not only denied by us, but by all the Greek, Armenian, Nestorian, Abyssin Churches; so that we dare say, it was never allowed in any one Age of the Christian Church: but we need not insist on the proof of this, since the late mentioned Authors of the Roman Communion have taken so great pains, not only to prove the Popes Supremacy to be an Incroachment and Usurpation in the Church, but that the laying it aside is necessary to the Peace and unity of it. And until the Divine Institution of the Papal Supremacy be proved, it is to no purpose to p. 42. debate what manner of Assistance is promised to the Pope in his Decrees. Our Author is willing to decline the debate about his personal Infallibility, as a matter of Opinion, and not of Faith; and yet he faith, he doubts not but God doth grant a special Assistance to the High Priest, for the good of the whole Flock, under the New Law, as he did under the Old, and produces the Instance of Caiaphas, Joh. 11. 51. This is a very surprizing way of Reasoning; for if his Arguments be good from Scripture, he must hold the Popes personal Infallibility as a matter of Faith; and yet one would hardly think he should build an Article of Faith on the instance of Caiaphas. For what consequence can be drawn from God's over-ruling the mind of a very bad man, when he was carrying on a most wicked design, to utter such words, which
which in the event proved true in another sense than he meant them that therefore God will give a special assistance to the Pope in determining matters of Faith? Was not Caiaphas himself the man who proposed the taking away the Life of Christ at that time? Was he assisted in that Council? Did not he determine afterwards Christ to be guilty of blasphemy, and therefore worthy of Death? And is not this a rare Infallibility which is supposed to be consistent with a Decree to crucify Christ? And doth he in earnest think such Orders are to be obeyed, whether the supreme Pastor be infallible or not? For so he concludes, That his Sentence is to be obeyed, whether be be Infallible or no.

XIX. Of Dispensations.

Here the Misrepresenter faith, That a Papist believes that the Pope hath Authority to dispense with the Laws of God, and absolve any one from the Obligation of keeping the Commandments. On the other side, the Representers affirms, That the Pope has no Authority to dispense with the Law of God, and that there’s no power upon Earth can absolve any one from the Obligation of keeping the Commandments: This matter is not to be determined by the ones affirming, and the others denying: but by finding out, if possible, the true sense of the Church of Rome about this matter. And there are Three Opinions about it.

1. Of those who affert, That the Pope hath a power of dispensing in any Divine Law, except the Articles of Faith. The Glofs upon the Canon Law faith, That where the Text seems to imply, that the Pope cannot dispense against the Apostle, it is to be understood of Articles of Faith. And Panormitan faith, This Exposition pleases him well; for the Pope may dispense in all other things: contra Apostolum dispensat, faith the Glofs on the Decree: And the Roman Editors in the Margin, refer to 34 Dift. c. Lector to prove it: And there indeed the Glofs is very plain in the case, sic ergo Papa dispensat contra Apostolum: And the Roman Correctors there justify it, and say it is no absurd Doctrine as to positive Institutions, but the former notable Glofs, as Panormitan calls it, sets down the particulars wherein the Pope may dispense. As 1: Against the Apostles and their Canons. 2. A-
gainst the Old Testament. 3. In Vows. 4. In Oaths. The Summa Angelica faith, the Pope may dispence as to all the Precepts of the Old Testament. And Clavasius founds this Power upon the plentitude of the Popes Power, according to that Expression in the Decretal mentioned, that he can, ex plenitudine Potestatis de Fure supra fias dispensare; and without such a Power, he faith, God would not have taken that care of his Church, which was to be expected from his Wisdom. Jacobi batius brings several instances of this Power in the Pope, and refers to the Speculator for more. "Jac. Almain faith, That all the Canonifts are of Opinion, that the Pope may dispence against the Apostle; and many of their Divines, but not all: For,

2. Some of their Divines held that the Pope could not dispense with the Law of God, as that implies a proper relaxation of the Law, but could only Authoritatively declare that the Law did not oblige in such a particular case; because an Inferior could not take away the force of a Superiors Law; and otherwise there would be no fixed and immutable Rule in the Church; and if the Pope might dispence in one Law of God, he might dispence in the rest. And of this Opinion were some of the most eminent School-Divines, as Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Major, Soto, and Catharinus, who at large debates this Question, and denies that the Pope hath any Power to dispence with Gods Law: But then he adds, that the Pope hath a kind of Prophetical Power to declare in what Cases the Law doth oblige, and in what not; which he parallels with the power of declaring the Canon of Scripture; and this he doth not by his own Authority, but by Gods; He confesseth the Pope cannot dispence with those precepts which are of themselves indispenfable; nor alter the Sacraments; but then, faith he, there are some Divine Laws, which have a general force, but in particular cases may be dispensed with; and in these cases the Law is to be relaxed, so that the Relaxation seems to come from God himself: But he confesses this power is not to be often made use of, & that he makes this power to be no Act of Jurisdiction, but of Interpretation, as he calls it; and he brings the Instance of Caiaphas to this purpose: And he adds, that the difference between the Divines and Canonists was but in Terms, for the Canonists were in the right as to the power, and the Divines in the manner of explaining it.
3. Others have thought this too loose a way of explaining the Pope's power, and therefore they say, That the Pope hath not a bare declaratory Power, but a real Power of dispensing in a proper sense in particular Cases: For say they, the other is no act of Jurisdiction, but of Discretion, and may belong to other men as well as to the Pope; but this they look on as more agreeable to the Pope's Authority and Commission, and a bare declaratory power would not be sufficient for the Churches. Necessary; as Sanchez shews at large, and quotes many Authors for this Opinion; and Sayr more; and he saith the Practice of the Church cannot be justified without it. Which Suarez much insists upon; and without it, he saith, the Church hath fallen into intolerable Errors; and it is evident, he saith, the Church hath granted real Dispensations, and not mere Declarations. And he founds it upon Christ's promise to Peter, To thee will I give the Keys, and the charge to him, Feed my sheep. But then he explains this Opinion, by saying that it is no formal Dispensation with the Law of God, but the matter of the Law is changed or taken away.

Thus I have briefly laid together the different Opinions in the Church of Rome about this power of dispensing with the Law of God, from which it appears, that they do all consent in the thing, but differ only in the manner of explaining it.

And I am therefore afraid our Representative is a very unstudied Divine, and doth not well understand their own Doctrine, or he would never have talked so boldly and unskilfully in this matter.

As to what he pretends, that their Church teaches that every Lye is a Sin, &c. it doth not reach the case; For the Question is not, Whether their Church teach men to lye, but, Whether there be not such a power in the Church, as by altering the Nature of things, may not make that not to be a Lye, which otherwise would be one: As their Church teaches that Men ought not to break their Vows; yet no one among them questions, but the Pope may disolve the Obligation of a Vow, although it be made to God himself. Let him shew then, how the Pope comes to have a power to release a Vow made to God, and not to have a power to release the Obligation to veracity among men.

Again,
Again, We do not charge them with delivering any such Doctrine, That men may have Dispen- sations to lye and forswear themselves at pleasure; for we know this Dispensing power is to be kept up as a great Mystery, and not to be made use of, but upon weighty and urgent causes, of great consequence and benefit to the Church, as their Doctors declare. But as to all matters of fact, which he alludes to, I have nothing to say to them; for our debate is only, whether there be such a power of Dispensation allowed in the Church of Rome, or not?

XX. Of the Deposing Power.

To bring this matter into as narrow a compass as may be, I shall first take notice of his Concessions, which will save us a labour of proofs.

1. He yields that the Deposing and King-killing power hath been maintained by some Canonists and Divines of his Church, and that it is in their opinion lawful, and annexed to the Papal Chair.

2. That some Popes have endeavoured to act according to this Power.

But then he denies that this Doctrine appertains to the Faith of his Church, and is to be believed by all of that Communion. And more than that, he faith, The affirming of it is a malicious calumny, a down-right falsity.

Let us now calmly debate the matter, Whether according to the received principles of the Church of Rome, this be only a particular opinion of some Popes and Divines, or be to be received as a matter of Faith. The Question is not,

Whether those who deny it, do account it an Article of Faith; for we know they do not: But whether upon the principles of the Church of Rome they are not bound to do it.

I shall only, to avoid cavilling, proceed upon the principles owned by our Author himself, viz.

1. That the sense of Scripture, as understood by the community of Christians in all Ages since the Apostles, is to be taken from the present Church.

2. That by the present Church he understands the Pastors and Prelates assembled in Councils, who are appointed by Christ and his Apostles.
files for the decision of controversies; and that they have infallible assistance.

3. That the Pope as the Head of the Church, hath a particular assistance promised him, with a special regard to his Office and Function.

If therefore it appear that Popes and Councils have declared this Depositing Doctrine, and they have received other things as Articles of Faith upon the same Declarations. Why should they then stick at yielding this to be an Article of Faith, as well as the other?

It is not denied, that I can find, that Popes and Councils for several ages have asserted and exercised the deposing power; but it is alleged against these Decrees and Acts. 1. That they were not grounded upon Universal Tradition. 2. That they had not Universal Reception.

Now, if these be sufficient to overthrow the Definitions of Councils, let us consider the consequences of it.

1. Then every man is left to examine the Decrees of Councils, whether they are to be embraced or not; for he is to judge whether they are founded on Universal Tradition; and so he is not to take the sense of the present Church for his Guide, but the Universal Church from Christ's time: which overthrows a Fundamental principle of the Roman Church.

2. Then he must reject the pretended Infallibility in the Guides of the Church, if they could so notoriously err in a matter of so great consequence to the peace of Christendom as this was; and consequently their authority could not be sufficient to declare any Articles of Faith: and so all persons must be left at liberty to believe as they see cause, notwithstanding the Definitions made by Popes and Councils.

3. Then he must believe the Guides of the Roman Church to have been mistaken, not once or twice, but to have persisted in it for five hundred years: which must take away, not only infallibility, but any kind of Reverence to the authority of it. For whatever may be said as to those who have depended on Princes, or favour their parties against the Guides of the Church, it cannot be denied that for so long time the leading party in that Church did assert and maintain the Depositing power; and therefore Lessius truly understood this matter, when he said, That
there was scarce any Article of the Christian Faith, the denial
whereof was more dangerous to the Church, or did precipitate Men
more into Heresie and Hatred of the Church, than this of the Depo-
sing Power; for, he says, they could not maintain their Churches
Authority without it.

And he reckons up these ill Consequences of denying it.

1. That the Roman Church hath erred for at least five hundred
years, in a matter fundamental as to Government, and of great
Moment: Which is worse than an Error about Sacraments, as
Penance, Extream Unction, &c. and yet those who deny the
Church can err in one, holde that it hath erred in a greater matter.

2. That it hath not only erred, but voluntarily and out of
Ambition, perverting, out of Design, the Doctrine of the Prin-
mative Church and Fathers concerning the Power of the
Church, and bringing in another contrary to it, against the
Right and Authority of Princes; which were a grievous sin.

3. That it made knowingly, unrighteous Decrees, to draw
persons from their Allegiance to Princes; and so they became
the causes of many Seditions and Rebellions, and all the ill
consequences of them, under a shew of Piety and Religion.

4. That the Churches Decrees, Commands, Judgments and
Censures may be safely condemned as Null, and containing in-
tolerable Errors. And that it may require such things which
good Subjects are bound to disobey.

5. That Gregory VII. in the Canon Nos Sanctorum, &c. Urban II.
Gregory IX. the Councils of Lateran under Alex III. and Innocent
III. the Councils of Lyons, of Vienna, of Constance, of Lateran under
Leo X. and of Trent, have all grievously and enormously erred
about this matter; For that it was the Doctrine of them all, he
shews at large; and so Seven General Councils lose their In-
fallibility at one blow.

6. That the Gates of Hell have prevailed against the Church:
For the true Church could never teach such pernicious Doctrine
as this must be, if it be not true. And if it erred in this, it
might as well err in any other Doctrine, and so Men are not
bound to believe or obey it.

7. That Princes and all Laymen have just Cause to withdraw
from their Church; because it shewed it self to be governed by
a spirit of Ambition, and not by the Spirit of God; and not only
ly so, but they may justly prosecute all that maintain a Doctrine so pernicious to Government, if it be not true.

Let us now see what our Author faith to clear this from being a Doctrine of the Church of Rome.

1. That for the few Authors that are abettors of this Doctrine, there are of his Communion Three times the number that publickly disown all such Authority.

If this be true, it is not much for the Reputation of their Church, That there should be such a number of those who are liable to all these dreadful consequences, which Lessius urges upon the deniers of it: But is it possible to believe there should be so few followers of so many Popes, and Seven General Councils, owned for such by the disowners of this Doctrine, except the Lateran under Leo 10? The poor Eastern Christians are condemned for Hereticks by the Church of Rome, for refusing to submit to the Decrees of one General Council, either that of Ephesus, or of Chalcedon: and they plead for themselves, That there was a misinterpretation of their meaning, or not right understanding one another about the difference of Nature and Person, which occasioned those Decrees. I would fain know, whether those Churches which do not embrace the Decrees of those Councils, are in a state of Heresie or not? If they be, then what must we think of such who reject the Decrees of Seven General Councils, one after another, and give far less probable accounts of the Proceedings of those Councils in their Definitions, than the other do.

2. He faith, Those who have condemned it, have not been in the least suspected of their Religion, or of denying any Article of Faith. Let any one judge of this by Lessius his Consequences: And the Author of the first Treatise against the Oath of Allegiance faith in plain Terms, That the Opinion that the Pope hath no such Power, is erroneous in Faith, as well as temerarious and impious; And he proves it by this substantial argument; Because they who hold it, must suppose that the Church hath been for sometime in a damnable Error of Belief, and Sin of Practice: And he not only proves that it was defined by Popes and Councils, but for a long time universally received; and that no one Author can be produced before Calvin's time, that denied this Power absolutely, or in any case whatsoever. But a few Authors that are Abettors
of it, faith our Representer: Not one total Dissenter for a long time, faith the other: And which of these is the true Representer? The deniers of it not in the least suspected of their Religion, faith one: Their Opinion is erroneous in Faith, temerarious and impious, faith the other. And a Professor of Lovain, now living, hath undertaken to show, that the number is far greater of those who assert this Doctrine, than of those who deny it.

3. If we charge their Church with this Opinion, may not they as well charge ours with the like; since Propositions as dangerous were condemned at Oxford, July 26. 1683. as held not by Jesuits, but by some among our selves? This is the force of his Reasoning: But we must desire the Reader to consider the great disparity of the case. We cannot deny, that there have been men of ill Minds, and disloyal Principles, Factions and Disobedient, Enemies to the Government, both in Church and State; but have these Men ever had that countenance from the Doctrines of the Guides of our Church, which the Deposing Doctrine hath had in the Church of Rome? To make the case parallel, he must suppose our Houses of Convocation to have several times declared these Damnable Doctrines, and given Encouragement to Rebels to proceed against their Kings, and the University of Oxford to have condemned them; for this is truly the case in the Church of Rome; the Popes and Councils have owned, and approved, and acted by the Deposing Principle: but the Universities of France, of late years, have condemned it. How come the Principles of the Regicides among us to be parallel'd with this Doctrine, when the Principles of our Church are so directly contrary to them; and our Houses of Convocation would as readily condemn any such damnable Doctrines, as the University of Oxford? And all the World knows how repugnant such Principles are to those of the Church of England; and none can be Rebels to their Prince, but they must be false to our Church.

As to the personal Loyalty of many persons in that Church, as I have no Reason to question it, so it is not proper for me to debate it, if I did; since our business is not concerning Persons, but Doctrines; and it was of old observed concerning the Epicureans, That tho their principles did overthrow any true Friendship, yet many of them made excellent Friends.
XXI. Of Communion in One Kind.

FOR our better proceeding in this Controversie, I shall set down the State of it as clearly as I can.

1. The Question is not, Whether the first Institution of the Sacrament of the Eucharist by Jesus Christ, were in one Kind, or two : for all confess it was under both Kinds.

2. It is not, Whether both Kinds are not still necessary for the due Celebration of it ; for it is granted that both Kinds are necessary to be upon the Altar, or else there could be no compleat Sacrifice.

3. It is not, Whether the people may be wholly excluded from both Kinds, and so the Sacrifice only remain : for they grant that the people are bound to communicate in one Kind.

4. It is not concerning any peculiar and extraordinary Cases, where no Wine is to be had, or there be a particular Aversion to it, or any such thing, where positive Institutions may be reasonably presumed to have no force: But concerning the publick and solemn Celebration, and participation of it in the Christian Church.

5. It is not concerning the meer disuse or neglect of it, But concerning the lawfulness of Excluding the people from both Kinds, by the Churches prohibition, notwithstanding the Institution of it by Christ in both Kinds, with a command to keep up the celebration of it to his second coming.

Here now consists the point in Controversie, Whether the Church being obliged to keep up the Institution in both Kinds, be not equally obliged to distribute both as our Saviour did, to as many as partake of it ? Our Author not denying the Institution, or the continuance of it, faith, Our Saviour left it indifferent to receive it in one Kind, or both. And that is the point to be examined.

1. He faith, Christ delivered it to his Apostles, who only were then present, and whom he made Priests just before: yet he gave no command that it should be so received by all the Faithful.

But were not the Apostles all the Faithful then present ? I pray in what capacity did they then receive it ? As Priests ?
How did they receive the Bread before the *hoc facite*? As Priests or as faithful? It is ridiculous to suppose the *hoc facite* changed their capacity; and if it did, it only relates to consecrating, and not to receiving: but if Christ gave it only to the Apostles as Priests, then for all that I can see, the People are not at all concerned in one kind or other; but it was intended only for Priests: if the people be concerned, how came they to be so? Where is there any command but what refers to the first Institution? And it had been more plausible, according to this Answer, to exclude the People wholly, than to admit them to one Kind, and to debar them the other.

2. Christ attributes the obtaining Life Everlasting, the end of the Institution, sometimes to receiving under both Kind; sometimes under one, John 6. 51, 57, 58. He could not easily have thought of any thing more against himself; for our Saviour there makes it as necessary to drink his Blood, as to eat his Flesh, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except you eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you*: If this be understood of the Sacrament, as he faith, How is it possible for him to make the Cup indifferent? Unless it be indifferent whether the People be saved or not.

3. Christ himself administering the Sacrament to some of his Disciples under one kind only, Luke 24. 30. But is he sure Christ did then administer the Sacrament to them? Or that if he did, the Cup was not implied, since breaking of Bread, when taken for an ordinary Meal in Scripture, doth not exclude drinking at it? But S. Augustin, he faith, (I. 49. *de Consensu Evangel.*) understands that place of the Sacrament. If he doth, it cannot be where he faith; for S. Augustin wrote but Four Books of that Subject: but I. 3. 25. he doth say something towards it; yet S. Augustin in another place supposes that these Disciples did both eat and drink. *The Disciples did not know him, but in the breaking of Bread; and truly be that doth not eat and drink Judgment to himself, doth in the breaking of Bread own Christ.* Where it is plain, that he applies both, to the breaking of Bread here spoken of.

4. He faith, it was the Custom of the Primitive Christians to give it under one kind to Children, the Sick, and to Men in a journey. I would he had produced his Authorities to prove these things: for I can bring several to prove the direct contrary as to Chil-
...and sick Persons, and Travellers, and not only Ancient Writers, but the most Learned of their own Church. And therefore I cannot but wonder to find him saying, *This was attested by all Ancient Writers and Modern Historians.* But I have ever found those have been most mistaken, who produce *all Writers and Historians*, when it may be, there is not one that speaks home to the business. At least, we have here none mentioned, and therefore none to examine; and it would be too hard a task to search *All*.

5. He adds, to this extravagancy, in saying, *That Receiving in one or both kinds, was indifferent for the first Four Hundred Years;* when the contrary is so manifest, that the most ingenious of their own Writers confesses it. If any Persons did carry home one kind (which is very questionable, for *Baronius* and *Albasinaeus* say, they carried both Kinds) to receive it in times of Persecution, at what season they thought fit afterwards; This ought not to be set up against the general and constant Rule of the Church; which is attested, not only by *Callander* and such like, but even by *Salmero, Ruardus Tapperus,* and *Lindanus,* who make no scruple of saying. The publick Celebration in the Primitive Church was in both Kinds. But then, how is it possible for us to judge better, what they thought themselves bound to do, than what they constantly observed in all their publick Celebrations? The Church is not accountable for the particular Fancies or Superstitions of Men; but what was observed in all publick Offices, we have reason to think the Church thought it self obliged so to do, out of regard to the Institution of Christ. And to shew how Universal this Observation was in the Church, those who give account of the *Eastern Church* say, *That the Greeks, Nestorians, Armenians, Maronites, Cophtites and Abyssins do all observe it still,* *viz.* That the publick Communicants do partake of both kinds. And not one of all these Churches, but think themselves bound to observe it, out of regard to the Institution of Christ; and why then should any think the Primitive Church thought it indifferent?

6. The first Precept of receiving under both Kinds, was given to the Faithful by Pope *Leo,* A. D. 443. and confirmed by *Gelasius,* A. D. 490. This is a great mistake, for *Leo* gave no Precept about it; but only told the People how they might certainly discover the *Manichees,* for they would conform in other things, but
but they would not taste of the Wine: which argued, that all other Communicants did then partake in both Kinds. Gelisius not only confirms the custom then used, but he faith, That it is Sacral'd to divide that Holy Mystery. And surely he did not account Sacral'd an Indifferent thing.

7. Laftly he faith, That those who receive in one Kind, are truly partakers of the whole Sacrament. This is a new way of Con-comitancy; we used to hear of Whole Christ under either Species, and that Whole Christ was therefore received: But how comes it to be the whole Sacrament, which consists of two distinct Parts? And if it be a Sacrifice, the Blood must be separated from the Body, else the Blood of Christ is not considered as shed, and so the Notion of the Sacrifice will be loft: Which is our next Head.

XXII. Of the M A S S.

Under this Head, which is thought of so great Consequence in the Roman Church, I expected a fuller Representation than I here find; as about the Opus Operatum, i.e. how far the meer Act is effectual: About their Solitary Masses, when no Person receives but the Priest: About the People having so little to do, or understand, in all the other parts of the Mass: About the Rites and Ceremonies of the Mass, how useful and important they are: About reconciling the present Canon of the Mass with the present Præstifices: About offering up Masses for the honour of Saints. All which we find in the Council of Trent, but are omitted by our Representer; Who speaks of the Mass, as tho there were no controversy about it, but only concerning the Sacrifice there supposed to be offered up, and which he is far from true Representing: For the Council of Trent not only affirms a true proper propitiatory Sacrifice to be there offered up for the quick and dead, but denounces Anathema's against those that deny it. So that the Question is not, Whether the Eucharist may not in the sense of Antiquity be allowed to be a Commemo-rative Sacrifice, as it takes in the whole Action: but whether in the Mass there be such a Representation made to God of Christ's Sacrifice, as to be itself a true and Propitiatory Sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the Dead?
Now, all that our Representer faith to the purpose, is,

1. That Christ bequeathed his Body and Blood at his last Supper, under the Species of Bread and Wine, not only a Sacrament, but also a Sacrifice. I had thought it had been more proper to have offered a Sacrifice, than to have bequeathed it. And this ought to have been proved, as the foundation of this Sacrifice, viz. That Christ did at his last Supper offer up his Body and Blood as a Propitiatory Sacrifice to God. And then what need his suffering on the Cross?

2. He gave this in charge to his Apostles, as the first and chief Priests of the New Testament, and to their Successors, to offer. But Where? When? and How? For we read nothing at all of it in Scripture. Christ indeed did bid them do the same thing he had there done in his last Supper. But did he then offer up himself, or not? If not, how can the Sacrifice be drawn from his action? If he did, it is impossible to prove the necessity of his dying afterwards.

3. This Sacrifice was never questioned till of late years. We say, it was never determined to be a Propitiatory Sacrifice, till of late. We do not deny the Fathers interpreting Mal. 1.11. of an Offering under the Gospel; but they generally understand it of Spiritual and Eucharistical Sacrifices: and altho' some of them, by way of accommodation, do apply it to the Eucharist, yet not one of them doth make it a Propitiatory Sacrifice, which was the thing to be proved: For, we have no mind to dispute about Metaphorical Sacrifices when the Council of Trent positively decrees it to be a True, Proper, and Propitiatory Sacrifice.

XXIII. Of PURGATORY.

Here our Author begins with proving from Scripture and Antiquity, and then undertakes to explain the Doctrine of Purgatory from substantial Reasons.

1. As to his Proof from Scripture.

1. Is that from 2. Maccab. c. 12. where he saith, Money was sent to Jerusalem, that Sacrifices might be offered for the slain: and 'tis recommended as a Holy Cogitation, to pray for the dead.
To this, which is the main foundation of Purgatory, I answer, 1. It can never prove such a Purgatory as our Author afferts; for he supposes a Sinner reconciled to God, as to eternal punishment, before he be capable of Purgatory; but here can be no such supposition; for those men died in the sin of Achan, which was not known till their bodies were found among the flain. Here was no Confession, or any sign of Repentance, and therefore if it proves any thing, it is deliverance from eternal punishment, and for such as dye in their sins without any shew of Repentance. 2. We must distinguish the Fact of Judas from the Interpretation of Jason, or his Epitomizer. The Fact of Judas was according to the strictness of the Law, which required in such cases a Sin Offering; and that is all which the Greek implies: ἀπεστάλει ὡς ἵππον αὐτοῦ ἔγαγα γὰρ πρὸς ἀμάξιον Οὐσίαν. And so Leo Allatius confesses all the best Greek Copies agree, and he recks Twelve of them. Now what doth this imply, but that Judas remembred the severe punishment of this sin in the case of Achan, upon the people, sent a Sin-offering to Jerusalem? But faith Leo Allatius, It was the sin of those men that were slain. I grant it. But the Question is, Whether the Sin-offering respected the dead or the living? For the Law in such a case required a Sin-offering for the Congregation. And why should not we believe so punctual a Man for the Law, as Judas, did strictly obserue it in this point? But the Author of the Book of Maccabees understands it of those that were slain. I do not deny it: but then 3. We have no Reason to rely upon his Authority in this matter; which I shall make appear by a parallel instance. He doth undoubtedly commend the fact of Razias in Killing himself (2 Macc. 14. 42) when he faith he did it, ἐγένετο, like a brave Man; and if he had thought it a fault in him, he would never have given such a Character of it, but he would have added something of caution after it. And it is no great advantage to Purgatory, for him that commends Self-murder, to have introduced it. The most probable account I can give of it is, That the Alexandrian Jews, of whole number, Jason of Cyrene seems to have been, had taken in several of the Philosophical Opinions, especially the Platonifts, into their Religion, as appears by Philo; and Bellarmine himself confesses, that Plato held a Purgatory: and they were ready to apply.
ply what related to the Law, to their Platonick Notions. So here the Law appointed a Sin-offering with respect to the Living; but used would needs have this refer to the dead: and then sets down his own remarks upon it, That it was a holy cogitation to pray for the dead, as our Author renders it. If it were holy with respect to the Law, there must be some ground for it in the Law: and that we appeal to, and do not think any particular Fancies sufficient to introduce such a Novelty as this was, which had no Foundation either in the Law or the Prophets. And it would be strange for a new Doctrine to be set up, when the Spirit of Prophecy was ceased among them.

But S. Auguft. held these Books for Canonical, and faith, they are so received by the Church, 1. 18. de Civit. Dei. To answer this, it is sufficient to observe, not only the different opinions of others before mentioned as to these Books: But that as Cauns notes, it was then lawful to doubt of their Authority: And he goes as low as Gregory I. Whom he denies not to have rejected them. And I hope we may set the authority of one against the other; especially when St. Augufin himself, being pressed hard with the fact of Razias, confesses, 1. That the Jews have not the Book of Maccabees in their Canon, as they have the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, to whom our Lord gave Testimony as to his Witnesses. Which is an evident proof, he thought not these Books sufficient to ground a Doctrine upon, which was not found in the other. 2. That however this Book was not unprofitably received by the Church, if it be soberly read and heard. Which implies a greater caution than St. Auguftin would ever have given, concerning a Book lie believed truly Canonical: But faith Bellarmin, his meaning is only to keep men from imitating the Example of Razias: whereas that which they pressed S. Augufin with, was not merely the Fact, but the Character that is given of it. Sanétarum Scripturarum Authoritate laudatus est Razias, are their very Words in S. Augufin: and therefore the Caution relates to the Books, and not merely to his Example: and he lessens the Character given by the Author, when he faith, He chose to dye nobly; It had been better, faith he, to have died humbly. But the other is the Elogium given in the Heathen Histories, and better becomes brave Heathens, than true Martyrs. Can any one now think S. Augufin believed this Writer Divine-
ly inspired, or his Doctrine sufficient to ground a point of Faith upon? And I wonder they should not every jot as well commend Self-murder as an Heroical Act, as prove the Doctrine of Purgatory from these words of Jason, or his Epitomizer. For the argument from the authority of the Book, will hold as strongly for one as the other. And yet this is the Achilles for Purgatory, which Natalis Alexander (whom our Author follows in this matter) faith, is a Demonstrative Place against those that deny it. But I must proceed.

2. Purgatory is plainly intimated by our Saviour, Matt. 12.

32. Whosoever speaketh against the Holy-Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. By which words, Christ evidently supposes, that some sins are forgiven in the world to come. I am so far from discerning this plain intimation, that I wonder how any came to think of it out of this place. Well, But doth it not hence follow, that sins may be forgiven in the world to come? Not near so plainly, as that Sins will not be forgiven in the World to come. Not that particular sin, but others may: How doth that appear? What intimation is there, that any Sins not forgiven here, shall be forgiven there? Or that any Sins here remitted as to the Eternal Punishment, shall be there remitted as to the Temporal? and without such a kind of Remission, nothing can be inferred from hence. But if there be a Remission in another World, it can be neither in Heaven nor Hell, therefore it must be in Purgatory. But those who own a Remission of Sins in another World, say it will be on the Day of Judgment: For the actual deliverance of the Just from punishment, may be not improperly called the full Remission of their Sins. So S. Augustin, whom he quotes plainly faith, Si nulla remitterentur in judicio illo novissimo, &c. c. Julian, l. 6. c. 5. where it is evident S. Augustin takes this place to relate to the Day of Judgment; and so in the other, (De Civit. Dei l. 21. c. 24.) But as he supposed a Remission, so he did a purgation as by Fire in that day. In illo judicio penas qualidam purgatorias futuras. De Civit. Dei l. 20. c. 25. And so he is to be understood on Psal. 37. to which he applies 1 Cor. 3 15. But our Author was very much out, when he faith S. Augustin applied 1 Pet. 3. 15. to some place of temporal chastisement in another World, when Bellarmine sets himself to confute St. Augustin about it, as understanding it of this World. And therefore
he hath little cause to boast of St. Augustini's authority about Purgatory, unless he had brought something more to the purpose out of him. His other Testimonies of Antiquity are not worth considering, which he borrows from Natalis Alexander: that of Dionysius Areopag. Eccl. Hierarch. c. 7. is a known Counterfeit, and Impertinent, relating to a Region of Rest and Happiness: and so do Tertullianus Oblations for the dead, De Cor. Milit. c. 3. For they were Eucharistical, as appears by the ancient Liturgies, being made for the greatest Saints. St. Cyprian Ep. 66. speaks of an Oblation for the Dead: and he there mentions the Natalitia of the Martyrs: but by comparing that with his Epist. 33. it will be found that he speaks of the Anniversary Commemoration of the Dead, which signifies nothing to Purgatory, for the best men were put into it: and St. Cyprian threatens it as a punishment to be left out of the Dyptichs: but surely it is none to escape Purgatory: Arnobius l. 4. only speaks of praying for the Dead, which we deny not to have been then used in the Church, nor with respect to any temporary pains in Purgatory, but to the Day of Judgment: and therein lies the true state of the Controversie, with respect to antiquity; which is not, Whether any solemn prayers were not then made for the dead: But whether those prayers did relate to their deliverance out of a state of punishment before the Day of Judgment. For whatever state Souls were then supposed to be in, before the great Day, if there could be no deliverance till the Day of Judgment, it signifies nothing to the present Question.

As to the Vision of Perpetua concerning her Brother Dinocrates who died at Seven Years old, being baptized, it is hardly reconcilable to their own Doctrine, to suppose such a Soul in Purgatory: I will not deny that Perpetua did think she saw him in a worse condition, and thought likewise that by her Prayers she brought him into a better, for she saw him playing like little children, and then she awaked, and concluded that she had given him ease: But is it indeed come to this, that such a Doctrine as Purgatory must be built on such a Foundation as this? I do not call in question the Acts of Perpetua, nor her sincerity in relating her Dream; but must the Church build her Doctrines upon the Dreams or Visions of Young Ladies, tho very devout? for Ubia Perpetua was then but Twenty Two, as she faith her self: but none are to be blamed, who make use of the best supports their Cause will afford.
It is time now to see what strength of Reason he offers for Purgatory. 1. He faith, When a sinner is reconciled to God, tho the Eternal punishment due to his sins is always remitted, yet there sometimes remains a temporal penalty to be undergone; a: in the case of the Israelites, and David. But doth it hence follow, that there is a temporal penalty that must be undergone either here or hereafter, without which there will be no need of Purgatory? Who denies, that God in this Life, for example sake, may punish those whose sins he hath promised to remit as to another World? This is therefore a very slender Foundation. 2. There are some sins of their own nature light and venial. I will not dispute that; but suppose there be, must men go then into Purgatory for mere Venial Sins? What a strange Doctrine doth this appear to any Mans Reason? That God should forgive the greater sins, and require so severe a punishment for sins in their own nature venial, i. e. so inconsiderable in their Opinion, that no man is bound to confess them; which do not interrupt a state of Grace; which require only an implicit detestation of them; which do not deserve eternal punishment; which may be remitted by Holy Water, or a Bishops Blessing, as their Divines agree. 3. That to all sins some penalty is due to the Justice of God. And what follows from hence but the necessity of Christs Satisfaction? but how doth it appear, that after the Expiation of Sin by Christ, and the remission of eternal punishment, there still remains a necessity of farther satisfaction for such a temporal penalty in another World? 4. That generally speaking few men depart out of this Life, but either with the guilt of venial sins, or obnoxious to some temporal punishment; No doubt all men are obnoxious by their sins to the punishment of another World; but that is not the point, but whether God hath declared, That altho he remits the eternal punishment, he will not the temporal; and altho he will forgive thousands of pounds, he will not the pence and farthings we owe to him: But if Mortal Sins be remitted as to the guilt, and Venial do not hinder a State of Grace, what room is there for vindictive Justice in Purgatory.

Yet this is the Doctrine which too much weight is laid upon; that Bellarmin faith, They must go directly to Hell, who do not believe Purgatory. If this be true, why was it not put into the Representation of the World? S. Th. part 3. q. 87. art 3. in cor. v. Mar. fil. Column. Hydragiolog. Sect. 7. c. 3. n. 32. Sect. 3. c. 2. n. 15. 29. c. 3. n. 1. Bell. deCulturSanct. I. 3. c. 7. Sect. secundo.
Representation, that we might understand the danger of not believing so credible, so reasonable a Doctrine as this? But we believe it to be a much more dangerous thing to condemn others for not believing a Doctrine which hath so very slender a pretence either to Scripture or Reason.

XXIV. Of Praying in an unknown Tongue.

The Question in short is, Whether the Church Service, at which persons are bound to assist, ought not to be in a Language understood by those who are bound to assist?

For our Author grants, That a Papist is bound to assist at the Church-Service, and to hear Mass; but he is not bound to understand the Words there spoken.

This is a plain state of the case; and one would have thought St. Paul's Discourse about Edification in the Church-Service, and a known Tongue, and the Primitive practice, had deserved a little consideration, but not a Word is said to either of them; and the whole is so managed, as tho there had been no Rule, or any appearance of practice to the contrary. But I must consider what he doth say,

1. The Mass is a Sacrifice: And what then? Have they no other Church-Service but the Mass? What then becomes of their Breviaries, Litanies, and all other Offices? But suppose the Priest's Office in the Mass, be to offer the Sacrifice; are there no Prayers in the Canon of the Mass, wherein the people are concerned? Why must not they understand what they are required to assist in Prayer for? If they have English Books, as he faith, to teach them every part and Ceremony of the Mass, why not as well the Prayers in the Mass, wherein they are to join? They tell us, It is unseasonable then for the People to say their Beads, and other Devotions: And I suppose as unseasonable to talk, or think of other matters. Why then should not they know what it is they are to do, and what Petitions they are then to make to God? Are there no Responses to be made? No Lessons to be read? No Creed to be professed? Doth not the Priest speak to the People to pray, and they answer him? Is there no Thanksgiving after the Communion which the people is concerned
cerned in? We are as much for their Devout Affections, as they can be, but we think they are not hindred by understanding what they are about: We cannot but wonder, that any man should say, That it nothing concerns his Devotion, that the Mafs is in Latin, if he understand it not. Is it no part of Devotion to joyn in the publick prayers, not meerly by rote, but from a due apprehension of the matter contained in them? He requires, That they accompany the Priest in Prayer and Spirit: And why not in understanding also? But the Church hath so ordered it: And that is the thing we complain of, as done against St. Paul, against the Primitive Church, against the natural sense of Mankind, who think it is fit for them to know what they do, especially in the Worship of God: But it is to preserve Unity: Methinks however Unity in Spirit and Understanding is better than without it: There are other good Reasons: I know not one good one; and if there were more, he would have produced them: The greatest part is said in a low voice, that it is not possible he should hear it: And to what purpose should it be spoken louder, if they are not to understand it? But why so low in publick? Yet the people might have Books, and joyn, if they understood what was said. But why should not the rest be understood, which is spoken as if it were.

2. As to other Offices, he saith, He is taught, that he may perform them in a Language which he understands not, with great benefit to his Soul, and the acceptance of God, if at those occasions he endeavours to raise his thoughts to Heaven, and fix his heart upon his Maker. But the Question is not, Whether a Man may not have devout Thoughts at that time, but whether he can perform his part in the publick Offices, with true Devotion, without Understanding? For the publick Offices of Devotion were designed for the uniting the Hearts and Desires of the people in the same things. It is not, Whether one Man may not pray for Heaven, and another for fair Weather, and another for pardon of his Sins, and a Fourth for Patience, and so on, in the same place, and at the same time; for all this might be done as well in a silent Meeting, where not a Word is spoken: But there being one Form of Praying for all to join together in, that with the united force of the whole Congregation, their Petitions may go up to Heaven; The Matter now in dispute is, Whether it be not necessary in order to this united Devotion,
votion, that the people all know what they pray for? And one would think nothing need to be said to prove this: But what our Author adds in justification of this, overthrows all publick Devotion; For he faith, *It is not necessary to have attention on the Words, or on the Sense of Prayers, but rather purely on God:* Which is to make all publick Forms unnecessary, and to turn all Devotion into *Prayer of Contemplation:* For if this be true, all Forms whatsoever are not only useless, but burdensome; and by the stinting the Spirit, do hinder the nimble flights of the Soul, in pure silence towards God: And this principle must lead men to *Enthusiasms,* and unintelligible Unions; and make them despise Forms as a mean and dull Dispensation.

But at last he faith, *A Petitioner may accompany his Petition with an earnest desire of obtaining it, tho the Language in which it is written, be unknown to him.* Very true, if he indited the matter of the Petition, and trusted another to put it into that Language, which the Person to whom he makes it, doth understand, but not his own: But all Languages are alike to Gods Infinite Wisdom, and so there can be no pretence on that account, to keep only to some particular Tongues, tho unknown to the Party; and if it were so to all men, no man would have a Petition presented in a Language which he did not know: But in prayer to God, the design of it is not to acquaint him with something which he knew not, but to excite the hearts and affections of men to an earnest desire of the things which are fit for them to ask: Now let any man undertake to prove, that mens affections are as easily moved by words they do not understand, as by those they do: and I will give up this Cause.

XXV. Of the Second Commandment.

**THE Dispute about this, is not,**

*Whether the Second Commandment may be found in any of their Books, but by what Authority it comes to be left out in any:* As he confesses it is *in their short Catechisms and Manuals:* but not only in these, for I have now before me the Reformed Office of the Blessed Virgin, Printed at Salamanca, A. D. 1588. published by Order of Pius V. where it is so left out: And in the English Office at Antwerp, A. D. 1658. I wish he had told
XXVI. Of Mental Reservations.

Under this Head he denies Two Things.

1. That they are ever taught to break Faith with Heretics.

2. That their Church doth allow any Equivocations, or Mental Reservations.

As to the former I am sincerely glad to find a Principle so destructive to all humane Society, so utterly disowned, when he faith, He is taught to keep Faith with all sorts of People, of whatsoever
ever judgment or persuasion they be; and to stand to his Word, and observe his Promise given, or made to any whatsoever. And whatever Opinions and Practices there may have been of that kind formerly, we hope there will never be occasion given to revive that dispute.

2. As to the Second, We embrace his Declaration against it, and hope there is no Equivocation, or Mental Reservations in it. But there are some things which must here be taken notice of.

1. He cannot deny that there are Authors in Communion with his Church, which may be charged with teaching another Doctrine; and those not a few, nor inconsiderable; who not only allow the Practice of Mental Reservations and Equivocations, but lay with great confidence, it hath been received in the Roman Church for no less than four hundred years; and that in some Cases they are all still agreed in it. See Præfens Treatise of Mitigation, c. 7. Sect. 2. 3. c. 10. Sect. 1.

2. We do not deny, that Innocent XI. hath condemned Equivocations, and Mental Reservations in Swearing, as at least Scandalous and Pernicious in Practice; and therefore we cannot charge the Pope with abetting this Doctrine. But we cannot but reflect on what our Author said about the Depositing Doctrine, That although Popes had believed it, and acted by it, yet the greater number opposed it. And what shall we say in this Case, if the Generality of their Cæsuits in some Cases approve it, and think it no Lie or Perjury, as in that of Confession; but if it be really so in any one Case, then it may be some other fault; but it is not a Lie or Perjury in any other, when a Man doth not think himself bound to speak all he knows.

3. That as we highly commend the Popes condemning such Doctrines and Practices now; so we have Reason to think the contrary did not once want the encouragement and approbation of the Roman See. As may be found in the Resolution of some Cases by Pius V. relating to some Missionaries, who were to be sent hither; and then it was declared, That if they were summon’d before our Judges, they might Sophistice Jurare & Sophistice Respondere; and that they were not bound to answer according to the Intention of the Judges, but according to some true sense of their own, i. e. which was made true by the help of

Apud G. Abbot de Mendacio, &c. in Praz. p. 6, &c.
of a Mental Reservation. But it is very well, that now the very same things are condemned at Rome, as scandalous and pernicious in practice.

XXVII. Of a Death-Bed Repentance.

We have no difference with them about this matter, as far as they hold to these points: 1. That men are strictly obliged to work out their Salvation with fear and trembling in time of Health. 2. That it is very dangerous to defer their Repentance to the last. 3. That if any are surprised, they ought in charity to have all possible assistance, to put them into the best way for their Salvation.

But yet there may be some particular Doctrines owned in the Church of Rome, which may give men too much encouragement to put off true Repentance; as 1. The easiness of being put into a state of Grace by the Sacrament of Penance; for which no more is required than removing the impediment; as appears by the Council of Trent. Seff. 7. Can. 6. and afterwards it defines that bare Attrition doth sufficiently dispose a Man to receive Grace in that Sacrament, Seff. 14. c. 4. So that altho a Man hath led a very bad Life, if he hath but this Attrition for his sins when he doth confess them, he is put into a state of Grace by this Sacrament. And what can any Man expect more, and what can he do less! I do not mean a bare natural Attrition, the sufficiency whereof is condemned by Innocent XI. in the same Propositions (Fifty seventh) but that which the Council of Trent calls imperfect contrition, i.e. a good Motion in a Mans mind to forfake his sins for fear of punishment, if really no more be required for a state of Grace but this, it is no wonder if men put off the doing of that which may be done at any time so easily by the help of a Priest.

2. The Treasure of the Church is another thing which is very apt to hinder Mens speedy Repentance; for by that they believe there is a stock ready of so many Merits and Satisfactions of others, if duly applied to them by Indulgences, that they need not be at such pains to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling. When a Man by the Sacrament of Penance is put in to
into a state of Grace, the Eternal Punishment is discharged, and nothing remains but some Temporal pains: and to ease him of these he hath many helps, but especially the Treasure of the Church, which the Pope hath the dispensing of, as he is bound to believe: and by Indulgences he may easily get off some Thousands of Years of Purgatory Pains: and if these should fail him, there is another help yet left, which is leaving a stock for Prayers for his Soul, when he dies; which, even our Author assures him, are very available towards his speedier release out of Purgatory.

XXVIII. Of FASTING.

THE Question here is, Whether a Man doth not observe their Churches Command about Fasting who forbears all forbidden things, but takes liberty in those which are not forbidden?

It is not, Whether they may not break the Commands of God, against Gluttony and Drunkenness: But whether they break the Law of the Church about Fasting? And notwithstanding what our Author hath said, I see no Reason for the Affirmative. I do not deny, 1. That it is a very indifferent sort of Fasting, to abstain from Flesh, unless all other sorts of Excesses at the same time be carefully avoided. 2. That Excesses on such days are more scandalous, because there is a pretence of Fasting. 3. That God's Command doth at all times forbid Intemperance. Which are the chief things he insists upon. But yet this doth not reach the point, which is about their Churches Command. For their Casuists distinguish Fasting into 1. Natural: which is total Abstinence: and this is required only in order to receive the Eucharist. 2. Moral: which is the same with Temperance, or Fasting for Health. 3. Ecclesiastical: which is defined by them to be, An Abstinence from Food forbidden by the Church. And if this Definition be true, it cannot be broken but by eating what the Church hath prohibited.

And therefore their Casuists, as far as I can find, are agreed in these things,

1. That
1. That a Man may eat a full Meal of what is not forbidden, and not break the Churches Precept of Fasting, provided Vespers be first said. And the later Casuists blame Covarruvias for making any scruple about it. If a Mans Excess comes to be a Mortal sin; yet for all that, faith Reginaldus, He shall not be judged as a breaker of his Fast. Nay, Lessius goes further, and faith, He doth not lose the Merit of Fasting. Quamvis aliquis multum excedat non solvit Jejunium, faith Card. Tolet. And Paulus Zacchias faith, This is the common Opinion; and he thinks the Intention of the Church is sufficiently answered. And so doth Pasqualus in his Praxis of Fasting.

2. A Man may drink Wine, or other drink, as often as he pleaseth, without breaking his Fast. He may toties quoties bibere, faith Diana. Zach. Pasqualus, who hath Written most fully on this Subject, shews, That it is the general Opinion, that no quantity of Wine or other drink, tho taken without any necessity, is a violation of the Precept of Fasting; no, not although the Wine be taken for nourishment, because the Church doth not forbid it; but this last, his faith, is not the general, but the more probable Opinion.

3. A Man may eat somethin[g] when he drinks, to prevent its doing him hurt; besides his good Meal, he may take what quantity he pleases of Sweet-meats or Fruit; he may have a good Refectation at Night, and yet not break this strict Precept of Fasting; For the eating as often as one drinks, it is the common Opinion, faith the same Casuist (who was no Jesuit) That it is not forbidden, because it is taken by way of a Medicine; and he quotes a great number of their Casuists for it. A Collation at evening is allowed, faith he. And Lessius faith, There is no certain Rule for the Quantity of it. And Card. Tolet faith, every large ones are allowed at Rome by the Popes Convenience; even in the Court of Rome, faith Reginaldus. And now I leave the Reader to judge of the severity of Fasting required in the Church of Rome.
XXIX. Of Divisions and Schisms in the Church.

Two things he faith upon this Head.

1. That they are all agreed in matters of Faith.
2. That they only differ in some School Points; from whence he infers, That they have no Schisms or Separations among them.

But that this is no just consequence, will appear by the Schisms and Separations among us, made by such who profess to agree in all matters of Faith. Yet let us see how he proves that they agree in all matters of Faith; because they agree to submit equally to the Determinations of the Church.

Now this very way evidently proves that they do not all agree, because they do not equally submit to the Churches determinations. For,

1. Some say they are bound to submit to the Churches Determinations, as it represents the Universal Church; Others say no: but as the Churches Power is virtually lodged in the Guides of it. Now this is a very material Difference: For if it be on the former Account, then not the Popes and Councils Declarations are to be regarded, but as they express the sense of the Universal Church; and so the Majority of Votes, and Numbers in the Representative and Diffusive Church is chiefly to be regarded. And on this Ground some reject the Deposing-Power, tho plainly decreed by Popes and Councils: but they unhinge their Churches Authority by it. Now how is it possible for them to agree about matters of Faith, who differ fundamentally about the way how any things come to be matters of Faith? If they be decreed by Popes and Councils, say some; and so the Deposing Power is become an Article of Faith. No such matter, say others, for a greater Number in the diffusive Church oppose it, as in the Gallican Church, and elsewhere. Very well! But how then can these Parties be said to agree in matters of Faith, and an equal Submission to the Determinations of the Church?

2. Some again say, That it is not the consent of the present Church can make any Article of Faith, but there must be an Universal
Universal Tradition from the Apostles times. And so they tell us the Deposing Power can never be an Article of Faith, because it wants the Consent of all the Ages before Gregory VII. So that upon this Ground there can be no Article of Faith which cannot be proved to be thus delivered down to us. Others again say, this is in effect to give up their Cause, knowing the impossibility of proving particular Points in this manner: and therefore they say, the present Church is wholly to be trusted for the sense of the foregoing.

Now these differences are still on Foot in their Church; and from these do arise daily disputes about Matters of Faith, and the Seat of Infallibility, whether in the Guides, or the body of the Church: if the former, whether in the Church Representative, or Virtual? whether the Personal Infallibility of the Pope be a matter of Faith or not? Our Author says, Not; others say yes: and yet he faith, they are agreed in matters of Faith: So that by his own Confession they differ about other things than mere School-points.

But suppose they were agreed in Articles of Faith, can there be no Schisms or Divisions in their Church? What thinks he of all the Schisms between Popes and Popes? Of all the Schisms between the Popes and the Emperors Parties? Which were as notorious, and scandalous, and mischievous, as ever were in the World. What thinks he of the Schisms between the Bishops and the Regular Orders, which were as crooked and peevish towards the Bishops and Secular Clergy, as our Dissenters themselves? And among the Regular Orders, what Heats and Contentions have been, Not about the Practice of a devout Life, I assure him, but about matters of Doctrine: and which both Parties severally plead to be matters of Faith? As in the noted Controversies of this last Age, about the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, the power of Grace, and the Popes Personal Infallibility: and they cannot say they are as yet agreed about these things.
Our Dispute is not, About the lawfulness of retiring from the World by such Persons who are rendred unfit for doing Service in it; and the more they spend their time in Devotion and Contemplation, the more the better.

But it lies in these Things,

1. Whether the Perfection of a Christian State of Life lies in being cloyster'd up from the World, or labouring to do good in it? For this was the great snare made use of, to draw men into it, because they represented this as the most perfect state; whereas according to the Doctrine and Example of Christ and his Apostles, the active Life of doing good, is far beyond it.

2. Whether, altho' such a retirement be allowed, it be a thing pleasing to God, to tye such Persons up by indispensible Vows, whatever their Circumstances may be, not to alter that State of Life; who either in Youth, or through Force, Passion, or Discontent, have entred into it? And this may be so much rather questioned, because those who assert the Pope may dispense, go upon this Ground, Because Circumstances may alter the Obligation of a Vow; and when a greater good is to be attained, it ceaseth to oblige; which to my apprehension doth not prove the Popes power to dispense, but the dispensible Nature of the Vows themselves.

3. Whether all things of this nature being liable in continuance of time, to great Degeneracy and Corruptions; and the numbers of such Places being unserviceable either to Church or State, it be not in the power of the King and States of the Kingdom, to dissolve and reduce them to ways more suitable to the Conveniences of both?

As to what he discourses about Councils of Perfection, the Distractions of the World, the Corruptions of the best Things, &c. They reach not the main points, but are only general Topicks, which we are not concerned to debate.
XXXI. Of Wicked Principles and Practices.

The Misrepresenter charges the Church of Rome with many horrid Practices, as the French and Irish Maccacres, the Murders of Two Kings of France, the Holy League, the Gun-powder-Treaty, &c. And charges these as being done according to the Principles of that Church.

But in answer to this he faith, 1. In General, That the Doctrine of it is holy, teaching the Love of God and our neighbour, and that none can be saved by Faith alone. In which Doctrine we heartily concur with them. 2. That although many uncertain things pass for certain, and false for true, yet he cannot deny that all ranks and degrees of men have been corrupted among them, being scandalous in their Lives, wicked in their designs, without the Fear of God in their hearts, or care of their own Salvation. This is a general acknowledgment, but no particular Answer to the things objected.

3. That the whole Church is not to be charged for the sake of such villanies. Very true, unless some Doctrine owned in that Church gave encouragement to them: As suppose any should ever have fallen into Rebellion upon the belief of the Deposing Power; is not that Doctrine chargeable with the Consequences of it? They are extremely to blame who charge a Church with what her Members do in direct Opposition to her Doctrine; but it is quite another Case, when the main Ground we allege for their Actions is some allowed Principle in it. 4. They are not accountable for the Actions of every Bishop, Cardinal, or Pope; for they extend not their Faith beyond the Declaration of General Councils. But suppose General Councils have declared such Doctrines, and Popes act but according to them; is not their Church then accountable for their Actions? 5. There is more Praying and Fasting, and receiving the Sacraments, more visiting the Prisoners, and the Sick, more Alms-giving in any of our neighbouring Popish Towns, as Paris, Antwerp, Gant, &c. than in any Ten Towns of the Reformation. And is there more charity too? It doth not appear, if they be as ready to cenfire others, and admire themselves, as our Author, who so freely gives his Judgment about a matter it is impossible for him to know.

We
We see no reason to admire or imitate the manner of their Praying, and Fasting, and receiving the Sacraments; for to pray without understanding, to fast without Abstinence, to receive a maimed Sacrament, are things we do not envy them for; but altho our Devotion be not so pompous, and full of show, yet We may pray and fast in secret, according to our Saviours Directions, far more than they do; however our People are mightily to blame if they do not understand what they pray for, if they do not receive more of the Sacrament than they; and we verily believe there are as great and remarkable Instances of true Charity among those of the Church of England, as among any People in the World.

XXXII. Of M I R A C L E S.

O U R Author faith, He is not obliged to believe any one Miracle besides what is in Scripture.

1. He sees no Reason to doubt the truth of many Miracles, which are attested by great numbers of Eye-witnesses, examined by Authority, and found upon Record, with all the Formalities due to such a Process.

Now, how can these two things stand together? Is not a Man obliged to believe a thing so well proved? And if his other Arguments prove any thing, it is, that he is bound to believe them. For he thinks there is as much Reason to believe Miracles still, as in the time of the old or new Law. If he can make this out, I see no reason why he should not be as well obliged to believe them now, as those recorded in Scripture. But I can see nothing like a proof of this. And all Persons of Judgment in their own Church, do grant there is a great difference between the Necessity of Miracles for the first establishing a Religion, and afterwards. This is not only asserted by Tostatus, Erasmus, Stella, Andradius, and several others formerly; but the very late French Author I have several times mentioned, faith it in express Terms. And he confesses the great Impostures of modern Miracles, which, he faith, ought to be severely punished; and that none but Women and weak People think themselves bound to believe them. And he cannot understand what they
they are good for: Not to convert Hereticks; because not done among them: Not to prove there are no corruptions or errors among them, which is a thing incredible; with much more to that purpose, and so concludes with Monfieur Paschal, That if they have no better use, we ought not to be amused with them.

But Christ promised, that his Apostles should do greater Miracles than himself had done. And what then? Must therefore S. Francis, or S. Dominic, or S. Rosa, do as great as the Apostles had done? What Consequence can be drawn from the Apostles times to latter Ages? We do not dispute God's Omnipotency, or say his hand is shortned; but we must not from thence infer, that every thing which is called a Miracle is truly so; or make use of God's Power, to justify the most incredible stories. Which is a way will serve as well for a false as a true Religion; and Mahomet might run to Gods Omnipotency for cleaving the Moon in two pieces, as well as others for removing a House over the Seas, or any thing of a like nature.

But, he faith, their Miracles are not more ridiculous and absurd than some in the Old Testament. Which I utterly deny; but I shall not run out into the examination of this Parallel, by shewing how very different the Nature, Design, and Authority of the Miracles he mentions, is from those which are believed in the Roman Church. And it had been but fitting, as he set down the Miracles of the Old Testament, so to have mentioned those of the Roman Church which were to vye with them; but this he was willing to forbear, for certain good Reasons. If most of poor Man's imposibles be none to God, as he concludes, yet every thing is not presently true which is not impossible; and by this way of Arguing, there can be nothing objected against the most absurd and idle Fictions of the Golden Legend, which all Men of Understanding among themselves, not only reject for want of Authority, but of Credibility.
XXXIII. Of Holy Water.

The Misrepresenter charges him with approving superstitious uses of inanimate things, and attributing wonderful effects to them; as Holy-Water, Candles, Oyl, Bread, &c.

In Answer, our Author declares, That the Papist truely represented, utterly disapproves all sorts of Superstition. But if he had designed to have represented truely, he ought to have told us what he meant by Superstition, and whether any Man who observes the Commands of the Church can be guilty of it.

2. He faith, That these things are particularly deputed by the Prayers and Blessing of the Priest to certain uses for God's Glory, and the Spiritual and Corporal Good of Christians.

This is somewhat too general; but Marshallius Columna, Archbishop of Salerno, who hath taken most pains in this matter, sums them up; 1. As to Spiritual, they are Seven. 1. To fright Devils. 2. To remit Venial sins. 3. To cure Distractions. 4. To elevate the Mind. 5. To dispose it for Devotion. 6. To obtain Grace. 7. To prepare for the Sacrament.

2. As to Corporal. 1. To cure Barrenness. 2. To multiply Goods. 3. To procure Health. 4. To purge the Air from pestilential Vapours.

And now, as our Author faith, What Superstition in the use of it? He names several things of Gods own appointing to Parallel it; as the Waters of Jealousy, the Show-bread, the Tables of Stone; but the first was miraculous, the other had no such effects that we ever heard of. Elisha's Salt for sweetning the Water, was undoubtedly a Miracle. Is the Holy-Water so? As to the Liver of the Fish for expelling the Devil, in the Book of Tobit, he knows the Book is not owned for Canonical by us; and this very place is produced as an Argument against it; there being no Ground from Scripture, to attribute the Power of expelling Devils, to the Liver of a Fish, either naturally or symbolically: Vallesius offers at the only probable account of it, that it must be a Divine Power given to it, which the Angel Raphael did not discover; and yet it is somewhat hard to conceive, how this Liver should
should have such a power to drive away any kind of Devil, as it is there expressed, unless by a Devil there, no more be meant than some violent Disease, which the Jews generally believed to arise from the possession of evil Spirits: But however here is an Angel supposed, who made this known to Tobit; but we find not Raphæl to discover the virtue of Holy Water against Devils. As to Christ using Clay to open the Eyes of the Blind, it is very improperly applied, unless the same miraculous Power be supposed in it, which was in Christ himself: And so is the Apostles laying on of Hands, and using Oyl for miraculous Cures; unless the same Gift of Miracles be in every Priest which consecrates Holy Water, which was in the Apostles: And Bellarmine himself confesses, That no infallible effect doth follow the use of Holy Water, because there is no Promise of God in the case, but only the prayers of the Church. But these are sufficient to sanctifie the Water, faith our Author: And to what end? For all the spiritual and corporeal benefits before mention ed? Is no promise of God necessary for such purposes as those? How can any Church in the World dispose of Gods Power without his Will? It may appoint significant and decent Ceremonies, but it can never appropriate Divine Effects to them; and to suppose any Divine Power in things which God never gave them, is in my Opinion, Superstition; and to use them for such ends, is a superstitious use. St Cyril, whom he quotes, speaks of the Consecration of the Water of Baptism, Catech. 3. St Augustine only of a consecrated Bread, which the Catechumens had (De Peccat. Merit. & Remiss. 1. 2. c. 26.) but he attributes no Divine Effects to it. Pope Alexanders Epistle is a notorious Counterfeit. Those Passages of Epiphanius, Theodoret, and S. Jerom, all speak of miraculous effects; and those who had the power of Miracles, might sometimes do them with an external sign, and sometimes without, as the Apostles cured with anointing, and without: But this is no ground for consecrating Oyl by the Church, or Holy Water, for miraculous Effects. If these Effects which they attribute to Holy Water, be miraculous, then every Priest must have not only a power of Miracles himself, but of annexing it to the Water he consecrates; if they be super-natural, but not mira culous, then Holy Water must be made a Sacrament to produce these Effects ex operè operato; if neither one nor the other, I know not how to excuse the use of it from Superstition.
XXXIV. Of breeding up People in Ignorance.

The Misrepresenter charges them with this, on these Accounts. 1. By keeping their Mysteries of Iniquity from them. 2. By performing Divine Service in an unknown Tongue. 3. By an implicit Faith. To which the Representer answers. 1. That they give encouragement to Learning; and he instances in their Universities and Conventual Libraries; But what is all this to the common People? But their Indices Expurgatorii, and prohibiting Books so severely, which are not for their turn, (as we have lately seen in the new one of Paris) argues no great confidence of their Cause, nor any hearty love to Learning: And if it could be rooted out of the World, their Church would fare the better in it; but if it cannot, they must have some to be able to deal with others in it. 2. As to the common People he saith, They have Books enough to instruct them. Is it so in Spain or Italy? But where they live among Hereticks, as we are called, the People must be a little better instructed to defend themselves, and to gain upon others. 3. If the People did know their Church-Offices and Service, &c. they would not find such faults, since the Learned approve them. Let them then try the Experiment, and put the Bible and their Church-Offices every where into the Vulgar Tongues: But their severe Prohibitions shew how much they are of another Opinion: What made all that Rage in France against Voifins Translation of the Missal? Such Proceedings of the Assembly of the Clergy against it; such complaints both to the King and the Pope against it, as tho all were left, if that were suffered? Such an Edict from the King, such a Prohibition from the Pope in such a Tragical Stile about it? Such a Collection of Authors to be printed on purpose against it? Do these things shew, even in a Nation of so free a Temper, in Comparison as the French, any mighty Inclination towards the encouraging this Knowledge in the People? And since that, what stirs have there been about the Mens Testament? What Prohibitions by Bishops? besides a Bull from this very Pope against it. What vehement Opposition by others? So that many Volumes have already been written on the occasion of that Translation. And yet our Author would persuade
persuade us, That if we look abroad, we shall find wonderful care
taken to keep the People from Ignorance; but we can discern much
greater to keep them in it.

XXXV. Of the Uncharitableness of the Papists.

The Misrepresenter, (as he is called) charges this Point home,
Because they deny Salvation to those who believe all the Articles
of the Christian Faith in the Apostles Creed, and lead virtuous and
good Lives, if they be not of their Communion.

To this the Representer answers in plain terms, That this is
nothing but what they have learnt from the mouth of Christ and his
Apostles. And to this end he multlers up all their sayings against
Infidels, false Apostles, Gnosticks, Cerinthians, as tho they were
point-blank levelled against all that live out of the Communion
of the Church of Rome.

But this is no Uncharitableness, but pure zeal, and the same the
Primitive Church [ brethren against Hereticks, such as Marcion, Bafi-
lides, and Bardesanes, who were condemned in the first Age for deny-
ing the Resurrection of the dead, &c. What in the first Age! Me-
thinks the Second had been early enough for them: But this is to
let us see what Learning there is among you. But do we deny
the Resurrection of the Dead? Or hold any one of the Herefies
condemned by the Primitive Church? What then is our Fault,
which can merit so severe a Sentence? We oppose the Church:
What Church? The Primitive Apostolical Church? The Church
in the time of the four General Councils? I do not think that will
be said, but I am sure it can never be proved: What Church then?
The present Church? Is it then damnable to oppose the pre-
fent Church? But I pray let us know what ye mean by it;
The Universal Body of Christians in the World? No, No, a-
abundance of them are Hereticks and Schismaticks, as well as
we: i.e. All the Christians in the Eastern and Southern parts,
who are not in Communion with the Church of Rome: So
that two parts in three of Christians, are sent to Hell by this
Principle; and yet it is no Uncharitableness. But suppose the
Church of Rome be the only true Church, must men be damned

P. 92.

P. 95.
presently for opposing its Doctrines? I pray think a little better on it, and you will change your Minds. Suppose a Man do not submit to the Guides of this Church in a matter of Doctrine declared by them; Must he be Damned? What if it be the Deposing Power? Yet his Principle is, If a Man do not hold the Faith entire, he is gone. But Popes and Councils have declared this to be a point of Faith; therefore if he doth not hold it, he must be damned. There is no way of answering this, but he must abate the severity of his Sentence against us. For upon the same Reason he questions that, we may question many more. And all his Arguments against us, will hold against himself; For, faith he, he that disbelieves one Article of Catholic Faith, does in a manner disbelieve all. Let him therefore look to it, as well as we. But he endeavours to prove, the Roman Catholic Church to be the true Church, by the ordinary Notes and Marks of the Church. Although he is far enough from doing it; yet this will not do his business. For he must prove, that we are convinced that it is the true Church; and then indeed he may charge us with Obstinate Opposition, but not before. And it is a very strange thing to me, that when their Divines say, that Infidels shall not be damned for their Infidelity, where the Gospel hath not been sufficiently proposed to them; and no Christian for not believing any Article of Faith till it be so proposed; that we must be damned for not believing the Articles of the Roman Faith, which never have been, and never can be sufficiently proposed to us. Methinks such men should Study a little better their own Doctrine about the sufficient Proposal of matters of Faith, before they pass such uncharitable and unlearned Censures.

XXXVI. Of Ceremonies and Ordinances.

His Discourse on this Head is against those who refuse to obey their Superiors in things not expressed in Scripture, which is no part of our Controversy with them. But yet there are several things about their Ceremonies we are not satisfied in: As 1. The mighty Number of them, which have so much muffled up the Sacraments, that their true face cannot be discerned. 2. The Efficacy attributed to them, without any promise from
from God; whereas we own no more but decency and significance. 3. The Doctrine that goes along with them, not only of Obedience, but of Merit; and some have asserted the Opus Operatum of Ceremonies as well as Sacraments, when the Power of the Keys goes along with them; i.e. when there hath been some Act of the Church exercised about the Matter of them; as in the Consecration of Oyl, Salt, Bread, Ashes, Water, &c.

XXXVII. Of Innovation in matters of Faith.

The Substance of his Discourse on this Head may be reduced to these things. 1. That the Church in every Age hath Power to declare what is necessary to be believed, with Anathema to those who Preach the Contrary; and so the Council of Trent, in declaring Transubstantiation, Purgatory, &c. to be necessary Articles, did no more than the Church had done before on like Occasions. 2. That if the Doctrines then defined had been Innovations, they must have met with great Opposition when they were introduced. 3. That those who charged those points to be Innovations, might as well have laid the scandal on any other Article of Faith which they retained.

These are things necessary to be examined, in order to the making good the charge of Innovation in matters of Faith, which we believe doth stand on very good Grounds.

1. We are to consider, Whether the Council of Trent had equal Reason to define the necessity of these points, as the Council of Nice and Constantinople had to determine the point of the Trinity; or those of Ephesus and Chalcedon, the Truth of Christ's Incarnation. He doth not assert it to be in the Churches Power to make new Articles of Faith, as they do imply new Doctrines revealed; but he contends earnestly, That the Church hath a Power to declare the necessity of believing some points which were not so declared before. And if the Necessity of believing doth depend upon the Churches Declaration, then he must assert, that it is in the Churches Power to make points necessary to be believed which were not so; and consequently to make common Opinions to become Articles of Faith. But I hope we may have leave to enquire in this Case, since the Church pretends to no new Revelation of matters of Doctrine, therefore it can declare no more than
than it receives, and no otherwise than it receives. And so nothing can be made necessary to Salvation but what God himself hath made so by his Revelation. So that they must go in their Declaration either upon Scripture, or Universal Tradition; but if they define any Doctrine to be necessary without these Grounds, they exceed their Commission; and there is no Reason to submit to their Decrees, or to believe their Declarations. To make this more plain by a known Instance: It is most certain that several Popes and Councils have declared the Depositing Doctrine, and yet our Author faith, It is no Article of Faith with him. Why not, since the Popes and Councils have as evidently delivered it, as the Council of Trent hath done Purgatory, or Transubstantiation? But he may say, There is no Anathema joined to it. Suppose there be not; But why may it not be, as well as in the other Cases? And if it were, I would know, whether in his Conscience he would then believe it to be a necessary Article of Faith, tho he believed that it wanted Scripture and Tradition? If not, then he sees what this matter is brought to, viz. That altho the Council of Trent declare these new Doctrines to be necessary to be believed; yet if their Declaration be not built on Scripture and Universal Tradition, we are not bound to receive it.

2. As to the impossibility of Innovations coming in without notorious opposition, I see no ground at all for it, where the alteration is not made at once, but proceeds gradually. He may as well prove it impossible for a Man to fall into a Dropsy or a Heelick-Fever, unless he can tell the punctual time when it began. And he may as well argue thus, Such a Man fell into a Fever upon a great Debach, and the Physicians were presently sent for to advise about him; therefore the other Man hath no Chronical Distemper, because he had no Physicians when he was first sick; as because Councils were called against some Heresies, and great Opposition made to them, therefore where there is not the like, there can be no Innovation. But I see no Reason why we should decline giving an Account, by what Degrees, and Steps, and upon what Occasions, and with what Opposition several of the Doctrines defined at Trent were brought in. For the matter is not so obscure as you would make it, as to most of the Points in difference between us. But that is too large a Task to be here undertaken.

3. There
3. There is no Colour for calling in Question the Articles of Faith received by us on the same Grounds that we reject those defined by the Council of Trent; for we have the Universal Consent of the Christian World for the Apostles Creed; and of the Four General Councils for the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation: who never pretended to determine any Point to be necessary which was not revealed in Scripture; whose Sense was delivered down by the Testimony of the Christian Church from the Apostles times. But the Council of Trent proceeded by a very different Rule; for it first set up an Unwritten Word—unto be a Rule of Faith, as Sess Quarta, well as the Written; which altho' it were necessary in order to their Decrees, was one of the greatest Innovations in the World; and the Foundation of all the rest, as they were there established.

An Answer to the CONCLUSION.

Having thus gone through the several Heads, which our Author complains have been so much Misrepresented; it is now fit to consider what he faith in his Conclusion, which he makes to answer his Introduction, by renewing therein his doleful Complaints of their being Misrepresented just as Christ and his Apostles, and the Primitive Christians were. I P 119, hope the former Discourse hath shewed their Doctrines and Practices are not so very like those of Christ and his Apostles, and the Primitive Christians, that their Cases should be made so parallel: but as in his Conclusion he hath summed up the Substance of his Representations, so I shall therein follow his Method, only with this difference, that I shall in one Column set down his own Representations of Popery, and in the other the Reasons, in short, why we cannot embrace them.

Wherein Popery consists as Represented by this Author.

1. In using all external Acts of Adoration before Images, as Kneeling, Praying, lifting up the Eyes, burning Candles, Incense, &c. Not merely to worship the Objects before them, but to worship the Images themselves on the account of the Ob-

Our Reasons against it in the several Particulars.

1. Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven Image, or any likeness of any thing in Heaven, or Earth; &c. Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them. Which being the plain clear, and express Words of the Divine Law, we dare not worship any
Papery as Represented.

2. In joining the Saints in Heaven together with Christ in Intercession for us, and making Prayers on Earth to them on that Account. P. 5.

Our Reasons against it.

any Images, or Representations, left we be found Transgressors of this Law. Especially since God herein hath declared himself a Jealous God; and annexed so severe a Sanction to it. And since he that made the Law is only to interpret it, all the Distinctions in the World can never satisfy a Mans Conscience, unless it appear that God himself did either make or approve them. And if God allow the VVorship of the thing Represented by the Representation, he would never have forbidden that VVorship absolutely, which is unlawful only in a certain respect.

2. We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, 1 John 2. 1. And one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus, 1 Tim. 2. 5. For Christ is entered into Heaven it self, now to appear in the Presence of God for us, Heb. 9. 24. And therefore we dare not make other Intercessors in Heaven besides him: and the distance between Heaven and us, breaks off all Communication between the Saints there, and us upon Earth; so that all Addressses to them now for their Prayers, are in a way very different from desiring others on earth to pray for us: And if such Addressses are made in the solemn Offices of Divine VVorship, they join the Creatures with the Creator in the Acts and Signs of VVorship, which are due to God alone.

3. Call
Popery as Represented.

3. In allowing more Supplications to be used to the Blessed Virgin, than to Christ; For he denies it to be an idle Superstition, to repeat Ten Ave Maria's for one Pater Noster.

4. In giving Religious Honour and Respect to Relicks. Such as placing them upon Altars, burning Wax-Candles before them, carrying them in Processions, to be seen, touched, or humbly kissed by the People: Which are the known and allowed Practices in the Church of Rome. P. 8.

Our Reasons against it.

3. Call upon me in the Day of Trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorifie me, Psal. 50. 15. When we pray to Our Father in Heaven, as our Saviour commanded us, we do but what both Natural and Christian Religion require us to do: But when men pray to the Blessed Virgin for Help and Protection now, and at the Hour of Death, they attribute that to her, which belongs only to God, who is our Helper and Defender: And altho Christ knew the Dignity of his Mother above all others, he never gives the least encouragement to make such Address to her: And to suppose her to have a share now in the Kingdom of Christ in Heaven, as a Copartner with him, is to advance a Creature to Divine Honour, and to overthrow the true Ground of Christ's Exaltation to his Kingdom in Heaven, which was, His suffering on the Cross for us.

4. And no man knoweth of the Sepulcher of Moses unto this day, Deut. 34. 6. Why should God hide the Body of Moses from the People, if he allowed giving Religious Honour and Respect to Relicks? Why should Hezekiah break in Pieces the Brazen Serpent, because the Children of Israel did burn Incense to it? 2 Kings 18. 4. Especially when it was a Type or Representation of Christ himself, and God had wrought many Miracles by it.
Popery as Represented.

Our Reasons against it.

5. In adoring Christ as present in the Eucharist on the account of the Substance of Bread and Wine being changed into that Body of Christ which suffered on the Cross. P. 10.

6. In believing the Substance of Bread and Wine by the Words of Consecration, to be changed into his own Body and Blood, the Species only or Accidents of Bread and Wine remaining as before. P. 10.

8. In making Confession of our sins to a Priest in order to Absolution. P. 14.

9. In the use of Indulgences for taking away the Temporal Punishments of sin, remaining due after the Guilt is remitted.

fisting in the enjoyment of God, it is impossible there should be any just Proportion, or due Commenfuration between our best Actions, and such a Reward.

8. And the Son said unto him, Father I have sinned against Heaven, and in thy sight, St. Luke 15. 21.

Where Confeflion to God is required because the Offence is against him, but it is impossible for any Man upon earth to forgive those whom God doth not forgive: And he alone can appoint the necessary Conditions of Pardon, among which true Con- trition and Repentance is fully decla-red; but Confeflion to a Priest, tho' it may be useful for the ease of the Pe- nitent, is no where in Scripture made necessary for the Forgiveness of Sin.

9. I said, I will confefs my Trans- gressions unto the Lord; and thou for- gavest the iniquity of my sin, Psal. 32. 5.

If God doth fully forgive the Guilt of sin, there remains no Obligation to punishment; for whereever that is, the guilt remains: It is true, God may not sometimes fully pardon; but he may reserve some temporal punishment here for his own Honour, or the Chaitifement of a penitent Sinner: But then what have any men to do, to pretend that they can take off what God thinks fit to lay on? Can any Indulgences prevent pain or Sickness, or sudden Death? But if Indulgences be understood only with
Popery as Represented.

10. In supposing that Penitent Sinners may in some measure satisfy by Prayer, Fasting, Alms, &c. for the Temporal Pain, which by order of God's Justice sometimes remains due, after the Guilt and the Eternal Pain are remitted. P. 17.

Our Reasons against it.

respect to Canonical Penances, they are a most notorious and inexcusable Corruption of the Discipline of the Ancient Church.

10. For if when we were Enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his Life, Rom. 5. 10. And therefore no Satisfaction to the Justice of God is now required from us, for the Expiation of any remainder of Guilt. For if Christ's Satisfaction were in it self sufficient for a total Remission, and was so accepted by God; what Account then remains for the Sinner to discharge, if he perform the Conditions on his part? But we do not take away hereby the Duties of Mortification, Prayer, Fasting, and Alms. &c. but there is a difference to be made between the Acts of Christian Duties, and Satisfaction to Divine Justice for the Guilt of Sin, either in whole or in part. And to think to joyn any Satisfactions of ours, together with Christ's, is like joyning our hand with Gods in Creating or Governing the World.

11. Let the Word of Christ dwell in you richly in all Wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another, &c. Coloss. 3. 16.

How could that dwell richly in them, which was not to be communicated to them, but with great Caution? How could they teach and admonish
Popery as Represented.

Our Reasons against it.

monish one another in a Language not understood by them? The Scriptures of the New Testament were very early perverted; and if this Reason were sufficient to keep them out of the Hands of the People, certainly they would never have been published for common use, but as prudently dispensed then, as some think it necessary they should be now. But we esteem it a part of our Duty, not to think our selves wiser than Christ or his Apostles, nor to deprive them of that unvaluable Treasure which our Saviour hath left to their use.

12. All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, 2 Tim. 3. 16. Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy-Ghost, 2 Pet. 1. 21.

Therefore, where there is no Evidence of Divine Inspiration, those Books cannot be made Canonical. But the Jewish Church, To whom the Oracles of God were committed, never deliver'd these Books as any part of them, being Written when Inspiration was ceas'd among them. And it is impossible for any Church in the World to make that to be divinely inspired, which was not so from the Beginning.

13. But I say, Have they not heard? Yes verily, their sound went into all the Earth, and their Words into the ends of the World. Rom. 10. 18.

Therefore the Intention of God was, that the Gospel should be under-
14. In believing that the Scripture alone can be no Rule of Faith to any Private or particular Person. P. 28.

Our Reasons against it.

stood by all Mankind; which it could never be, unless it were translated into their several Languages. But still the difference is to be observed, between the Originals and Translations; and no Church can make a Translation equal to the Original. But among Translations, those deserve the greatest esteem which are done with the greatest Fidelity and Exactness. On which account our last Translation deserves a more particular Regard by us; as being far more useful to our People, than the Vulgar Latin, or any Translation made only from it.

14. Thy Word is a Lamp unto my Feet, and a Light unto my Path, Psalm 119. 105.

Which it could never be, unless it were sufficient for necessary direction in our way to Heaven. But we suppose Persons to make use of the best means for understanding it, and to be duly qualified for following its Directions: without which, the best Rule in the World can never attain its End. And if the Scripture have all the due Properties of a Rule of Faith, it is unconceivable why it should be denied to be so; unless men find they cannot justify their Doctrines and Practices by it, and therefore are forced to make Tradition equal in Authority with it.

15. Wo unto you Lawyers, for ye have taken away the Key of Knowledge; 

15. In relying upon the Authority of the present Church for the Sense of Scripture. P. 29.
Popery as Represented.

16. In receiving and believing the Churches Traditions as the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and assenting to them with Divine Faith, just as he doth to the Bible. P. 31, 32.

Our Reasons against it.

ye entered not in your selves, and them that were entering in, ye hindered. S. Luk. 11: 52.

From whence it follows, that the present Guides of the Church may be so far from giving the true Sense of Scripture, that they may be the chief Means to hinder Men from right understanding it. Which argument is of greater force, because those who plead for the Infallibility of the Guides of the present Church, do urge the promises made to the Jewish Church at that time; as our Author doth from those who sat in the Chair of Moses, and from Caiaphas his Prophecying.

16. We have also a more sure word of Prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, 2 Pet. 1: 19.

And yet here the Apostle speaks of something delivered by the Testimony of those who were with Christ in the Holy Mount. From whence we infer, that it was not the Design of Christ to leave us to any Vocal Testimony, but to refer us to the Written word, as the most certain Foundation of Faith. And it is not any Persons assuming the Title of the Catholick Church to themselves, can give them Authority to impose any Traditions on the Faith of Christians; or require them to be believed equally with the Written Word. For before any Traditions can be assented to with Divine Faith, the Churches
Authority must be proved to be Divine and Infallible, either by a written or unwritten Word; but it can be done by neither, without overthrowing the necessity of such an Infallibility in order to Divine Faith; because the Testimony on which the Churches Infallibility is proved, must be received only in a way of Credibility.

17. Also of your own selves shall Men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away Disciples after them, Acts 20:30. Which being spoken of the Guides of the Christian Church, without Limitation of Number, a possibility of Error is implied in any Assembly of them; unless there were some other Promises which did assure us, That in all great Assemblies the Spirit of God shall always go with the casting Voice, or the greater Number.

18. And he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers— for the edifying of the Body of Christ— till we all come in the Unity of the Faith, &c. Ephes. 4:13, 14, 15.

Now here being an account given of the Officers Christ appointed in his Church, in order to the Unity and Edification of it, it had been unfaithfulness in the Apostle to have left out the Head of it, in case Christ had appointed any. Because this were of more consequence than all the rest; being declared necessary to Salvation
Popery as Represented.

19. In believing that Communion in both Kinds is an indifferent thing; and was so held for the first four hundred years after Christ; and that the first Precept for Receiving under both Kinds, was given to the Faithful by Pope Leo I. and confirmed by Pope Gelasius. P. 51.

Our Reasons against it.

19. For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord’s death till he come, 1 Cor. 15. 26.

The Apostle speaking to all Communicants, plainly shews, that the Institution of Christ was, That all should partake of both Kinds, and so to continue to do as long as this Sacrament was to shew forth the Death of Christ, viz. till his Second coming. And there is no colour for asserting the Christian Church ever looked on observing Christ’s Institution in this matter as an indifferent thing; no not for a thousand years after Christ. Altho’ the Practice and the Obligation are two things, yet when the Practice was so agreeable to the Institution, and continued so long in the Church; it is hardly possible for us to prove the sense of the Obligation, by a better way than by the continuance of the Practice. And if some Traditions must be thought binding, and far from being indifferent, which want all that Evidence which this practice carries along with it, How unreasonable is it in this Case to allow the Practice, and to deny the Obligation?  

20. In
Popery as Represented.

20. In believing that the Doctrine of Purgatory is founded on Scripture, Authority, and Reason. P. 54, &c.

21. In believing that to the saying of Prayers well and devoutly, it is not necessary to have attention on the Words, or on the Sense of Prayers. P. 62.

Our Reasons against it.

25. And whom he justified, them he also glorified, Rom. 8. 30.

But whom God justifies, they have the Remission of their Sins as to Eternal Punishment. And if those who are thus justified, must be glorified, what place is there for Purgatory? For there is not the least intimation of any other state of Punishment that any who are justified must pass through before they are admitted to Glory. We grant they may, notwithstanding, pass through many intermediate trials in this World; but we say, where there is Justification, there is no Condemnation; but where any part of guilt remains unremitted, there is a Condemnation remaining so far as the punishment extends. And so this distinction as to Eternal and Temporal Pains, as it is made the Foundation of Purgatory, is wholly groundless; and therefore the Doctrine built upon it can have no Foundation in Scripture or Reason.

21. I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the Understanding also, 1 Cor. 14. 15.

What need this Praying with the Understanding, if there were no necessity of attending to the sense of Prayers? For then praying with the Spirit were all that was required: For that supposes an attention of the Mind upon God. And I can hardly believe any Man that thinks with understanding, can justify praying without it: Especially when there are Exhortations and
22. In believing that none out of the Communion of the Church of Rome can be saved; and that it is no Uncharitableness to think so. P. 92.

23. In believing that the Church of Rome, in all the new Articles defined at Trent, hath made no Innovation in matters of Faith. P. 107.

and Invitations to the People to join in those Prayers, as it is plain there are in the Roman Offices.

22. Then Peter opened his mouth and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of Persons; but in every Nation, he that feareth God, and worketh Righteousness, is accepted with him, Acts x. 34, 35.

Whereby we perceive, that God doth not limit the possibility of Salvation under the Gospel to Communion with the See of Rome; for if St. Peter may be believed, the capacity of Salvation depends upon Mens fearing God and working Righteousness; and it is horrible Uncharitableness to exclude those from a possibility of Salvation, whom God doth not exclude from it.

23. That ye should earnestly contend for the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints, Jude v. 3.

Therefore all necessary Doctrines of Faith were at first delivered; and whatever Articles cannot be proved to have been delivered by the Apostles, can never be made necessary to be believed in order to Salvation. Which overthrows the additional Creed of Pius IV. after the Council of Trent; and puts them upon the necessity of proving the Universal Tradition of those Doctrines from the Apostolical Times: And when they do that, we may think better of them than at present we do; for as yet we can see neither Scripture, nor Reason, nor Antiquity for them.

Q 2

Thus
Thus I have represented that kind of Popery which our Author, (who complains so much of misrepresenting) allows; and I have in short, set down how little ground we have to be fond of it; nay, to speak more plainly, it is that we can never yield to, without betraying the Truth, renouncing our Senses and Reason, wounding our Consciences, dishonouring God and his Holy Word and Sacraments, perverting the Doctrine of the Gospel as to Christ's Satisfaction, Intercession and Remission of Sins; depriving the People of the Means of Salvation which God himself hath appointed, and the Primitive Church observed, and damning those for whom Christ died.

We do now in the sincerity of our Hearts appeal to God and the World, That we have no design to misrepresent them, or to make their Doctrines and Practices appear worse than they are: But take them with all the Advantages even this Author hath set them out with, we dare appeal to the Judgments and Consciences of any impartial men, whether (the Scripture being allowed on both sides) our Doctrines be not far more agreeable thereto than the new Articles of Trent, which are the very Life and Soul of Popery? Whether our Worship of God be not more suitable to the Divine Nature and Perfections, and the Manifestations of his Will, than the worship of Images, and Invocation of Fellow-Creatures? Whether the plain Doctrine of the necessity of Repentance and sincere Obedience to the commands of Christ, do not tend more to promote Holiness in the World, than the Sacrament of Penance, as it is delivered and allowed to be practised in the Church of Rome, i.e. with the easiness and efficacy of Absolution, and getting off the remainders by Indulgences, Satisfactions of others, and Prayers for the dead? Whether it be not more according to the Institution of Christ to have the Communion in both Kinds, and to have Prayers and the Scriptures in a Language which the People understand? And lastly, whether there be not more of Christian charity in believing and hoping the best of those vast Bodies of Christians, who live out of the Communion of the Church of Rome, in the Eastern, Southern, Western, and Northern Parts, than to pronounce them all incapable of Salvation on that Account? And therefore out of regard to God and the Holy Religion of our Blessed Saviour; out of regard to the Salvation of our own and other Souls, we cannot but very much prefer the Communion of our own Church, before that of the Church of Rome.

But before I conclude all, I must take some notice of his Anathema's: And here I am as much unsatisfied, as in any other part of his Book, and that for these Reasons.

1. Because he hath no manner of Authority to make them, suppose they were
were meant never so sincerely: And if we should ever object them to any others of that Church, they would presently say, What had he to do to make Anathema's? It belongs only to the Church and the General Councils to pronounce Anathema's, and not to any private Person whatsoever. So that if he would have published Anathema's with Authority, he ought to have printed those of the Council of Trent; viz. such as these,

Cursed is he that doth not allow the Worship of Images.  
Cursed is he that faith Saints are not to be Invocated.  
Cursed is he that doth not believe Transubstantiation, Purgatory, &c.

2. Because he leaves out an Anathema in a very material point, viz. As to the Deposing Doctrine. We do freely, and from our Hearts Anathematize all such Doctrines as tend to dissolve the Bonds of Allegiance to our Sovereign, on any pretence whatsoever. Why was this past over by him, without any kind of Anathema? Since he seems to approve the Oxford Censures, P. 48. Why did he not here show his zeal against all such dangerous Doctrines? If the Deposing Doctrine be fallly charged upon their Church, let us but once see it Anathematized by publick Authority of their Church, and we have done: But instead thereof, we find in a Book very lately published with great Approbations, by a present Professor at Lovain Fr. D'Enghien, all the Censures on the other side cenfured and despised, and the holding the Negative as to the Deposing Doctrine, is declared by him to be Heresie, or next to Heresie: The Censure of the Sorbon against Sanctarellus, he faith, was only done by a Faction; and that of Sixty Eight Doctors, there were but Eighteen Present; and the late Censure of the Sorbon, he faith, was condemned by the Inquisition at Toledo, Jan. 10. 1683, as erroneous and Schismatical; and so by the Clergy of Hungary, Oct. 24. 1682.

We do not question but there are Divines that oppose it; but we fear there are too many who do not; and we find they boast of their own numbers, and despise the rest as an inconsiderable Party: This we do not misrepresent them in, for their most approved Books do shew it.

However, we do not question, but there are several worthy and Loyal Gentlemen of that Religion, of different Principles and Practises: And it is pity such be not distinguished from those who will not renounce a Doctrine so dangerous in the Consequences of it.

3. Because the Anathema's he hath set down, are not Penned so plainly and clearly, as to give any real Satisfaction: but with so much Art and Sophistry, as if they were intended to beguile weak and unwary Readers, who see not into the depth of these things, and therefore may think he hath done great matters.
matters in his Anathema's, when if they be strictly examined, they come
to little or nothing; as

1. Cursed is he that commits Idolatry. An unwary Reader would think
herein he disowned all that he accuses of Idolatry; but he doth not curse
anything as Idolatry, but what himself thinks to be so. So again, Cursed is
he (not that gives Divine Worship to Images, but) that prays to Images, or
Relicks as Gods, or VVorships them for Gods. So that if he doth not take the
Images themselves for Gods, he is safe enough from his own Anathema.

2. Cursed is every goddess worshipper, i.e. That believes the Blessed Virgin
not to be a Creature. And so they escape all the force of this Anathema.
Cursed is he that Honours her, or puts his trust in her more than in God. So that
if they Honour her and trust in her but just as much as in God, they are
safe enough; Or that believes her to be above her Son: But no Anathema to
such as suppose her to be equal to him.

3. Cursed is he that believes the Saints in Heaven to be his Redeemers, that
prays to them as such. VVhat if men pray to them as their Spiritual Guardians and Protectors? Is not this giving Gods Honour to them? Doth this de-
serve no Anathema?

4. Cursed is he that worships any breaden God, or makes Gods of the empty Elements of Bread and VVine: viz. That supposes them to be nothing but Bread
and VVine, and yet supposes them to be Gods too. Doth not this look like
nonsense? And yet I am afraid our Author would think it a severe Anathema
in this matter, to say, Cursed is he who believes Nonsense and Contradictions.

It will be needless to set down more, since I have endeavoured by clear
stating the several Controversies, to prevent the Readers being imposed upon
by deceitful Anathema's. And yet after all he faith,

Cursed are we, if in answering and saying Amen to any of these Curses, we
use any Equivocations or Mental Reservations, or do not assent to them in the
common and obvious use of the VVords.

But there may be no Equivocation in the very VVords, and yet there
may be a great one in the intention and design of them: There may be
none in saying Amen to the Curses so worded; but if he would have pre-
vented all suspicion of Equivocation, he ought to have put it thus,

Cursed are we if we have not fairly and ingeniously expressed the whole
Meaning of our Church as to the Points condemned in these Anathema's; or if
we have by them designed to deceive the People: And then I doubt he would
not so readily have said Amen.
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Sir, I have perus'd your Answer, and am glad
to find it so moderate and calm: You make
here and there some Personal reflections in-
deed; but this being done soberly, without
heat and passion, I am still bound to thank
you, if not on my particular, yet on the Publick
score; For having by this convinc'd the World, that
Men of different judgments may now treat of matters
of controversie, without making use of Satyr and
Scurrility, or letting Cavil fill up the place of Judg-
ment and Reason. This method I cannot but ap-
prove as most agreeable to Christianity; And If I
pursue the same, in giving a farther explication of some
most material Points, you have been pleas'd to questi-
on in my small Treatise, as also in letting you
know my farther fence of Yours; I hope it may be
A done
done without offence, and that the shortness I shall use, will be easily pardon'd, if it be but to the purpose.

Sir, You let me know, my First Character of a Papist Mis-represented is not satisfactory, as not found ed on the sense of a Party, and the quotations of Authors, but being rather my own False Apprehensions, my Ignorant, my Childish, or Willful Mistakes. Indeed had I been bred up in a Wood, and jump't forth into the World, with this Character in my head, I should have had reason to subscribe to you: But because, upon examination, I find I was educated in a well-peopled Town, at the foot of the Pulpit, and liv'd always in Company and Conversation, I cannot imagin this Character so my own, as you seem to understand it, but rather my own, as I receiv'd it. And you need not wonder that I did not heretofore by the help of Books or Friends, receive better information, and correct my false Apprehensions of Popery. For indeed, were I even at this time to be rul'd by the greatest number of these, the Character of a Papist would be with me much blacker yet, than I have there drawn it. There would be, but few strokes of reason of Christianity in it, But Beast and Barbarous all over. And pray do you see, Sir, what weighty proofs are urg'd against me, to shew how foul and monstrous a Religion I have chosen. They shew me the Book of Homilies laying a good foundation, Mr. Fox's Book of Martyrs, Bishop Ridley's Writings, The Publick Test, A Manuel of Three small Trea tises, by John late Arch-Bishop of York, for the use of a Lady, to preserve her from the danger of Popery. Printed London 1672. Then a large Description given by Mr. Sutcliffe in his Survey of Popery.
Popery, where he undertakes to draw its several features; as (chap. 10.) That Popery is a sink of Heathenish Idolatry. (chap. 27.) That 'tis a most absurd and foolish Religion. (chap. 32.) That it is a Doctrine of Devils. (chap. 47.) That in many points 'tis more absurd and abominable than the Doctrine of Mahomet. Then the Anatomy of Popery Printed at London 1673, in which an Argument is shewn between Paganism and Popery in Six and twenty Points; and with the Jews and Pharisees in other ten. Then Mr. Julian Johnson who has again set forth this Comparison of Popery and Paganism, especially as to Polytheism and Idolatry; With the approbation of his Answerer Jovian, who assures him that He, with all the rest that have so hundred of late with the Thebean Legion, like it well, and are as well satisfied with it, as he himself is, bating some irreverent Phrases. Nor Sir, amidst these Authentick proofs, besides a great number of other Authors, who undertake to draw Popery in its own Colours; what convenience or even possibility had I, of framing any better apprehension of this Religion, then was here laid before me: Especially since my friends were not wanting to vouch the truth of all this, and to assure me; they had heard all this over and over from Men of Character, and in Places, which gave it reputation beyond all question? Neither does it appear to me, had it been my fortune to have consulted you in this affair, that I should have been much rectified as to these my Childish or Wilful Mistakes concerning Popery; as is evident from the Character you give of it throughout your Answer, and especially at the end (pag. 161.) viz.: “That it is that you can never yield to, without betraying the truth, renouncing your senses and Reason, wound-
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"ing your Conscience, dishonouring God, and his " Holy Word and Sacraments; perverting the Doc-" rine of the Gospel, as to Christ's Satisfaction, Inter-" ceSSION and Remission of sins; depriving the People " of the means of Salvation, which God himself hath " appointed, and the Primitive Church observ'd, and " and damning those for whom Christ died.

But however I will not insist upon this point; He rather yield, than be contentious: and because you say that my Character of a Papift Mis-represented, is made up of False Apprehensions, Ignorant, Child-" ish, and Wilful Mistakes, I'll own it to be no better: But then, Sir, you must give me leave to make use of your Authority with my Friends and acquaintance, in assuring them, that wheresoever they shall for the future either hear, or read such things charg'd upon the Papists, they must give it no credit, and esteem in no better than the False Apprehensions, Ignorant, Childish, and Wilful mistakes of the Relators. Upon this condition I close this point; only adding, that in laying down the Colours of a Papift Mis-repre-" sented, I never thought of declaring the Articles of your Church; or by Mis-representing the Papift, to Represent you; as you seem to mistake me: But only to shew the many Mistakes and Errors to be found amongst Protestants of what kind soever, concern-" ing the notion of Popery, for Debitor sum sapientibus & Inipientibus. And tho' you seem willing in your Introduction, that your Reader should esteem this our complaint of being basely Mis-represented, no better than a meer Pretence, or a Design of such who go about to deceive, by comparing it with the Complaints of the Arians, Pelagians, Nestorians, &c, Yet we are beholding to you soon after; when finding some of the.
the dirt thrown at us, to fall upon your own Face, by your standing so near us, you then own it to be ground-ed, and Real, pitying the Weakness and Folly of those who cast it (pag. 10.) And therefore I believe you will close with me in this Point, that Mis-representing is Mis-representing, tho' from those who dissent from your Church. But we go on to the other Character of the Papist Represented.

And this too, it seems, affords you as little satisfaction, as the former, on several accounts. And First you move a Scruple by the by, (pag. 9.) by your having no mind to ask, How the Council of Trent should come to be the Rule and Measure of Doctrine to any here, where it was never receiv'd? As if in this Character I had observ'd a Rule, which ought to be none Here, nor is own'd as Such. And as to this, I need only enforce you; that the Council of Trent is receiv'd here and all the Catholick World over, as to all its Definitions of Faith; altho' it be not wholly receiv'd in some places, as to its other Decrees, which relate only to Discipline. And therefore in appealing to this Council, for the vindicating all I have there asserted, to be the Doctrine of Catholicks, I have done nothing but what I was oblig'd, and is justifiable before the whole World; And on the truth of what I have said concerning the Councils being universally receiv'd as to Doctrines of Faith, I'll allow the whole caufe between us to depend. But this only as to your mistake.

Now supposing this to be the Rule of such Points of Faith, as are there set down for the Belief of the Papists, you raise your difficulty (pag. 11.) because I shew no Authority I have to Interpret that Rule in my own sense: It being a thing expressly forbidden by Pius.
Thus 4th. And because several of my Representations depend upon my own private Sense and Opinion. Truly Sir, had I, in undertaking to state the Belief of our Church, Interpreted the Council of Trent in my own private Sense, or Obtruded any Opinion of mine for an Article of our Faith, you might justly have Arraigned me at that Barr. But you must give me leave here to tell you, that you Wrong me, and Impose upon your Reader. For so far was I from committing this Fault of Interpreting the Council of Trent in my own Sense: That I have only deliver'd it, as it is Interpreted to me and to all our Church, in the Catechism ad Parochos, composed and set forth by Order of the said Council and Pius 5th. for the Instruction of the Faithful in their Christian Duty touching Faith and Good Manners, in conformity to the Sense of the Council. And for this reason in my Conclusion, I appeal'd to this Catechism, for the justifying of what I have represented to be the Faith of the Papist, to be really so. And that you may see, how vainly you have charg'd me with the Transgression of Pope Pius's Bull: Remember I appeal'd again in my Conclusion to Veron's Rule of Faith, and to that set forth by the Bishop of Condom, for maintaining the Character of the Papist Represented, to be just. Now you must know the Latter of these, drew up a like Character in Paris, of the Belief of a Papist, and it being conform to the Principles of Piety and Christianitv, it quite overthrew the foul charge of its Adversaries There, from their Books and Pulpits; and this so home, that they had no other way of preserving their Credit with their Flock, than to declare to them, that the the Character set forth by the Bishop was not Exact and True; but only
only vampt up by him into that Form for the benefi-
t of the Publick cause. Upon which he Published
another Edition with several distinct attestations of
many Bishops and Cardinals, and of the present Pope
himself, wherein they at large approve the Doctrine
contain'd in that Treatise, for the Faith and Doctrine
of the Church of Rome, and conform to the Council
of Trent. And now Sir, in proposing the Faith of
our Church, as I found it deliver'd by this Reverend
Prelate, and supported by such Authentick approba-
tions, wherein have I Entrenched upon the Priviledg
of the Apostolick See, of Interpreting the Council
of Trent? Or what necessity of relying upon a pri-
ivate Mans Judgment; as you Phrafe it, of no Name,
and no Authority, instead of that of the Pope and
Council, The Faith of a Papift I have deliver'd ac-
cording to the Catechism Publish'd by Order of the
Council? or as Explicated by a Prelate, who brings
along with him the Authority of the See Apostolick;
and which part of all this is my private Sense or Op-
nion?

But you offer to make good this charge in some In-
stances. As in the Invocation of Saints, I seem to li-
mits their Power of helping us to Prayers only, which
Limitation is not to be found in the Council of Trent.
I cannot but acknowledge, Sir, that the Council men-
tions their Aid and Assistance, which we may reason-
ably expect. But there being no other means, of their
Aiding and Assisting us express'd in the Council, or
in the Catechism ad Parochos, besides that of their
Prayers to God to obtain benefits for us, through
our only Saviour and Redeemer Jesus Christ. And it
being thus limited by the Bishop of Condom on this
Subject (pag. 33. Edit. Pa. 168.) with the Pope and
and Cardinal's approbation; I think I need no further vindication to shew, that in the proposal of that Point, I followed not my own private sense or Opinion, as you endeavour to prove.

In the Point of Merit you urge this again, pag. 56.) as if I had qualified this Doctrine with the dependance on Grace, on God's goodness and promise, without the Authority of the Council; there being no such qualification express'd in Can. 32. read and cited by you. 'Tis true, 'tis not in this Canon. But if you please to look back to Can. 26. Sect. 6. you'll find it there clear enough to acquit me from the scandal of publishing my own private sense or Opinion.

You instance again (pag. 11.) in the Point of the Pope's personal Infalibillity, which I represent to be no matter of Faith: (pag. 42.) and what reason have you, you say, to adhere to my representation, rather than to that of many others, who assert the contrary? But this difficulty is nothing but your mistake: For I do not in the least deliver here my own private sentiment or opinion touching this point, in opposition to other Authors: But I only by way of Narrative relate, that whereas some Divines endeavour in their School debates to prove and maintain this Personal Infalibillity, yet it is not receiv'd amongst Catholicks as any matter of Faith, because not positively determin'd by any General Council, and propos'd to the Faithful to be embrac'd as such. And this, Sir, again is not my private sense or Opinion, but a bare Narrative of Fact.

But I am now to encounter your Goliath Argument, which shews it self throughout your Answer, and seems to defy all the Hosts of Israel. If I can find never a Stone to sling at it, I must e'en lie at its mercy. And
And it appears thus. In my Character of a Papist Represented I pretend to declare the Faith of a Roman Catholic, as 'tis defin'd and deliver'd in allow'd General Councils; and yet though the Deposing Doctrine has been as evidently declar'd in such Councils, as ever Purgatory and Transubstantiation were in that of Trent, yet still with me 'tis no Article of our Faith. This is the main strength of it, as urg'd by you on several occasions.

I answer it in short; That tho' all Doctrinal Points defin'd in any approv'd General Council, and propos'd to the Faithful to be receiv'd under an Anathema, are with us so many Articles of Faith, and are obligatory to all of our Communion: yet not so of every other Matter declar'd in such a Council: There being many things treated of, and resolv'd on in such an Assembly, which concern not the Faith of the Church, but only some Matter of Discipline, Government, or other more particular Affair. And these Constitutions and Decrees are not absolutely Obligatory, as is evident even in the Council of Trent, as is before hinted; whose Decrees of Doctrine are as much acknowledg'd here by Catholicks in England and Germany, as within the Walls of Rome it self, or the Vatican: And yet its other Constitutions and Decrees are not universally receiv'd, and it may be never will. Now, Sir, altho' we allow some Councils have made Decrees for Deposing in particular Cases, yet the Power it self not being declar'd as a Doctrinal Point; and the Decrees relating only to matter of Discipline and Government, it comes short of being an Article of our Faith, and all that in your Answer depends on it, falls to the ground. I have no place here to give you a distinct
distinct account of the several matters treated of in Councils, and of the difference between Decrees of Faith, and others which are not so; yet because you seem to require some satisfaction in these Points, I remit you to such Authors, who treat of them at large, and most particularly the Considerations upon the Council of Trent, Canus, Bellarmine and others. This that I have here said may be sufficient to evince, that in my declaring the deposing Power to be no Article of Faith, I have not follow'd my own private Opinion, or meerly the number of Authors, but rather the sense of the whole Church, Councils, and Popes themselves, who plainly enough own this, in letting so many open and Positive Assertors of the no-deposing Power, to pass without any Censure of Heresie: It being certain that, were this Doctrine any Article of our Faith, as likewise that mention'd in the preceding Paragraph, of the Popes Personal Infallibility, the obstinate Opposers of them would no more escape without that brand, than those that deny other Articles of our Faith, as Purgatory and Transubstantiation.

These Instances I look upon as the most Principal throughout your whole Reply, because in them you have made use of a Medium directly opposite to the Intent of my Book, and which, if it had been effectual, would have shew'd, that I have not Represented the Faith of the Papist according to the Rule of approv'd General Councils, as I pretend; but rather according to my own private Apprehension or Opinion; which I confess would have been a full Answer to it as to such particulars. But how far you have fail'd of your endeavours even in this Point, I leave now to the Prudent Considerer to judge. But the way you take in
in all other Parts of your Book, seems to me not to answer your design, nor to agree with the Title of it. For whereas I undertake to propose the Faith of a Roman Catholick, as he is really taught to believe in Conformity to the Definitions of Oecumenical Councils: Bating those Points I have already spoke to, in your Answer.

You either own the Doctrine, to be the establish'd Belief of your Church, as in part that of the Power of Priestly Absolution, Confession, of due veneration to the Relicks of Saints, of Merit, of Satisfaction, of the Authority of the Church, of General Councils, &c.

Or you shew the Doctrine I have deliver'd, not to be the Faith of our Church, by appealing from the Definitions of our Councils, and sense of our Church, to some expressions found in Old Mass-books, Rituals, &c, as if this were a serious way of truly Representing the Doctrines of the Church of Rome. Can any Religion stand this Test? Will not many expressions in all sorts of Prayers, Preaching, and Devotions, if separated from the sense of the Church, prove unjustifiable and Ridiculous? Let but an Atheist take this liberty even with the Scripture itself, and thus separate infinite number of expressions there, and see what will be presently the colour of all Religion, and whether Christianity will be better than Turcism: and especially whether the allow'd Psalms in Meeter will prove the devotion of Men of sense and reason; tho' all may be reconcileable to Piety and Religion, if taken in the sense of the Church.

Or you appeal again from the Declarations of our Councils, and sense of our Church to some external Action, as in case of respect shewn to Images and Saints,
Saints, upon which from our External Adoration, by Construction of the Fact, viz Kneeling, Bowing, &c. you are willing to conclude us guilty of Idolatry: As if a true judgment could be made of these Actions, without respect to the Intention of the Church, that directs them, and of the Person, that do’s them. As if they were not in themselves Indifferent, and capable of being paid to God, or to Men. Or as if your Measures being follow’d, Abigail ought not to come in, and share with us in our constructive Idolatry, because she fell before David on her face, and bow’d her self to the ground, and fell at his feet. Joshua likewise, because he fell on his face to the Earth, and did worship the Angel. And as many who on their Knees pay their Respects to the King and bow before him: As likewise all the Beggars in Lincolns-Inn-Fields, who on their Knees, with their Hands lifted up, ask an Alms of Passers-by: Must not all these by Construction of Fact come into the List of your Idolaters? 

Or finally, not being willing the Doctrine should pass for ours, in the form I have stated it, you appeal again from our Councils and Sense of the Church, which I follow, to the Sentiments of some of our own Private Authors, and so you come often with, This French Author says this, Vives says that, Wicelius says another thing, and Leffius another; by this Method endeavouring to convince your Reader, that the Belief of a Papist is much different from what I have Represented it. But, Sir, this way may do well enough with the unwary; but it ill suits with what you pretend. The Frontispiece of your Book puts us upon expecting The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly Represented. And when we
we come to peruse it, we find several Doctrines propos'd, but without any Authority of Church or Councils, but This Author says this, and That Author says that; as if the Sense of every Author, were immediately the Doctrine of our Church. The Church speaks to us in her approv'd General Councils, and from them you might have truly Represented her Belief and Doctrine; but from particular Authors, some of which may Write upon a Pique, others upon a Passion, others upon some other Biais, nothing more can be Collected besides their own Opinion, and with understanding Men it passes for no more. So that nothing can be more unjustifiable, than to make a Collection of private Mens Sentiments, and obtrude them for the truly Representing the Doctrine of the Church in whose Communion they are. And this is not the Case of our Church alone, there's no Church or Congregation in the World will stand this Test. And if it come a little home to you, it may be you will be more sensible of this truth. For altho' you seem to maintain in your Answer, that good works of justifid Pag. 57. Persons are not Free; yet 'tis not just, this Doctrine should be immediately charg'd for the Belief of your Church. Altho Mr. Thorndike seems to allow Prayers for the Dead, yet neither from him are we to take a true representation of the Doctrin of his Church. Tho a worthy Divine declares, that in case a Popish Julian indeed should Pag. 152. Reign over us, he should believe him uncapable of Repentance, and upon that Supposition should be tempted to pray for his Destruction; yet would it not be honest hence to blacken his Church with this Disloyal Principle, as if she allow'd her Members, tho not to Fight against, yet to pray for the Destruction of such a Prince. The like may
may be said of King James the First his holding Christ to be truly present in the Sacrament, and there also to be truly ador'd, maintaining in his Epistle to Cardinal Perron the Doctrine of the Real Presence to be the Doctrine of the Church of England: And again what the aforesaid Mr. Thorndike delivers of the same Real Presence and Adoration of Christ in the Eucharist, practis'd in the Ancient Church from the beginning; and thereupon owning the Eucharistical Sacrifice to be truly the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, in as much as the Body and Blood of Christ are contain'd in them; and then farther adding, That the Sacrifice of the Cross being necessarily Propitiatory and Impetratory both, it cannot be deny'd, that the Sacrament of the Eucharist, in as much as it is the same Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, is also both Propitiatory and Impetratory. Will you give me leave from hence to infer, That because these are the Sentiments of such Eminent Persons in the Communion of the Church of England, that therefore they are the Doctrine of that Church, I suppose you will not; and therefore in the true Representation of the Doctrine of yours or our Church, I suppose, you will easily grant, that no Appeal ought to be made to such Private Authors; but the Undertaker is oblig'd to keep close to the sense of either Church, declar'd in their Councils and Decrees, and as explicated by their Authority: And as far as you have effectually prov'd this against what I have Represented for the Faith of a Papist, so far will I allow you have given me a just Answer; And as much as you fail of this, so much you come short of what you undertake, which I recommend to your own perusal to examine.

But
But for any of these ways, they are insignificant to your Design, and deserve not to stand under the Title of an Answer. For how do’s your acknowledging our Doctrine to be yours, your producing some broken Expressions out of Mass-Books, your putting Objections from external Actions, from private Authors, as your own Opinion, any ways prove, that the Faith of a Papist, as I have Represented, is not according to the Council of Trent, and what really he is bound, as a Papist, to Believe? And yet this is the thing you ought to have prov’d, to make good your Title. But instead of this, you generally let your Reader understand, that I have indeed stated the Matter a-right, and only tell him, that you have something to say against the Doctrine, and do not like it. But your saying, I hope, (or if it could be proving) that Catholicks do not do well to Believe, as I Represent, is no Argument to prove that I do not Represent well. This as to the Representing the Doctrine of our Church.

I should say something to your concluding Argument, which comes so home (p. 14.) I allow it seems, the Orders of the Supream Pastor are to be obey’d, whether he be Infallible or no. I confess likewise in another place, that some Popes have own’d the Deposing Doctrine, and Acted according to it. And here you infer, Therefore the Papists are bound by the Doctrine of their Church to Act, when the Popes shall require it, according to the Deposing Power. And do’s this bring the matter home? Why then, Sir, you must e’en give me leave to make another Inference: That, What brings the matter home, is nothing but an ordinary piece of Sophistry, and let the Reader judge.
judge. The *Representor* (pag. 42.) speaking of the Pope’s Authority, says, That as in any Civil Government, the Sentence of the Supream Judge or Highest Tribunal is to be Obey’d, tho there be no assurance of Infallibility, or Divine Protection from Error or Mistake: So is he taught should be done to the Orders of the Supream Pastor, whether he be Infallible or no.

Where a Parallel is made between the Orders of Popes and Civil Powers, as to the Obedience due to them from their Subjects. Now, Sir, if it be your Opinion that this Authority and Power in these Supream Governors is so Absolute and Unconfined, that like to God himself, there can be no just Exception made to any of their Actions or Decrees, whatsoever they be: then indeed your Reasoning answers your Intent. But if the Case be possible, that these may so Act or Command, that the not-following or not-obeying in Inferiors may be no Crime; then you come but short of home, and prove just nothing. Now change but the matter of your Argument, and see how far it goes. The Orders of a Prince, being Supream Governor, are to be Obey’d, whether he be Infallible or no: But some Princes have done thus and thus; therefore the People by the Law are bound to Act so and so: Does this hold in every Action or Order of a Prince, without Limit or Exception? Tho a Prince be to be Obey’d, yet it follows not that his Word is the Law? So that whoever takes this for a concluding Argument, must neither understand Law nor Logick.

I need not put the Reader in mind, how often you make your Digressions amongst the Schoolmen, and leave not scouting among them, till you have lost the matter in hand; and dispute about their Opinions instead
fleed of matter of Faith; how in the point of dispensations, where we speak of the Moral Law; and assert the Pope cannot dispense with it, as give leave to break the Commandments, to lie or for-swear: You shew your learning, in proving he can dispense with other Laws and Positive Institutions, a thing scarce to be doubted of, and nothing to our purpose. I'll say nothing of the admirable close of Your Chapter of Dispensations, in which, tho' you have not produc'd one proof of Dispensations, for lying or for-swear being allow'd in our Church on any account whatsoever, you yet give this assurance to your Reader; We know this Dispensing Power is to be kept up as a great Mystery, and not to be made use of, but upon weighty and urgent Causes—as their Doctrines declare: Where certainly one proof of the Who, the Where, and the When, had been much more Satisfactory, than the Positive We know, and Their Doctrines declare: For tho' many are willing to take this upon trust, yet it would have gone farther, if you had prov'd it down right, without taking Sanctuary in a Mystery. I'le pass by your dexterity wherewith you have manag'd the History of St. Perpetua in the Chap. of Purgatory: Where after you have disguis'd it to your purpose in the Relation, and droll'd the Vision of a Martyr, and so esteem'd by St. Augustin, into a young Ladies Dream; you at last set it forth for the Foundation of our Churches Doctrine, and would perswade your Reader, that our Tenent of Purgatory is built upon it; when 'tis us'd by me for no more, than a Marginal Citation; amongst several others: And yet this is our Foundation, and our Doctrine is built on it: Here I fear, you had forgot your promise made in the
beginning of being sincere, and using no Tricks. But I for bear;

And will only conclude, That if you have truly Represented the Doctrines of the Church of Rome, I would as soon be a Turk as your Papist; whose Character you have drawn at large throughout your Book, and in little in pag. 161. Which, however you may call truly Representing, I can look upon no better than truly Misrepresenting. And by what I see, I think I might with as good reason go to a Pharisee, to be inform’d of Christ, and receive the Character of a Christian from a Mahometan; as come to you, to know what a Papist is, what his Belief and Doctrine. Neither do I wonder, that you come thus wide of what you pretend to: The method you take would bring a Scandal even upon the Apostles themselves, and render the Church of those purer Times, of the same colour with ours. Observe but the same, in drawing the Features of your own Church, and then tell me whether this be the way of truly Representing. If a man were but to bring into publick your School-Debates, the differing Opinions of your own Authors, concerning the Scriptures, Predestination, Free-will, the Authority of the Church, the Reformation, Traditions, &c. all Expressions of Sermons, Prayers, &c. and out of these, and all others of this kind, pick out and patch up a Religion according to the best contrivance of the Undertaker, and then shew it forth to the World, do you think this would be yours truly Represented? Why then must such another Jumble as this be expos’d to the World for ours? If you’ll let your Flock see what our Religion is, send them to the Council of Trent, the Catechism ad Parochos, this we’d own
own and stand by: But for you to pick here a bit and there a bit, to patch as you please, to make you Inferences and Applications at pleasure, and then tell your Reader, these are the Doctrines of the Church of Rome truly Represented; this is to abuse the World and your selves, and to render us infamous for Principles which are nothing of our Religion. And in case you do not judge what I have here said sufficient to convince you, that the Faith, as I have Represented it, is really the Faith of a Papist, I'll be content all these Reasons at present pass for nought, and that the Decision of this whole Affair depend upon an Expe-dient. Do but you, (or any Friend for you) give your Assent to those Articles of Faith, in the very Form and Manner, as I have stated them, in the Character of the Papist Represented; and if upon request, you are not admitted into the Communion of the Roman Catholicks, and own'd to Believe aright in all those Points, I'll then confess, that I have abuse'd the World, that my Representing is Misrepresenting the Faith of a Papist, and that my Design has been not to undeceive, but to deceive the People. But if on the contrary it shall appear, that the Faith, as I have Represented it, is the approv'd Doctrine of that Church, and sufficient for any one to be receiv'd a Member of it, I may then justly renew my Complaint of its being Misrepresented, that the Religion of the Papist is nothing like what 'tis commonly render'd; and that 'tis a hard fate, that the Professors of it should be so injur'd in their Reputation, and by this means become so Odious, that even amongst Fellow-Christians, Atheists and Jews, shall be tol-erated with less regret than they.
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Do not love to be behind-hand in Civility with any Man, and therefore, in the Name of the Answerer, I return the Reflecter his Complement, and that with some advantage: For I heartily thank him for the Civility of his Language, and more for the Civility of his Arguments; and having done this once for all, I shall apply my self to consider his Reflections, and will complement no more.

His Reflections consist principally of two general Heads.

I. What concerns the Misrepresentation of a Papist.
II. Concerning the Rule of true representing.

I. The Misrepresentation of a Papist. And here I confess, he has shewed some Art, but very little Honesty. He was told in the Answer, that some of those Misrepresentations which he had made of a Papist, and given out for the Protestant Character of Popery, were his own ignorant, or childish, or wilful Mistakes.
Doctrines and Mistakes. As that Papists are never permitted to hear Sermons, which they are able to understand; or, that they held it lawful to commit Idolatry; or, that a Papist believes the Pope to be his great God, and to be far above all Angels. These, I think, may pass for Mistake represenations, and very childish and ignorant ones too; and hence the Refleter craftily infinuates, that we grant all his Misrepresentations of a Papist, to be ignorant, childish, or wilful Mistakes; and is willing to end this Dispute (and I very much commend him for it) upon these terms, that his Character of a Papist misrepresented, should be confessed to be made up of false Apprehensions, ignorant, childish, and wilful Mistakes; and that he may use the Authority of the Answener to assure his Friends and Acquaintance, that wherefoever they shall for the future, either hear, or read such things charged upon the Papists, they must give it no Credit, and esteem it no better than the false Apprehensions, ignorant, childish, and wilful Mistakes of the Relators. This would be a great Point gained indeed, and I am sorry we cannot oblige him in it.

Especially, since he has taken the Pains to prove by great and good Authorities, that his Character of a Papist misrepresented, is not made up of such childish Mistakes; but is indeed what the best and wisest Men have believed of them; and this we thank him for. He alleages the Authority of the Homilies, a Book which we greatly reverence. Fox's Book of Martyrs, where we read, how many were burnt for not believing, as his Papist misrepresented believes. Bishop Ridly's Writings, a very learned and holy Man, who may be supposed to have understood what Popery was, and that he was not so fond of misrepresenting, as to burn for it. The publick Test, a ver-
ry authentick and lasting Proof of this Matter; with several other good Authors: he mentions, whose Credit is never the worse, because he hath thrust one bad Man into the Company. Nay, lie has been so civil, as to grant the Answerer to be as very a Misrepresenter as the rest (and he had been a very strange Answerer, if he had not;) which argues great Modesty in him, to desire leave to use his Name and Authority to condemn the Misrepresentation; that is, to confute his own Book, (which in all the material Points, proves what he calls the Misrepresentation (I wo'nt say not to be ignorant Mistakes, but,) to be the avowed Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome,) which is the only way I know of, that it can be confuted; for unless he condemn it himself, I am sure this Refleeter can never confute it.

Well, but what then is the meaning of all this pother and noise about this double Character of a Papist misrepresented and represented? Why are we so angry with what he calls the Misrepresentation, if it be true? or, what is the fault of it? This is a Mystery which ought to be explained: and I doubt our Refleeter will have no reason to glory, that he gave the occasion of it. And I shall do these two things.

I. Show you what are the Faults of the Misrepresentation.

II. That allowing for such Faults, the Papist represented (excepting some very few cases) professes to believe all that the Papist misrepresented is charged with.

I. As for the Faults of the Misrepresentation, they are briefly these.

1. That
1. That he puts such things into the Character of a Papist, as no Man in his Wits ever charged them with; and these the Answerer calls childish, and ignorant, or wilful Mistakes.

2. That the Opinions of Protestants concerning Popish Doctrines and Practices, and those ill Consequences which are charged, and justly charged upon them, are put into the Character of a Papist misrepresented, as if they were his avowed Doctrine and Belief; which is misrepresenting indeed, but is his own, not our Misrepresentation. We charge them with nothing, but what they expressly profess to believe, and what they practice, and we tell them what we think of such Doctrines and Practices, what their Nature, and what their Consequences are; but do not charge them with believing as we believe, concerning these Matters; and therefore it is not fair to put such things into a Protestant Character of a Papist misrepresented.

As to give an Instance of a like nature; There are some dissenting Protestants, who think it lawful to resist their Prince, and take up Arms against him: this we say is Rebellion; and yet it would be a very ridiculous Misrepresentation of such Men, to say, they are those, who believe it lawful to rebel; for no Man believes Rebellion, no more than Idolatry; to be lawful: and they no more believe taking up Arms in such cases to be Rebellion, than the Papist thinks his Worship of Saints and Images to be Idolatry; which shows how unjust it is, to put the Interpretations and Consequences of Mens Opinions and Practices, which they themselves disown, into their Character. And tho we never do this, the Misrepresenter has done it for us; which makes it a false Character, tho every thing which is said in it may be true.

3. It
3. It is still so much the worse, when the Interpretations and Consequences, which are charged upon Mens Practices and Opinions, are set in the front of the Character, as first and Original Principles. As, to keep to our former Instance. To say, that Men believe Rebellion to be lawful, and therefore make no scruple of taking up Arms against their Prince; is a very different thing from saying, that Men believe they may lawfully take up Arms in some Cases, and in doing so are guilty of Rebellion.

These are some of the principal Arts our Author has used in drawing the Character of a Papist misrepresented, as I will presently show in particular. But then on the other hand, to draw a fair Character of a Papist represented; He, (1.) as easily he might, denies that he believes those Interpretations and Consequences, which we charge their Doctrines and Practices with, and which the Misrepresenter has put into their Character, and charges them with believing. But, (2) he generally owns the Doctrines and Practices, which we charge them with, and attempts to vindicate them, and to put new Colours on them; so that the main difference between us is not in the Character, but whether their Doctrines and Practices be of so hainous a nature as we say they are, which is matter of Dispute, not of Representation. Though, (3.) in some Cases he disowns that to be the Doctrine and Belief of their Church, which manifestly is so, and has been proved on them, beyond all possibility of a fair Reply, by the Learned Answerer.
That this is the true State of the Case, with reference to the two-fold Character of a Papist misrepresented and represented; I come now to show, which I shall do in these Characters, which he himself has given us of them: Only I must desire the Reader, for his own satisfaction, to compare what I write with his Characters, for I shall not transcribe them at large, both to save my Labour and Paper.

I. Of Praying to Images.

The Misrepresentation here as to the Matter, is every word true; but yet is a false Character by the second and third Rules of Misrepresentation. A Papist misrepresented, worships Stocks and Stones for Gods. We only charge them with worshipping Images; and the fault of that, we say, is, (though we never charge them with saying or thinking so) that they worship Stocks and Stones for Gods. But now to misrepresent us in the Character of a Papist misrepresented, he makes us charge a Papist with believing his Images of Wood and Stone to be Gods; and that this is the reason and foundation, (not meerly the true Interpretation) of their Image-worship; as he adds, And for this reason he erects stately Monuments to them in his Churches——falls down prostrate before them, and with his eyes fixed on them, cries out; Help me Mary, &c. Whereas we only charge them with worshipping Images, and do say, and prove too, that in the Scripture-Notion, this is to worship Stocks and Stones for Gods.

Now
Now comes the Representor, and he says, That a Papist Represented, believes it damnable to worship Stocks and Stones for Gods: That is, he does not believe, that worshipping Images, (as we say, it is) is worshipping Stocks and Stones for Gods: And whoever said that they did believe this? But does he worship Images or not? This he grants, when he says, That the honour which is exhibited to the Images, is referred to the Prototypes, which they represent; which is all that can be possibly meant by worshipping Christ, or his Saints, by Images; that they refer all that worship, which they pay to Images, to Christ, or the Saints, whom those Images represent. Now if they refer that worship, which they give to the Image, to Christ, they must worship the Image; and this (Image-worship) is all we expressly charge them with owning. What the nature and true Interpretation of this worship is, which we say, is worshipping Stocks and Stones for Gods, we will dispute with them when they please.

II. Of Worshipping Saints.

Thus the Papist Misrepresented, is said to make Gods of dead men: Whereas we only charge them with Praying to the Virgin Mary, and Saints departed; and this we say, is to make Gods of them, such Gods as the Heathens made of their Inferior Daemons, and Intercessors between God and Men. And does the Representer deny that they pray to Saints? No, but owns and defends it, as well as he can; and there we are ready to joyn Issue with him.

Well,
Well, but he Confides in Saints as his Mediators and Redeemers, and expects no Blessing, but what is to come to him by their Merits, and through their hands. That they trust in Saints, as their Redeemers, no understanding Protestant ever yet said, though they think it a great injury to the Intercession of our Saviour, to apply to any other Advocates, of what nature soever, especially to think, that Christ, who died for us, and is our Advocate with the Father, needs any other Advocates to make him merciful and propitious to us; or that he, who merited with his own Blood, needs any additional Merits of the Saints to make his Intercession the more efficacious. But I am not to Dispute now, but only Represent; and the Papist represented owns all that we Protestants charge them with. His Arguments and Colours must be dismissed, till there be farther occasion to consider them.

III. Of Addressing more Supplications to the Virgin Mary, than to Christ.

We charge them with nothing, but what is their daily practice, of saying ten Ave Maries for one Pater noster, or ten Prayers to the Virgin Mary for one to God. And this we think (if Prayer be a sign of Honour) is to honour her ten times more, than they do her Son, or God the Father; and if Prayer signifies our belief of the power, or interest of that Being, to whom we pray to help us, the frequency of our Prayers to the Virgin must signify, that we expect more help and relief from praying to her, than from directing our Prayers immediately to God.
of Christ; for it is natural to pray ofteneft to those, from whose power or intercession (which is power too) we expect moft. But now our Misreprefenter has made a very fälle Character of this, by putting thefe confequential charges into the Character, and fetting them in the first place as the Reafon, not the Consequences or Interpretation of their frequent Prayers to the Virgin. That he believes the Virgin Mary to be much more powerful in Heaven than Christ, and that she can command him to do what she thinks good; (which is not a Protestant but a Popifh Misrepresentation, if it be one, it being found in fome of their old Missals, and Modern Poets) and for this reafon he honours her more than he does her Son, or God the Father, for one Prayer he fays to God, faying ten to the Holy Virgin. And now the Reprefenter might fafely deny, that they believe the Virgin more powerful than God, or that they intend to honour her more; for we pretend not to know their private Belief and Intentions, and therefore never made this a personal charge, but only a charge upon their Practice; he owns the Practice, and we’ll make good the Charge, when he pleafes, not by inquiring into their private Intentions, but from the natural Interpretation of fuch Actions.

IV. Of paying Divine Worship to Relicks.

WE only charge them with giving Religious Honour to the Relicks of Saints and Martyrs, by falling prostrate, kneeling down to them, kiffing them, and going in Pilgrimages to their Shrines and Sepulchers, and expecting aid and help from them,
to go to them opis impetranda causâ, as the Council of Trent directs. This is Matter of Fact, and owned by the Representer. Now we think this is to ascribe Divinity to them, if Religious Worship signifies any Divinity in the Object of Worship. This the Misrepresenter puts into the Character of a Papist, which we never did; and the Representer on the other hand denies, that they believe any such thing, which for ought I know, may be true: but the Question is, Whether they do not give a Divinity to them by worshipping them? And this we assert they do, and this they may do without believing any Divinity in them.

V. Of the Eucharist.

As for worshipping the Host, we only charge them with worshipping the Consecrated Bread, which we say is Bread still; but which, they say, is the natural Body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, and suffered on the Cross: and for so doing, some Protestants charge them with Idolatry in worshipping a Breaden God; and some Papists acknowledge it would be Idolatry, if what they worshipped were only Bread, and not the natural Body of Christ: but no Protestant ever gave such a Character of a Papist, That he believes it lawful to commit Idolatry, that he worships and adores what he believes only to be a Breaden God, and the poor empty Elements of Bread and Wine. The Question is not, what a Papist believes, but what the truth of the thing is? not whether he believes the Host to be only Bread, but whether it be so or not? not whether he believes Idolatry
Idolatry to be lawful, but whether he be not guilty of Idolatry in worshipping the Host? and therefore this ought not to be put into the Character of a Papist; for those who believe that he worships nothing but Bread and Wine, and is guilty of Idolatry in it, do not charge him with believing so. And therefore, the Representer, who acknowledges the worship of the Host, might very truly deny all the rest.

As for Transubstantiation, we charge them with believing no more, than what they themselves own, That the Consecrated Bread and Wine is changed into the natural substance of Christ’s Flesh and Blood; which the Misrepresenter very fallaciously calls Christ’s being really present under those appearances; that our People may not perceive the difference between Transubstantiation, which the Church of England denies, and a real presence, which she owns, not under the appearances of Bread and Wine, but in the use of the Consecrated Bread and Cup; which differ as much as a Bodily and Sacramental presence. Now if this Doctrine of Transubstantiation be true, besides many other Absurdities, we say, Christ must have as many Bodies, as there are Consecrated Hosts; and that his Body must be on Earth, and that in fifty thousand distant places at the same time; though the Scripture assures us, That he ascended in his Body into Heaven, and is to continue there till he come to Judgment. But we do not charge the Papists with believing these Absurdities, (for we cannot guess what they believe); much less do we charge them with believing, that there are as many Christs, as many Redeemers, as there are Churches, Altars, or Priests. For there is (we grant) some little difference between Christ’s having many Bodies, and there be-
ing many Christs. What an easy Task has the Represener to take off such Characters as these.

VI. Of Merits and Good Works.

Here we only charge them with saying, as the Council of Trent does, That the Good Works of justified Persons, are truly meritorious of the increase of Grace, and of Eternal Life: And though we think this is too much for any Creature, especially a Sinner, to pretend to Merit, and know not how to reconcile Grace, and strict Merit together; yet we never charged a Papist with believing Christ's Death and Passion to be ineffectual and insignificant, and that he has no dependance on the Merits of his Sufferings, or the Mercy of God for attaining Salvation. For, it is plain, the Council of Trent owns both the Grace of God, the Merits of Christ, and the Merits of Good Works.

The Representer indeed qualifies this by saying, That through the Merits of Christ, the good Works of a just Man proceeding from Grace, are so acceptable to God, that through his Goodness and Promise, they are truly meritorious of Eternal Life. The Answerer alleges the 32d Canon, Sess. 6. of the Council of Trent, where no such Qualification is used, which yet is the Canon purposely designed to establish the Merits of goods Works. This the Reflecter grants, (pag. 8.) and refers us to the 26th Canon of that Session, where there is not one word of the Merit of good Works; and therefore, how we should learn from that Canon, in what sense good Works are said to merit, I cannot tell; but in the sixteenth Chapter
of that Session, this Doctrine is explained at large, and there we may expect the fullest Account of it, which in short is this.

That that Divine Vertue which flowes from Christ into justified Persons, as from the Head to the Members, and from the Vine to the Branches, makes the good Actions of such Men acceptable to God, and meritorious; and that such good Works which are done in God, do satisfy the Divine Law, and truly and properly merit Eternal Life. That this is called our Righteousness, because we are justified by its inhering in us; and the Righteousness of God, because it is infused into us by God, through the Merits of Christ: and that the Goodness of God as to this matter, consists in this, that he will have his own Gifts to be our Merits: And therefore in the 32d Canon, they pronounce an Anathema against those, who shall say, that the good Works of a justified Man are so the Gift of God, as not to be his own Merits. So that though they do indeed own the Grace and Promise of God, and the Merits of Christ, as the Cause and Foundation of their own Merits; yet they do assert, that the inherent Righteousness and good Works of a justified Man, have that intrinsick Vertue, as to satisfy the Divine Law, and to be truly meritorious of the increase of Grace and Eternal Life. This we think injurious to the Grace of God, and the Merits of Christ: they think it is not, and we never said they did.
VII. Of Confession.

We charge them with making a particular Confession to a Priest of all our Sins committed after Baptism, necessary to obtain Pardon and Forgiveness, and with attributing a Judicial and Prætorian Authority (such as is exercised by Judges and Magistrates) to the Priest to forgive Sins. And tho' we do not say, that he believes it part of his Religion to make Gods of Men; yet we say and prove it too, that this is a Power, which God has reserved wholly to himself. We do not charge them with saying, that the Absolution of the Priest is valid without any thoughts or intentions of Amendment in the Penitent: but they do say, that Attrition, which is but an imperfect degree of Sorrow for fear of Hell, and can produce only some faint and sudden thoughts of Amendment, does qualifie Sinners for Absolution; and we say, whatever the Doctrine of their Church teaches, the constant Practice of absolving all that confess, without any apparent signs of Repentance, and purposes of a new Life, and that after many and repeated Relapses, is apt to teach Men to place their Confidence in the Priest's Absolution, without any serious intention to forsake their Wickedness.
VIII. Of Indulgences.

We charge the Church of Rome with teaching the Pope’s Power to grant Indulgences, not to commit Sin for the future, but for the Pardon of those Sins which are committed; that is, for the remitting those Temporal Punishments, which are due to Sin in Purgatory. The Absolution of the Priest remits the Eternal Punishment of Sin, and keeps Men out of Hell; but still the Temporal Punishment in Purgatory remains due: and this must be taken off, either by humane Satisfactions and Penances (of which presently) or by the Pope’s Pardon, which surely is a different thing from the Relaxation of Canonical Penances, as the Representer states it; for I never heard before, that Purgatory Fire was a Canonical Penance, enjoined by the Church; for sure the Decrees of the Church did not kindle Purgatory, and it is strange the Church should grant so many thousand Years Pardon of Canonical Penances, (if they concern this Life) as some Indulgences contain, when few Men live an hundred Years in this World, and then have no need of all the rest.

We say the Popes have, and do to this day sell these Indulgences, at different rates, according to the nature of the Crime; and Men who have Mony, need not fear the Purgatory Fires, and Men who have none, must be contented to endure them: this we grant with the Representer to be a great Abuse, but it is an Abuse of their Popes, and hardly separable from the Doctrine and Practice of Indulgences.
IX. Of Satisfaction.

We charge them with making human Penances necessary to satisfy for the Temporal Punishment which is due to Sin in Purgatory, when the Eternal Punishment is pardoned for the Merits and Satisfaction of Christ; which we say is injurious to the Satisfaction of Christ: for all Men must grant, that Christ had been a more perfect Saviour, had he by his Death and Passion delivered us from the Temporal Punishment of Sin in Purgatory, as well as from the Eternal Pains of Hell. Yet we do not say, that they believe very injuriously of the Passion of Christ, that his Sufferings and Death were not sufficiently satisfactory for our Sins; and therefore think it necessary to make Satisfaction for themselves; but that they believe, as their Church teaches them, that they must satisfy themselves for the Temporal Punishment of their Sins, and this is injurious to the Satisfaction of Christ. We do not charge them with evacuating Christ's Passion by relying on their own penitential Works; but that they rely on Christ to satisfy for the Eternal Punishment of Sin, and on their own Satisfactions for the Temporal Punishment; which ascribes indeed the better half, but not the whole, to Christ; and all this the Representers owns.
X. Of reading the Holy Scriptures.

We only charge them with denying the People the use of the Bible in the vulgar Tongue, as every body knows they do, and as the Representer owns, and defends it. And to justify this Practice, we say, many of their Divines have charged the Scripture with being a very dark, obscure, unintelligible Book; and that it is of very dangerous consequence to grant a liberty to the People to read it; and this we think is not much for the Credit and Reputation of the Holy Scriptures. But we do not, as the Misrepresenter says, charge the Papist with believing it part of his Duty, to think meanly of the Word of God, and to speak irreverently of the Scripture. Whether denying the People the use of the Bible in a Language they understand, be an Argument of their Respect or Disrespect to the Scriptures, let any Man judge; but for whatever reason they do it, the Effect is plain, that it keeps People in great Ignorance; and as we fear, occasions the eternal Damnation of many Souls; though we do not say, as the Misrepresenter does, that they do it with this design, That Men may be preserved in Ignorance, and damned eternally. But they know their own Designs best.

XI. Of
XI. Of Apocryphal Books.

Here can be no pretence of misrepresenting, unless it be in the first clause, which he usually takes care shall contain some Misrepresentation. That he believes it lawful to make what additions to Scripture his party thinks good. For, as for their receiving such Apocryphal Books, as Tobit, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and the Maccabees, into the Canon of Scripture, which is all we charge them with, the Representer owns and defends it. This indeed we think to be making Additions to the Scripture, but we don't charge them with believing, that they may make what Additions to the Scripture they please; for we believe they have so much Wit, as to know it safer to do it, than to say it may be done.

XII. Of the Vulgar Edition of the Bible.

All that we charge them with here, is, that they make the Vulgar Latin Edition of the Bible so Authentick, as not to allow of any Appeals to the Originals for the Interpretation of doubtful places; and we know not what Authority can make a Translation more Authentick than the Original. That this is truly charged on them, the Representer cannot deny, though the Misrepresenter makes tragical work with it; as any one may see, who will divert himself with reading that Character; which though in some parts it may have too much Truth in it, was never
never before made the Character of a Papist; but we must give them leave to speak some blunt and bold Truths of themselves.

XIII. Of the Scripture as the Rule of Faith.

XIV. Of the Interpretation of Scripture.

We do not charge them with denying in express words the authority of the Scripture to be a Rule, but with saying that which is equivalent to it. That the sense of it is so various and uncertain, that no man can be sure of the true meaning of it in the most necessary and fundamental Articles of the Faith, but by the Interpretation and Authority of the Church, which does effectually divest it of the authority of a Rule: for that is my Rule, which can and must direct me, which (it seems) is not the Scripture considered in itself, but as interpreted by the authority of the Church, which makes the Faith and Interpretation of the Church, not the Scriptures, my immediate Rule. But why does he now complain of Misrepresentation? When the Representer owns and justifies every particular of it; except it be, those goodly Introductions; That he believes it lawful, nay, that it is his Obligation to undervalue the Scripture, and take from it that Authority which Christ gave it; and that he believes his Church to be above the Scripture, and profanely allows to her an uncontrollable Authority of being Judge of the Word of God. For though there may be some truth in such Consequences as these from their Doctrine, yet they were never
never charged upon them by us, as their Principles, or Faith: Which is the chief Art he uses in drawing up these Misrepresentations.

XV. Of Traditions.

WE charge them with making some unwritten Traditions of equal authority with the Scripture, and believing them with a Divine Faith. This we say, derogates from the perfection of the Scripture, or the written Word of God. For if our Rule be partly the written, partly the unwritten Word; then the Scripture (or written Word) is but part of the Rule; and part of a Rule cannot be a whole and perfect Rule. And we say, That these unwritten Traditions are but humane Ordinations, and Traditions of men: but we do not say a Papist believes them to be Humane, but Divine, though unwritten, Traditions: and therefore, though we affirm, that they give equal authority to such Traditions as are in truth no better than humane Ordinations, as to the Scriptures themselves; yet we do not say, that they admit what they believe to be only humane Traditions, to supply the defects of Scripture, allowing equal authority to them, as to the Scriptures themselves; which is the only Misrepresentation in this Character, all the rest being owned by the Representer himself, who then had very little cause to complain of Misrepresenting.

XVI. Of
XVI. Of Councils.

The difference between the Misreprenter and Representor in this Article, is no more but this, That the Papift Misreprented is said to receive new Additions to his Creed from the Definitions and Authority of General Councils, and to embrace them with a Divine Faith. The Papift Represented, owns the Authority of General Councils, as well as the other, and receives all their Definitions, and believes them as firmly; but though they define such Doctrines for Articles of Faith, as were never heard of in the Christian Church, at least were never put into any Christian Creed before, yet he will not believe them to be Additions to his Faith, or to what was taught by Christ and his Apostles: But Pope Pius the 4th his Creed must be the Faith of the Church from the Apostles days. Now here I fancy our Author mistook his side, for the Papift Represented has much the worse Character, that he is so void of all sense, that he cannot tell which is most, twelve, or four and twenty Articles in a Creed. This is a hard case, that Men must believe all the Definitions of their Councils, but though they see their Creed increase every day, must never own that their Faith receives any Additions. However, I think, he has no reason here to complain of Misreprenting, since he owns all that any Protestant charges him with, such an Implicit Faith in General Councils, as receives all their
their Definitions, and rather than fail in defiance of Sense and History, will believe that to be the old Faith, which was never defined till yesterday.

XVII. Of Infallibility in the Church.

The Misrepresenter says, a Papist believes that the Pastors and Prelates of his Church are infallible: which, if it be understood of every particular Pastor and Prelate, no Protestant ever charged them with, and therefore the Representer might very safely deny it; and this is all the difference between them, except it be this, That what the Misrepresenter barely affirms, the Representer endeavours to prove, viz. the Infallibility of the Church, at least, as assembled in General Councils; and yet this must be called Misrepresenting too: a Word, which (I suppose) must have some secret Charm in it to Convert Hereticks.

XVIII. Of the Pope.

Here the Misrepresenter is very Rhetorical and facetious, and we may give him leave to be a little pleasant with his own Universal Pastor. He says, the Papist believes the Pope to be his great God; how great I cannot tell, but some Flatterers of the Papal greatness, have given the Title of God to the Pope,
Pope, and possibly some Protestants have repeated the same after them, but never charged the Papists with believing it; much less do they charge them with denying Christ to be the Head of the Church, or with saying, That the Pope has taken his place; but we do charge them with making the Pope the Universal Pastor and Head of the Church under Christ: and this (I hope) is no Misrepresenting; for it is asserted, and proved after his Fashion, by the Representers. But why is the Pope's personal Infallibility put into the Character of a Papist Misrepresented? Why not as well the Infallibility of General Councils? Since he grants some Papists do believe the Pope's Infallibility, and such Papists are not Misrepresented by charging them with it; and there are others, who do not believe the Councils Infallibility without the Pope, which therefore cannot be an inherent Infallibility in them. The truth is, the Infallibility of the Church is the Faith of a Papist; but in whom this Infallibility is seated, whether in the Diffusive, Representative, or Virtual Church, in Pope or Council, or the whole Body of Christians, is not agreed among them. But neither of these are Misrepresentations of a Papist, unless you tell, what particular sort of Papists you represent; and then, I am sure, you misrepresent a Jesuit, if you make him deny the Pope's Infallibility.
H ere, I confess, the Misrepresenter and Representer do flatly contradict each other; and I am heartily glad to hear the Representer so fully disown those Principles, which are destructive to all Religion, as well as to Humane Societies; and should be more glad still had there been never any foundation for what he calls the Misrepresentation. However, this he does very ill in, to charge Protestants with this Misrepresentation of a Papist; for I know no Protestant that charges these Principles upon Papists in general: but I hope it is no Misrepresentation to charge those Men with such Principles, who charge themselves with them; and I suppose our Author will not say, that these Principles were never taught or defended by any Papist. Whenever he is hardy enough to say this, I'll direct him to such Popish Authors as will satisfy him about it.
XX. Of the Deposing Power.

Here the dispute between the Misrepresenter and Representer, is only this, Whether the Deposing Power be the Doctrine of the Church of Rome? For it's granted on all hands, that it is, or has been, the Doctrine and Practice of many Popes, Divines, and Canonists; but that it has been condemned by other Divines, and some famous Universities, tho' I do not hear, that it was ever condemned by any Pope. But what does he think of this being decreed by General Councils? Does not this make it the Doctrine of their Church? This he says nothing to here, but we shall meet with it by and by in his Reflections, and therefore will dismiss this Cause till then.

XXI. Of Communion in one kind.

Here we charge the Church of Rome with altering the Institution of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; for Christ instituted it in both kinds, but the Church of Rome denies the Cup to the Layity: but yet we do not say, That a Papist believes that he is no longer obliged to obey Christ's Commands, than his Church will give him leave; but we
we say, that herein he transgresses the Institutions of our Saviour, to comply with the Innovations of his Church. And does the Representer deny this? Yes, he denies, that they alter the Institution of Christ; for (he says) Christ did not command them to receive in both kinds, but left it indifferent. But does he deny, that the Church of Rome takes away the Cup from the People? No, this he owns and justifies. Wherein then do we Misrepresent them? For we charge them only with taking away the Cup: whether this be agreeable, or contrary to the Institution of our Saviour, is not Matter of Representation, but of Dispute.

XXII. Of the Mass.

Here we charge them with making the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper (as the Council of Trent defines) a true proper propitiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and the Dead. And this, we say, infers an insufficiency in the Sacrifice, made by Christ upon the Cross. For if Christ by his Death upon the Cross had made a complete and perfect Atonement and Propitiation for sins, by his once offering himself, what occasion can there be for the repetition of such a Propitiatory Sacrifice? for the only reason the Apostle assigns, why the legal Sacrifices were so often repeated, was, because they could not make the Comers therunto perfect, Hebr. 10. But we do not charge them with believing an insufficiency in the Sacrifice, made by Christ on the Cross. Much less do
do we say, that they are taught, wholly to rely on
the Sacrifice of the Mafs, and to neglect the Passion
of Chrift, and to put no hopes in his Merits, and the
Work of our Redemption. The firft is a Confe-
quence which we charge upon their Doctrine and
Practice, but do not charge them with believing
it. The second was never charged on them, that
I know of before. So, that if there be any Misre-
presentation here, it must be in charging them,
That they believe the Sacrifice of the Mafs to be
a true proper propitiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and
Dead. But this is the very definition of their Coun-
cil, and an Anathema pronounced against those,
who deny it: and this the Repreſenter acknowled-
ges, though he conceals as much of it as he can,
calling it a Commemorative Sacrifice, representing in an
unbloody manner, (what, when the Blood of Chrift
is actually shed in the Sacrifice of the Mafs, is it
still an unbloody Sacrifice) the bloody Sacrifice which
was offered for us upon the Cross: But is it a Pro-
pitiatory Sacrifice or not? Does it make an actual
Propitiation for our Sins? If they do not own this,
then indeed we misrepresent them; if they do (as
they muft, if they own the Council of Trent) we
represent them truly; and whether the Consequences
we charge upon this Doctrine, be true or false, that
is no part of the Representation: we may argue ill,
but we represent right; though we are ready to justi-
fy that too whenever they please.

XXIII. Of
XXIII. Of Purgatory.

To carry on the humour of Misrepresenting, he complains of Misrepresenting here too; when all that is charged on them is, the belief of Purgatory, a middle place between Heaven and Hell, where Souls departed, who are acquitted from the Sentence of Eternal Punishment, must undergo a Temporal Punishment for those Sins, which were not expiated in this Life. That there is such a State, the Representer most industriously and zealously proves: Why then is the belief of Purgatory thrust into the Character of a Papist misrepresented? All that I can perceive is, That the Misrepresentation consists, not in charging them with believing a Purgatory, but with believing it contrary to all Reason, the Word of God, and all Antiquity; for the Representer says, he believes it damnable to admit of any thing for Faith, that is contrary to Reason, the word of God, and all Antiquity. Damnable is a very dangerous word, especially when it is applied to believing things contrary to Reason; and therefore though it may serve now and then to bluster with, I would advise him to use it sparingly: but though I must confess, we think, that they do believe a Purgatory, and a great many other things, which are contrary to Reason, Scripture, and Antiquity; yet we do not say, that they admit any thing for Faith, which they believe contrary to Reason, Scripture, and Antiquity; and therefore this is no part of their Character, and therefore no Misrepresentation.

XXIV. Of
XXIV. Of praying in an unknown Tongue.

Here indeed I meet with somewhat of Misrepresentation. For he says, He (the Papist misrepresented) is counselled by his Church to be present at Sermons, but never permitted to hear any he is able to understand; they being all delivered in an unknown Tongue. This is misrepresenting with a witness. But no Protestant ever charged them with preaching, as well as praying in Latin: but the meaning of this is easily understood, to persuade those People, who place all their Religion in hearing Sermons, that it is no matter what Language their Prayers are in (which they care not much for hearing when they are in English) if they have but English Sermons to entertain their Curiosity and itching Ears. And it is, I confess, a cunning Suggestion, and I hope will warn all sober Christians to joyn more devoutly in the Prayers of the Church, which they do understand, and that will teach them the difference between an English Liturgy, and Latin Mass-Book.

The rest of the Character only charges them with praying in Latin, a Language which the People do not understand; and therefore, whatever other devout Thoughts they may have, they cannot joyn with the Priest in offering up the same Petitions to God, when they do not understand what it is he says: All this is granted on all hands to be true, and yet this also which the Representers owns, is called misrepresenting.
XXV. Of the Second Commandment.

WE charge them with making the second Commandment, which forbids the Worship of Images, only a part and branch of the first, which forbids the Worship of other Gods, which is designed to obscure the true sense and interpretation of that Law, and to excuse all Men from the Sin of Image-worship, who are not so senseless to believe the Images to be Gods. And yet not thinking themselves safe in this, they dare not trust the People with the second Commandment, but leave it out of their Catechisms and Manuals, and such Offices as are like to come into Peoples hands. Is this charge true, or is it not? The Representer grants the whole, and excuses it; thinks the second Commandment too great a burden to Mens Memories, and a needless Explication of the first: but whatever may be said for or against it, if the Charge be true, why is this called misrepresenting?

XXVI. Of Mental Reservations.

THE Representer himself grants all that we charge them with; not that this Doctrine was ever defined by any general Council, or that it was universally received and practised by all of that Communion, but that it has been taught and defended by great
great numbers of their Divines, and Casuists (not to take notice of any greater Authorities now) and practised, as occasion served, by themselves and their Disciples. To charge all Papists in general with this, would indeed be a Misrepresentation, but I hope it is none to charge those who are really guilty.

XXVII. Of a Death-bed Repentance.

We do not think so ill of any Sect or Profession of Christians, but that they will all grant, that Men ought to live, as well as die in the Faith and Fear, and Obedience of God; nor did we ever charge the Church of Rome with teaching otherwise: but then we say, that Men may teach such Doctrines, as may give great encouragement to Sinners to take their fill of Sensual Lusts, and to put off the thoughts of Repentance to a Death-bed; and this indeed we think the Church of Rome has done; but do not charge her with teaching her Children to make such an ill use of these Doctrines, or with encouraging them to live wickedly in their Health, and to repent when they are sick. This is no part of the Character which we give of a Papist; but we alleadg it only to convince Men, how dangerous the Communion of such a Church is, which has found out so many easy ways to keep good Catholics out of Hell, as without her teaching any such Consequence, is very apt to incline Men, who
believe them, to take greater liberties than are consistent with the safety of their souls.

XXVIII. Of Fasting.

WE do not blame the Church of Rome for enjoying Fasting, which is a very useful Duty, when it serves the true ends and purposes of Religion; nor do we deny, that a Papist may fast very devoutly and religiously; but we say the common Practice of Fasting among Papists, is far enough from being religious; an Ecclesiastical Fast being very reconcilable with the greatest Excesses: and though this be the fault of the Men, and we charge none with it, but those who are guilty, which, I suppose, is not misrepresented, yet their Church has given occasion to it by making Fasting to signify Eating, so they do but abstain from all Meats forbidden by the Church; and their Casuists have stated this matter so loosely, that no Men who have not an Antipathy to the best Fish, and most delicious Wines and Sweet-meats, need do any great Penance in Fasting; and it is hard we cannot be allowed to complain of these Abuses without being charged as Misrepresenter.
NN this Point we are not the Affairants, but are only on the defensive part; when they make it an Argument against the Reformation, that there are so many Divisions and different Opinions among us: We desire them to look home; and to the eternal shame of a pretended Infallibility, consider how many different Opinions there are among themselves. We are all agreed in following the same Rule of Faith, as he says they are, only our Rule indeed differs; we take the Scripture to be the safest Rule, and we all agree, that it is so; they the Sense, and Judgment, and Faith of their Church; and I doubt not, but we shall as soon agree in the Sense of every Text of Scripture as they will, what that Authority in the Church is to which they must yield, what these Traditions are they must receive, and what is the true Sense and Interpretation of the Definitions and Decrees of their Councils. We agree in the Articles of the Apostles Creed, which was the ancient Faith of the Church; and our Differences as to matters of Faith, are as meer School-Discourses, as they say theirs are, and in most cases the same, as about Predestination, Election and Reprobation, the Efficacy of Grace, and Free-will. We have some indeed which they have not; and they have
have some that we have not; as about the the immaculate Conception, the Infallibility of the Pope. & c. They have a way indeed to confine these Disputes to their Schools, which we have not, and that is to keep the Common People in Ignorance, which will effectually cure their disputing; but we think it better that our People should understand their Religion, tho they dispute a little about it. Now we are so far from misrepresenting in this case, that we do not think this a reasonable Objection against either side; but if they will needs be talking of our Divisions, to persuade People for Peace and Unities fake to take Sanctuary in an Infallible Church, they must give us leave to tell our People, that Infallibility, tho it sounds big, does not do such feats in the Church of Rome as is pretended. Their Common People indeed do not dispute about Religion, because they know little of it; and their Divines and Scholars agree just as our Divines do, or it may be not so well: And this is all the misrepresenting we are guilty of in this matter.

XXX. Of Friers and Nuns.

VV Herein the Misrepresentation he complains of here consists, I cannot guess; Is it, that Papists are taught to have an high esteem of Friers and Nuns? This he himself owns; Is it, that many who enter into this religious course of Life, live very irreligiously? this he also confesses,
fesses, and apologizes for; and these two things make the Character: I suppose he forgot something else, which was to be the Misrepresentation.

XXXI. Of Wicked Principles and Practices.

Here also I cannot find wherein the Misrepresentation consists. There are a great many ill things said to be committed by some Persons of the Roman Communion; this the Representer grants, and excuses the Church from the scandal of such Examples; how well is not my business at present to enquire, who am no farther concerned, than to see Right done them, that they be not misrepresented.

XXXII. Of Miracles.

Here the Papist is charged with believing a great many idle Stories, and ridiculous Inventions, in favour of his Saints, which he calls Miracles. And if this be a Misrepresentation, they themselves are guilty of it; for these Popish Miracles were not invented by Protestants, but published by themselves, who are the only Persons that ever saw them; but their believing such Miracles (which I hardly think a wise Man among them does, tho they are willing the People should) is the least thing
thing in it: for bare Credulity, which does no hurt, is very innocent, though very silly; but to recommend such Miracles as credible, which are no better than Impostures, is an injury to common Christianity, and makes Men suspect the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles to be Cheats too; and it is a horrid abuse of Christianity to coin such Miracles to nurse Men up in Superstition, which is the general design of them: So that here the matter is not represented so bad as it is, which is the only Misrepresentation I have hitherto met with.

XXXIII. Of Holy Water.

The Papist misrepresented, is said highly to approve the superstitious use of many inanimate things, and to attribute wonderful Effects to Holy Water, Blessed Candles, Holy Oil, and Holy Bread. The Papist represented, disproves all sort of Superstition, but yet is taught to have an esteem for Holy Water, &c. So that when we charge them with using such Religious Charms as these, we do not misrepresent them, for they own they do so; but the Misrepresentation is in charging these usages with Superstition; but if this be misrepresenting, it is not to misrepresent a Papist, but to misrepresent Popery. We charge them with nothing but what they own and justify, but we charge their Doctrines and Practices with such Guilt, as they will not own, but this is not matter of Representation, but of Dispute.

XXXIV. Of
XXXIV. Of breeding up People in Ignorance.

We do indeed charge them with breeding people up, and keeping them in Ignorance, because they deny them the means and opportunity of knowledge; will not suffer them to read the Bible, nor lay their publick Prayers in a Language, which they understand, and forbid them to read such Books as might inform them better. Is this true or not? If it be, then though they may have a great many Learned Men among them, their Learned Men may keep the People in Ignorance. We deny not, but they do instruct People after a fashion, but yet they take care to let them know no more, than they are pleased to teach them, and they may be very ignorant for all that. But I think, though this be a very great fault, it belongs neither to the Character of a Papist misrepresented nor represented; but is the fault of their Governours, their Popes, and Bishops and Priests, and I charitably hope, it will be some excuse to the Ignorant and deluded People.
XXXV. Of the Uncharitableness of the Papists.

We here charge them with damning all, who are not of their Church and Communion; and this we think very Uncharitable. For it damneth far the greatest number of Christians in the World. The Representer does not deny, that they do this; only endeavours to prove, that it is not Uncharitableness in them to do it. I am not to dispute this point with him now, but if this be his charity, I like it as little, as I do his Faith.

XXXVI. Of Ceremonies and Ordinances.

We charge them with corrupting the Christian Worship by a great number of Ceremonies and Ordinances, which we judge useless, burdensome, or Superstitious, unworthy of the simplicity and spirituality of the Christian Worship, and a great infringement of true Christian liberty. That they do command great numbers of such Ceremonies, the Representer grants; and therefore we do not misrepresent them in it: whether they do well or ill in this, is no part of the Character, but the matter in Controversie between us.

XXXVII.
And so is his last Character about Innovations, a mere dispute, and cannot be made a Character, unless we should charge them with believing those Doctrines to be Innovations, which we say, and prove to be so; but never charge them with believing so: at this rate he may make Characters of a Papist misrepresented, out of all the disputes which are between us. It is but saying, what we charge their Doctrines and Practices with, and this makes the Character of a Papist misrepresented; and it is but denying this charge in another Column, and then you have a Character of a Papist represented: if we charge them with believing any thing, which they do not believe, or with doing what they do not, then indeed we misrepresent them: but he has not given any one instance of this in all his 37 Characters. But if to condemn their Doctrines and Practices, if to charge them with contradicting the evidence of Sense, of Reason, and of Scripture, that they are innovations in Faith, and corruptions of the Christian Worship, be to misrepresent them; we confess we are such misrepresenters, and, for ought I can perceive, are like to continue so; unless they have some better arguments in reserve, than ever we yet saw; for Character-making will not do it: so that all this cry about misrepresenting is come to just nothing. We like a Papist as little, as he has represented him, as when we see him represented by a Protestant Pen; for there
there is no difference at all in the Parts, Proportions, and Features, though there is some difference in the Colours. A Papist is the same in both Characters, only with this difference, that a Protestant thinks him a very bad Christian; and a Papist, we may be sure, thinks him a very good one. A Protestant thinks the Faith and Worship of a Papist to be contrary to Sense, Reason, and Scripture; and the Faith and Practice of the Primitive Church; a Papist thinks it agreeable to all these Rules, or can give a Reason why it should not. And therefore I could not but smile at his concluding Proposal, to convince us, that the Faith, as he has represented it, is really the Faith of the Papist, (which we believe is true, excepting the deposing Doctrine, and some few other Points, which I have already observed) that the decision of this whole Affair depend upon an experience. Do but you, or any Friend for you, give your assent to these Articles of Faith in the very form and manner as I have stated them, and if upon your Request, you are not admitted into the Communion of the Roman Catholicks, and own'd to believe aright in all those Points, I'll then confess, that I have abused the World, &c. and truly I am apt to think so too; but we must like his Faith better, before we shall make the Experiment.

Secondly, But it is time now to proceed to his other Reflections, which concern the Rule, whereby the Doctrine of the Church of Rome is to be known. For though the Faith of their Church be infallible, it is wonderful hard to know what their Faith is. Now his Reflections may be reduc
ced to two general Heads. First, Concerning the Authority of the Council of Trent in England, and the Rules of expounding it. Secondly, Concerning the false Rules the Answerer has used in judging of the Faith and Doctrine of the Church of Rome.

First, Concerning the Authority of the Council of Trent, and the Rules of expounding it. The Author of A Papist misrepresented and represented, in drawing the Character of a Papist represented, professes to follow the Doctrine prescribed in the Council of Trent. This the Answerer says, he finds no fault with, and therefore would not ask, How the Council of Trent comes to be the rule and measure of Doctrine to any here, where it was never received, p. 9. ed. 1. To this the Refleeter answers, That the Council of Trent is received here, and all the Catholick World over, as to all its definitions of Faith, p. 5. By which, I suppose, he means, that all English Catholics do own the Authority of the Council of Trent, and take their Rule of Faith from it; but this is not, what the Answerer means by that Question; Whether English Catholics singly for themselves, and in their private Capacities, own the Doctrine of the Council of Trent; but by what publick Act of Church or State it has been received in England, as it has been in other Catholick Countries. The Church of England had no Representatives in that Council, nor did by any after Act own its Authority, and therefore it is no authentick and obligatory Rule here.
But allowing the Authority of this rule to determine, what is Popery, and what not, which the Answerer allows reasonable enough, considering that its definitions of Faith are received all the Catholick World over, as the Reflecter faith, the greater difficulty is about the Interpretation of this rule. For not only we Hereticks interpret this Council a little differently from our Author, but Catholick Doctors themselves cannot agree about it. Now when other good Catholicks differ from him in explaining the definitions and Decrees of this Council, why must his sense, and not theirs, pass for the character of a Papist?

Pope Pius IV. did strictly forbid any private Man to interpret the Council according to his own private sense and opinion; but if any dispute happened about the true meaning of their definitions and Decrees, he reserved the decision of it to the Apostolick See; and a very wise Decree it was, considering that many of their definitions were penned in loose and ambiguous words on purpose to compose the disputes and differences of their Divines (who were many times very troublesome to the Council) that each party might think their own sense favoured; but then considering what ill consequence this might be of, to suffer them to dispute the sense of the Council, and wrest it to countenance their private opinions, which would rather inflame, than compose these disputes (a fresh example of which, they had in the dispute between Catharinus and Soto while the Council was sitting) the Pope very prudently forbids this, that if they would still wrangle among themselves, yet the authority of the
the Council might not be concerned in it. But now if their Doctors do differ still about the sense of the Council, and affix their private opinions on it, and Popes think it rather to connive at these differences, than to undertake to determine them, why must any one of these different opinions be so made the character of a Papist, as to exclude the other? If some, and those of greatest note and authority in the Church, and not inferior in number (to say no more) are for the depositing Doctrine, and others against it, why must those only be thought Papists, who deny this depositing power, and not those also, who assert it? Whether it be the Faith of the Church or not, is a dispute between them: and though our Author denies, that it is the Faith of the Church, and therefore that a Papist is not bound to believe it; yet those who are for the depositing Power, assert that it is the Faith of the Church, and that with much greater reason than he denies it; and what authority has he to decide this dispute, and who gave him this authority? Does not his representation of a Papist, in this point, depend upon his own private sense and opinion.

No, he says, He is so far from being guilty of this fault of interpreting the Council of Trent in his own sense, that he has only delivered it, as it is interpreted to him, and to all their Church in the Catechism ad Parochos, composed and set forth by the order of the Council and Pius V., for the instruction of the faithful in their Christian duty touching Faith and good Manners, in conformity to the sense of the Council: And is he sure, that all his representations are conformable to the sense of this Catechism?
May he not play tricks with the Catechism, and expound that by a private spirit, as well as the Council?

Well, but he appealed in his conclusion to Veron's rule of Faith. And what of that? How comes Veron's rule to be so Authentick, as to justify any interpretation, which agrees with it? Why did not our Author appeal to his own character? which may have as much authority, for ought I know, as Veron's rule. But besides Veron, he appeals to the Bishop of Condom, who drew up a like character in Paris of the belief of a Papist. And what is the authority of this Bishop's character? For Bishops have no more authority to expound the Council of Trent (which is entirely referred to the Apostolick See) than private Doctors. Yes, the Bishop of Condom's Book has all requisite authority, because the second Edition was published with several distinct attestations of many Bishops and Cardinals, and of the present Pope himself, wherein they at large approve the Doctrine contained in that Treatise for the Faith and Doctrine of the Church of Rome, and conform to the Council of Trent. I shall take it for granted, that it is, as the Reflefter says, but what then? Had not Cardinal Bellarmin's controversies as great an attestation as the Bishop of Condom's Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church? Did he not dedicate them to Pope Sixtus V. and that with the Popes leave and good liking, Te annuente, as he himself says? and how much inferior is this to a Testimonial under the Popes hand? And why then are not Bellarmin's Controversies as authentick a rule
a rule for the exposition of the Catholick Faith, as the Bishop of Condom's?

But Melchior Canus, to whom the Reflecter refers us, would have taught him that the Popes private approbation is as little worth, as any other Bishops. That the name of the Apostolick See does not signify the Pope in his personal capacity, but acting as it becomes the Chair; that is, not giving his own private sense, but proceeding in Council, with the advice of good and learned Men. And therefore that is not to be accounted the judgment of the Apostolick See, which is given only by the Bishop of Rome privately and inconsiderately, or with the advice only of some few of his own mind, but what he determines upon a due examination of the thing, by the advice and counsel of many wise Men. And therefore I doubt, notwithstanding the present Popes approbation, he is a little out, when he calls this the Authority of the Apostolick See.

But the Answerer did not only charge him in general with interpreting the Council of Trent by his own private sense and opinions, but gave some particular instances of it, and I must now consider, how the Reflecter takes off this charge.

1. As to Invocation of Saints, he limits their power of helping us to Prayers only, whereas he grants the Council mentions their Aid and Assistance, as well as Prayers. And the only vindication he thinks necessary to make for this is, that no other means of their aiding and assisting us, is expressed in the Council, or in the Catechism ad Parochos, besides that of their
their Prayers; and it is thus limited by the Bishop of
Condom on this Subject, with the Pope and Cardinals
approbation. But though the Council does not spe-
cific, what other aid and assistance we may expect
from the Saints besides their Prayers; yet it men-
tions Aid and Assistance, without limiting it to the as-
sistance of their Prayers; and the Answerer (P. 25.)
told him what reason he had to believe, that neither
the Trent Council nor Catechism did intend any such
limitation: but this he thought fit to take no notice
of, for it had been very troublesome to answer it.
As for the Bishop of Condom, though his authori-
ty is nothing, yet I do not find, that he limits their aid
and assistance only to their Prayers for us; for after
repeating the Decree of the Council, That it is good
and useful to invoke the Saints by way of supplication,
and to have recourse to their succors and assistances,
&c. he quietly drops the last clause without say-
ing any thing of it, and only tells us, It is evident
that to invoke the Saints according to the intent of this
Council, is to resort to their Prayers, for the obtaining
the blessings and benefits of God by Jesus Christ. And
no doubt but this is true; but the Council speaks
not only of invoking the Saints, but of flying to their
aid and assistance: and pray what does that signify?
That he had no mind to tell us, and when he says
nothing of it, how comes our Refleter to know,
that he limits it to their Prayers?
As for the point of Merit, I have already con-
sidered that, though I do not see upon second thoughts,
how the Answerer is concerned in it; for he does
not alledge the 32 Canon to oppose, what he as-
serts, that good works are meritorious by the good-
ness and promise of God, but for the sake of the Ana-
them, which it denounces against those, who deny,
that
that good works are truly meritorious of the increase of Grace and eternal life: And therefore his next instance is the Popes personal Infallibility. This our Reflector denies, and makes it the Character of a Papist misrepresented to assert it: and yet there are as many Papists, who believe the Popes Infallibility, as there are, who deny it; and were they to make Characters, to deny the Popes personal Infallibility, would certainly be one Character of a Papist misrepresented: But he says, this is only a School-debate, and not matter of Faith, because not positively determined by any general Council. And yet whoever reads Cardinal Bellarmin and several others on this subject, would think they made a matter of Faith of it. But I would ask him, Whether the Infallibility of the Church be an Article of Faith? If it be, my next question is, In what general Council it was defined? It seems indeed to be taken for granted in some later Councils, but I am yet to seek, what General Council has positively defined it. I am sure Bellarmin and other learned Divines of the Roman Communion, who use all manner of arguments, they can think of, to prove the Infallibility of the Church, never allledge the authority of any Council for it: So that it seems infallibility it self was never determined by any General Council; and if the Infallibility of the Church be matter of Faith, though it were never defined by any General Council, why may not the Infallibility of the Pope be so too? nay how does our Reflector come to believe the Infallibility of a General Council? for this is no more defined by any General Council, than the Infallibility of the Pope is.

If there must be Infallibility in the Church somewhere, I think, the Pope, whom they acknowledge to be the supream Pastor, has the fairest Pretences to
to it. For Infallibility ought in reason to accompany the greatest and most absolute Power. If we must have an infallible Judge of Controversies, it must be the Pope, not a Council; because if you place Infallibility in a Council, the Church has no infallible Judge any longer than while the Council is sitting. For the Definitions and Decrees of Councils, how infallible soever they are, yet certainly cannot be an infallible Judge, which they will not allow to the Scriptures themselves. And therefore if the Church can never be without an infallible Judge, he who is the supreme Pastor and Judge must be infallible. Now this being the Case, I desire to know, why our Reflecter prefers the Infallibility of a General Council, before the Pope's personal Infallibility? how one comes to be matter of Faith, and not the other? or if neither of them be, why one makes the Character of a Papist misrepresented, the other of a Papist represented. For though he pretends not to deliver his own private Sentiment or Opinion concerning this Point; but only to relate matter of Fact, yet he has so cunning a way of telling his Tale, as to let every body know, which side he is of. For we may guess, that he does not over admire the Papist misrepresented, and then he cannot be very fond of the Pope's Infallibility, which is part of that Character.

And now I come to the Goliath-argument, as he calls it, concerning the deposing Power, which he puts into this form. In my Character of a Papist represented, I pretend to declare the Faith of a Roman-Catholick, as it is defined and delivered in allowed General Councils; and yet though the deposing Doctrine has been as evidently declared in such Councils, as ever Purgatory and Transubstantiation were in that of Trent;
Trent; yet still with me, it is no Article of our Faith. This indeed is an untoward Argument, and I wish him well delivered; and I think he does very prudently to keep at a distance with a sling and a stone, and not venture to grapple with it. To this he thus replies:

"I answer it in short, that though all Doctrinal Points defined in any approved General Council, and proposed to the Faithful to be received under an Anathema, are with us so many Articles of Faith, and are obligatory to all of our Communion; yet not so of every other Matter declared in such a Council: there being many things treated of, and resolved on in such an Assembly, which concern not the Faith of the Church, but only some matter of Discipline, Government, or other more particular Affair; and these Constitutions and Decrees are not absolutely obligatory, as is evident in the Council of Trent—whose Decrees of Doctrine are as much acknowledged here by Catholics in England or Germany, as within the Walls of Rome itself, or the Vatican. And yet its other Constitutions and Decrees are not universally received, and it may be never will. Now, Sir, although we allow some Councils have made Decrees for deposing in particular Cases; yet the Power it itself not being declared as a Doctrinal Point, and the Decrees relating only to Discipline and Government, it comes short of being an Article of our Faith, and all that in your Answer depends on it, falls to the ground.

Now in answer to this, I must inquire into these three things. First, Whether nothing be an Article of Faith but what is decreed with an Anathema. Secondly, Whether the deposing Decree be a Doctrinal
Doctrinal Point, or only matter of Discipline and Government. Thirdly, What Authority General Councils have in *decretis morum*, or such matters as concern Discipline and Government.

First, Whether nothing be an *Article of Faith*, but what is decreed with an *Anathema*. Now here we must (1) consider, what they mean by an Article of Faith. For an Article of Faith may be taken in a *strict*, or in a large Sense. In a *strict* Sense, it signifies only such Articles, the belief of which is necessary to Salvation; in a large Sense, it includes all Doctrinal Points, whatever is proposed to us to be believed: There are Articles of both these Kinds, both in Scripture, and in some General Councils; and the difference between them is not, that we must believe the one, and may refuse to believe the other, when they are both proposed with equal Evidence and Authority; but that a mistake in one is not of such dangerous consequence, as it is to mistake the other. Whoever refuses to believe, whatever is plainly taught in Scripture, and which he believes to be taught there, is an Infidel, and guilty of disbelieving God, though the thing be of no great consequence in itself, but what he might safely have been ignorant of, or mistaken in; and thus it is with General Councils, if we believe them to be infallible; though their definitions are not all of equal necessity, yet they are all equally true: and therefore we must not pick and choose, what we will believe, and what we will not believe in the Definitions of a General Council; but we must believe them all, if not to be equally necessary, yet to be equally true; and therefore to reject the belief of any thing plainly taught
in the Council as points of Doctrine, is to disown the Authority and Infallibility of the Council. Whatever is defined in the Council is the Faith of the Council, and therefore of the Catholick Church, which is both represented, and infallibly taught by a General Council; and if we will give Men leave to distinguish, they may soon distinguish away all the Council; for it is ease for every Man to find a distinction to excuse him from believing, what he does not like. And I believe this is the true reason of this Dispute about the Marks and Characters of Articles of Faith, that Roman Catholicks must maintain the infallibility of their General Councils, and yet meet with some things in them which either they do not believe or dare not own: and therefore (though it may be they do not believe the Infallibility of Councils themselves, yet) they are put to hard shifts, to find out some Salvo to reconcile the Infallibility of their Councils, with their disowning some of their Decrees. But this will not do; for though Men, who believe these Councils to be infallible, are not bound to believe all their Definitions to be Articles of Faith in such a strict Sense, as to make the belief of them necessary to Salvation, yet they are bound to believe all their Definitions to be true: and therefore we have no need of any other Mark of the Roman Catholick Faith, than to examine, what is defined in their Councils, whether with or without an Anathema, it is all one; for all Doctrines decreed by the Council must be as infallibly true, as the Council is, and must be owned by all those, who own the Authority of the Council.

Secondly, and therefore the use of Anathemas is not to confirm Articles of Faith, but to condemn Heretics,
Heretics, and does not concern the Faith, but the Discipline of the Church. *Anathemas* relate properly to Persons, not to Doctrines. The Faith of the Church is settled by the Definitions of Councils, and must be so, before there can be any place for *Anathemas*. For till it be determined, what the true Faith is, how can they curse or condemn Heretics? The infallible Authority of the Council to declare the Faith, gives Life and Soul to the Decree; the *Anathema* signifies only what Censure the Church thinks fit to inflict upon Heretics, who deny this Faith. And therefore even in the Council of *Trent* the Decrees of Faith, and the Anathematising Canons are two distinct things; the first explains the *Catholic Verity*, and requires all Christians to believe as they teach, and this establishes the Faith before the *Anathemas* are pronounced by their Canons, and whether any *Anathema* had been denounced or no. And thus it is even in the Council of *Trent*, which decrees the Doctrine of Purgatory without an Anathema, and yet asserts it to be the Doctrine of the Scriptures, and Fathers and Councils, and commands the Bishops to take care this Doctrine be preached to all Christian People, and believed by them, which, *Melchior Canus* saies, is a sufficient mark of an Article of Faith without an Anathema; and I suppose our Refleeter will grant, that the Doctrine of Purgatory is an Article of Faith. The validity of the *Anathema* depends upon the truth and certainty of the Decree or Definition of Faith, not the truth of the Definition upon the *Anathema*; for it is strange, if the Church cannot infallibly declare the Doctrines of Faith without cursing; that the most damning Councils should be the most infallible; which, if it be true, I confess, gives great Authority to the Council of *Trent*. I do
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I do not deny, but that there is great reason for the Church in some cases to denounce Anathema's against great and notorious Hereticks; but I say this belongs to the Discipline, not to the Faith of the Church; and it is very unreasonable to think, that when a Council defines what we are to believe in any particular point, they should not intend to oblige all Christians to believe such definitions, unless they curse those who do not: In the Council of Florence they decreed the Procession of the Holy Ghost from Father and Son, the Doctrine of Purgatory, the Primacy and Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, without an Anathema, which I suppose, the Church of Rome owns for Articles of Faith, and the Council intended should be received as such: And in the same Council Pope Eugenius IV. in his Decree for the Union of the Armenians, delivers them the whole Faith of the Church of Rome, all their Creeds, seven Sacraments, &c. without any Anathema; which shows that tho' Anathema's have been anciently used, yet this is but a late invention to distinguish Articles of Faith from some inferior Theological Truths by Anathema's; for had it been known in the time of the Council of Florence, we may suppose they would have anathematized too, as well as decreed. But this Council supposing that now the Greeks and Armenians were united to the Church of Rome, the Heresie and Schism at an end, and the Persons reconciled, there was no need to exercise any Church Censures, and therefore no use for Anathema's: For this seems to be the true reason why the Council of Trent was so liberal of Anathema's, because there were so many obstinate and incorrigible Hereticks at that time.

2. The next Enquiry is, Whether the deposing Decree be a Doctrinal Point, or only matter of Discipline.
and Government: For thus the Reflecrer says, That
the Deposing Power is not declared as a Doctrinal Point,
and the Decrees relate only to Discipline and Government,
and therefore come short of being an Article of Faith.
This I confess, I look on as a very childifh Evasion. For
as they have been lately told, To decree what shall be
done, includes a virtual Definition of that Doctrine on
which that Decree is founded. But I will only ask this
Reflecrer one short Question, Why he rejects this De-
cree of Deposing Heretical Princes, or Favourers of
Hereticks? Is it because he thinks the Doctrine of De-
posing Heretical Princes, erroneous, or only because he
don't like the Practice of it? If the first, then it
seems this is a Doctrinal Decree, as well as a Decree of
Discipline and Government: If he only condemns
the Practice of it, without renouncing the Doctrine;
let him say so, and fee how Princes will like it. When
Papists dispute among themselves about this Deposing
Decree; those who are for it, vindicate the Popes
Power to depose Princes; those who are against it, de-
ny that the Pope hath any such Power; which shows
that they think it a Doctrinal Dispute; for there is no
other difference between them, but whether the Pope
has, or has not, Power to do it, which is a point of Do-
ctrine: But when they dispute with us Hereticks, then
the Church has not decreed it as a Point of Doctrine,
but only of Discipline and Government: But let them
tell me then, if this Decree do not involve a Doctrinal
Error, what is the fault of it?

3. But suppose this Decree must be only ranked
among the decreta morum, which concern the Discipline
and Government of the Church, Is not the Authority
of the Church as sacred in such matters, as in points
of Doctrine? Is not the Church guided by an infalli-
ble
ble Spirit in making such Decrees as concern the whole Christian World, and the propagation and security of the Christian Faith? At least, Is not the Church secured from making wicked and sinful Decrees?

The only Example they have in Scripture, whereon to found the Authority and Infallibility of General Councils, is the Council of the Apostles at Jerusalem, Acts 15. And yet that contains no definition of Faith, but a Decree of Manners, as they call it, that is, a rule whereby they are to guide their Actions, without defining any point of Doctrine, whereon that Decree is founded: *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from meats offered to Idols, and from Blood, and from things strangled, and from Fornication, from which if ye keep your selves, ye shall do well; fare ye well.* They might as well object here, as they do against the deposing Decree, That there is no Point of Doctrine determined in it, but it is only a Decree to direct them what to do; and yet we find the Holy Ghost assisting in such Decrees; for indeed the rules of Discipline and Government, to direct the lives and manners of men, is the only proper subject of Ecclesiastical Authority; and therefore we may most reasonably expect, that God should assist and direct his Church in such matters. The Church has no Authority to make new Articles of Faith; the Gospel was preached by Christ, and what Christ could not perfectly instruct them in, because they were not able to bear it at that time, was supplied by the Holy Spirit, who led the Apostles into all truth; and now we must expect no farther Revelations. And therefore as to matters of Faith, the Authority
of General Councils was no more than the Authority of Witnesses, to declare what Doctrine they received from Christ and his Apostles; and therefore their Authority could reach no farther, than we may reasonably presume them to be credible Witnesses, that is, while the Tradition might be supposed clear and strong, which I doubt, will go no farther than the four first General Councils, which are Received by the Church of England; but the Authority of the Church in Decrees relating to Discipline and Government is perpetual; and therefore in all Later Councils (if there be any Infallibility in the Church) I should more securely rely on such Decrees than on their Definitions of Faith. And therefore Bellarmin for the Pope, and Melchior Canus for General Councils (the two Authors to whom our Refle&ter refers us) declare, that they cannot err in those Decrees which relate to manners, if they concern the whole Church, and are in things necessary to Salvation, that is, that they cannot forbid any Vertue, nor Command any thing which is a Sin. So that they who believe the Infallibility of Popes and Councils, must acknowledge the Lawfulness of deposing Heretical Princes; for if it were Unlawful to do it, Popes and Councils could never Command it.

Our Refle&ter indeed proves, That such Decrees and Constitutions as concern Discipline and Government, are not absolutely obligatory from the Example of the Council of Trent, whose decrees of Doctrine are as much acknowledged here by Catholicks in England, and Germany, as within the Walls of Rome it self, or the Vatican; and yet its other Constitutions and Decrees are not Universally received, and it may be never will. But pray can he tell me, for what reason this is? Let him say, if he dare, that it is for want of Authority or Infallibility
bility in the Council to make Decrees to oblige all the Christian World; and if Christian Princes will not submit to the Decrees of Councils, and the Church dares not compel them to it, does this justify such a refusal? The truth is, such Decrees ought not to take place, nor become Laws in a Christian Nation, without the Consent and Authority of the Sovereign Prince; and therefore the Roman Emperors gave Authority to the Decrees of Councils, and made them Laws; but since the Church has pretended to act Independently on the Secular Powers, and to give Laws to them without their consent; no wonder that Princes, who understand their own Authority, and have power to defend it, take what they like, and reject the rest.

And for the same reason (as our Refle{c}ter observes) the Popes suffer so many Positive assertors of the no-deposing power to pass without any censure of Heresy. Which is no Argument, that they do not believe it an Article of Faith, as he suggests; but only that they want power to do it. Princes will not be deposed now, nor suffer those to be Censured, who deny the Deposing Power; But should the blessed Hildebrand-times return again, we should quickly see, whether the Deposing Power be an Article of Faith or not.

What I have now discoursed will abundantly justify an argument which I find our Refle{c}ter much grieved at. The An{c}werer in his Introduction (p. 14.) lays two passages together, which he thinks will oblige them to own the deposing power: For in the Papist misrepresented (p. 42.) the Author saies, the orders of the supremum Pastor are to be obeyed, whether he be Infallible or not; and in another place he confesses, that Popes have owned the deposing Doctrine, and acted
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according to it; and others are bound to obey their Orders, whether Infallible or not, and consequently by the Doctrine of their Church, to act when the Popes shall require it, according to the deposing power. To this the Refle&ct answers, That he only made a comparison between Civil and Ecclesiastical power, That as in the Civil Government the sentence of the Supream Judge or highest Tribunal is to be obeyed, tho' there be no assurance of Infallibility or Divine protection from error or mistake; so is he taught should be done to the orders of the Supream Pastor, whether he be Infallible or not. Now he saies, it is as unjust from hence to infer, that all the Orders of the Pope must be obeyed, as it would be to say that Subjects must obey their Princes in every thing they command, whether it be good or bad: And I acknowledge his answer to be good, if he will grant the deposing Decree to command a sin, which he has never done yet; and when he does it, I would desire him to consider how to reconcile himself to his two Friends Bellarmine and Canus, who assert that Popes and General Councils can make no sinful Decrees which shall relate to the whole Church.

2/4. Let us now consider what faults the Refle&ct finds with the Answerers way of proceeding; and they are reduced to Four heads.

1st. He saies, that in some points the Answerer owns the Doctrine (which he has represented to be the Faith of a Roman-Catholic) to be the established belief of the Church of England; as in part, that of the power of Priestly absolution, confession, of due veneration to the Relicks of Saints, of merit, of satisfaction, of the authority of the Church, of General Councils. Now here our Refle&ct returns to his old trade of Misrepresenting again;
again; for every one who will believe his own eyes, may soon satisfy himself, that the Answerer in these Doctrines owns nothing which is peculiar to the Faith of a Papist, as distinguished from the Common Faith of all Christians. He might as well say, that because Protestants own that Christ is to be worshipped, therefore they in part own the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, that Christ is to be worshipped by Images.

This is the very case here. The Answerer grants, that Christ gave to the Bishops and Priests of the Catholic-\footnote{Page 60.} Church, authority to absolve any truly penitent sinner from his sins, and that such absolution is ratified in heaven. Therefore in part he owns the Popish Doctrine of Absolution, which is a Judicial and Pretorian Authority to forgive sins; tho we think, that to absolve as a Minister and as a Judge, are two very different things; as different as the Kings granting a Pardon, and the Chancellors sealing it, which is a publick and authentick declaration of the thing. The Answerer owns the ancient practice of Canonical confession, as part of the discipline \footnote{Page 60.} of the Church for publick offences; that is, that those who had been guilty of any publick and scandalous sins, were not reconciled to the Church without making as publick a confession, and giving publick Testimonies of their sorrow and repentance; therefore he in part owns the Auricular confession of the Church of Rome; there being little difference it seems, between confessing our sins to the whole Congregation, and in the ear of a Priest. He owns the use of voluntary confession, for the ease and satisfaction of the perplexed minds of doubting or dejected Penitents; and therefore he in part owns the Sacramental Confession, as necessary to the Remission of Sins before God.
The Answere grants, *The necessity of good Works in order to the reward of another Life.* And if he will call this Merit (in which large Sense the Fathers sometimes use that word) we will not dispute with him about it; but is this to own the Popish Doctrine of Merit? *That the good Works of justified Persons, are truly meritorious of the increase of Grace, and Eternal Life.*

The Answere distinguishes between satisfaction to the Church before Absolution, (according to the Discipline of the Primitive Church, which did not use to reconcile publick Penitents, till by a long course of Penance and Mortification, they had given sufficient Testimonies of the Sincerity of their Repentance, and had made some Satisfaction for that Scandal they had given to the Church) and Satisfaction to the Justice of God, for some part of the Punishment to Sin, which is unremitted. The first we own, as a very useful part of Church Discipline, and with the restoring of it; but the second, we utterly disown; for there is no other Satisfaction to the Justice of God for Sin, but the meritorious Death and Sacrifice of Christ; whereas the Church of Rome takes no notice of Satisfaction in the first sense, but has changed the Ancient Discipline of Satisfaction to the Church, into Satisfaction to the Justice of God for Sin.
The Answerer grants, That truly penitential Works are pleasing to God, so as to avert his Displeasure, but denies the Popish Doctrine of Satisfaction, that there can be any Compensation by way of Equivalency, between what we Suffer, and what we Deserve: and is this in part, to own his Doctrine of Satisfaction?

The Answerer owns the right and necessity of General Councils, (upon great Occasions) if they be truly so; which have been, and may be of great use to the Christian World, for settling the Faith, healing the Breaches of Christendom, and reforming Abuses; and that the Decrees of such Councils ought to be submitted to, where they proceed upon certain Grounds of Faith, and not upon unwritten Traditions. But this is no part of the Doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning Councils, which owns the Authority of all Councils called by the Pope, and confirmed by him; tho' (as we say) neither Free nor General; and ascribes an unerring Infallibility to them, and so puts an end to all inquiries into the Grounds of their Faith. We are sorry we are at such a distance from the Church of Rome, that there are few things besides the common Principles of Christianity, wherein we can own any part of their Doctrine; and if we own no more than the Answerer has done, I think the Reflecter has no great Reason to Glory in it.

2½, The Reflecter charges the Answerer, with appealing from the Definitions of their Councils, and sense of their Church, to some Expressions found in old Mass-Books, Rituals, &c. what this &c. means, I cannot tell; for I find but one instance of this in the whole Answer, relating to the Worship of the Virgin Mary, That famous Hymn,
O felix puero!, who dost expiate our sins! by the right of a Mother command, our Redeemer, being found in the old Paris Missal, which the Answerer himself has seen, and as Balinghem a Jesuit faith, in the Missals of Tournay, Liege, Amiens, Artois, and the Old-Roman. Now I confess, I should not have thought it so great a fault, to have taken the fence of their Church from their Missals, be they never so old: for their Missals are not like private books of devotion, but are the allowed and approved worship of their Church, as our Liturgy is; and therefore is either the fence of their Church at present, or once was so; and if it be damnable to own that the Virgin is more powerful than her Son (or can command him, which seems to be an argument of greater power) it is very hard to charge it upon an Infallible Church, that her publick Offices did once contain damnable Errors; for surely, She was not Infallible then; which may bring her Infallibility into question still. And therefore old Missals have so much Authority still, that nothing contained in them ought to be thought damnable.

And yet the Answerer does not appeal from the Definitions of Councils, to old Mass-books; for the Church of Rome has never condemned this Hymn, nor the Doctrine of it. The Council of Trent, in her Decree for Invocation of Saints, faith nothing in particular of the Worship of the Virgin Mary; and yet all Roman Catholics make a vast difference between the Worship of the Virgin, and other Saints; how then shall we learn the Sense of the Church, but from her Practice, from her publick Offices and Hymns? And tho'
tho, since Hereticks have been Inquisitive into these
matters, they have reformed some of their Hymns,
yet they have never condemned the old ones. And
if he remembers, the Answerer in the same place
told him a notable Story, whereby he might
gues at the Sense, at least, of the governing part of
their Church still; That a Book, which was writ by a
 Gentleman ten Tears since, to bring the People to a bare
Ora pro nobis, to the blessed Virgin, was so far from
being approved, that it was condemned at Rome, and
vehemently opposed by the Jesuits in France, and a whole
Volume published against it.

3ly, He complains, that the Answerer appeals from
the Declaration of their Councils, and Sense of their
Church, to some External Action, as in case of respect
shown to Images and Saints, upon which, from our Exter-
nal Adoration, by constriction of the Fact, viz. Kneel-
ing, Bowing, &c. you are willing to conclude us guilty
of Idolatry: As if a true Judgment could be made of
these Actions, without respect to the Intention of the
Church, who directs them, and of the Person that does
them. The Paragraph in the Answer (p. 21.) to
which the Reflecter refers us, is but a short one, and
if he had thought fit to answer it, it would have
cleared this point. He saies, To Worship Stocks or
Stones for Gods, (as far as we charge them with any
such thing) signifies, to give to Images made of Wood
and Stone, the Worship due only to God, and so by con-
struction of the Fact, to make them Gods, by giving them
Divine Worship. And if they will clear themselves of
this, they must either prove that External Adora-
tion is no part of Divine Worship (notwithstanding the
Scripture makes it so, and all the rest of mankind look
upon it as such, even Jews, Turks and Infidels) or that
their External Adoration hath no respect to the Images (which is contrary to the Council of Trent) or that Divine Worship being due to the Being represented, it may be likewise given to the Image; and how then could the Gnostick be Condemned for giving Divine Worship to the Image of Christ, which Bellarmin confesses, and is affirmed by Irenæus, Epiphanius, St. Austin, and Damascen?

Wherein now does the Answerer appeal from the Declarations of their Councils; and hence of their Church, to External Actions? Does the Council forbid such External Acts of Adoration, as Kneeling, Bowing; Offering Incense, &c. to be paid to Images? No, it enjoyns it. Does the Council then deny, that the Worship which is paid before the Image, has regard to the Image? No, both the Trent Council and Catechism teach the Worship of Images. The whole Mystery of this pretended Appeal from their Church and Councils to External Actions, is no more than this; that they do not believe the giving such Worship to Images, to be giving the Worship due to God to Images; and the Answerer considering the Nature of those External Acts of Adoration, knows not how to excuse them from it; but has put him into a way of doing it, if he can; if he can either prove, that External Adoration is no part of Divine Worship, or that they do not give this External Worship to Images, or, that Divine Worship being due to the Being Represented, it may likewise be given to the Image; then he will grant that they are not guilty of Worshiping Stocks and Stones for Gods; but till he can do this, he must give us leave to Interpret such Actions, as all Mankind besides themselves Interpret them.
But our Reflector did not like this; he is for Judging of Actions by the intention of the Church that directs them, and of the Person that does them. Well, and what is their intention in it? Is it not to Worship Images? Yes, this is the Intention, and the express Declaration of their Church. Right! but their Church does not intend to break the Second Commandment, and to commit Idolatry in the Worship of Images, and therefore you ought not to charge this upon them. Very. true! nor did ever any man in the World intend to commit Idolatry. We charge them not with any such Intention; but if they Worship Images, we desire to know how they excuse themselves from breaking the Second Commandment, and committing Idolatry? Whether they are Idolaters or not, let God Judge; but we think we should be guilty of Idolatry if we did it, and that is the reason why we cannot comply with such practices.

I would only desire to know, whether there be any such thing as External and Visible Idolatry? If there be, it must consist in External and Visible Actions, for we can never know what men's intentions are, but by their Actions; and then if men do such Actions as are Idolatrous, how can the intention excuse them from Idolatry? Especially no intention can alter the nature of Actions, which are determined by a Divine or Human Law; for then men might Murder, or commit Adultery, or Steal; or Forswear themselves, and yet avoid the sin and guilt of such actions, by intending to do no evil in them; if then the External Acts of Kneeling or Bowing to or before an Image, directing such Actions to the Image, be called Worshiping of them, and are forbid
in the Second Commandment, without any regard to what intentions men have in doing so, we put no other Interpretation upon such Actions, but what the Divine Law puts upon them; and if they will venture to Expound them otherwise, and think to justify themselves in doing forbidden Actions, by their good Intentions; they may; but we dare not.

As for what he says, that these Actions, such as Bowing, Kneeling, &c. are in themselves indifferent, and capable of being paid to God and men; I readily grant it; but is there then no way to distinguish between Civil and Religious Worship, between the Worship of God and men? I will tell him one Infallible Distinction, allowed by all the rest of mankind, viz. the Worship of the Invisible Inhabitants of the other World, tho' with such External Acts as may be paid to Creatures, has always been accounted Religious Worship. Civil Respects are confined to this World, as all Natural and Civil Relations, which are the Foundation of Civil Respects, are; but we have no Intercourse with the other World, but what is Religious. And therefore as the different kinds and degrees of Civil Honour are distinguished by the sight of the object, to which they are paid, tho' the External Acts and Expressions are the same; as when men bow the Body, and are uncovered, you know what kind of Honour it is by seeing who is present, whether their Father, their Friend, or their Prince, or some other Honourable Persons; so the most certain mark of distinction between Civil and Religious Worship is this, That the one relates to this World, the other to the Invisible Inhabitants of the next.
But God allows us to Worship no Invisible Being but himself, which would unavoidably confound the Worship of God and Creatures. If the Refleeter can give me any one Instance of any Nation in the World, which did not account the Worship of all Invisible Beings to be Religious, I will own myself mistaken. And if all Worship of Invisible Beings is Divine and Religious Worship, this puts an end to this Dispute, and Abigail might fall down on her Face before David, and the Beggars in Lincolns-Inn-Fields may beg upon their Knees (as the Refleeter argues) without any constructive Idolatry; but so cannot a Papist, who prays to the Virgin Mary, to Saint Peter, and Saint Paul; now they are in an invisible State, with all the External Signs of Worship and Adoration, excepting Sacrifice, which we can give to God himself. And as for his Instance of Joshua's falling down before the Angel, when he can prove that this was only a created Angel, and that Joshua took him for no more; we will consider it farther.

Now, if to Worship any Invisible Being, be to give Divine Honours to it; then to be sure, to Worship the Image of such an Invisible Being, must be Religious Worship also. For if the Worship of the Image be referred to that Invisible Being, whom the Image represents, it cannot be Civil, but Religious Honour.

4. The last Complaint is, That the Analler appeals from their Councils, and Sense of their Church, to the Sentiments of some private Authors. And this I confess were a just Exception against the Answer, if it were true; but I challenge him to give any one Instance of it, wherein the Answerer has set up the judgment of private Authors against the declared Sense and Judgment.
ment of their Councils and Church. He has indeed quoted several of their Authors, and to very good purpose; as to give an account of matter of Fact, and what the practice of their Church is, and what Opinion Wise Men among them had of such practi-
ces; to which purpose he cites some French Authors, Wicelius, and Vives, (p. 27, 28.) which our Reflecter is so much grieved at; or to give an Historical Ac-
count of the state of the Controversie, what it was before, and what since the Council of Trent; as about the worship of Images, p. 17. about the necessity of Confection, p. 61. or about the Senfe and Interpreta-
tion of some controverted Texts of Scripture; or to state the notions of things expressed, but not defined by the Council; as what Merit is; (p. 57.) for tho the Church has defined the good works of justified Persons to be truly meritorious, yet it has not told us what true and proper Merit is, and therefore we must learn this from the allowed and received definitions of their Divines. Thus the Council has determined due Honour and Worship to be given to Images, but has not determined what this due Honour and Worship is; and therefore we have no way to know it, but by appealing to the general Practice of the Church, and the Doctrine of their Divines; which is not to oppose the sentiments of private Authors to the judgment of the Church, but where the Church has not explained her self, to learn her sense as well as we can, from their most approved Divines. Thus the Council has de-
creed the use of Indulgences, but has not defin'd in what cases and to what purposes they may be used; and therefore when the Reprcfenter says confidently, that it is only a relaxation of Canonical Penances, the Authority, and especially the argument of Greg. de
Valent.
Valent. and Bellarmin are good against him, tho not against their Church, had their Council defined it. (p. 66.) When he asserts that Indulgences are not sold, the Tax of the Apostolick Chamber is good Authority against him; especially, if those who sell Indulgences receive the Money only under the notion of Alms, which is allowed by the Council; and when he denies, that Indulgences do concern the remission either of mortal or venial sins, the Answerer might well appeal to the very form of the Popes Bulls, which not only grant the remission of sins, but in some cases the plenary, and most plenary remission of sins.

Thus in what cases the Pope can dispense, and in what not, is not determined by the Council, and therefore there is no other way of knowing how large this power is, but by appealing to the practice of Popes in granting Dispenfations, and the Opinions of their Divines and Canonists about it: And I cannot imagine what should make the Refle&cter so angry with the Answerer for stating this matter, as he seems to be (p. 17.) but that he rebukes his confidence by discovering his unskilfulness in such disputes: Nor do I discern the Answerers fault in saying, We know this dispensing power is to be kept as a great Mystery, and not to be made use of but upon weighty and urgent causes of great consequence and benefit to the Church, as their Doctrines (tho the Errata, which a Refle&cter ought to have consulted, would have told him it should be Doctors) declare: for if their Doctors, who may be presumed best to understand the intrigue, do say this, what fault did the Answerer commit in saying it after them; and thus it is in several other cases; the Answerer has alleged the Opinions of their Divines and Casuists, Not to oppose them to the Authority of the Church, but to
learn from them what is the most received and currant Doctrine in such matters as are not expressly defined by their Councils; and is this like picking up some particular sayings out of private Authors, to charge them upon any Church? I do not think my self concerned to examine his citations out of some of our Authors, these being so great a disparity between these two cases; but if he have dealt by others as he has done by the Answerer, he is a very Misrepresenter still. He says, The Answerer seems to maintain, that good works of justified persons are not free. And the Answerer indeed does say, that they are not free, as freedom is opposed to a Divine assistance in doing them, and to an antecedent obligation to do them, which freedom is necessary to merit; but does this destroy the liberty of the Will as assisted by the Divine Grace? Or will the Reflecter own such a freedom as the Answerer denies?

These are all the material Exceptions the Reflecter has made against the Answer, which come to little more than some popular talk; for I do not think the Vision of St. Perpetua worth disputing about; and if he did not think this Vision gave some Credit to the Doctrine of Purgatory, I would know why he mentioned it. The Answerer does not charge them with making such Visions and Apparitions, the only Foundation of Purgatory; but certainly those who have taken so much pains to tell, if not to invent, such Stories, and to father them upon ancient Writers, did think that they would do some service to propagate the belief of it in the World: and if they be true, I know no reason they have to be ashamed of them, and notwithstanding all their other arguments, I confess I think they want them.
And now I know nothing in his Reflections unanswered but some Popular Harangues and Insinuations; but plain truth, like a true Beauty, needs no Paint and Varnish; and therefore I shall only for a Conclusion assure our People, That the Answer is every way agreeable to its Title, *the Doctrines and Practifes of the Church of Rome truly Represented*; and when this Reflecter, or any one for him, shall think fit to examine any part of it as it becomes men, and Scholars, they shall either have a fair Reply, or a Recantation.

FINIS.
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SIR,

It is not any distrust of the Abilities of your former Adversary (which have sufficiently made him known) nor an overweening Opinion of my own undertaking, that hath engaged me in this Controversie, but a design to serve the Interests of Truth, and to assure you, that you have not yet convinc't the World, that your Character of your Religion, as you represent it, is so just, and exact, or your Reasonings so cogent, but there is something [perhaps material, and of weight] to be objected to both; and I shall follow the Method, that * you profess to like, to reason as closely, as I can, with all moderation, and calmness, without making any Reflections, but such as cannot be avoided, when I treat of some Subjects, among which, I dare undertake, none shall personally concern you; tho' you will allow me to tell you, you have not so carefully followed your own prescriptions, when you impeach our † Church in general, reckoning her Books of Homilies among those Books, that have misrepresented Popery; and in particular charge your learned, and modest Adversary with the * same crime, and too liberally bestow your Characters on him, charging him † with wronging you, and imposing upon his Reader, with * Sophistry, with understanding neither Law, nor Logick, and with being insincere, and using tricks, but probably the Answer hath made you angry, and men in a passion cannot forbear hard Language.

A 2

I do
I do acknowledge, that it is a severe dealing to pick up all the extravagant passages in private Authors, and to father them on the whole Church (no Church, of whatever denomination, being without both evil men as to their Morals, and opinionative men as to their Tenets) but withal I must say, that it is one thing to cite Quotations from all sorts of Authors, and another thing to cite Men of Eminence, and Authority in your Church, (and such, whose Station, Learning, and Repute, were as great, as ever the Bishop of Condom's, or Monseigneur Verois's, whom yet you rely upon, as you also sometimes quote other men of your Communion to confirm your Opinions,) whose Books also have come into the World with Licence, and Privilege, and Commendations of the Authors, and whose Assertions have never been condemned, after they have been published, (and some of them probably Members of that very Trent-Council, which you stick to for the Articles of your Faith) and in matters of fact, which cannot be foreign to the Controversies between your Church, and ours, there is a necessity of having recourse to such Writers, as I shall be often forc'd to do in these Remarks.

And that I may consider every thing methodically, that belongs to this Topic, I cannot but observe your *Reflections on the Opinions of some Eminent men in our Communion, which, say you, we are unwilling to have charg'd upon our Church. For the first, which you charge on your Antagonist, *That, good works of justified persons are not free, I must say, that either I misunderstand your Adversary, or you do

do misrepresent him; for when † he says, That, what † Ch.6. p. 43. we pretend to merit by, must be our own free act; (for these are his words, and not as you quote them) citing for it the Authority of the Jesuit Coster's Enchiridion, and adds, That therefore the works of justified persons cannot be said to be their own free acts, because the power of doing them depends upon Divine assistance; and being done by the power of God's grace, which could never have been done without it, cannot be. (for that reason) truly meritorious, he is so far from giving an account of the Doctrine of our Church, that he proves from the principles of your own, that, if good works be done only by the Grace of God, and made acceptable only through the merits of Christ, they cannot be truly said to be meritorious, because not the free acts of them, that do them.

When Mr. Thorndyke allows of prayers for the Dead (though you quote no Book of his for that Assertion) he does no more, than in some sense our Church allows, when it prays for a joyful Resurrection in her Office at Funerals; and whatever the good man might add else of his own, was but his private Opinion (as is also his notion, that the Eucharistical Sacrifice is truly the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross propitiatory, and impetatory, as well as the other, which I take upon your credit, not having the Book by me, out of which you cite the Opinion) however we assert, that Mr. Thorndyke never owned Prayers for the Dead, as you do (but in the sense of some of the Antients) for he denied Purgatory, upon which you ground your Prayers for the Dead, and that our Blessed Saviour is really present in the Sacrament, is the Doctrine and Belief of the Church.
Church of England, and did not you limit that Real Presence to Transubstantiation, there would be no difference between you, and us, in that point.

I cannot but observe your disingenuous manner of treating the Author of Jovian, in charging him with a disloyal principle, who hath given as many instances of his Loyalty, in the most difficult times, as any man of his station, and were there no other, the writing of that excellent Treatise, in that critical juncture, is an undeniable evidence of it, when by defending the Succession, and the Doctrine of Non-resistance, he acquired the ill will, and displeasure of all the disloyal Party. Why did not you, nor any other of the English Roman Catholicks, write then in the defence of those Doctrines, against the disloyal and rebellious Doctrines of Julian?

The Press was open for you, and perhaps there was reason for your not answering of them, * because the generality of the Writers of your Church agree with that Author in his principles of disloyalty. Well, but you have found out one disloyal principle in Jovian, but are you sure of it? It is not your saying, It is a disloyal principle, that makes it to be so, and therefore I must desire you, and those that perhaps are misled by you, to read the Book from p. 139. to p. 152. out of which you have cited the passage, and then you will find it to be such a disloyal principle, as will not allow any Christian subject "έπε οἱ πολλοί ὁ Νερο, οἱ διολίσιαν, ὅπως εἰς τὸν Παῦλον Μαυρίκιον, ταύτα ἐπετραγωγός τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἔθετον τὸ ταύτα τῆς θεοτόκου νομον, Κονσταντίου, οὐκ δέδηλον Ἀντωνίου." to pray for the death of a Nero, Dioclesian, (though he set up Inscriptions, ob deletum nomen Christianum,) Constantius, or Valens, but only for
for a Julian, whose Apostasie and Wickedness is singular in Ecclesiastical History, and the like of whom in all probability can never be expected again.

Nay Sir, this disloyal principle will not let Christian subjects pray, for the death of a Julian, though he tyrannizes never so much over their bodies, goods and liberties, if he do not blaspheme Christ, and persecute the Church of God, with a diabolical spite, against the evidence of Divine Miracles. It leaves the Christian subjects of all Tyrants, but such as are Julians indeed, under the obligation of praying for them, according to the Apostle's direction, and the practice of the Primitive Christians, which the Author of Jovian hath so much insisted upon, and commended; and his Prince must be a Julian indeed, a Julian in all circumstances, before he can be so much as tempted to pray against him; for he doth not say, that he would pray, but that he should be tempted to pray for the destruction of a Julian indeed. And it had been happy for the Christian world, if the chief Pastors, and Bishops, and Councils, and Doctors, and Casuists, of that which you call the Catholick Church, had never taught any principle more disloyal than this. Now Sir, I beseech you, to tell me, how much disloyalty there is in this principle, which secures all Infidel, Heretical, and Apostate Princes against the Prayers of their Christian subjects, unless they be in all degrees as bad as Julian, and secures even Julians themselves against all resistance? and how much disloyalty there is in a man, who by his principles will pray for all Tyrants, but such an one as Julian was, according to the Author of Jovian? Sir I would to God you, and your Doctors would declare
declare as much Loyalty as this; and I desire you to
tell me, that suppose a Roman Catholick Prince
should become a Julian indeed, and take up the me-
ths of that Apostate, whether you think his Ro-
man Catholick Subjects would be tempted to pray
for his destruction? and if they should do so and no
more, do you think they would transgress any rule of
Christian Loyalty? Answer me these two questions
sincerely and positively; and if your answer to the
first, be affirmative, give your arguments for your O-
pinion, and I dare engage, the Author of Jovian
shall submit to your reasons, or answer them.

For I am confident he hath no fondness for his
Opinion, to which it is evident he was led, by his
great Charity for the Bishop, and Church of Na-
anzum. And though in apologizing for them, he
hath asserted, that he should be tempted to pray for
the destruction of a Julian indeed, yet he is so Loyal
a Person, that I believe he would overcome the
temptation, and only forbear praying for him, as
having sinned the sin unto death.

After which Apology you will suffer me to tell
you, that your Reflections will hardly be called an
answer to the Doctrines, and Practices of the Church of
Rome, because in them you have not said a word to
some material points of Controversy between you, and
us, stated in that Book out of the Trent-Council
and Catechism, as if either the right were on your
Adversaries side [which, I suppose, you will be loath
to acknowledge] or his reasonings were unworthy
your second thoughts [which, I suppose, you will
not own, and if you do, few wise men will acquiesce in
in your Sentiments] for you wholly prætermit reflecting upon the Chapters of the Eucharist, of Indulgences, of satisfaction ex condigno, of keeping the Scriptures, and Prayers in an unknown Tongue, of communion in one kind, and of adding the Apocrypha, and traditions to the holy writ, with some others; which, being some of the most material points in difference between your Church, and ours, will either deserve some new thoughts, or you will allow us to say, that that book cannot be thought an answer, which in silence passes by, or leaps over so many weighty things, that make up so much of the Controversy.

You assure us, * that the Council of Trent is recei- * Refl. p. s. ved here, and all the Catholick World over as to its definitions of Faith, though it be not wholly received in some places as to its other decrees, which relate only to discipline. Where I shall not ask, what you mean by the Catholick World, for I am well assured that you mean all Christians of the Roman persuasion, which is a very narrow notion of the Catholick World, excluding all other Christians from being Members of the Catholick Church, but those of your own Opinion; so that neither the Greek Church, nor the rest of the Eastern Christians are in your sense any more Catholics, than the Church of England, and the rest of the Protestants (though antiently any man, or Church of men, were called Catholick, because they agreed with the whole Catholick Church in Faith; but now the holy Catholick Church of Christ must lose its name, if it agree not with the particular Church of Rome) but I would willingly know of you, whence any particular Church hath that power, that it may receive a general Council (as you call that of Trent) in
some things, and not in others? I thought, that the highest authority of the Church on Earth had been a general Council, and if so, why its definitions in matters of discipline should not be received, and observed by all particular Churches, is to me a great question; for I cannot but see, that one of these two things must follow from your Opinion, either that Councils, and Popes are fallible (for if they are deceived in one Opinion, such as that of the power of the Church to depose Princes, why may they not be deceived in another, such as Transubstantiation, orurgatory?) or else, that they are infallible in greater matters only, and then to me it is a great wonder, that they should erre in things of less moment; and I never yet understood, but that if general Councils could decide matters of Doctrine, but that they had also as great a power in matters of discipline (for if it be a lawful preface to the decrees of all Councils, as your men say, *Visum est spiritui sancto, & nobis*, then the holy spirit is doubtless their guide in matters of discipline, as well as in matters of Doctrine.) I am sure, that the Antient Councils took upon them to decide both by their authority, and all Christians thought themselves oblig'd to follow their dictates; so the first general Council of the Apostles bound up all Christians from eating things strangled, and Blood; so the Council of Nice determin'd the precise day, when Easter should be celebrated, as well as the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father; and so also the second general Council made Constantinople a Patriarchate as well as Rome; to go no further. And I find no persons disputed those constitutions (though only in matters of Discipline, and Government) till the Popes began to assert their Authority in opposition to general Councils.
And whereas * you say, that your Adversary * Relf. P. 9. wrongs you, and imposes upon his Reader, by saying, that you give your private sense, and Opinion only of the Articles of your Religion contrary to the Bull of Pius 4. pleading in your own behalf, that you expound the Canons of the Trent-Council according to the Catechism set forth by the order of the Council, and the Pope, as if both of them allowed of it; I must say, that this cannot be, for the Council never saw the Catechism, and consequently could never approve, that they never saw, unless they also were bound to exercise an implicite Faith; for though they ordered a * Catechism * Siff. 18. & to be published (having observ'd, how much the Pro. Siff. 25. testants prevailed against their Church by their constant Catechizing) they left it wholly to the Pope to see it done, and to give it authority; and this the Author of the Prolegomena to the Paris Edition of that Catechism, An. 1671. fairly acknowledges *, affirming, that after the dissolution of the Council, An. 1563. & 3. several Fathers were summoned to Rome to make this Catechism, among whom the principal man was S. Charles Barromée (as you call him) Archbishop of Milan; we are also told, that Cardinal Seripandus made the explanation of that Article (one holy Catholic Church) Michael Medina of another, &c. and that after it was finisht, it was An. 1566. offered to Pope Pius 5. for his approbation, who committed the examination of it to Cardinal Sirlet, who taking to himself the assistance of other learned men, examined both the matter, and language of it, after which the Pope gave his approbation, and ordered it to be printed by Paulus Manutius, confirming it by his Bulls. And Possenne tells us, that Gregory the 13. made this Catechism the rule, by which he reformed the Canon Law;
Law; so that if you interpret the Canons of the Council by the Catechism, then the Canons depend upon the Catechism for their meaning, and the sense of the Catechism upon the Pope, who gave it authority, by which deduction it appears, that your Religion is still built not on the Council, but on the Pope; and perhaps it was for this reason, that the Italian Bishops in their Synods (as do the Synods of Rouen, and Aix in France) call it not the Trent, but the Roman Catechism, for in truth so it is. Against all which I know only this to be objected, that the same men, that made the Canons, made the Catechism (which is hardly true, as to every particular person) but to that I answer, that I believe, you will not aver; that the same men have the same assistances in a Council, and out of it; so that were the assertion true, yet the one being done in Council, had the assistence of the Blessed Spirit (as you hold) to assist the Compilers; which, I presume, you will not say, that the same men had, when out of the Council.

And if this be so, then does not this make the Pope judge of Controversies of Faith? For, say you, the Church must interpret Scripture, and interpret Articles of Faith declared in Councils, which Church must either be the Church Representative, or the Pope; now to hope for a general Council upon every emergent dispute in matters of Faith, is a vain expectation, and if so, you will do well to show us any other judge in such cases, but the Pope; unless every particular Church must judge for it self, or every private person be his own director, and then, where is the interpretation of the Church Catholick?

Now
Now if the Pope be the Judge, how know we, but the next Pope may require the belief of the Deposing Doctrine, and expound the passages of former Councils that look that way, as Articles of Faith? what would you do in that case, especially if the generality of the Ecclesiastics should side with him [as they did in the case of the Emperor Henry 4. and of our King John] and in their Synods declare for the Ecclesiastical Monarchy? —and upon this supposition, how know we, but that, although the present Pope hath confirmed the Bishop of Condom's Book, another Pope may condemn his mincing the Articles of Faith? for we do not want Instances of Popes, who have rescinded, not only one anothers Acts, and Ordinaries, but one anothers Decrees, even in what they have called matters of Faith; although I must confess, what is very observable, that though very many Popes have asserted the Ecclesiastical Power over Princes, and their Right of Deposing them, we never read of one of them, that condemned the Doctrine.

You further say, * that though the Trent Council mention the Aid, and Assistance of the Saints, and Angels over and above their Prayers, yet it means no other Aid, but that of their Prayers, which seems to me not so agreeable to the words of the Council†, which are, That it is good, and useful ad sanctorum orationes, open, auxiliumque confugere, to fly to their Prayers, Aid, and Assistance. Now I cannot believe, that the Fathers of that Council would have explain'd a particular act by two more general words, nor when they had mention'd in particular, Prayers, would they, I believe, have afterward inserted in general
their Aid, and Assurances, unless the Aid, and Assurances were distinct from their Intercession; and this is agreeable to your allowed Prayers in your Missal, where you beg God, * ut ejus meritis, & precibus, &c. that by the merits, and prayers of St. Nicolas, you may be deliver'd from the flames of Hell. And again, † That by the merits of St. Peter, and St. Paul, you may attain the glories of Eternity, where the Merits, and Intercessions of the Saints are manifestly distinguished, as they are also in the Trent-Catechism, * where in the Margin there is this Note, The Saints help us with their Merits; and in the body of the Catechism these: They always pray for the happiness of men, and God confers many benefits upon us, eorum merito, & gratia, for their merits, and sake; and truly, were we assured that the Guardian Angels could hear us, I see no reason why we should scruple any more to pray them to protect us against the Devil, and all other Enemies that may hurt us, than to beg them to intercede for us to God; and this also is agreeable to the Catechism †.

Your next Reflection * is about the merit of good works, and your self, and adversary are agreed, that Can. 32. Seff. 6. of the Council of Trent there is no mention of the qualification of Merit with respect to dependance on God's grace, goodness, and promises; but both in that Canon, and Can. 26. the words are plain, * quæ ab eo per Dei gratiam (misericordiam) & Jesu Christi meritum, &c. And if so, the Controversie seems to me easly decided; for if it be of grace, how is it then of works? where is the merit?

Your Answer to the Goliab Argument of your Adversary, as you are pleased to call it, I remit to be consider'd
consider'd towards the end of these Remarks, because it ought to be spoken to more largely, and by itself, and proceed to take notice, that you blame your Adversary for taking the sense of your Church from some expressions in your old Missals, and Rituals, [tho I am apt to think, that the Church of England will be contented to be judged by her Liturgy, and Rituals in the like case] but perhaps you are not disgusted at the use of your Missals, but at the use of old Missals; and I am persuaded, that you have reason so to be, because the subtility of the modern Church hath made it self appear in your present Missals, and Breviaries, as well as in your Edition of the Vulgar Translation of the Bible, and in other Treatises. For instance, in the old Roman Breviary printed at Venice An. 1482. and at Paris An. 1543. Jun. 28. leafl. 2. noct. 2. S. Leonis, the words run thus, In eo Concilio damnati sunt Cyrus, & Sergius, Honorius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, &c. in that Synod Cyrus, and Sergius, Honorius, &c. were condemned; but in the new Breviary the name of Honorius is left out, which, had it been left there, would have reflected too much on the Papal Infallibility, and inform'd the World, that even Popes themselves have fallen into Heresie, while in the same Office they take care to keep up the memory, that that Pope Leo 2. fregit superbiam Ravennatum, brought the Archbishop of Ravenna to acknowledge the Roman Supremacy, which before that time that See did not.

A second Instance may be this: In all the antient Missals in Cathedra, S. Petri Antioch, Feb. 22. (as also in the old Diurnale printed at Antwerp 1553.) the Prayer is read in these words, Deus qui B. Petro Apo-
O God, who having given thy blessed Apostle St. Peter the Keys of thy heavenly Kingdom, gavest him Episcopal power of binding, and loosing Souls; but they have now left out the word Animas, i.e. Souls; for with that limitation the Pope's power was only Priestly to use the Keys in binding, and loosing men's Souls, but without that limitation every man is at liberty to believe that St. Peter's Keys may be employed in temporal affairs also, in binding Kings, and setting up a Pontifical Monarchy, to which I shall add one Instance more; that whereas in the Sacramentarium of St. Gregory the Prayer for St. Leo runs thus, Annue nobis, Domine, &c. Grant, O Lord, that this Oblation may be advantageous to the Soul of thy Servant Leo; now the words are altered into, Annue, &c. Grant, Lord, that by the intercession of thy Servant Leo, this Oblation may be profitable to us; the first being an Instance of the Antients Prayers for the Dead, for Saints, as well as others; the latter an endeavour to countenance Prayers to Saints by asserting their intercession.

And whereas to requite us for quoting your Missals *, you object to us all the expressions of Prayer, Preaching, and Devotion in our Church, the parallel doth not hold, unless you mean our authoriz'd Liturgy, in whose collects we are ready to vindicate, whatever is ascertained. Nor is it fair to say, that an Atheist may make himself sport with Scripture, if he may be allowed to separate an infinite number of expressions there, i. e. as I understand you, to make use of broken sentences (for if an Atheist uses Scripture in the sense, to which the coherence leads him, he can ne-
never make Christianity ridiculous, much less as ridiculous as Turcism) and for the passages quoted out of your Missals, they are quoted in the sense, in which they are meant, and if you deny this, you may right your self by shewing the contrary.

Nor do you do well with the Church of England to say, *she allows the Psalms in Meeter. I dare be confident to aver, that the Singing Psalms (as they are usually called) were never commanded by our Church to be used, and are no part of our service, as our Rubric's will inform you; where there is not the least mention of them; though we acknowledge, the custom was brought in through the connivance of our Governors, who at that time were intent upon matters of greater moment; nor do we say, that the sense of the Church will help out the nonsense, or ill expressions of any of those Rhymes (which is a subtle insinuation) but withal we say, that since custom hath brought in the use, no Priest of our Communion, that I know of, is so weak (I am sure, no one ought to be so) but he knows how to choose out of that great number some few Psalms, that are pertinent enough translated, and incentive of Devotion, by singing of which neither God is dishonor'd, nor the Congregation engaged to any thing, that is either evil, or ridiculous; which Apology cannot be made for any of your Missals, which your Priests were obliged to use without any power left them to choose what Collects, or Antiphons, &c. they pleased.

And now you will allow me to smile, when † you say, that if we conclude a Papist guilty of Idolatry, because he bows down, kneels, &c. to an Image, we may C
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as well say, that Abigail was guilty of constructive Idolatry, when she fell on her face before David, and so are Subjects, when they kneel to their Prince, and the Lincolns-Inn-Field Beggars, when they kneel for an Alms to those, who pass by. For these instances do not reach the case, that we are talking of, for if Abigail should have kneel’d before the Picture of David, or a Subject before the Picture of his Prince, or a Beggar before a Gentleman’s Picture, and begg’d with earnestness, and seeming devotion any blessing, there is no sober man, but would believe, that they were either very mad, or very foolish; but if they thought them sober, and in their right sense, (as we do believe your people at Church to be) they cannot be acquitted of Idolatry, if so be the honour be Religious (as you acknowledge, your veneration of Images is more than civil honour) so that by these instances you seem to run into the error of those Schoolmen, that the same honour (let it be Latria, hyperdulia, or dulia) is due to the Image, that is, due to the person represented; and if any Law be to be judged of by the common practice (as the Maxim faith, Lex currit cum praxi) this is very plain from the usages of the generality of people in your Church. And I am sure, (to confirm this your way of arguing) that I have somewhere read (though I cannot now readily light on the place) that Scribanus affirms, that Adoration of Saints, and Images is very lawful, because Abraham bowed down to the Children of Heth, Gen. 23. 7. Surrexit Abraham, & adoravit populum terræ, filios, viz. Heth. As it is in the Vulgar Latine. And if I must not judge of any man’s Idolatry by his outward actions (which is your exception) then I can never know any man to be an Idolater; for a Heathen may fall down before one of his Idols,
Idols, and call upon it for help, and yet say, that his intention is just, and that he only meant thereby to worship the True God, which is the excuse made by the men of your Church.

After this, * you compare the Power of the Pope to that of Civil Powers, as to the Obedience due to them from their Subjects; but, pray deal candidly, Do you believe the Pope to have no more Authority in commanding Obedience, than Civil Powers have? Doubtless you do believe him to have more Authority, or else, why do so many of your Church refuse to take the Oath of Allegiance, which yet you † allow to be a lawful Oath? for you say, † Cath. prin. they refuse it, not for any unlawfulness in the Oath, but because the Doctrine of Deposing Princes is there-in called Heretical, which they cannot allow of, as the word is understood in a Catholic sense (where you will allow me to observe, that for the true notion of Heresie, you depend on the Pope's Breve, and so allow the Pope to be a Judge in matters of Faith; for Heresie is contrary to the Faith, and consequently the Deposing Power, which the Pope hath determin'd, is a matter of Faith) and why do they follow the Papal Dictates in those things, wherein by the Laws of God, and Nations they are bound to submit to their Superiors?

Here also I observe, that when * you Treat of the Pope's Power, you give your self a great latitude, when you say, That you never scruple to receive his Decrees, and Definitions, such as are issued forth by his Authority, with all their due Circumstances,
and according to Law; but never tell us, what those Circumstances are (as your Adversary well remarks) which puts me in mind of somewhat, which your Authors say concerning the Bull of Sixtus 5. prefixt to his Edition of the Vulgar Translation, which was afterward recalled by Clement 8. That it was true the Bull was printed with the Bible, but that it was not affixt to the Gates of St. Peter's Church, and in the Campo fiore so long, as it ought to have been according to the Laws of the Romish Chancery, as if such little things as those made Ecclesiastical Decrees more, or less valid.

And now to shew you, that your Answerer did not shew his Learning in discovering, that the Popes have dispenc'd only with positive Institutions, but not with the Moral Law, with Lying, and Forswearing, (as if he fought a knot in a Bull-rush, and took Sanctuary in a Mystery, as you term it, by talking only in general terms) what think you of the many Dispensations, that have been given by former Popes to the Subjects of this, and other Kingdoms, to break their Oaths of Allegiance, and Duty to their Soverains? (the relation between Princes, and their Subjects, being not grounded on their being Christians, but on the Obligation of Civil Society, so that a dispensing with the Oath of Allegiance, is a dispensing with a Duty of Natural Religion, which binds Subjects to obey their Superiours.) For either Subjection to Princes is a Duty of the Fifth Commandment, (as we reckon them) Honour thy Father, and Mother, &c. or it is not; if it be not, you will do well to assert it, and we shall take care to prove it to be a Duty of that Commandment, not only
only from the Authority of the Antients, and from Reasoon, but from the Authority of your own Catechism, which † says, That all persons, who are possessors of power, or dignity, are included under the term Parents, which is afterward explain'd by those, who have Empire, Magistracy, or power committed to them, who govern the Commonwealth. But if to obey Princes be a duty of that Commandment, then to dispence with that duty, is to dispence with a Moral Law, and to dispence with Oaths, that bind to that duty, is to give men a dispensation to be perjur'd, and to forswear themselves. And because you tell us *, That the Papift is taught in all Books, that to Lye is a sin, and to call God to witnesse to an untruth, is damnable, and that the practices of your Church are according to those prescriptions, and that neither the Sacrament, nor an Oath of Secrecy can excuse any man from perjury; nor did you ever hear of any such thing from any Priests in Sermons, or Confessions, never read of them in your Books, or Catechisms, nor saw the practice of any of them in any of your Communion; in which words there is some Art used; for, do you believe, that any Priest of your Communion may reveal what he hears in confession against the Laws of your Church, which bind him to Secrecy sub sigillo? and when you tell us, You never read of any such thing either in Books, or Catechisms, you mean, I suppose, Books of Devotion; for in other Books, you may undoubtedly read such Doctrines, or else why should the Pope condemn them? And when you say, You never saw any such thing, I hope you mean, it never fell within the reach of your particular observation, but if you read the account of Mr. Garnet, and his accomplices, *you will find, that they took the Sacra-
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ment as an Oath of Secrecy, to carry on that Hellish design.) And withal subjoyn, *That the present Pope hath condemned all Equivocations, and Mental Reservations under the penalty of Excommunication latent sententia by his Decree March 2. 1679. We do still averr, that your Church hath given dispensations for Lying, and Forswearing, and we know not, but it may be done for the future. For, not to instance in the Jesuite Moralists †, Filiutius, Sanches, &c. their averring, That if a man promises any thing, and swears to it, yet if he do not intend it, he may without sin break that promise, and that Oath; so that the intention of the Swearer among these Casuists, makes the Oath valid, as the intention of the Priest makes the Sacrament. Some other of the same Order, have given dispensations for the breach of the Moral Law*, Escobar says positively, virtute bullae potest votum non pec-candi mutari, i.e. that a man may break his Vow of not sinning by virtue of a Bull, and he instances in the committing of Fornication; he † also says, That a man may Lye even to his Confessor, that a man may promise a general Confession, and yet not confess all his mortal sins, quia quamvis mentiatur, id tamem parum refert ad Confessarii judicium, i.e. for tho he Lye, yet that hath little or no relation to the Judgment of his Confessor.

Now to these proofs probably you will object, that this is not the Opinion of the Church, but of private men; to which I answer, that had it not been the Opinion of your Church, when those Books were written, such men would never have been allowed to be Confessors (which no man can be unless by the allowance of the Pope, the
the Bishop of the Diocess, &c.) though it is well known, that the Jesuits then were, and still are as Eminent for being Confessors, as any other Order in your Communion, and perhaps more, and this notwithstanding their owning these damnable Doctrines, as both you, and I agree to call them. Nor is it enough to say, that the Book of Escobar, after having been 39 times printed for an excellent Book (which is an argument, it was much bought, and much valued) was the 40th time printed only to be censured, and condemn'd by the French Bishops (which the poor Jansenists lookt upon to have been a condemnation both of the Author, and his Opinions, whereas they found at last to their cost, that themselves were censured at Rome, as the criminals) nor that the present Pope (being more wise, and moderate than some of his Predecessors) hath condemn'd those Doctrines (which vindicates us, that we have not unjustly charg'd the men of your Church with such Doctrines) among which propositions if you consult the 26 and 27, it is asserted, That a man may either, being askt, or of his own accord say, and swear, that he did not do a thing, which he really did, and yet by virtue of a secret meaning, be neither a liar, nor perjured. And that this he may do, as often as it is necessary, or profitable to save his Body, Honour, or Estate, or for any other good end. For this is to acknowledge, that your Church for a long time heretofore conniv'd at, or allow'd of the breach of plain moral commandments, since the man in authority, that doth not prohibit the sin, that he may hinder, seems to injoin it. I also observe,
1. That according to your Opinion, whatever the Pope, and Cardinals, or other Bishops do either allow, or condemn, is not binding as to the Faith, since the infallibility is lodg'd no where, but in a general Council. 2. If we look into the Censures, there is nothing relating to the breach of Oaths given to Princes, which is the highest trust in temporal matters, and withal, that the propositions are not condemn'd as contrary to the Laws of God, and Nature, as assertions, that promote impiety, and injustice; but *minimum tanquam scandalosus, & praxis perniciosas,* [which is the manner of expression that Alexander 7. makes use of in his censure, An. 1665.] as at least scandalous, and pernicious to practice, and therefore to be condemn'd, which whether this doth not look like a trick, and juggle (because you have encouraged me to use the word) you your self shall be the judge; for notwithstanding this censure, whenever the scandal ceases (which no one knows, how soon that may be) and they are judg'd no longer pernicious, the propositions may be again owned, and maintained. 3. It is moreover observably, that whereas former Popes have allowed these Tenents, and Practices without condemning them, who knows, but the Successors of the present Pope may, when they please, licence anew the propositions, which are now condemn'd? 4. That some such thing hath been formerly done, your *Adversary hath given you an instance, which you did not think fit to meddle with, nor to reflect upon, out of Archbishop Abbot's *Preface to his six Lectures, where you will find, that Pius 5. the same Pope, who authoriz'd the Trent-Catechism, gave his resolution to some of the English Missionaries, that whenever
whenever any of them were called before a judge in England, he might either refuse the Oath, or Swear, and answer sophistically; potest Catholicus trautus coram haereticis vel recusa jurementum (quod est prudentius) vel sophistice jurare, & sophistice respondere suis interrogatibus. And if you look into the Book called Foxes, and Firebrands, you will see there, that Heath the Jesuit had a Bull with him dated An. 1. of the same Pius 5. allowing him to preach what Doctrine the Society of the Jesuits should order him for the dividing of the Protestants, and not to instance in the dispensation given by Eugenius 4. and his Legate Card. Julian to Ladislaus King of Hungary to break his League with the Grand Signior, for which he was so severely punished in the unfortunate Battel of Varna, and some other such examples, the Examination of Mr. Garnet is a very plain proof of this our assertion; for though some men call these little arts equivocation, and mental reservation, as if they were small, or no sins, yet you fairly, and honestly condemn both alike, and I know few wise, and good men, but look upon both as alike sinful, and perhaps the equivocation the more so, because the design is more cunningly laid to deceive.

And now I am talking of the Jesuits, I think fit to mind you, that whereas you seem to say, * that it * Pap. missi. pre. p. 69, 70. is a scandal upon your Church to affirm, that 'tis more lawful to be drunk on a Fasting day, than to eat flesh, I have met with a Casuist * of your communion, who will not allow a man to eat Flesh on a Fasting day, but as to drink gives great indulgence, when he says, * that a man may drink Wine even in great quantity, and if he happen to be drunk, im-
moderatio potest temperamentiam violare, sed non-jejunium. He may transgress the Laws of Temperance, but he does not transgress the Laws of Fasting.

After this I will not decide the controversy between your Adversary, and your self, whether the story of S. Perpetuus’s Vision be seriously related, or droll’d on (who pay a great veneration to all Antient writings, and can hardly think, that a Martyr in view of an Eternal Crown of happiness would indulge to any thing, that is light, or deserves to be exposed) but I have some things to say relating to that Vision. As, 1. That it is very probably believed by most learned men, that SS. Perpetua, and Felicitas were Montanists, among whom there were many visions, which the rest of the World gave no credit to; but this I shall not dispute. But, 2. I aver, that it is very disputable both from the vision itself, and from the quotations in St. Austin, whether Dinocrates were baptiz’d, or no. I know, your Adversary says, he was baptized, and St. Austin would fain have it so, but there is no convincing proof, that he was so; and the silence of the Writer of that Passion seems to imply, that he was not so. Now then I urge you with this Dilemma, either Dinocrates was baptiz’d, or not; if he were not baptiz’d, (as it is very probable, because his Father was a very violent Heathen, and so in all likelihood would not suffer his Son, being so young, to be baptiz’d) then you have nothing to do with him in Purgatory; for, tho you have allotted an apartment there for the unbaptiz’d Children of Christian Parents, yet you allow no place there to the unbaptiz’d Children of Heathen Parents, who with their
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Pagan Progenitors are condemn'd to Hell; unless we must reckon this story with those other of St. Thecla's bringing the Soul of Falconilla out of Hell, or St. Gregory's praying thence the Emperour Trajan, which later story the * Jews, who themselves allow of a sort of Purgatory, make sport of; but if he he were baptiz'd, (as I profess, I cannot believe, tho St. Austin says so) then it seems very hard, that a Child of seven years old, (when few Children are capable of understanding enough to chuse to be wicked) should be sent to Purgatory for sins, which he knew not of; for, if that be true, which St. Austin says, that his Father probably carryed him to the Heathen Temples, as we will suppose it to be, this was the Father's sin, and not the Child's, and so I cannot see, why Dinocrates should be punisht.

And to confirm my conjecture, that he was not baptiz'd, I am apt to think, that in the Vision the Water, * which Perpetua saw her Brother endeavouring to drink of, but could not come at, was an Emblem of the Waters of Baptism, which he seem'd to endeavour after, and at last Perpetua her self says *, that she her self was a Catechumen, when she was apprehended, and that at that time she had two Brethren both Catechumens; now if we reckon Dinocrates for one of those two Brethren of hers, or allow him to be dead some time before, (as I rather conjecture) I am strongly inclined to believe, that while the Father was an obstinate Pagan, the Sister, and the other Brothers only Catechumens, that this younger Son, who was but seven years old when he died, was not baptiz'd, before he went out of the World; now, if he were not baptiz'd, the Fathers tell
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tell you, there was no hopes of Salvation for him; for to omit St. Austin, and the African Fathers, I will only instance in two remarkable passages, the one for the Western Church out of * Gennadius, Nullum Catechumenum, &c. That no Catechumen, tho' he die in a state of good works (which is more than St. Austin says of Dinocrates, for he accuses him of Idolatry) can attain to Eternal life, unless he be a Martyr. And for the Eastern Church out of St. Chrysostom †, κλειστα τος ως εοις φωτισας ανερχυσαι το θε έξ. Mourn over those, who leave the world without Baptism; they deserve your sighs, and lamentations; they are out of the Kingdom of God among the unrighteous, and the condemn'd.

And now if all your former Arguments will not make us Converts, you tell us, * that if a man assent to these Articles, as you have stated them, he shall have admittance into your Church, and probably so, for we know, you deal very gently with your new Converts, till you have secured them; but who knows how much further he must go, when he is under new Oaths of Obedience to that Church, who makes her unwritten Traditions (which no man knows, till she reveals them) to be as much the Rule of Faith and Manners, as the Holy Scriptures, and consequently binds all her followers to an Implicit Faith to believe, whatever she shall reveal? And I remember, that Mr. Camden † records a report, that once there were more ease terms of Reconciliation proposed by the Pope's Nuncio, viz. the allowance of the Sacrament in both kinds, and the confirmation of the English Liturgy, and probably many other things, so the Papal Supremacy were acknowledged; but we are very
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very well satisfied, that St. Peter had no more Authority than the rest of the Apostles, and that every Bishop by Divine Right, is a Successor of the Apostles, and consequently hath equal power in the Church of Christ; that the making more Sacraments, than we are sure Christ instituted, is an encroachment upon his Right, (and that the establishment of your five additional Sacraments, is such an encroachment) that the Jewish Canon of the Old Testament (the Jews, till our blessed Saviour's time, being the only True Church of God) with the uncontroverted Books of the New, are the only divinely inspired Oracles, and a sufficient Rule of Faith, and Manners, without the help of the Apocrypha, or of unwritten Traditions: that General Councils are not infallible, much less the Pope, either singly, or with the College of Cardinals; that giving the Communion in one kind, is robbing the people of what our Saviour gave them a right to; and that Prayers in an unknown Tongue are a contradiction to St. Paul; with many other such points, which it is now needless to mention, for which reason the Members of the Church of England think fit to continue, where they are, where they enjoy all the forementioned blessings, with many others, which must necessarily be forfeited, when they embrace the Romish Communion.

Thus have I cursorily taken notice of your Reflections in whatever material points, you have thought fit to speak to, except that very weighty, and most material point of the power of Depositing Princes, the thorough consideration of which, was the first cause of my present undertaking. Now you encounter your Adversaries.
Adversaries Golath-Argument (as you seen in scorn to
call it, as Card. Bellarmine in the Preface to his Answer to
Barclay says, that writing in defence of Princes, Barclay
came out like Goliath, to defie all the Armies of Israel)
with this distinction*, that in all Councils there are
some Articles of Faith, which all Catholicks receive, and
some Constitutions, and Decrees relating to Discipline, and
Government, which are not absolutely obligatory, (so that
I perceive, that in some fort, and upon some consider-
ations, those other Constitutions, and Decrees relating
to Discipline, and Government, are obligatory,
_ı. e. upon condition, tho not absolutely}_ and withal,
you tell us as freely, that if the Deposing Doctrine had
been as evidently declared in former Councils, as ever
Purgatory, or Transubstantiation were in that of Trent,
yet with you it should be no Article of Faith. Which way
of arguing (tho it be very generous) seems to me to
destroy your distinction of matters of Faith, and mat-
ters of Discipline; for if the Lateran Council had de-
fin'd the Deposing Doctrine as a matter of Faith, and
requir'd the belief of it under the penalty of an Anathema,
as the Trent-Council did Purgatory, and Transub-
stantiation, then either you must have believ'd, as
the Council required, or else in matters of Faith de-
fin'd by a general Council a man may think himself
not bound to believe them; and if so, I see no other
reason, why any other man may not as well refuse to
believe Purgatory, and Transubstantiation upon your
own principles. But if we allow of your distinction
in your own sense, I suppose, you will hardly allow
another man to make the like deductions, and think
himself at Liberty to follow his own dictates; for, if
so, then the half communion, Priest's Marriages, Pray-
ers in Latin, the Pope's Supremacy, and many other such
points
points being matters of Discipline, every man by parity of reason may give himself a dispensation to believe contrary to the definitions of Councils, if you allow your self a liberty to believe the Princes cannot be deposed, though it were defin'd as matter of Faith in a general Council. And it is remarkable, that for the better understanding of this distinction you recommend *Card. Bellarmine to us, who, I am sure, makes the Popes personal infallibility, his superiority to a general Council, and his power of deposing Princes matters of Faith.

But to allow of your distinction between matters of Doctrine, and matters of Discipline, and that in matters of Faith from the definitions of a general Council, no man ought to vary, but in matters of Discipline, though defined by the same Council, a man is left at liberty; pray, tell me serioursly, is every man left at liberty, or some men only? If every man, then the assertors of the Deposing Doctrine have as much right on their side, as you have, ( for the private spirit is not to be your guide in your Church any more, than in ours, and the assertors of that deposing power have Councils on their side, and Popes, and many private Doctors ) and if you tell me, that you are not to follow your own prudence, but the Doctors of the Church, where you live, in what a general Council hath not decided as matters of Faith, then you must change Opinions with the climate, you live in ( as Pere Cotton said of himself, that in France he believ'd a general Council to be above the Pope, but in Italy, that the Pope was above a general Council ) for if you inquire in France, whence, I suppose, you have your principles, as well as your arguments, they will tell you now, that the Pope hath...
hath no superiority over Kings, and that they have condemn'd Sanétarellus his book, and burnt Mariana's; but if you inquire in the Neighbouring Countries, they will tell you the contrary; it is well known, what the Belief of Italy is in this point; and for Spain, the Inquisition at Toledo, Jan 10. 1683, condemn'd the late cenfure of the Sorbon; and in the Low-countries D'Engbien a Professor of Louvaine hath written in defence of the Popes power over Princes against Natalis Alexander, and positively averts, that the French Opinion is either Herefie, or next to Herefie, and that more Authors in your Church assert, than deny the Depos'g Doctrine (the present Pope urging that, and several other Universities to censure the Decrees of the French Assembly, An. 1682. Among whom it is observable, that the University of Doway prayed the King of France, their new Master, to whom they were lately made Subjects) that he would not force them to change their Doctrine, lest they should be accused of taking up a new Theology with a new Sovereign) and if you go into Hungary, the Clergy there also condemn'd the Doctrine of the French Bishops as erroneous, and schismatical Oct. 24. 1682. and when the Arch-Bishop of Gran, the Primate of lower Hungary wrote against the Propositions of the said French Assembly, an order was given to the Sorbon to censure the Arch-Bishop's Book, which they refused to do, but upon this condition, that they might be allowed to condemn the propositions, as if extracted out of some other Author, which looks like a fine fetch of Sophistry. And now, Where is three times the number, who disown this Doctrine of deposing to them, that own it, as you say? Whereas, besides what hath been above mention'd,
mention'd, the Author of the first Treatise against the "Oath of Allegiance," p. 13, says, that the Deposing Do-
ctrine hath been the common received Doctrine of "all School-divines, Casuists, and Canonists, from "first to last (afore Calvin's time) in the several Na-
tions of Christendom, yea even in France itself, and "even there of those French Divines, that were most "eager for their Temporal Princes against the Pope, "as Occam, Almain, Joh. l'aristensis, Gerston, &c.
And is it not an argument of the great care, which your Church hath taken of the Persons and Interests of Princes (which are sacred) that every Writer of your Church, whether Priest, or Lay-man, shall have liberty freely to publish his thoughts about the rights of Soveraigns, and whether their Subjects, or the Pope may depose them? As if the Doctrine of Obedience to Superiors were such a slight indifferent thing, that a man may with safety to his Religion, and Conscience believe, either that the Pope may, or may not absolve Subjects from their Obedience. A wise man would think, that there were a greater necessity to define such a point (upon which the safety of Kings, and their Kingdoms depends) than to define the precise manner of our blessed Saviour's presence in the Sacrament, which had it never been defin'd (while all Christians acknowledge him to be there) might have been the occasion of much peace and happiness to Christendom. And if you plead, that some men among us have asserted the Deposing Doctrine, to this your Adversary hath given you a full answer. For until you can show, that our Archbishops, Bishops, and inferior Clergy in Convocation have owned any such Doctrine, or countenanced such men in asserting it, you say nothing to the purpose; for we damn the Do-
ctrine,
Doctrine, by whomsoever vented, and our superiors are ready to censure the assertors of it, if they durst appear openly. Nor is it enough to say, that this hath been done by the French Clergy, which is equivalent to an act of our Convocation; for the agreement will not hold, because the dispute is not between the English, and the French Church, but between the Church of England, and the Roman-Catholic Church in this point; now we aver, that the whole Church of England damn, and disowns the Doctrine of Deposing; but you tell us, that only a part of your Catholic Church doth so too, whereas a far greater part own, and defend it; we assert, that it is Herefie to own the Doctrine, but you dare not give it that name, lest you offend his Holiness.

Nay, it is plain from experience, that so far are the Pope, and the great men of your Church from condemning the Deposing Doctrine, that those few men among you, that have been so just, and stout, as to assert the rights of Princes, have fallen under the Church Censures, of which I need quote no more instances, than Widdrington of old, and F. Barnes (if he be yet alive) and F. Welsb at this present Excommunicate for affirming it to be the Duty of Subjects to Swear Allegiance to their Prince, and to defend him even against the Pope himself, and all his Censures; whereas we daily see the assertors of the Deposing Doctrine not only live, and dye in your Communion without Censure, but to be the most thriving men, and the soonest preferr'd to dignities. So very true is that saying of *Marcus Ant. de Dominis Arch bishop of Spalato, that the Pope, and his followers are not pleased with anything so much, as with the rendring the power of Kings, vile, weak, and contemptible, to which I will add, and the exposing all, who defend it. And
And to convince you, that you your self have not
that venerable Opinion of the Majesty of Princes, and
the Duty, which their Subjects owe them, as you ought,
I cannot but observe, that you not only tell us,* that
it is a disputed point among your Doctors (as if it were
one of those School-points, which you mention p. 72.
which may be maintain'd this way, or that way, without a-
ny breach of Faith, or injury to Religion) but withal, that
whereas upon every other head of Doctrine, or Disci-
pline, that you represent, you are frequent in quotations
out of holy Scripture to prove your assertions
(how pertinently applied, your Adversary hath con-
sider'd) upon this head of the deposing power (as also
when you treat of it more largely than of any other
thing in your* Roman Catholic principles, if that Book
be yours) you quote not one text against Rebellion,
you confess, that Rebellion against a Prince is contrary
to the Fundamental Laws of the Nation, injurious to So-
veraign power, destructive to peace, and Government, and
by consequence in his Majesties Subjects impious, and dam-
nable (where I shall not takenotice of your limitation
of the proposition to his Majesties Subjects, which
hath no relation at all to the question, whether the Sub-
jects of an Heretical Prince, as you account him, may
not take up Arms against him;) but why do not you
speak out, and say it is directly impious and damnable?
(if you will not say, it is Heretical) being against an
express Law of God, that binds you to obey (even a
Nero, or a Dioclesian) * not only for wrath, but for con-
sience sake; that tells you, that * no man (upon any pre-
tence whatsoever) can lift up his hand against the Lords
anointed, and be guiltless. For by your way of argu-
ing, if the Fundamental Laws of a Nation may be secu-
red by such a Rebellion (and you know, the pretence
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of all Rebels is Liberty, and Property) and the Government duly settled, peace promoted, and the Soveraign power, i. e. the Monarchy not injured, though a particular Monarch may be (and yet your Deposing Divine say, that it is no injury to an Heretical Prince to depose him, but a just Execution of the Laws) then a Rebellion may be lawful. But upon the principles of the Church of England, if all these things could be secured, yet no man can be a Rebel, but he must be damn'd, because the Laws of God forbid Rebellion, taking up Arms against a Prince, or endeavouring to depose him; for as long as the word of God stands firm, and the above-cited texts, with many others, are not blotted out of our Bibles, we think it directly damnable (and not only by consequence, as you do) to take Arms against our Soveraign, let his Religion be what it will.

So that, upon the whole, I cannot but ask you, while you have endeavoured to prove Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, &c. from both Scripture, and Fathers, how happens it, that in the defence of the Rights of Princes, you quote neither? especially, when you cannot but remember, that the Affertors of the Pope's Temporal Monarchy, and his power over Princes, are frequent in their doughty arguments from holy Scripture, such as, God made two great Lights; behold, here, are two Swords; Feed my sheep; rise, Peter, kill, and eat, &c. and is there no place to be found in all the sacred Oracles, that forbids Rebellion, and requires Obedience? does not that inspired Book injoin all Christians*, to render to Cæsar the things, that are Cæsar's, and† to submit to every ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake; and if you are a Priest, are you not requir'd to teach others to do*† to put them in mind to be subject to principalities.

*Mat. 22.21
† 1 Pet. 2.13
*Titus 3.1
ties, and powers, to obey Magistrates, and to be ready to every good work? Is there also nothing in the Fathers, that looks this way? doth not Tertullian say, that a Prince is inferior only to God? doth not Irenæus aver, that by the same power that men are made, are Princes constituted? Doth not Origen tell Celsus, that among the Christians he should not find any act of sedition, or tumult, (notwithstanding all their pressures and persecutions) and doth not St. Ambrose say to the Emperor, we intreat thee, O Prince, we do not fight? not to multiply quotations.

And, before I leave this head, I cannot but remark, that whereas the *Trent Catechism* allows, that Emperors, and Magistrates are called Fathers, and so are included in the Commandment, (Honour thy Father, &c.) which is more, than you acknowledge; yet they quote no place of Scripture to make this good, but the History of Naaman, (sic Naaman a famulis pater vocabatur) where his Servants call him Father, which does not look like fair dealing, for the Example does not reach the Doctrine, unless the Fathers of that Council praevirate, Naaman being a Subject to the King of Syria, whereas they might have found without much seeking, that *David* calls Saul, my Father, who was his King; and in truth, the title was so proper to Princes, that the Kings of the Philistim were always called Abimelech, i.e. *my Father the King* by a general name, whatever their proper name was. Now I am loath to judge, that those Fathers made use of an instance of a Subject called Father by his Servants, that the Example might limit the Doctrine to subjection to inferior Magistrates, when, had they inserted the Example of *David*, it would plainly have proved the Obedience of Subjects to Sovereign Princes. And
And whereas the Fathers of the fame Council, who were concern’d in the Catechism, use to quote such places of the Antients, as they thought pertinent to the Subject treated of, they having * quoted Rom. 13.1, to prove that men ought to be obedient to the Higher Powers, confirm the Doctrine only by the testimony of Tertullian, (who it is true, speaks plain, and to the purpose) omitting St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and others on the place, who have told the World, that by every Soul, in St. Paul, are meant Priests, and Bishops, as well as Laymen, nay the Pope himself, as says St. Bernard; but this probably would have unriddled the Mystery, and exposed a Doctrine, which they were not willing to disown; the Catechism, like the Canons, leaving every man, in many such things, a great latitude; so that in short, I desire you to answer this Question; Either Rebellion is against a Moral Law, or not; if it be, then the Pope cannot dispence with it, and then, how happens it, that so many things of lesser moment were decided in the Trent Council, while this was forgotten, or past by? If it be not against a Moral Law, then by your own principles, the Pope may dispence with it, and what then becomes of all Obedience, when another Gregory 7. or Sixtus 5. shall fill the Chair? And tho the Council would not condemn the Deposing Doctrine, yet why had not the Authors of the Index Expurgatorius cenfured such dangerous Books? for if we may judg of the sense of the Trent Council by its Catechism, (tho made after the Council broke up) why may we not judg of its sense by the Index, which was ordered to be made at the same time, &c. by the fame men, who composed the Catechism? In which Index more than a few passages are
are expunged, that interfere with the Papal Grandeur, but not one poor sentence condemn’d, that is destructive to the Rights of Princes.

Here also, pray, suffer me to mind you of a bold assertion of a private man, as you are, and which, I am sure, as things are now, you cannot accomplish *, for you undertake, that all Roman Catholic Nations in the World shall subscribe to the condemnation of all such principles, and practices (i.e. in your own words, of such principles as destroy the peace of Nations with Fires, and Massacres, and rob Soveraigns of their Crowns, and Subjects of their Liberties) for I am sure, there was a time, when all Roman Catholics were not of that mind, when the League was rampant against Henry 3. and 4. of France, in which one of them actually fell, and by the principles of which the other also was murdered; (not to mention, what the Emperors Henry 4. and 5. and our King John suffered) and when the Parisian, and Irish Massacres were sufficient proofs to the contrary. Nor is it possible; even now, to make good your promise, since I have told you already, what the belief of the Spanish, Netherland, and Hungarian Churches are in this point, besides what the Italians hold.

Now against all this Doctrine you have nothing to object, but that this Doctrine hath been condemn’d * in France by the Ecclesiasticks there, and by the Universities of Caen, Rhenes, Poitiers, &c. all which Universities are within the one Kingdom of France, so that (tho there be no need of considering the Argument, because it is only the sentiment of one National Church against the rest of what you call Catholic Christendom) if I make it appear, that the French Church hath not always been of this belief, and
and perhaps is not so now, then all, that you say upon that Topick, will be far from proving your asservation; while withal I profess, that if what I am about to say doth not reach so far as a conviction, and be only a well-meant Essay, yet the cause, which I maintain ought not to be prejudiced by it, because the main position about the rights of Princes hath been already proved by other arguments, and authorities. And to evince this, I shall pursue the method which the famous * Monfieur Jurieu hath laid down, adding here, and there my own observations.

If therefore this be, and always hath been the Doctrine of the Gallican Church, then you have stated your argument aright, but if it hath not been always their belief, then the present Gallican Church may be as well mistaken, as the former, and if so, where is its authority? besides, if the French Church do condemn the Deposing Doctrine, and all the rest of the Catholic World do assert it, then the Tradition is not on the side of the French Church, though never defin'd as a matter of Faith by a general Council. Now to prove, that the Deposing Doctrine hath been the Opinion of the Gallican Church, I shall produce one remarkable instance, and that is, the deposition of Childerick, and the introducing of Pepin (the first King of the second race) into his Throne, and I shall briefly tell the story out of the French Historian, that I have now by me, who relates, that Pepin after his Conquest of the Sarazins did so honour, and reverence the Clergy, and repair'd so many of their Temples, that had been ruined, that the most holy men of that time thought him a Saint, whereupon aiming at the Crown, and finding nothing stick in his way, but the Oath, which

* Calvinisme, & Papisme mis en parallele: part. 3. ch. 3.

* Girand. de Haillan de l'Estate, &c.
  l. 1. p. 65, &c.
which the French had given to their King, he sent to the Pope (whom he had before obliged) for his dispensation (Pepin having already gained the greatest part of the Nobility, Ecclesiastick’s, and Commons to his party) the Pope readily granted a dispensation, the clergy, as well as the Nobility, and Commons acquiesc’t in what was done, acknowledging Pepin for their rightful King, and thrusting Childerick into a Monastery; and so do Paulus Aemilius, and others also relate the story, and among them Cardinal Perron, and Monsieur Mezeray says, that this was very likely done in that general Assembly held in March, An. 751. The Bishops being there in great numbers, and Boniface Arch-Bishop of Mentz in the head of them, who declared to the rest of the Assembly the validity of the Pope’s answer; and he intimates the reason, why they complied so readily with Pepin, because he gave them a great share in the Government.

It is true, what our King James observes, that the elder Historians, Ado Vienneusis, &c. say, that the States had dethron’d Childerick, and only got the Pope’s consent to it; and confirmation of it, and so does Mezeray, and Monsieur Maimburge, who is zealous in the case against the Papal power of deposing, but which way soever Childerick were deposed, his deposition is a confirmation of what I undertake to prove; for if the Pope did it, and the French Clergy consented, or the three Estates in France did it (of which the Clergy are the first) and the Pope consented, it is all one, the matter of Fact being plain, that they both thought it lawful to depose their Prince (for a less crime than Heresie) because he was dull, and unfit for Government. And we also know,
that when the Line of Pepin was laid aside, and
Hugh Capet (the first King of the third Race) came
to the Crown, there was a right Heir of the Caroli-
vian, or second Race of Kings alive, viz. Charles
duke of Austria, or Lorraine, who was also laid aside
by the consent of the States, of which the Clergy
were the chiefest; it being * Monsieur Mezeray's ob-
servations, that Charles of Lorraine, the last Male of
the Line of Pepin, was deprived of the Crown, as
Childeric had been; and the same judicious Histori-
ian elsewhere gives an account, how it was done,
that Charles being a Vassal to another King, and a
stranger to his own Country, Hugh Capet being ve-
ry powerful, and esteemed, was Proclaimed King at
Noyon in an Assembly of the Lords, and in a little while
after Anointed, and Crowned by the Archbishop of
Rheims, not one of those, who were present at either
Solemnity, claiming for Charles, but all giving their
Oaths as well in writing, as by word of mouth to
his Enemy; and when Archbishop Arnold, Brother to
Charles was taken with him, the Bishops of France
Assembled in Council at Rheims, degraded him of his
Prelature for breaking his Oath to King Hugh, where-
as all his crime was the assisting Charles of Lorraine,
who was his lawful Prince.

But to come nearer home. In the time of the League
it is very plain, that the Ecclesiastics generally de-
clared for the Leaguers, and allowed of the depo-
sition of the two Kings, Henry 3. and 4. And whereas
you may object, that some Popish Bishops, and many
of the Popish Nobility continued with Henry 3. to his
death, and after that execrable parricide, with his
Successor Henry 4. yet D'Avila, * the Bishop of Rhodez,
and * Mezeray, to name no other Historians, say, that
after
after that barbarous affassinate, the Catholicks, who were the greater part of the Army, met, and, though some few were for adhering to the King without any conditions, yet the greatest part thought themselves bound to observe Divine, before humane Laws, (as they phras'd it) and at last both parties united in one upon these terms, that they would declare the King of Navarre King of France upon condition, that he would change his Religion, since it would be strange to their consciences, and to the whole Christian World, that one should be establisht King of France, who was no Catholic, whereupon (many Prelates in the Camp declining even this moderate course) the agreement was made by a writing mutually signed, wherein the King swears, and promises upon the word of a King, to cause himself to be instructed in the Catholic Religion within six Months &c. and to maintain the Catholic Religion, &c. and yet at last this did not please all, but many went over to the Leaguers. Now here you see all the Bishops of France (for they were all either of the party of the League, and it is not doubted, what their Opinion was, or of the Court party,) were of Opinion, that the King of France should not be acknowledg'd, their rightful Soveraign, unless he declared for the Roman Catholic Religion, nor would his own party admit him, till he had so promised, and sworn, as the Leaguers would not admit him, when he had so done; and this is worth the remembering, that his own party, thinking he would dally with them, set him a certain number of days, wherein to give them his resolution; and in all their conferences with the Leaguers, the Popish Lords, who were Friends to Henry 4. made this their Apology. And upon
upon these terms, says D'Avila, the Duke of Mayenne himself promis'd by Villeroi his Agent to acknowledge him the King of France, though at the same time the Pope's Legate, and the Sorbon had made a Decree, that no agreement should be made with the Hereticks, and particularly with Henry of Bourbon, by which passage you may see, what was the Opinion of the Society of the Sorbon at that juncture, as by what else was done you may know the Opinion of the Prelates.

And further the Bishop of Rhodez confesses, 'That if the Duke of Mayenne the head of the Leaguers had upon the importunity of the Pope, &c. declared another King of France, upon that nomination there was much appearance, and likelihood, that all the Catholick Potentates of Christendom would have acknowledg'd that King, whom the States should have Elec'ted, that the Clergy would have done the like, and the Nobility, and People, who followed not Henry 4. But because he had the Title of King, and would have made no conscience to have quitted him for another, to whom the States had granted it. And at last he subjoins, 'That it was high time for Henry 4. to enter into the bosom of the Church, or to resolve on a War, of which possibly he might never see the end.

These things succeeded the death of Henry 3. But there were many remarkable accidents, that preceded it, which give you an account of the Opinion of the French Church of that Age. We know, the Sorbon is, and hath always been accounted the defender of the Gallican Liberties, and yet in the * time of the League the whole College (except Johannes Faber the Dean, and two Senior Doctors) unanimously determin'd, that Henry 3. by reason of the Murther of the Duke, and
Cardinal of Guise had forfeited his right to the Crown, and that his subjects were free from their Oath of Allegiance; nor were Faber, and the other two Dissenters (says Jurieu) dissatisfied as to the point of Law. i. e. Whether the King were deesignable, or not, but as to the matter of fact, whether the crimes charged on him were true, or not, or if true, whether they deserve'd so heavy a censure; and when the Ambassador of the King of France urged the Pope, Sixtus 5. to condemn the determination of the Sorbon with this argument, that such a business did belong to Christ's Vicar, and not to a petulant College consisting of a few passionate corrupted persons; yet the Pope liked the censure too well to condemn it. Besides, two or three dissenters in so great a body, signify nothing; for, had it been in an Assembly of the Clergy, or in a General Council, the majority would easily have outweighed so small a number of contrary Votes; (and if the Syndick Faber's ascertaining the Right of Princes, makes this no Decree of the Sorbon, then the Syndick Richer's assertion, An. 1611. in his Book de Ecclesiastica, & politica potestate is enough to prove, that the Sorbon does not acknowledge the Government of the Church to be Monarchical) nor were the Sorbonists wanting to countenance this their assertion, ordering Boucher, and others to preach up the Authority of the Pope in such cases, and the Justice of the King's Deposition; and there was a Book written in defence of the Censure (the Author of it believed to be our learned Stapleton, by others more likely, to be the above-named Boucher) de justa abdicatione Henrici 3. and to make it appear, that the Assistants of the League lookt on it as a quarrel on the behalf of Religion; it is remarkable, that the Duke of
of Parma left his own, and the publick concerns in Flanders in a very ill posture; only that he might re-enforce the League, and relieve Paris, which was likely to have fallen into the hands of Henry 4. who besieged it.

And now we are come to the Times, that succeeded the Parricide of Henry the Great, (who, tho never so heartily reconciled to the Church of Rome, was never forgiven the sin of his first Apostasie, as they called it, till his death) in the minority of whose Son Lewis 13. When the third Estate would have past a Law, that the King was deposable for no cause whatever, the Clergy violently opposed it, and ordered the Cardinal de Perron to make a Speech against it, which after they had examin'd, and approved of in the Chamber Ecclesiastick, they attended him to the convention of the three Estates, where he pronounced it An. 1615. (which Speech our King James learnedly answer'd in his declaratio pro jure regio, where you may see it proved, that the Cardinal took upon him to assert, that the Pope or the Church had power to depose Princes, and that it was universally owned in France ever since their Schools had been opened; and the event made it appear, what the design of the Speech was, after which the third Estate law it impossible to go on with their design successfully, and so declin'd it) and whatever F.*Mainburge says to the contrary, yet his own argument confirms what I assert, "That when this difference happened between the Clergy, and the third Estate (the two Chambers, as he calls them) the Clergy inform'd Pope Paul the 5. in their answer to his Breve of Jan. 31. 1615. Angebamur non mediocriter, &c. That they were troubled above measure
measure to see Catholics transported with an un-
discreet Zeal meddle with matters of Faith ( where
you may observe that the deposing power is acknow-
gled by them to be a matter of Faith, earum rerum,
que ad fidel um pertinent, though you deny it to be so )
which did not belong to the third Estate, who were
Lay-men, and Lawyers, but withal, they confess,
that the determination of this point did belong to
the Church, i.e. to themselves, and the Pope, omnem
banc autoritatem penes Ecclesiam, eosque solos esse, quos
illa fidelium gregi præesse voluerit. By which it is
plain, that that Speech was not one Doctor's Opinion
only, as Monsieur Maimbourse affirms, but the Opinion
of the whole Chamber Ecclesiastic, or their whole Clergy. And, that the French Church afterward owned
the Opinion of that Speech, seems plain, because
the general Assembly of the Clergy An. 1665. gave the
Abbot Gentil 6000. Livres to collect the Memoirs of the
Gallican Church, which were afterward solemnly reviewed by several Bishops, and Abbots, and then pub-
lished, among which this Speech of Cardinal de Perven
is printed, and approved, the whole scope of which, Maimbourse himself confesses, is inconsistent with the independent right of Princes, and their exemption from any deposing power.

It is true, this Speech, that so few years since,
was Printed among the Memoirs with so much ap-
plause, and approbation, is now ordered to be left
out of them; which is so far from being an argu-
ment to incline any man to acquiesce in the judgment
of such a Church, that it may justly affright him
from confiding in such volatile changeable men, who in such weighty matters vary their Opinions so
so often from one extreme to another. And the reason is plain, the French Bishops following the dictates of that Court, so that since the quarrel about the Regale, they have fought to stoop the Pope, and probably to make his Election depend on the present French King, as it did antiently on Charles the Great. And of this I could give some likely proofs, but that the digression would be too long.

But against all this it is objected, That under the present King Lewis 14. the Sorbon, An. 1663. condemn'd even the indirect Power of the Pope over Princes, and asserted, that the King of France hath no other Superior but God; to which we answer, that the same Colledge did in the days of the League maintain the contrary, as I have formerly proved; and at last the Sorbon is not the Representative of the French Church; nor can it be imagined, says the Author of the second Treatise against the Oath of Allegiance, "That those men, who took upon them to vary from the Censures, Decrees, or Definitions of Rome, would ever "go about to set up an independent, or infallible "Chair in the Sorbon, and deliver their Opinion ei-"ther as an Article of Faith in itself, or as a Rule of "Faith to others. But the Objection is strengthened, That the Archbishops, and Bishops assembled at Paris, An. 1682. as Representatives of the French Church, did decree the same; to which we answer, that the Declaration was made but by thirty or forty Prelates within the verge of the Court, whereas in a free National Council the contrary might have been determined. But put the case that this had been decreed in a full, and free National Synod, yet neither could this have established an indefeasible right; for
I remember, that in the Convocation under Henry 8, the King's Supremacy was decreed and esatablisht by our Bishops (even by Gardiner, Bonner, &c. who in all other things were zealous Catholicks) and yet I suppose you will be loath to grant, that for that reason the King had a just Right to that Supremacy. And this also serves to answer your Objection from the Determinations of the French Universities against the Deposing Doctrine, because not onely the greatest part of the Universities of Christendom did allow of Henry the Eighth's Divorce from his first Wife, which the Pope, and perhaps you, would not allow to be lawful; but withal, the two most famous Universities of England, (which to us are equivalent to all those in France) and the most famous Monasteries of the Kingdom, when this Question was propos'd to them, An aliquid Autoritatis in hoc regno Angliae Pont. Romano de jure competat, plusquam alii cuicunque Episcopo extero? Whether the Pope had any lawful power in this Kingdom, more than any other forreign Prelate? The Answer was generally return'd in the Negative.

Besides, who knows not, that the generality of men speak as their hopes of Preferment lead them? and that there was a great truth in that Observation of Æneas Sylvius, That many men wrote in vindication of the Pope's Authority, and few for the Authority of a Council, because a Council gave no Dignities nor Benefices; but the Pope did. And I should be glad to see the present French Clergy deal with the present Pope (when he meddles out of his Sphere with the Crowns of Princes) as their Predecessors did with Gregory the Fourth, who under the pretext of being a Mediator between the Emperour Lewis the Debonaire,
naire, and his Sons, promoted the Rebellion, and was suspected to come with a designe to excommunicate the Emperor and his Bishops; for they protested,

Si excommunicaturus ad veniret, excommunicatus abiret: i.e. That if the Pope came to excommunicate them, they would excommunicate him for acting contrary to the Authority of the ancient Canons.

And at last we have Advice given us, * That June 26. An. 1683. at Clermont in Auvergne, the Jesuits publickly maintain'd four Theses, in opposition to the decision of the French Clergy, An. 1682. 1. That although they call their Theses Explanations of the Doctrine of the Gallican Church, the first Article of the Decree did not diminish the special Authority of the Church over Kings and Princes Christian. 2. That the second Article was not intended to weaken the Monarchick Primacy of the Pope over the Church. 3. That by the third Article, they intended not to take from the Pope the Soveraign Power of dispensing with Canons, &c. 4. That by the fourth Article, they intended not to deprive the Pope of all Infallibility in matters of Faith. Which Theses, as far as I know, yet pass uncensured. And the Jansenists, who goes under the name of René Clerc Tonsuré à l’Archevesque de Paris, in his System of the Theology of the Gallican Church extract'd from their Memoirs, proves, that the French Bishops are not such Friends to Crowned heads, as they would appear to be; and that they take the Power from the Pope onely to place it in themselves: affirming, That the French King cannot be judged by a Council except the French Bishops be there, (implying, that then he may be judged) as if the last resort were to them; and that the Declarations of the
the Pope against their King, ought not to be obeyed, till
the Kingdom consent thereunto; so that if the Kingdom
consent, the Deposition is lawful: with other such
Positions. And the same Author affirms, That where-
as some English Gentlemen, Decemb. r. An. 1679. ad-
dressing themselves to some Doctors of the Sorbon, had
inclined them to decide for the lawfulness of our Oath
of Allegiance, the Archbishop of Paris sent to them, that
it was the King's pleasure they should not decide it:
which makes it plain, that the Allegiance of the French
Church is founded on the Catholic Religion, and that
an Heretical Prince hath not the same Right with the
most Christian.

And though since that time the Sorbon, An. 1686. hath
given its approbation of the Oath of Allegiance
with the word Heretical in it, yet this is only an ho-
nest acknowledgement of the Rights of Princes, by
one Colledge of learned men; while in the same year
the Jesuits at Gaunt, in their Provincial Congregation,
expressly condemn'd the taking of the said Oath.
And who knows, but the Sorbonists of the next Age
may do as their Predecessors of the last did in the
time of the League, contradict all that hath lately been
asserted. Nor does the Condemnation signify any
thing in your sense, since even a General Council can-
not define any thing to be heretical, unless it be de fide,
and the belief required under the penalty of an An-
thema: and when all this is done, if the matter be of
Discipline or Government you profess, you may safely
refuse to obey the Council.

To which Observation I will adde one Remark: That though Monsieur Arnald hath written in
more:
vindication of the French Church, that they never owned the Deposing Doctrine, yet if he be the Author of the Jesuits Morals, (for though Monseur Paschal his Nephew have the honour of the Book, yet all men believe that Arnald had a great hand in the contriving it) he hath not dealt so ingenuously in this case, as he might: for when he quotes so many Passages out of the Moralists of the Society, what liberty they give to violate Sacraments or Oaths, to Lye and Equivocate, and to break all Trusts, Vows, and Promises, he never so much as touches on the many palpable Propositions in their Books, which encourage and allow of the breach of Allegiance to Princes.

I have little more to subjoyn, but this: That whereas you appeal to the Council of Trent for the Faith of your Church, I have observed in that Council some things (how cunningly ever the Decrees were contrived, and how warily ever they were penn'd) which seem not to accord so well with your Catholick Principles. For instance: 1. The Council says, Si quis dixerit, &c. If any man shall say, that the Canon of the Mass contains any Errors in it, let him be Anathema. And in another place* the Mass is said to be free from all Error. Now if it be so, I suppose some of your Doctrines must fall to the ground, being confuted by your Mass. As, 1. The Doctrine of Transubstantiation: for after the Consecration, the Priest calls the Sacrament Bread and Wine; Offerimus panem sanctum vitæ aeternaæ, & calicem salutis perpetuæ: And afterward desires God to look down upon it, as he did on the Sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchizedeck: And prays, That those things might be carried by the hands of the holy Angels of God into Heaven. For how are
are these Expressions suited to Christ's Corporeal Presence? 2. All the Prayers of the Mass relate to a Communion, and so are a confutation of private Masses; and yet the Priest in a private Mass, when no one but himself receives, says, Ut quotquot ex hac altaris, &c. That as many of us as have received the most holy Body of thy Son, &c. 3. To instance in no more, the Prayer for the Dead in this Canon doth not relate to Purgatory: for the Priest says, Memento, Domini, &c. Remember, O Lord, thy Servants, and thy Handmaids (and then names the Persons whom he is to pray for) who have gone before us with the mark of Faith, and sleep in the sleep of Peace. Which are plain demonstrations, that those Prayers were made before those new Doctrines and Practices were the Belief and Customs of your Church, or else there are Errors in the Mass, which the Council under an Anathema forbids any man to affirm.

2. The Council declares, † Episcopos in Apostolorum † Sess. 23. locum successisse; That Bishops are the Successors of the Apostles: and if so, then there being an equality among the Apostles, so there is also among Bishops; and where then is the Pope's Supereminent Power as Successor to St. Peter? and how is he above his fellow-Bishops, if they all succeed the Apostles, to use St. Cyprian's Phrase, Pari confordio & potestatis, & honoris; In an equal right to power and honour?

3. The Council * commands the interpretation of * Sess. 4. Scripture according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers: and if so, we are well assured, that the Controversies between us will be easily decided on the side of the Church of England, for to the Fathers we are ready to appeal. And
And now after all this, suffer me to assure you, that though I love your generous dealing in the affixing your Anathema's at the end of your Book, (wherein you deal much more candidly than many of your Brethren) yet I cannot but mind you, that you have left your self and others, by reason of the generality of your Expressions, liberty to explain your meaning; and therefore I have added some Anathema's agreeable to your own notions of things, (if I understand you aright) to which I should be glad to find that you sincerely say Amen: and it is as lawful for me, who am but a private person in the English Church, as it is for you to do so in the name of the Church of Rome. And withal, I do engage to make good, that all these Opinions which I propose to be condemn'd, are maintain'd by some Writers of the Church of Rome.

1. He who pays true and proper Religious Worship to Images, let him be Anathema. Amen.

2. Whosoever confides in the Intercession of Saints and Angels, as much as in that of Jesus Christ, for Salvation, let him be Anathema. Amen.

3. Whosoever believes the blessed Virgin to have as much power in Heaven as her Son, and prays to her to command him, and begs from her, pardon of Sins, and the assurance of Salvation, let him be Anathema. Amen.

4. He who does not believe that the Merits of Jesus Christ are the only meritorious cause of our Salvation, let him be Anathema. Amen.

5. He who believes that a Papal Indulgence doth remit Sins, or deliver from eternal Death, let him be Anathema. Amen.

6. He
6. He who believes that the performance of Ecclesiastical Penances makes satisfaction for eternal Punishment due to his Sins, let him be Anathema. Amen.


8. He who believes that the Church hath power (in a General Council, or otherwise) to make additions to the Christian Faith, let him be Anathema. Amen.

9. He who believes the Pope to have any personal Infallibility, either in Cathedra, or in Conclave, let him be Anathema. Amen.

10. He who afferts, that the Pope, or any other, hath any power to depose Princes, to dispense with their Subjects Allegiance, and to authorize them to take up Arms against them, either upon the account of Heresie, or for any other cause, let him be Anathema. Amen.

11. He who afferts, that the Pope, or any other, hath any power to dispense with any Moral Law of God, and to give men a License to Murther, Forswear, Lye, or Equivocate, let him be Anathema. Amen.


13. He who says, that men are not bound to the obligation of the Ten Commandments, (and among them, of what we call the Second, you a part of the First) under pain of eternal Damnation, let him be Anathema. Amen.

14. He
14. He who thinks that Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, and that Mental Reservation may be used with men of another Perswasion, let him be Anathema. Amen.

15. He who thinks that Attrition is enough to fit a man for Absolution, let him be Anathema. Amen.

16. He who thinks that any thing besides a sincere and true Repentance, can bring a man to Heaven, let him be Anathema. Amen.

17. He who believes that the modern Miracles of the Blessed Virgin, &c. are to be credited, as he credits the Miracles of our Blessed Saviour and his Apostles recorded in Scripture, let him be Anathema. Amen.

18. He who thinks Ignorance to be the Mother of Devotion, and wilfully hides the Holy Scriptures from the sight and knowledge of the People, let him be Anathema. Amen.

19. He who says a man ought to obey his Superiours (whether Civil or Ecclesiastical) in things that are sinful, let him be Anathema. Amen.

20. He who maintains any other Doctrines, than what were establish'd by Christ and his Apostles, and believ'd in the Primitive Church, let him be Anathema. Amen.

These I give you as a Specimen; and when these are condemn'd, I shall think my self much more inclinable to be reconciled, than now I am.

And because you are a private Person, and whatever you say, is but one Doctor's Opinion; and because your Writers differ where your Infallibility is fixt, whether in a General Council, or the Pope, and if in the
the Pope, whether in his single Person, or in Conclave; you will oblige the World, if you use your interest to get these Doctrines Condemn'd by the Pope, ex-Cathedra, (and so you will bind the Jesuits and others, who believe the Personal Infallibility) and by the Conclave of Cardinals, (for this will bind others of your Communion) and by a Council of all the Prelates of your Church, (and this will bind you, the French Church, and all others that call themselves Roman Catholicks:) for unless this be done, we are still where we were. And I shall tell you, that the regaining so considerable a part of the Protestants, as the Church of England is, out of a state of Schism and Heresie, (as you are pleased in your great Charity to call it) is a Reason weighty enough to summon such a Council, and to do what is required towards an Accommodation: and till this is done, all that you say else, is but the sprinkling of a little Holy Water, and gratis dictum. And this I write to you, because you appear the Advocate of your Party, while I acknowledge that I make these Proposals onely as a private Person; though I doubt not, but all the Prelates of the Church of England would rejoice to see so much done towards the healing of the Breaches of Christendom. Amen.

And here I thought to have put a period to this Essay, had not your Vindication of your Reflections come to my hands; upon which I cannot but bestow a few Remarks, while your learned Adversary will take care of a more full Reply. In which, among other things, you undertake to prove, by several instances, That our Church is guilty of mis-representing yours, because it impeaches the Papists of Idolatry in the worshipping of Images: and we acknowledge that the
does so impeach you; but withal we affirm, that there is a great difference between what is spoken by any man, or any Society of men, in a Homily or Sermon, and what is thetically laid down as an Article, or maintain'd in disputation, (you your selves, as well as we, being often forc'd to make use of this distinction to salve many Sayings of the Fathers, that they were spoken not Dogmatically, but Rhetorically;) but we need not depend on this Answer, for our Homily does not speak of the Canons of your Councils, but of the received Opinions and Practices of your Church. Now that 'tis a current Opinion among many of your School-men, That the Image ought to have the same Worship with the Prototype, I have already proved, out of Cardinal Bellarmine; and that the Practice of the Common People in this case, was very disallowable, and much like the Idolatry of the Heathen, as I understand the Trent-Council, is the Complaint in general of those Fathers, and of some other of your Writers in particular: so that herein the Homily speaks but the fence of your own Authors, and with Justice, censures the Usages of the People of your Communion. And if what your *Council says, be true, That the Idolatry of the Heathens did consist in their putting their trust in their Idols, he who considers how much more Worship there is paid to the same Images of the Blessed Virgin, (at Loretto, Monferrat, &c.) than to other her Images elsewhere, (which can as well put the People in mind of the Mother of God, as those famous Shrines;) will be persuaded, that the generality of your Communion put their trust also in the Image, as did the Heathens in their Idols.

Now, to vindicate your Church from Idolatry in this
this cafe, though you † acknowledge, That you do † Prosec. give Religious Honour to Images, yet you say, That that Honour cannot be called Idolatry, unless it makes a God of that to which it is paid. But does not the Second Commandment (as we reckon them) forbid the worshipping of the true God by an Image? And do not the worst of Idolaters say, That they do not worship the Image, but the God, who is represented by it? Doth not Celsus say so much on the behalf of the Gentile Idolaters to Origen *, τοσ τον ἀλλατις, &c. Who, * Lib. 7. but a perfect Fool, thinks an Image made of Stone or Timber, of Brass or Gold, to be a God? &c. And for Cels. the Jews, when they fell into Idolatry in the Wilderness, by worshipping the Golden Calf, they onely worshiped it as a representation of the true God: for the Feast that was set apart for it, is called † a Feast held † Exod. to Jehovah, which is the incommunicable Name of 32. 5. the onely true God. (And the like might be said of the Calves in Dan and Bethel.) But perhaps you are of the opinion of some men of Eminence in your own Communion, (and whose Books have never been, that I know of, condemn'd) who think that the Worship of the Golden Calf was not Idolatry: for so Monceus in his Aaron Purgatus expressly affirmes, as * Greg. de Valentia in his Apologetic for Idolatry, (a c.7.p.49. bold Title for a Book written by a Christian Priest!) argues from 1 Pet. 4. 3. that because the Apostle doth forbid unlawful Idolatries, (abominable Idolatries, as our Translation renders it) that therefore there is some Idolatry that is lawful, which is that of the Wor- ship of Images.

But you object, † that we our selves are by this Ar. † Prosec. gument guilty of Idolatry, by bowing to the Altar, and Pop. p.34.
to the Name of Jesus, and by kneeling at the Sacrament. Whereas, I must tell you, that we bow not to the Altar, but towards it, toward the East, where the Christian Altar always used to stand, (and toward which part of Heaven the Primitive Christians used to direct even their private Devotions;) nor do we bow to the Name, but at the Recital of the Name of our blessed Saviour: so that we pay no Religious Worship to the Altar, or to the Syllables of that Venerable Name, (as you confess you do to Images;) and when we kneel, we profess we do not worship the Sacramental Elements, nor the Body and Blood of Christ hid under the Accidents of Bread and Wine; but we kneel, because then we pray, and we worship God, to whom we direct our Prayers: so that these actions are not external acts of Adoration to any thing that is seen, or heard, but onely to God. But by this way of arguing, I perceive, the Cause wants assistance, when you borrow Arguments from our Dissenters to assault our Church with: for these are their little Objections that have been so often hift off the Stage.

You further tell us, That it is the intention of the Person who pays the Worship, that makes the Worship either idolatrous or lawful. And if so, pray tell me, if a Christian in the East Indies should go into a Pagod, and bow down before one of their Images, and pay it in all respects the same outward Adoration that its most bigotted Votaries offer it, and at the same time intend his Worship towards the blessed Trinity, does this man, by virtue of his intention, escape the guilt of Idolatry? And I put you this Question the more willingly, because some of your Jesuits have determined it in the affirmative, and acquit the votary of Idolatry,
tarity, and I would willingly know your Opinion: for if you consult the Provincial Letters, the Author of them will tell you, that the Jesuits in China, and other places of the Indies, taught the People that they might publickly worship the Idols of the Country, Cacin choan, and Keumfucum, so they directed this Adoration of theirs intentionally to the Image of our blessed Saviour hid under their Cloaths; and that this is no Calumny, the same Author says*, That the Practice was complain'd of, and cenfured at Rome, July 9. An. 1646. But notwithstanding that Cenfure, if your way of arguing be good, the Practice is still lawful.

Now to evade your Adversaries Argument, That intention cannot alter the nature of actions, which are determin'd by either Divine or Humane Law; you shift the force of the reasoning, by making a Plea from the same Principle for the Quakers, (and probably it is well done of you, to turn Advocate for a Sect which owes its Original to the Jesuits, and other Emissaries of your own Church) because, if intention cannot alter the nature of actions determined by Law, no Oaths can be lawful, nor the payment of civil Honour allowed of, because the Scripture says, Swear not at all, and let your communication be yea, yea, nay, nay, and you shall not be called Master, &c. And the Answer would signify something, if you could shew us any place of Scripture where such Worship hath been paid to Images, notwithstanding the divine determination to the contrary, as we can shew you for the allowance of those things which you object: for we there read, that notwithstanding the prohibition, the Apostles did allow of the Title Lord, or Sir, or Master; for St. Philip.
Philip express no dislike, when † the Greeks gave him that appellation; nor St. Paul and Silas, * when the Jaylor at Philippi treated them with the same Language. And by Swear not at all, &c. the Holy Writ onely forbids vain and rash Swearing, and Perjury, and double Dealing, &c. for it in other places tolerates and requires Oaths, which, says the Apostle, are the end of all Strife. After which, you will do well to shew any place of Holy Scripture, that countenances the Worship of Images, and we shall willingly acknowledge the parity of Reason: for it is not the intention of the Person commanded, but of the Lawgiver, that makes an action lawful: for did a man's own intention legitimate his actions that are otherwise forbidden by any Law divine or humane, then a man may do evil, that good may come thereof, expressly against St. Paul; a man may commit Murther, Sacriledge, and every other gross sin, as some men have done, and plead for himself, that he intended nothing but Reformation, and the advancement of Religion; as the men in our Saviour's time persected the Apostles to death, with an intention to do God service: but the intention of the Lawgiver, when made known, is that which legitimates the actions of the subject either in matters purely civil, or in matters of Religion, of which latter fort is the Worship of Images; which I shall acknowledge to be lawful, when you shall have shewn that it is agreeable to the intention of our supreme Lawgiver.

But the further management of this Argument, I leave to your other Antagonist, while I observe, that you shift him off with no other Answer, but this:

† *Protest. Pop. p. 25. That a Question or two is (in his opinion) a confutation
tion of the Reflefter, because you are ask'd, Whether all your Representations are conformable to the sense of the Trent-Council and Catechism? which I have already proved they are not, particularly in the Doctrine of the assistance of Angels and Saints, which you say, consists onely in their Prayers, while the Council and Catechism, besides their Intercession, mention their Merits and Aid. And whereas, when he objects against the Pope's licensing the Bishop of Condom's Book, that Canus with judgment avers, That whatever the Pope determines privately, maliciously, and inconsiderately, is not to be accounted the judgment of the Apostolick See; you rejoyn, that the Pope's private determination of any Opinion, doth not hinder it from being the judgment of the Apostolick See, unless it be also determined maliciously and inconsiderately; I cannot understand Canus in that sense, but that, whatever is determined either privately, or maliciously, or inconsiderately, is not the judgment of the Apostolick See: for if this be not so, then a private determination, how malicious soever it can be, so it be upon due consideration, may be the judgment of the Apostolick See. And who knows, but the present Pope's allowance of the Bishop of Condom's Book, may be the product of malice, of his spleen against the French Hereticks, as he calls them, for whole Extirpation he hath so solemnly by his Letters thanked the French King? And if Malice may invalidate the Papal Judgment, why may not Favour, Affection, or Fear, when they interpoole in such Determinations, render them equally invalid? And if so, why may not the reaon of the present Pope's not cenfuring the French Clergie in the matters relating to the Papal Power over Princes, be his fear, lest that Victorious Prince should either set up
up a Patriarch of his own in France, or by an Army establish his Right in Italy, and make the Pope depend on him for his Election.

But to confirm the Authority of the Bishop of Condom's Book, you say, That it was printed at Rome, translated into divers Languages, and attested by the Pope and divers Cardinals, &c. Will you allow of all that hath been publish'd for Catholick Doctrine at Rome, with the same or the like approbation? Were not Cardinal Baronius's Annales (to instance only in one Book) printed at Rome in the Press belonging to the Vatican-Palace? Did not Pope Sixtus V. prefix a very large Epistle in commendation of the Author, and the Work? Was it not magnified by the Roman Cardinals? Was it not translated into Italian, German, Polish, and other Languages, and the two first Tomes of it into Arabick? Now if such a Recommendation be sufficient to make known the Sentiments of your Church, then how comes it to pass, that those Ecclesiastical Annals are not received in France in those things relating to Regal Power, nor in Spain in what relates to the Right to the Kingdom of Sicily? And if you do allow of the Annals, you must not only interfere with the fore-named Churches of your Communion, but you must also acknowledge, what you will be loath to own, that the Pope hath a right to dispose of his Majesties Kingdoms, as in truth that Cardinal hath intituled him to almost all the other Kingdoms of the World by name.

It is also observable, that the Bishop of Condom, when he speaks of the Pope, mentions the Primacy; but for the Deposing Doctrine, he says, It is not necessary to
to speak of it; adding in general, That all Catholicks acknowledge a Head established by God to conduct his whole Flock in his paths, which those who love Concord among Brethren, and Ecclesiastical Unanimity, will most willingly acknowledge. By which expression every man is left to his own Sentiments in that point; and it is no wonder, that the Pope (though he does believe his own Power of Deposing Princes) doth approve of this Book, for the Phrase of conducting the whole Flock of Christ, is as easily to be construed, as pace oves meas, to signify the Deposing of Princes whenever the Pope pleases. So that we see, that even this seeming Enemy of the Deposing Doctrine, dares not openly condemn it, but leaves it as a probable Opinion, and what 'tis not necessary to speak of; so that every Pope hath still his liberty to declare any Prince a Heretick, and then to proceed to Excommunicate, and to Depose him; after which, a Clement, a Ravillac, or any other Afsaine, may proceed to murther him, because he himself also is left at liberty to believe that the Pope is in the right, when he hath deposed a Prince, and that he ought, as much as lies in him, to obey him in bringing such Criminals to condign punishment.

At last you tell us, That a man may be admitted into your Church, notwithstanding his refusal to admit the Deposing Doctrine, and the Pope's Infallibility, but as they are stated by the Representor, i.e. not as Articles of Faith. But this seems to imply, that no man of your Communion shall dare to condemn the Doctrines, which must still be look'd on as probable and disputable; so that the safety of Princes and Kingdoms, and the guidance of the Church in matters of Faith (which depend on the plain stating of the Pope's Power and
Infallibility) must still be left at the mercy of opinionative men, who may take liberty to dispute and write about these great and weighty points pro and con, as themselves think fit.

And whereas your Adversary quotes Bellarmine, and Canus, That General Councils cannot err even in Decrees of Discipline and Government (decreta morum) when they relate to things necessary to Salvation, and concern the whole Church, you deny, that the Deposing Doctrine is of that nature. But are not the plain Offices of Morality necessary to Salvation, as well as Articles of Faith? If not, then nothing but Infidelity damn's a man; and if a man's Faith be Orthodox, it is no matter for his Conversation: If they are necessary, is not Obedience to Princes one of the moral Commands of God? And if so, is not the practice of that Obedience necessary to Salvation? and is not Disobedience (which necessarily follows the Deposing Doctrine) a great sin? And if so, destructive of the hopes of Salvation. And that it concerns the whole Church, is easily proved, because Princes are its Nursing-Fathers; and what Evils have fallen upon your own Church by such rash Attempts, some of your own Authors will tell you, is plain from the instance of Henry VIII. Besides, the whole Christian Church, and its Welfare, is concern'd in the Doctrine: for though all the Princes of Christendom have never been deposed at once, yet what is done in one Country, may be done throughout all Christendom, and so the whole Church actually concern'd in the sad effects of the Doctrine: And had the Empire been as intire under Henry IV, as it was under the elder Emperours, his Deposition had actually concern'd the whole Church.

*Protest.
Pop. p. 32.
And because you call that assertion, that the Pope hath not condemn’d the no-deposing Power, because he wants power to do, an Oracle, and say, you look for an Argument to prove it. It is plain from History, that those Popes who have been rich, and stout, and powerful, have adventured on the practice of Deposing (while others of lower Spirits, less Wealth and Haughtiness, have been afraid of the Attempt) we are not ignorant what the Dictates of Pope Gregory VII. are, and how busie he was, being back’d by the Countess Maud, who supported him with her interest; nor what Innocent III, Sixtus V, and some others have done in imitation of him. Nor is it unknown to the World, what Pope Paul V. thundered against the Republick of Venice, What Pius V. did here in England, and Innocent X. in Ireland during the Rebellion there: for what was it that encouraged those hot Popes to go so far, but that they thought their interest, at least in the Church-men, so great, that the Countries would immediately have shaken off their Soveraigns? And what is it that causes the present Pope to spare the French King about the Regale, but that he is afraid of him, and knows he wants power to compel him? Nor need the Argument seem so ridiculous to you, since Cardinal Bellarmine (a man from whom most of your Writers borrow all their Materials) doth not only affirm, that the Primitive Christians under the Heathen Emperours, did not take up Arms against them, because they wanted power, but avers against Barclay,† that the ancient Popes did not exert their Authority against the Emperours Constantius and Valens, &c. not because they had no right, sed quod Reges, &c. but because without great damage the Church could not
not compel them; but that the Popes did exert their Authority against Leo Isauricus, Henry IV. and Childeric, because they were able to compel them. That Julian was very powerful, and attended with many armed Legions, against which an unarmed Multitude signified nothing; that it was a falsehood that all his Army were Christians, and that St. Gregory affirms, that the Church made use of no other Remedy but her Tears, quia decrant vires, because she wanted strength to resist the Tyranny. So that, pray answer your own Cardinal, or else acknowledge, that your Adversary speaks such Oracles as may be confirm'd from some other Topick, besides the authority of the Assertor.

And now I shall put a period to these Remarks, when I have minded you of two things which are your own Concessions.

*Protest.*

1. That * upon the consideration of what is here charg'd, the salvation of every Roman Catholick's Soul depends, that their Eternity is at stake; and that if Popery be guilty of what your Answerer says it is, it cannot enter into your thoughts, that there is any room for it (or its Followers) in Heaven: That all our Martyrs died for a good Cause, and are doubtless in Heaven: That such Tenents bid open defiance to true Honesty and Christianity, strike at the World's Redeemer, and are impossible to be entertain'd by any, who is one degree above a Beast. These are the Conclusions I acknowledge, of a wise, a modest, and a good man; but then it behoves you seriously to consider whether this Charge be not true, and whether your Adversary be not to be acquitted of wronging your Church, (of which the impartial Reader will be the most competent
tent Judge) and withal to think, whether those School-men, and other Writers of your Communion, that do own all the Doctrines charg'd upon you, be not by your own Verdict, Men of no Honesty, no Religion, and but one degree above Beasts: For by this Concession every unbyaft person is able to satisifie himself which is the true Religion, that which allows its Followers to assert the Doctrine of Depositing Princes, to pay Religious Worship to Images, to expect more than intercession from Saints, Angels, &c. or that which is directed by the Revelations made in Holy Scriptures, and by the unanimous Interpretations made of those Scriptures by the ancient Fathers, as the Church of England expressly doth.

2. That you follow the methods of the French Church [which is so far from being the Catholick Church, even in your sense of the word, that it is but a small part of it] from them you take your Principles, from the Bishop of Condom, and Monfieur Veron; and after their Example, you make your complaints of being mis-represented: for so the Gallican Bishops did in their late general Assemblies, held July 11. An. 1685, complain of being mis-represented, and of the Calumnies, Injuries, and Falsities, which the Reformed Churches lay to their charge; desiring that King, in their Petition prefixed to the Acts of that Assembly, to revoke all the Edicts made in behalf of the Hugonots, because permitted only in times of disturbance, and for reasons which no longer subsist: which though they afterwards modifie and limit only to the passing an Edict to forbid the calumniating their Religion, yet every considering man sees what they aim at. And upon this Address the King past an Edict, Aug. 23, forbidding all the

Reformed
Reformed to preach or write any thing against the Catholic Religion, either directly or indirectly, and to allow them the liberty of the Press only for printing the Confession of their Faith, their Prayers, and the Rules of their Discipline, but no other Books written by the Reformed Divines of that Kingdom; and what the effects of that and other Edicts have been, every wise Observer hath seen.

"May our blessed and holy Saviour, the true and undoubted Head of the Catholic Church, heal all the Breaches thereof, convert all Hereticks to the knowledge of the Truth; shame, and bring back all Schismaticks into the Unity of his Mystical Body, that we may be one Sheepfold under one Shepherd, the Bishop of our Souls. Amen.
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THE Vanity of all Pretences for Tolleration,
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Enquiry after Happiness, by the Author of Practical Christianity. Octavo.

The Duty of Servants: containing, 1. How Parents ought to breed up their Children, that they may be fit to be employed and trusted. 2. How Servants may wisely choose a Service. 3. How they are to behave themselves in it, in discharging their Duty towards God, their Master, and themselves, with Prayers suited to each Duty. To which is added a Discourse of the Sacrament, intended chiefly for Servants. By the Author of Practical Christianity. Octavo.
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Against
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Vindication of the Prophecies of the Gospel and the Kingdom of Christ.
My Replier begins with Complements; and I cannot but admire his Art of weaving Raillery into them so neatly, that every Eye will not discern which is which. But of all his Complements, I take the Reply it self to be the greatest. Now in good Manners I should take my turn with my Complements; but am forc'd to drop the e, and stand upon my guard; for the Replier, while he Complements me with one Hand, is giving me a Box with the other; in his very next Lines calling in question my Honesty, without any mincing it at all. In the Mis-representation of a Papist, he says, I have shew'd some Art, but very little Honesty. The Replier said just before, that he would complement no more, and is as good as his word. As for me, I am much mistaken, if I find not upon occasion more Vouchers for my Honesty, than Art: If I did by chance stumble into it, 'twas against my Inclination, and I am sure I fell up-hill.

But he would have my Art lie in this; that whereas I was told in the Answer, That some of those Mis-representations, which I had made of a Papist, and given out
for the Protestant Character of Popery, were my own ignorant, or childish, or wilful Mistakes, I craftily insinuate, that they grant all my Mis-representations of a Papist, to be ignorant, childish, or wilful Mistakes. Which is in short, the Answer gives some, and I take all. And yet those two little Words, upon which the whole Stress and Truth of his Charge lie, are neither in the Answer nor Reflections; but are providentially juggled in here by himself, to give the Reader an early taste of his own Honesty, while he challenges mine. The Answerer had said, Must the Character now supposed to be common to Protestants, be taken from his ignorant, &c. Mistakes? The Reflecter says, Because you say my Character is made up of false Apprehensions, ignorant, &c. Mistakes. What difference is here in sense at all? And what difference even in words; save that I add false Apprehensions, which the Answerer likewise has in the very next page? Neither of us mention all or some, which the Replier, not without reason, suspects of craft. As the Answerer thereof meant, I assure him, I meant; the whole Character, if he meant so; and part only, if he meant no more: Nor did I ever think of extending his Authority farther than he extended it himself. If the Replier find any Art in this, I for my part, find no Dishonesty; and think I have ill luck to fall into his bad Opinion, for keeping precisely to my Adversaries Sense, and almost precisely to his Words.

The Replier comes after this with full Cry, and asks, What is the meaning of all this pother and noise about this double Character, of a Papist Mis-represented and Represented? Truly I cannot tell, and think he would do well to ask those who make it; for they in all likelihood know best. I for my part thought it a very inoffensive thing, to let People know what Papists are, and pray…
pray God there be not a fear they should appear what
they are, lest they should be found to be unlike what
they are made appear. They have been cry'd out upon,
for keeping the People in ignorance of their Doctrines;
and when they expose them to open view, 'tis strange
there should be a noise about it. Truly I did not expect
it, and I could not imagine a bare Narrative of Matter
of Fact should fructifie into Answers, and Reflections,
and Replies. I did but relate, playing the Historian, not
the Controvertift: Not but that, with the liberty of
Historians, who deliver their own Judgment of the
Matters they relate, and their Reasons for it, I disco-
ver'd what I thought, and sometimes said briefly why:
But every Body will see, I made not Disputing my bu-
iness. And yet, I know not how, it is taken, it seems,
for a Piece of Controversie, and, which is more unrea-
able, against the Church of England, and Defences
made for her, as if my Mis-represented Papift, were a
Represented Church of England Protestant: Whenas I
never gave that Character out for a Church of England
Character of Popery, thought nothing of her Rule or
Judgment, nor dreamt of concerning her, or any Body
in my Mis-representation, whose Conscience do's not of
it self concern them. All those who have such Idea's of
us, as I there draw, I said, Mis-represent us; and to those
who have not, I said nothing. He that would know
whether he be concern'd or no, has but to ask his own
Heart, to which I did then, and do still leave him.

And yet notwithstanding this harmless justifying our
selves, there is a posher and naise it seems about the Pa-
pist Mis-represented and Represented, and it is as fiercely
assaulted on every side, as if it came to declare open
War, and bid Defiance to the World. The Answerer set
upon it in the Mis-representing part, and will have that
to
to be false Apprehensions of the Author, to be taken from his Ignorant, Childish, or Wilful Mistakes: And then the Papists Represented he endeavours to overthrow with whole vollies of Objections. Now comes the Replier, and tho' he makes it wonderful hard (p. 40.) to know what the Faith of a Papist is; yet he acknowledges it in the same page to be true, as the Representer has declar'd it, excepting some few points; and therefore passing by the Papist Represented with some light touches only, his main attack is against the Papist Misrepresented: and not being willing this should be understood, as if made up of Childish, Ignorant or Wilful Mistakes, he will have it to be the very avow'd Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome. He will have the Papist Mis-represented and Represented to be all the same, excepting some very few cases.

And this he has urg'd so far, that I think 'tis not now so much my Personal Concern to make an Answer, as the Concern of as many as throughout the whole World profess themselves Catholics, to consider the Truth of what is here charg'd against them. The Salvation of their Souls, their Eternity is at stake. If what is here positively asserted against them be true, 'tis high time for them to reform, and to leave off the Doctrine and Practice of so much Heathenism, under a Christian Name. Protestants, in hopes of a mutual Condescendence, may flatter them as they please, and tell them, they have Charity enough to think they may be saved; for my part, I declare, if Popery be guilty of what he says, it cannot enter into my thoughts, there's any room for it in Heaven: and that there's any more possibility of a passage for its monstrous Extravagancies through the Narrow way, than for those of Barbary and Turkey. The Popery this Author describes, seems to me a flat Contradiction.
di&ion to the Commandments and the Gospel; and the Professors of it can have no other portion than with Idolaters, Murderers and Adulterers, whose Eternity is to be in utter darkness.

He declares plainly that Popery is really that Anti-christian Religion, which Protestants say it is; that it teaches and practises all those Fopperies, Superstitions, and Non-sense, which have been at any time charg'd against it by Protestants. His very Title of A Papift, not Mis-represented by Protestants, is a condemnation of the Religion to all those horrid shapes and monstrous forms, it has been at any time expos'd in by Members of the Reformation. He tells his Reader in the name of all his Brethren, We charge them (the Papists) with nothing, but what they express, profess to believe, and what they practise: And in this one Assertion vouches for the Truth of all that Infamy, and profaneness which is laid at their doors. And so gives assurance, that their complaint of being Mis-represented is but vain and idle; for that, what they call a Mis-representation, is in reality a Representation in all the material Points, of the avow'd Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome. That the Papift Represented (excepting some very few cases) professes to believe all that the Papift Mis-represented is charg'd with. This the best and wisest Men, he says (viz. of the Reformation) have believ'd of them. And in Fox's book of Martyrs we read how many were burnt for not believing, as the Papift Mis-represented believes. This is the General Character of a Papift according to the freshest and most Modern draught of our Adversary; So that now to receive a true information of the Papift's Creed, we are not to consult the Council of Trent, or the Catechism ad Parochos, but the writings and Sermons of Protestants: For however Papists may not know
know what they believe themselves; yet Protestants give a true and exact account of them, and are so far Infallible, that the Papists certainly are, what they say they are; believe what they say they believe, since they charge them with nothing, but what they expressly profess to believe, and what they practice. Upon the assurance of this Affidavit, me-thinks, 'twill not be amiss here to receive the satisfaction of knowing, what a Papist really is, and what he certainly believes, beyond the possibility of all exception. For since all that proceeds from a Popish hand of this nature, is suspected and challeng'd, and the double Character of a Papist misrepresented and Represented (about which, as the Replier says, there is so much pother and noise) is questioned as to its Method, its Sincerity and exactness, we'll now follow our Authors call, and learn what Popery is, from the Pens of Protestants: and especially from some of those, who are supposed to know what Popery is; but for the bad man, which the Replier excepts against, we'll make no advantage of him, but let a better Man take his room.

What Papists are according to the Character given by the most Reverend Father John, sometime Lord Archbishop of York, in his Book Written for the use of a Lady, to preserve her from the danger of Popery, where he brings in a Papist thus declaring the Belief and Doctrine of his Church:

**W**e must believe the Church of Rome, whether it teach true or false.

*If the Pope believe there is no Life to come, we must believe it as an Article of our Faith.*

*We teach that the Gospel is but a Fable of Christ.*

*That the Pope can dispense against the New Testament,* that he may check when he pleases, the Epistles of St. Paul, and
and controile any thing avouched by all the Apostles.

That there is an eternal Gospel, to wit, that of the Holy Ghost, which puts down Christ's.

That Christ is the Saviour of Men only, but of no Women: For Women are saved by St. Clare and Mother Jane.

That we put away Mortal sins, by becoming Franciscans, by a Bishop's Pardon for Forty days, and a Cardinals for a Hundred, and the Popes for ever.

That to become a Monk or a Nun, is as good as the Sacrament of Baptism.

That Whoredom is allowed all the Year long, and another sin for June, July, August, which you most not know: Allowed for this time by Sixtus Quartus to all the Family of the Cardinals of St. Lucie.

That the Pope can make that Righteous, which is Unrighteous.

That the Bishop of Rome is a God.

That the Pope may dispence with all Duties, and that our Principles set Men loose from all obligations, in all relations whatsoever, between Magistrates and Subjects, Lords and Tenants, Husbands and Wives, Parents and Children, Masters and Servants, Buyers and Sellers.

That there is not any sin, but is or may be Indulged amongst us; and scarce a known sin, but there is a known price for it, and at our Market-rate you may commit them when you will.

What is the Belief and Doctrine of the Papists, as 'tis deliver'd by Tho. Beard, D. D. in his Book intituled Antichrist the Pope of Rome.

They believe that Saints departed ought to be worshipped and invoked with trust and confidence as God himself.

That the Pope can Canonize them to this Worship at his pleasure.
That Images are to be adored with the same degree of honour as is due to their Patterns, contrary to an express precept of the Law.

That the Pardon of sins here in this Life, and deliverance out of Purgatory in the life to come, may be bought for Money, and where no Money there no remission.

They make their unwritten Traditions, not one, but the principal part of God's Word.

They place divers counterfeit Books, disguised under the Name of some of the Apostles, or their Disciples, full of Fables, Blasphemies, and Contrarieties, and yet commend them to the World as parcels of the written word of God, and Believe in them as Holy Scripture itself, as the Gospels of St. Nicodemus, of St. Thomas, &c.

The Pope hath set up a new God in the Church, namely a piece of Bread in the Mass; and to their Breaden God they ascribe power to forgive sins, to defend from evil both Men and Beast, and to bring to Heaven; when as in the mean while most horrible Blasphemies against Christ himself are tolerated and slighted over.

The Pope is above Angels and Magistrates, he exalteth himself above all that is called God, yea, above God himself.

They prefer their Saints before Christ: They rely more upon the mediation and intercession of Saints, than upon the mediation of Christ.

They not only equal St. Francis and St. Dominick unto Christ, but in some things prefer them before him.

They affirm that whoever dies in St. Francis's habit cannot be Damned, and that it is as forcible for the remission of sins as the Sacrament of Baptism.
What the Papists are as Represented by Mr. Sudcliffe in his Survey of Popery.

There is no point almost, wherein the Papists vary not from the ancient Church, the Article concerning the holy Trinity only excepted.

They teach Novelties and false Doctrines concerning the very grounds of Faith; for they believe the Church to be built upon the Pope.

They speak what they can in disgrace of the Holy Scripture.

They give the Office of Christ's mediation to the Virgin Mary, to Angels and to Saints; they make also Saints our Redeemers, &c.

For God they Worship Creatures, not only giving divine honour to the Sacrament, but also to Crucifixes and Images of the Trinity, made of Wood, &c. and they do adore not only Saints, but rotten bones and rags, they know not of whom.

They overthrow grace, and ascribe the merit of our Salvation, not to God's mercy through Christ, nor to the merit of his passion, but properly to our own works and merits.

They cut out the Second Commandment, because it cannot stand with the Popish worship of Images.

They pray before Stocks and Stones, nay they put their trust in them.

They make no Conscience to cut Christian mens throats for not yielding to all their Abominations, and think it Conscience to obey the Popes Decrees, tho very unlawful.

The Fourth Commandment concerneth the sanctifying the Sabbath, but the Papists profane it by Worshiping Idols, and frequenting the Idolatrous Mass.
Papists think they do God good service, when they murder true Christians.

Amongst Papists, Adultery and Fornication are reckoned amongst lesser Sins.

By the Doctrine of Papists the Devils of Hell may be saved — To this purpose they say, that not only wicked and reprobate Men, but also the Devils of Hell may have true and justifying Faith.

Papists blasphemy make Christ not only a desperate Man without Hope, but also an Infidel without Faith.

They deny Christ to be \( \omega \theta \epsilon \), and affirming that his Divine Essence had a beginning from some other, they fall within the compass of the Error of the Tritheites, which Herefie doth tear the Unity of the Godhead in pieces, and plainly makes more Gods than One.

Papists do diminish the Merit of Christ's Satisfaction, and enervate, as much as in them leth, the Cross of Christ, and the Effect of his Death and Passion — They are Teachers of Antichrist, opposite to Christ, and Enemies of his Cross.

That Christ is not the Redeemer of all Mankind.

They make Christ inferior to Saints and Angels, and prefer the Pope before Christ.

Papists make St. Francis and Dominick equal to Christ in divers things, and in some things superior.

They give equal honour to a Cross of Wood and Metal, and to Christ, and looking on a Wooden Crucifix, they say, Thou hast Redeem'd us.

They suppose the Virgin Mary more merciful than Christ.

Papists account it a small Sin to use Common Women.

Papists believe divers were by their Saints fetch'd out of Hell.

Papists by their irregular Doctrines and Traditions, have
have not only corrupted, but also disannul'd, for the most part, the Law of God.

They deny the Gospel to be a Rule of Perfection, but they doubt not to give that honour to the Rules of Bennet, &c. They speak more Blasphemously of the Holy Scriptures, than the Turks or Saracens.

To the Images of the Cross and Crucifix, they give as much honour as they do to God.

They fall down like Beasts before the Pope, and Worship him as God, ascribing to him most blasphemously the honour due to Christ.

Popery as a sink, hath together with Heresie receiv'd into it self most gross and Heathenish Idolatry.

Papistes say they put no trust in Images, but never did the Gentiles trust so much in the Images of Juno or Jupiter, as the Papistes trust in the Images of our Lady of Loretto, James of Compostella, &c.

They give divine honour to Images, which they themselves cannot deny to be Idolatrous.

They ascribe mans justification to this Work, and exclude justification, both by Christ's Justice, and by Faith, &c.

The Papistes teach their discipiles to distrust Gods grace, — and to trust rather in their own Works and Merits.

Popery is nothing else, but a pack of old and new Heresies.

Papistes despiše Marriage as Pollutions and fleshly life.

Bennet, Dominick, Francis, and other authors of feigned Religions took not their Rules from the Gospel, but thought they could frame a more perfect Religion than the Gospel.

As the Gentiles had one principal God, and divers de-my and inferior Gods, so have the Papistes.

As the Gentiles believed that every one had his good and bad Genius, so the Papistes assign to every Christian a good and bad Angel. The
The second Council of Arles, cap. 23. showeth it to be a custom of Pagans, to worship Trees or Stones, or Fountains, yet our English Papists cease not to go on Pilgrimage to St. Winifrides well, nor to worship Stocks and Stones.

The Romish Church consists of a pack of Infidels.

They forbid honest Wedlock.

The Papists Preachers seldom teach the People, and when they do it, they preach their own inventions, and tell idle tales without edification.

Both Priests and People are most ignorant of Matters of Faith, where Popery is profess'd.

The Scriptures and Fathers they read not.

In a member of the Catholick Church, (they say) neither inward Faith nor other vertue is requir'd, but only that he profess outwardly the Romish Religion, and be subject to the Pope.

The Papists promise Heaven to their followers, so they profess and set forward the Popes cause, whether they be Murderers of Kings, or Massacrers, or Rebels, or filthy Whoremongers, or Sodomites.

They make more conscience to abstain from flesh on Friday, than to murder Christians.

Divers points of Popish doctrine are specially said to proceed from the Devil.

It is a common practice amongst Papists to give divine Worship to dead men.

The Popish Church hath no true Bishops.

The Pope is Antichrist.

The Popish Synagogue hath no true Priests.

Popery in many points is more absurd and abominable, than the doctrine of Mahomet.

Papists, that positively hold the heretical and false doctrines of the modern Church of Rome, cannot possibly be saved.
Images in Churches and Idolatry go always both together — Images in Churches have been, be, and ever will be none other but abominable Idols.

Oenomaus and Hefiod shew that in their time, there were Thirty thousand Gods; I think we had no fewer Saints to whom we gave the honour due to God; and they have not only spoiled the true living God of his due honour in Temples, Cities, &c. by such devices and inventions that the Gentile Idolaters have done before them, but the Sea and Waters have as well special Saints with them, as they had Gods with the Gentiles, &c.

Papists make of true Servants of God, false Gods, and attribute to them the Power and Honour which is Gods, and due to him only.

Image maintainers have the same opinion of Saints, which the Gentiles had of their false Gods.

Image maintainers Worship Stocks and Stones; they give also the honour due to God to their Images, even as did the gentile Idolaters to their Idols.

Who can doubt but that our Image maintainers agreeing in all Idolatrous opinions, agree also with them in committing most abominable Idolatry?

In many Points our Image maintainers have exceeded the Gentile Idolaters in all wickedness, foolishness, and madness, and if this be not sufficient to prove them Image-Worshippers, that is to say, Idolaters, Lo you shall hear, &c.

The Learned and Unlearned, Laity and Clergy, all Ages, Sects and Degrees of Men, and Women, and Children of whole Christendom, have been at once drown'd in abominable Idolatry, the space of Eight hundred years and more.

This
This is the Protestant Character of a Papist, and such as I always look'd upon no other, than of a Papist Mis-represented; and whoever will take the pains to compare it with what I set down under that Title, will find there's little other difference between them, but that this is the Fouler. But now it seems it must be no longer a Papist Mis-represented, but Represented, and 'tis what the Best and wisest Men have believ'd of them. And here now what shall I say? Our Replier says, these are Great and Good Authorities, and we may well suppose they knew what Popery was. And for my part because I love not quarrelling, I shall so far joyn with them; that if this be the Popery they have hitherto prosecuted with so much Fervour and Zeal; if this be the Popery, from whose Infection they have so industriously labour'd to deliver the Christian World, they have done nothing but what is the duty of every true Believer. And if 'twas for the not Embracing this Popery, those Martyrs recorded by Fox pass'd the Fiery Trial, their Cause was surely a Glorious Cause; and I question not the Triumphs and Crowns of Glory that waited for them in Heaven, were not inferior to what those enjoy'd, who suffer'd under Decius or Diocletian. And for my part, I am so far in earnest, had I a Thousand Lives, I would rather chuse, by the assistance of Heaven, to lose them all at the Stake, than in the least assent to so much Heathenism, to so Foul and Monstrous a Religion. And what need now of any longer disagreement? What necessity of keeping up Names of Division? Protestant and Papist may now shake hands, and by one Subscription close into a Body, and joyn in a fair and amicable Correspondence. Popery has been hitherto the only cause of Separation; one part seeming to avow and support it, the other as zealously endeavouring its Overthrow.
throw: And all the strife it seems has been about a Word. For now we have been inform'd from Great and Good Authorities, what this Popery is; what Papist in the World is there, that will not so far become Protestant, as to give his hand for the utter suppressing this kind of Popery? And when Protestants and Papists concur for the rooting out of Popery, what possibility of Farther Divisions?

But if, on the other side, this Character of a Papist be intended for the setting forth the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome; if this be design'd as a True Representation of the Faith and Religion of Roman Catholics: Then returns afresh my Complaint of their being Mis-represented; that they suffer under the greatest Injustice imaginable; that they are expos'd in Bears and Tigers Skins, so to become a Bugbear to the Multitude; that they are malign'd and render'd odious for the maintaining such Doctrines, which they as heartily detest, as those that urge the Charge; and that 'tis no wonder that Papists are put in the Lift with Turks and Infidels, since their Religion is thus injuriously loaded with Calumnies, and they made the Professors of such Tenets, which bid open defiance to Truth, Honesty, and Christianity, which strike at the Worlds Redeemer, and are impossible to be entertain'd by any Creature, that is one degree above a Beast.

I will not deny, but whosoever will look into the Church of Rome, as the Scavenger do's into the City, who stops no where but at a Dunghil, may rake together so much as to defame her with the Inconsiderate and unwary; alas! the Vices of Men in her Communion, their Abuses of the most Sacred things, too abundantly furnish Matter of this kind. But yet whosoever shall expose this for the Doctrine and Practice of their Church,
Church, and describe her, and all in her Communion, by these Rubbish Collections, cannot possibly avoid the scandal of being unjust, and might with as good reason decipher London by those loathfion Heaps where all her Filth is emptied. And now since ’tis evident, the Adversaries of the Church of Rome do generally thus deal by her, scraping out of every corner of that vast Communion, and in every Age, whatsoever can possibly contribute to make her Infamous; there is too too much reason to complain of her being Mis-represented, and no just exception can be made against the Character of the Papist Mis-represented, which lays open to the World the Artifice of these unwarrantable Proceedings.

But here now strikes in the Replier, who undertakes to explain a Mystery in this Character; and the Replier, he says, will have no reason to glory, that he gave the occasion of it. And this Mystery, it seems, are some Faults he has discover’d in the Mis-representation.

First, He says, such things are put into this Character of a Papist, as no man in his wits ever charg’d them with. And yet those very things almost in express terms, and others far more absurd, we charg’d (as is shew’d above) by the Best and Wisest of Men, of great and good Authority with the Replier, as he confesses himself; (p. 2.) And this too is to me a Mystery, as well as to him; that what no Man in his wits ever urg’d, and what the former Answerer calls Childish, and Ignorant, or Wilful Mistakes, should be now seen Father’d upon Men of so high a Character.

Secondly, and thirdly, He complains, that the Opinions of Protestants, and the Consequences they draw from Popish Doctrines, are put into the Character of a Papist Mis-represented, as if they were his avow’d Doctrine and Belief. This is a pretty Speculative Quarrel.
I confess, and might deservedly find room here, were it our business to consider the due method of Mis-representation in the abstract: But as our present concern stands, here's a quaint Conceit lost, for coming in a wrong place. For what had the Author of the Papist Mis-represented to do with these Rules? He did not intend to Mis-represent any body. His Province was only to draw forth the Character of a Papist, as 'tis commonly apprehended by the Vulgar, or the Multitude, with the common Prejudices and Mistakes that generally attend such a Notion. Now I would fain know, whether this Character, as it lies in the Peoples Heads, is distinguish'd into Antecedents and Consequents: Whether they, when they hear one declaiming against Popery, for committing Idolatry, as bad or worse than that of the grossest Heathens, Worshipping Stocks and Stones for God, distinguish between the Doctrine of the Papists, and these Interpretations and Consequences charg'd against it. Alas! they swallow all down greedily, and in the lump; Antecedents and Consequents go down with them all at once. Neither do I find much care us'd to prevent this Misunderstanding in the People. For who is there, in laying open the Folly, as they will have it, of the Papists, and positively charging them, that They make Gods of Stocks and Stones, that they make Gods of dead Men, and raise the Virgin Mary to be Co-partner with Christ in Heaven, &c. do's afterwards tell his Auditory, that This is not what the Papists themselves Believe and Teach; but only what himself Believes and Infer's from their Doctrine, as the Consequence or Interpretation of it, but they deny.

Truly were our Adversaries so sincere as to tell their Hearers, that all their Charge against Popery is nothing more, than what they think of our Faith and Doctrine;
I would so far agree with the Replier, that this ought not to be called Mis-representing, but only saying of us what is not true. But they go beyond this, and in stead of saying we think so, they positively say so it is: And possess as many as take Idea's from their Words, not barely that they think we teach and practise Idolatry, v.g. but absolutely, that we do. Nay, our Image-worship is worshipping Stocks and Stones for Gods, says the Replier in his very next Leaf, without remembering his thinking.

And when the People read Books, intended as Preservatives against the danger of Popery, they are still expos'd to the like Deceit. For what ordinary Reader is there, that finds it positively asserted as above by the Arch-bishop of York; Papists believe the Church of Rome, whether it teach true or false. And if the Pope believes there is no Life to come, they must believe it as an Article of their Faith. What ordinary Reader, I say, is there, that will not swallow this presently as the Faith and Doctrine of the Papists; when at latter end 'tis only what he thinks, and a Consequence far fetch'd to discredit Popery with the Vulgar? And when he's told by another hand, that the common Answer of Catholics to excuse themselves from Idolatry in their Adoration of the Eucharist, is because they believe the Bread to be God? Has not he here a fair occasion again of taking this for the Belief of a Papist; and that he worships what he believes to be a Breaden God? Certainly he must be no small Logician that can discover, whether this be an Antecedent or Consequent, whether it be the Faith of the Papist, or only a Consequence of it. For my part, when I see Popery describ'd, as if none could be of that Communion, but he that can bring his Mind to believe the Word of God to be writ but for a few Years only, and afterwards to be abrogated and annul'd: That whatsoever
ver God says, shall be null and void, unless the Bishop of Rome will and command the same. When I hear that the Pope is Antichrist, and Rome the Whore of Babylon, that the Papists have taken away from the People the Holy Communion, the Word of God, the true Worship of the Deity, the right Use of the Sacraments and Prayers, and in stead of them, have given to please them, Salt, Water, Oyl, Spittle, Bulls, Jubilees, Indulgences, Crosses, Incense, and an infinite number of meer Toys and Baubles, and that in these they have placed all Religion; when I hear, I say, Popery thus describ'd to the People by eminent Apologizers for the Church of England, I cannot conceive, but 'tis to let them know, what Notion to frame of it. And yet whosoever shall suppose, that after such Directions, they'll conceive a regular Idea of it, without a confusion of Faith with its Interpretations, of Doctrine with its Charges, must conclude them to be better at Separating than the Chemists, and that in subtle Distinctions they are able to out-do Aristotle himself. But 'tis too much to be fear'd, that those who expose Popery to the People after this way, are not willing they should apprehend it in its genuine Purity, and as free from this disingenuous mixture: 'Tis so like those who impose upon the Multitude with artificial Monsters, by putting the wrong end forward, and shewing the Tail for the Head; that if they are not deluded into a Mistake, 'tis because they are not so credulous as they should be, and suspect something of a Trick in him that makes the Shew.

And has not the Reflecter now reason to repent after all, that he gave occasion to the Replier of explaining the Mysteries, he has discover'd in the Character of the Papist Mis-represented; since the faults he endeavours to lay open, are not in the Mis-representation, but
but in those, who by Mis-representing the Papist rais'd a false Idea of Popery in the Peoples heads? The Character of the Papist Mis-represented, was intended only, as the Author expresses himself in his Introduction, for a Copy of Popery as painted in the Imagination of the Vulgar: And being conform to that, 'tis exact and perfect: And if there be any faults in it, the blame must fall on those who drew the Original. But however we'll compound here again for this; if the Replier will but undertake to undeceive the People, and give them a more exact Notion of Popery, the Referrer will undertake to reform the Character accordingly. But till then the Character of the Papist Mis-represented stands good; and till the abus'd people are taught to distinguish between Antecedents and Consequents, between the Faith of Papists and the Consequences charg'd against it; the Character must remain as it is; and any Reformation in it would but make it irregular, and unlike that from whence it was taken. The Replier therefore might very well have sparr'd the almost Forty pages he has spent on this Subject; in which, tho' he has learnedly distinguish'd between matters of Dispute and of Representation: Yet this distinction being not to be found in the Notion the People have of Popery, 'tis nothing to our purpose. And the only end it can possibly serve for, is to let the World understand, how much the Papists are generally wrong'd in their reputation; whilst so many gross absurdities, which are often positively expos'd for Articles of their Faith, are here acknowledg'd by the Replier himself, not to be their Faith, but only the Interpretations and Consequential charges of their Adversaries.

These are the Mis-representing Arts and Faults he mentions. For the Representing Faults he allidges.
1. That I deny the Belief of their Interpretations. And the reason is, it may be, because he thinks, no body charges us with that Belief: Which if it be but true, then I have not so much as contradicted any body, and there is no fault, I hope, in that. 2. I generally own the Doctrines and Practices, which they charge us with. And how could this possibly be otherwise, if they charge us with none, but what we expressly profess to own? 3. That in some cases I disown that to be the Doctrine and Belief of our Church, which manifestly is so and has been prov'd on them. Then for all his word to the contrary, we are in some cases charg'd with more than we expressly profess to Believe. As for his manifestly, and his proving, let that go for no more than what it is, his Opinion: 'Tis none of mine, and I think 'twill be no bodies else, when the matter comes to a Tryal.

And here now we must turn over so many leaves till we meet with some other matter in the Reply. And the first that occurs, are some exceptions against the Rule observ'd by the Representer in declaring the Faith of a Papist, who to clear himself from the Scandal of Interpreting the Council of Trent by his own private sense and opinion, alleges the Catechism ad Parochos, which he had follow'd in delivering the sense of the Council. This the Replier could not pass by without an Answer, and therefore gives a satisfactory one. And is he sure, says he, that all his Representations are conformable to the sense of this Catechism? May he not play tricks with the Catechism, and expound that by a private Spirit, as well as the Council? Thus a Question or two is a full Confutation of the Reflefter.

He alleg'd again the Bishop of Condom's Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church, which being approv'd and attested by the Pope himself, by several Cardi-
dinals and Bishops, brought along with it the Authority of the See Apostolic. But this, it seems, works nothing upon the Replier: Canus has put a scruple in his head; and because he finds in this Author, that That is not to be accounted the judgment of the Apostolic See, which is given only by the Bishop of Rome privately, maliciously, (a word slipid over by the Replier) and inconsiderately, or with the advice only of some few of his own mind; he cannot therefore think, but that the Bishop of Condom's Exposition comes short of the Authority of the Apostolic See; and that the Reflecter is out, in taking shelter under one, whose Authority is nothing, as he says downright, p. 46.

This is answering, I confess, with a witness, thus to endeavour to overthrow so considerable and Reverend an Authority, without any Authority at all, besides that of an ungrounded and ill-turn'd consequence; viz. Because that is not to be accounted the Judgment of the Apostolic See, which is given only by the Pope, privately, maliciously, and inconsiderately, or with the advice only of some few of his own mind; therefore this Learned Prelate's Exposition of the Catholic Faith is to be thrown by, as of no Authority. So that our Replier, has here concluded without any more ado, that the approbation of this Book was only given privately, maliciously, inconsiderately, or else with the advice only of some few of the Popes own mind, otherwise the Consequence will not hold. But to shew how little the Rep'ier has weighed this matter, and with how little pains he can undervalue any thing when he pleases, I need only remit the Reader to the perusal of the Book it self, which is lately published in English; the Advertisements affixt to it will satisfy him, that there has not a Book appear'd in this Age supported by greater Authority
authority than this. He'll find it examin'd with all due deliberation, approv'd with all solemnity imaginable, by Men of known Integrity, Piety and Learning, by Abbots, Cardinals, Bishops, and by this present Pope himself, and recommended by his Holiness to be Read by all the Faithful. He'll find it not only thus approv'd, but even twice printed at Rome itself, and in the Press of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide, translated out of the Original French into divers Languages, as Latin, Italian, English, Irish, Flemish, High-Dutch, and this done by Eminent Men of these Nations: So that besides the Attestations of those great Men there specified, it may be said to have the General Approbation of all these Catholic Prelates, who in proposing it to their Flock, sufficiently recommend it for a True Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church. And yet notwithstanding all this, with the Replier, it has not the Authority of the Apostolic See; Nay its Authority is just nothing.

Now methinks, I would willingly here know of the Replier, whether those Great and Good Authorities above mention'd, who pretend to make a Survey of the Faith and Doctrines of Catholics, have better Authority and Grounds for what they assert and charge, than this Reverend Prelate for the Exposition which he gives. And whether it be not a great Mystery, that every Divine of the Reformation shall be thought to have Authority sufficient for defaming the Church of Rome, with whatsoever extravagant Opinions he can but find in one or two Writers of what condition soever: And yet a Catholic Prelate, Eminent in the Church for his great Vertue and Learning, in expounding the Faith of his Church, with the Consent, Approbation, and Authority of the Greatest Men of his Communion, and even of his Supream Pastor, shall be slighted, and thrown by as of
no Authority at all. For my part I cannot understand this uneven kind of Justice, and reasoning: Or why those who profess a Religion, and depend on it as to their Salvation, shall be thought less to understand it, than others who protest against it, and look no further into't, than to render it Ridiculous. But it must be so in an Age, in which a Papist is not to pass for a Christian, and must not be believ'd; we'll therefore go on to the other points.

And for the clearing the most material of them, we need not look beyond the Exposition deliver'd by this Prelate.

1st. As to the Invocation of Saints he declares expressly, that They have no other capacity of assisting us, but only by their Prayers. And tho' the Replier pretends, there's no such limitation found in this Author; yet methinks he should not have been so positive, in a case, in which he's so easily disprov'd. The French Edition Printed at Paris, 1681. has it expressly, pag. 32. The First English Edition Printed likewise in Paris 1672. pag. 29. And now this last Correct Edition, which came forth the last Week, pag. 9. So that, tho' the Answerer has made some little objection; yet the Representer is sufficiently vindicated, in thus declaring the Faith of a Papist: Since what he said is founded not upon his own private sense, but upon an Authority beyond all exception, besides that of mere Cavil.

2ly. And 3ly. As to the Popes Personal Infallibility, and the Depositing Power, the Representer declar'd, that, tho' there were Men of his Communion maintaining these Points by way of Opinion, yet that they were no part of the Catholic Faith; and that Papists had no obligation from their Church of assenting to such Doctrines. And for thus delivering a matter of Fact, he has the Authority again of this Great Prelate, who having declar'd the
the Primacy of St. Peter, and acknowledged the same in his Successors in the See of Rome, immediately adds, as for those things, which we know are disputed of in the Schools, tho' the Ministers continually allege them to render this Power odious, it is not necessary we speak of them here, seeing they are not Articles of the Catholic Faith. It is sufficient we acknowledge a Head established by God to conduct his whole Flock in his Paths, which those, who love Concord amongst Brethren, and Ecclesiastical Unanimity, will most willingly acknowledge.

And is not this a sufficient discharge of the Repræsentor from all the exceptions of his Adversaries? For if this learned Author, having propos'd the Primacy of St. Peter's Chair to be acknowledged as the common Center of all Catholic Union, do's purposely wave all other Points relating to the Authority of that Chair, as being no part of the Catholic Faith: And his Book in this form is own'd and approv'd by the Pope himself, by the most eminent of the Cardinals, and other great Prelates of the Church after a most strict examination, what ground of quarrel with the Repræsentor in his following this so Authentic a Rule? 'Twas the main design of the Bishop of Condom in that Treatise to separate the opinions of Divines and School Debates from the Doctrine of the Catholic Faith. And since he omitted to expound those Points of the Popes Personal Infallibility and the Deposing Power as not belonging to the Catholic Faith, with so full and Authentic an Approbation, as has been declared; where is the crime of the Repræsentor in not allowing them a place in that Lift?

And here I cannot but run the venture of another smile from the Replier, upon the reinforcement of my former Proposal. I desir'd that the Decision of the Quarrel with the Repræsentor might depend upon the Experiment
Experiment of any ones being judg'd capable of being receiv'd into the Catholic Church, upon his assenting to matters of Faith, in that form as deliver'd by the Representer. The Replier, having smil'd first, thought it not fit to put it to that issue; but chose rather to own that the Faith, as declar'd by the Representer, was really the Faith of a Papist, excepting the Deposing Doctrine, and some other few Points. Here then let him make the Proposed Trial, if he pleases, or any Friend for him; and if, notwithstanding his refusal to admit the Deposing Doctrine and the Popes Infallibility, but as stated by the Representer, (that is, not as Articles of Catholic Faith) he be not judg'd sufficiently qualified as to those Points, to be receiv'd into the Communion of the Roman Catholics, I will grant he has reason to charge the Representer not to have done his part in those Particulars. This will be a much shorter and surer Conviction than twenty Answers and Replies, fit only to cast a Mist before the Readers Eyes, and which such a Trial as this will quickly dissipate.

And this now is all that is requisite for a full Vindication of the Representer. For it being frankly own'd by the Replier himself, that he has made a true Representation of the Faith of a Papist; with the exception only of some few Points. And it being here made evident, that what the Representer deliver'd as to those very Points, is according to the Sense of the See Apostolic, of the greatest Prelates, nay, I may say, of the whole Church: The Papist Mis-represented and Represented stands untouched: And all that has been said against it, have been nothing more, than so many artificial Endeavours to perswade the World, that the Protestant understands better what the Faith of a Papist is, than the Papist do's himself; which will be easily answer'd after his manner, with a smile.
What the Replier adds after this, belongs not to the Representer, who being to Represent, and not to Dispute, is not concern'd with those tedious Arguments; however, not to be uncivil, we'll go so far with him, tho' it be out of our way.

1. He proves at large, that all Definitions of Faith, declar'd in General Councils, are not concluded with Anathema's; and in this we willingly agree with him: But this do's not at all prove, that whatsoever is declar'd in such a Council without an Anathema, is an Article of Faith; and therefore nothing against us deserving any farther answer.

2. He endeavours to prove the Deposing Power not to be a matter of Discipline and Government, but to be a Point of Doctrine; and this from a Principle lately publish'd in the Vindication of Dr. Sherlock's Sermon, viz. that To decree what shall be done, includes a virtual Definition of that Doctrine on which that Decree is founded. And this he says, as we have been lately told. But what respect can I possibly have for what has been lately told us by another hand, since the Replier himself, however he urges it in one Page, plainly undervalues it and contradicts it in his very next; where he tells us, that in the Council of the Apostles at Jerusalem there was a Decree of Manners, yet it contain'd no Definition of Faith. And for my part, I think the Replier in the right, and must needs stand with him against the Vindicator of the Sermon; that to Decree what shall be done, do's not include a virtual Definition of Doctrine. And the Example produc'd by the Replier evidently shews it: For tho' the Apostles in their Council (Acts 15.) decreed abstinence from Blood and strangl'd Meats: yet this Decree of what was to be done, did not include a virtual Definition of that Doctrine on which the Decree was founded: For,
if it had: then the Doctrine of abstaining from Blood and strangl’d Meats had been an Article of Faith; which I am sure is not agreeable either to the Principles or Practices of either of our Churches. And the Reason of this may be, because Decrees of what shall be done, are often made with relation to particular Circumstances, of Time, Persons, Place, &c. and not built upon Definitions of Faith, but upon Prudential Motives, upon Probable Opinions upon the Testimonies and Informations of Men; and so may be suspended or quite abrogated, as also confirm’d anew, or wholly chang’d, according to the alteration of Circumstances: Nothing of all which can stand with Articles of Faith, which being the indispensable Doctrine of Jesus Christ, are not subject to change or alteration.

3. But suppose this Decree to be rank’d only among the Decreta Morum, which concern only the Discipline and Government of the Church; yet our Adversary here urges out of Canus and Bellarmine, That General Councils cannot err even in such Decrees, when they relate to things necessary to Salvation, and concern the whole Church. And when the Replier has prov’d the Deposing Decree to be of this Nature, and esteem’d as such by our Church, he may then deserve a farther Consideration.

What the Replier adds of this Subject, (p. 57.) That the Pope permits the positive Assertors of the No-deposing Power to pass without any Censure of Heresie, because he wants Power to do it, is spoke like an Oracle I confess; but because these are ceas’d now adays, we may very well suspend our Assent, till we have some better Argument, than his bare Assurance of what the Pope would do if he had Power.

The last Argument is concerning the Veneration of Images. And tho’ the Answerer was willing, without any
any more ado, to condemn the Papists of Constructive Idolatry from some external Acts of Adoration us'd before Images; yet our Replier readily grants, that thofe Acts are in themselves indifferent, and capable of being paid to God and Men, and to be us'd as the Expressions either of a Civil or a Religious Honour. But he has given us an infallible Mark, by which to distinguish between Civil and Religious Honour, notwithstanding the very same external Acts being us'd in both; and 'tis, that Civil relates to this World, and Religious to the Invisible Inhabitants of the next. This, he says, is a Distinction allow'd by all the rest of Mankind; and tho' by all the rest he seems willing to exclude me, yet since he has given his Word for it, I'll come in for one of that number, at least so far as to suppose it. So that here we have it now laid down as a Principle by common agreement, that External Acts of Honour paid to things relating to this World is a Civil Honour, Respect, Veneration, or Worship. And when they are paid to things relating to the Invisible Inhabitants of the next, 'tis a Religious Honour, Respect, Veneration, or Worship. And hence 'tis concluded by him, That these External Acts of Honour express'd to any Image, that has Relation to some Invisible Being, must of necessity be a Religious Honour. This is what the Replier proves, and we at present agree to. But if he thinks, as he says, that this puts an end to the Dispute, I think him mistaken, we being as yet only in the beginning. For tho' it hence follows that Papists give a Religious Honour to Holy Images, yet till it be proved that all Religious Respect and Honour, is so a Divine Honour, as to make a God of the thing to which it is paid, at least constructively; he has not concluded Papists to be Idolaters, or guilty of constructive Idolatry; which
is the thing he intended and undertook. And that he cannot possibly prove it from these Principles, without proving too much; and bringing himself in for a share, I think may easily be made appear.

For if Papists must be condemn'd of this constructive Idolatry, because they use External Acts of Adoration to an Image, which has a Relation to some invisible Being; must not all those come into the same List, who use the like External Acts of Adoration to other things, which have a like Relation to the same invisible Being? What excuse shall there be for him, who Bows to the Altar, or Communion Table, to the Name of Jesus, &c. All these things relate to the invisible Inhabitants of the next World, and all External Acts express'd to them must by consequence be a Religious Worship: Then, in the words of our Replier, If to Worship any Invisible Being, be to give Divine Honours to it; then to be sure, to Worship the thing relating to such an Invisible Being, must be Religious Worship also. For if the Worship be refer'd to that Invisible Being, which the thing relates to, it cannot be Civil, but Religious Honour; and whosoever gives Religious Honour to a thing, do's immediately ascribe Divinity to the Object of that Worship, and in our Repliers Phrase, by construction of Fact is an Idolater.

And now how many here are included in this consequence? Certainly as many as admit of any Religious Respect besides to God; which yet the Replier himself was not unwilling (p. 60) to give to Reliques, allowing a due Veneration and Religious Decency to the Bodies of Saints and Martyrs: And the Learned Dr. Stillingfleet is well enough dispos'd to acknowledge a Reverence and Religious Respect due to Sacred Places and Things. So that I believe the Replier has overshot himself in this Argument: And that upon consideration, he will admit of
of some Degrees in Religious, as well as in Civil Honour: And that every thing is not immediately set up for a God, which is honoured with a Religious Respect, however this Honour may be ultimately terminated in God.

And this thought now brings into my mind, a close piece of Arguing us'd by the Replier, in urging this matter; and it lies thus: (p. 66.) Civil respects are confin'd to this World; But we have no intercourse with the other World, but what is Religious: Therefore as the different kinds and degrees of Civil Honour are distinguished by the sight of the Object, to which they are paid, tho' the External Acts of the same: So (says he) the most certain mark of distinction between Civil and Religious Worship is this, that the one relates to this World, the other to the invisible Inhabitants of the next. Here we have a Consequence and a Comparison, and both so excellent in their kinds, that if any better connexion can be found in them, than betwixt the Monument and the May-pole, it must be by one, who has found one trick more in Logick, than ever Aristotle knew. If instead of his So in the end of his Conclusion, he had made this application, So are the different kinds and degrees of Religious Honour distinguished by the Intention of the Givers, or by some visible representation, or determination of other circumstances. This might have been infer'd with some dependence on the Premises: And by it we might have compounded for the matter in hand: But as the Replier has it, it neither proves, nor is anything.

Another Argument we have just before this, which proves again too much, and is so unlucky as not to harm us, without cutting the Throat of his own Cause: The force of it may be thus express'd: No intention can alter the nature of Actions, which are determin'd by a Divine or Humane Law; Therefore since the External Acts
Acts of kneeling or bowing to or before an Image, are determinately forbidden by the Divine Law; the intention of doing no evil in them, cannot excuse them from Sin. For do's not this as severely strike at the Bowing down to the Altar, and Kneeling to the Sacrament as at us? For those very Actions are part of the Divine Worship, and Bowing down is the very Idolatrous Action expressly forbid in the Commandment: And then, if there be any such thing, (as the Replier says here) as External and Visible Idolatry, it must consist in External and Visible Actions; for we can never know what Men's intentions are, but by their Actions; and then (says he) if Men do such Actions as are Idolatrous, how can the intention excuse them from Idolatry? So that by this way of reasoning he can never throw us down, but we must fall both together. For tho' the Sacrament, or the Altar are not express'd in the Commandment; yet since the External Action of Adoration is a Religious and Divine Worship (according to the Repliers Principle before establish'd) the Bowing down and Kneeling to them cannot be excus'd from the guilt of Constructive Idolatry. And whatsoever hole the Replier can possibly find, to get out at with his Altar, the Representier will easily follow him at the same with his Image.

But that the Replier may see, how far his Argument concludes, I would fain know whether a Quaker might not as reasonably make use of the same, for the justifying his Tea's and his Nay's, and his other points of Quakerism? For if he should say; No intention can alter the Nature of Actions, which are determin'd by a Divine or Humane Law: But Swear not at all, Neither be ye called Masters, and let your Communication be Tea, Tea, Nay, Nay, are Actions or things determined by the Divine Law: Therefore the Intention of doing no evil in them cannot
cannot excuse the doing otherwise than is there determin'd from the guilt of sin. This has equal force from a Quaker as from a Replier, and makes evident, that the same Arguments which persuade to a Reformation from Popery, do upon the same grounds plead still for a farther Reformation.

Thus far have I follow'd the Replier beyond my business of Representing, and I hope I have so far oblig'd him in it, that however he has Question'd my Honesty, he will not at least, now call me Uncivil. Before I take my leave, I will be so free as to offer him a Request or two, which will not be thought unreasonable, I hope, since he himself has put them into my Mouth.

1. That he will use his interest with Protestants, to hold to what he says they do, and charge us with nothing, but what we expressly Profess to Believe and Practice.

2. That they pick not up the Abuses of some, the Vices and Cruelties of others, the odd Opinions of particular Authors, and hold these forth for the Doctrine and Practice of our Church. And that in charging any Practices, they charge them upon no more than are concern'd.

3. That as often as they tell what they think of our Doctrines and Practices, they would likewise at the same time inform their Hearers, that those Thoughts are, as the Replier says, Opinions, Interpretations and Consequences of their own, concerning our Doctrine, and not our avow'd Doctrine; But that we think as ill of those Crimes which they charge, as they themselves do; and that we, our Doctrine and Practices, are as free from them, as they think of their own; and that in this consists the Difference betwixt us.

These
These are but very Reasonable Requests, I think, and what every Man may very well expect from his Christian Neighbour; they being not so much Favours as Duties: And what every one, who understands that Golden Rule, of Doing as they would be done by, will comply with without long entreaties. This is desir'd by those of the Reformation too, who require in their Synod of Dort, that None judge of the Faith of their Churches, from Calumnies pick'd up here and there, or passages of Particular Authors, which are often falsely cited, or wrested to a sense contrary to their Intention: But from the Confessions of Faith of their Churches, and from the Declaration of their Orthodox Doctrine unanimously made in that Synod. And this is a caution of so great importance, that where 'tis not observ'd, 'tis no wonder to see Men contending for the Truth of Christianity, and to lose it amidst their Uncharitable Dissentions.

'Twas my intention not to increase, but to diminish these heats, and for this end I put forth the double Character of a Papist Mis-represented and Represented. 'Twas this was the design of the Bishop of Condom in his Exposition of the Faith of the Catholic Church, and of the Clergy of France, in the Acts of the General Assembly lately publish'd. The method is inoffensive, and free from provoking Reflections; and if by this I have let the World know what our Church Believes and Teaches, 'tis what I intended: And as for disputing I leave that to such, who think it worth their while.

FINIS.
AN ANSWER TO A DISCOURSE INTITLED, Papists Protesting against Protestant Popery;

Being a VINDICATION of Papists not Misrepresented by Protestants:

And Containing

A Particular Examination of Monsieur de MEAUX, late Bishop of Condom, his Exposition of the Doctrine of the CHURCH of ROME, in the Articles OF INVOCATION of SAINTS, AND THE WORSHIP of IMAGES, Occasioned by that Discourse.

W. Sherlock.

LONDON:
Printed for John Amery at the Peacock; and William Rogers at the Sun; both against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleetstreet.
MDCLXXXVI.
Imprimatur,


Martii 29: 1686.
AN ANSWER TO Papists Prote sting AGAINST Protestant Popery.

SINCE the Protefter thinks my Answer to his Re- 

flections fo great a Complement, I am resolved to 

oblige him a little farther, and to complement him 

very heartily, and I see no reason, but Complement-

ing may be as good a word for Disputing, as Represen-

ting is.

The Reply consisted of two parts, 1. Concerning the Mis-

representation of a Papift. 2. Concerning the Rule of true 

Representing, and I shall consider, what the Protefting Pa-

pift says to each of them.

As for the First, a Misreprefenter is fo foul a Character, 

that no Man can wonder, if we think our felves con-

cern'd to wipe off fuch an imputation: and therefore I ex-

pressly denied the charge, and made it appear from compa-

ring his own Characters of a Papift Misreprefented, and Re-

presented together, that we had not charged them fallly in 

any matter of Fact, and therefore are no Misreprefenters: 

for if we charge them with believing and doing nothing, but 

what
what they themselves confess to be their Faith and Practice, wherein is the Misrepresentation? Thus I particularly showed, that all matters of Fact (excepting some points, wherein they disown the Doctrine of their own Church) in the Character of the Papist Misrepresented, are confessed and defended in the Character of the Papist Represented; and the Protestant himself acknowledges, that I have learnedly (as he is pleased to speak) distinguished between matters of Dispute, and of Representation; and if so, then he ought to own, that we do not Misrepresent them: and this is all I undertook to prove in the first part of my Reply, and for that reason gave it the Title of, A Papist not Misrepresented by Protestants, wholly with relation to his Character of a Papist Misrepresented, which I had proved to contain nothing in it, which in a strict and proper sense can be called a Misrepresentation. We truly relate what the Faith and Practice of the Church of Rome is, and this is true Representing; and though we say their Faith is erroneous, and their Practices corrupt or superflitious, contrary to the Laws of God, and the usages of the Primitive Church; yet whether this be true or false, it is no matter of Representation but Dispute; though we believe thus of their Faith and Practice, we do not charge them with believing so, and therefore do not Misrepresent a Papist. Whether they or we be in the right is matter of Dispute, and not to be determined by Character-making, but by an appeal to the Laws of God, and the dictates of right Reason, and the Authentick Records of the ancient Church. While we agree about matter of Fact there can be no Misrepresenting on either side, for there is a great deal of difference between a Misrepresentation, and a false Judgment of things; and thus I hoped, the talk of Misrepresenting would have been at an end.

But our Author, though he confesses I am in the right, will have us to be Misrepresenter still; He says, I declare plainly, that Popery is really that Antichristian Religion, which Protestants say it is, that it teaches and practices all those fopperies, superstitions and nonsense, which have at any time been charged against it by Protestants. But I never said any such thing yet, but only said and proved, that all matters of Fact complained of in
the Character of a Papist Misrepresented, are owned by himself in the Character of a Papist Represented; and this, I thought, was proof enough, that we were no Misrepresenters. But the Title of my Reply offends him, *A Papist not Misrepresented by Protestants*, which he says, is a condemnation of the Religion to all those horrid shapes and monstrous forms, it has been at any time expos'd in by Members of the Reformation; by no means! If there have been other Misrepresentations of them, which our Author has not yet given us an account of, I can say nothing to them, till I see what they are; but my Title related only to my Book, and that related only to the Character of a Papist Misrepresented, which our Author had given us, and I undertook for that then, and will defend it still, that there is no Misrepresentation in it.

Of the same nature is what he adds, That *I tell my Reader in the name of all my Brethren, we charge them (the Papists) with nothing, but what they expressly profess to believe, and what they practice; and thus says the Protestant, in this one assertion vouches for the truth of all that infamy, and prophaness, which is laid at their doors: and thus, for ought I see, I am drawn in for a great deal more than I intended; I spoke with reference to his Characters, and now I must discharge the scores of all Protestants since the beginning of the Reformation; but when a Man's in, he must get out as well as he can: but would not one wonder, that there should not be one word of his own Characters all this while? that instead of defending his own Misrepresentations, which he has so unjustly father'd upon us, he should be hunting about to pick up some new Misrepresentations for me to answer? There must be a reason for this, and I believe, I can guess what it is.

But however he takes this occasion to ransack the Writings of Protestants, and to see what fine things they have said of Papists, and to collect a new Character of a Papist Misrepresented out of them. For since all that proceeds from a Popish hand of this nature is suspected and challenged, and the double Character of a Papist Misrepresented and Represented (about which, as the Replier says, there is so much pother and noise) is questioned as to its method, its sincerity, and exactness, we'll now follow our Author's call, and learn what Popery is, from the Pens of Prote-
flants, and especially from some of those, who are supposed to know what Popery is. And thus our Author makes as many turnings and doublings as ever any poor Hare did, which was almost run down. Because I have proved, that his Character of a Papist Misrepresents, contains no Misrepresentation in it, properly so called, therefore forsooth we will not take Characters from a Papist, because we confute them, as soon as they make them, which is not very civil; and therefore hoping that we will be more civil to Protestant Characters, he turns off the Dispute to them; never did any Man take more pains to defend Popery, than he does to prove a Papist to be Misrepresented; it seems there is something in the World called Popery, which he is very much ashamed of, and it is well if it does not prove to be his own beloved Popery at last.

I had told him as plainly as I could in Answer to his Character of a Papist Misrepresented, what I called Popery, and what I take to be the general sense of Protestants about it, and shewed him evidently, that what he calls a Misrepresentation is none; nay, in most cases I have allow'd his own Character of a Papist Represented, and surely there is no Misrepresentation in that, unless he has misrepresented a Papist himself; and why is he not satisfied with this? why so much Zeal to prove us Misrepresenters, when we are willing to fall with the Market, and to abate as much in the Notion and Idea of Popery, as they are pleased to lower it? Why must we be bound to justifie that Representation of Popery, which some Protestants have formerly made of it, when Popery was quite another thing, than the Bishop of Condons, and the Representer have now made it, any more than they are bound to justifie every thing, which Thomas Aquinas, or Bellarmin, or Vasquez have taught for Popery?

But let us consider that Character, he has made of a Papist out of the Writings of Protestants, only I must put him in mind, that he must still distinguish between matters of Representation and Dispute. If the matter of Fact they charge them with be true, they are no Misrepresenters; as for their Reasons and Arguments, I will no more undertake to defend all the reasonings of Protestants.
testants, than I suppose, our Protester will all the reasonings of Papists.

The first Misrepresenter, he brings upon the Stage, is John Lord Archbishop of York in his Manual or three small and plain Treatises, written for the use of a Lady, to preserve her from the danger of Popery. And all that I shall say to this, is, that if what he transcribes out of his Book, be a Misrepresentation, it is not a Protestant, but a Popish Misrepresentation. For the Archbishop cites his Authors for what he says, as the very Title of the Chapter tells us, which I shall here present to the Reader, with all the References and Authorities as they are Printed in his Book, and leave the Protester to consider of a good Reason, why he left all these Authorities out.

CHAP. VI.

Reasons of refusal to leave the Romish Religion, collected out of Printed Authors.

I cannot leave my Religion. Pap.

I. Reason.

Because we must simply believe the Church of Rome, whether it teach true or false. Stapl. Antidot in Evang. Luk. 10. 16. pag. 528.

And if the Pope believe there is no life to come, we must believe it as an Article of our Faith. Bulgradus.

And we must not hear Protestant Preachers, though they preach the Truth. Khem. upon Tit. 3. 10. And for your Scripture, we little weigh it. For the Word of God, if it be not expounded as the Church of Rome will have it, is the word of the Devil. Hosius de expresso verbo Dei.

II. Reason.
II. Reason.

You rely too much upon the Gospel, and S. Paul's Epistles in your Religion; whereas, the Gospel is but a Fable of Christ, as Pope Leo the tenth tells us. Apol. of H. Stephen fol. 358. Smeton. contra Hamilton pag 104.

And the Pope can dispense against the New Testament. Pap. normit. extra de divorciis.

And he may check, when he pleases, the Epistles of S. Paul. Carolus Ruinus Concil. 109. num. 1. Volum. 5.

And controul any thing avouched by all the Apostles. Rota in decis. 1. num. 3. in noviss. Anton. Maria in addit. ad decis. Rota nov. de Big. n. 10. And there is an eternal Gospel, to wit, that of the Holy Ghost, which puts down Christ's. Cirellos a Carmelite set it forth.

III. Reason.

You attribute all your Salvation to Faith in Christ alone. Whereas, He is the Saviour of Men only, but of no Women. Dial. of Dives and Pauper, compl. 6. cited by Rogers upon the Artic. and Postellus in Jesuits Catech. l. 1. cap. 10.

S. Clare.

For Women are saved by

S. Clare. Som. in Morn. de Eccles. cap. 9.


Nay to speak properly, S. Francis hath redeemed as many, as are saved since his days. Conformit. of S. Fran.

And the blood of S. Thomas à Becket. Hor. Beat. Virg.

And sometimes one man, by his satisfactions, redeems another. Test. Rheem. in Rom. 8. 17.

IV.
I V. Reason.

In your Church there is but one way to remission of sins, which you call Faith in Christ; but we have many. For we put away

2. The Blood of Becket, Ib.
3. Agnos Dei, or Holy Lambs, Cerem. l. i. t. 7.
4. Little parcels of the Gospel, Breviar.
6. A Bishops pardon for 40 days, a Cardinals for an 100. days, and the Popes for ever.

Taxa Camer. apud. Esp. in 1 ad Tim.

V. Reason.

You stand too precisely upon your Sacraments, and require a true Faith, in the partakers. Whereas with us, to become a Monk, or a Nun, is as good as the Sacrament of Baptism. Aquin. de Ingrat. Relig. l. 2. c. 21.

And the very true and real Body of Christ may be devoured of Dogs, Hogs, Cats and Rats, Alex. Hales, part. 4. q. 45. Thom. parte 3. q. 8. art. 3.

VI. Reason.

Then for your Ministers, every one is allowed to have his wife; or else inforced to live chastly: whereas with us, the Pope himself cannot dispense with a Priest to marry, no more than he can privilege him to take a Purse. Tuirianus found fault withal by Cassan. consult. art. 23.

But Whoredom is allowed all the year long. See Sparks's Discovery, pag. 13. and consult. Othen. de concubit. Cleric. re- movend.

And
And another sin for June, July, August, which you must not know of: Allowed for this time by Sixtus Quartus to all the Family of the Cardinal of S. Lucie, Vessels. Grovingenf. tract. de indulgent. citat. à Jacob. Laurent. Jesuit. lib. pag. 196. vide fo. Wolfit lection, memorab. centem. 15. pag. 836.

For indeed the wickedness of the Church-men is a prime Argument of the worthines of the Roman Church. Bellar. l. 4. de Rom. Pont. cap. 14. artic. 28.

And the Pope can make that righteous, which is unrighte-

sus, l. 1. Decretal. Greg. tit. 7. c. 5.

And yet can no Man say unto him, Sir, why do you so? In extrav. tom. 22. titul. 5. c. ad Apostolatus.

VII. and last Reason.

You in the Church of England have cast off the Bishop of Rome, whereas the Bishop of Rome is a God. Dift. 96. c. satis evidenter, & Panorm. cap. Quanto Abbas.

The Use and Application of this Doctrine you may find in the next Chapter, and a particular proof that some Do-

ctrines of the Roman Church destroy justice towards Men in all relations; as the Popes power of dispensing with the duties of all relations: their Doctrines of probabilities, of mental reservations, that the intention regulates the action, that no Faith is to be kept with Heretics; that the Pope may depose Princes, and dispose of their Kingdoms, pardon, may canonize King-killers, and absolve Subjects from their Allegiance, &c.

I know our Author calls all this Misrepresentation, but that is not our Dispute now; but whose Misrepresentation it is. It is plain, this is not Protestant but Popish Popyry; for not Protestants, but Papists, were the Original Authors: And I doubt not, were it worth the while, it might easily be proved, that the grossest Misrepresentations, which this Author charges on Protestants, are only transcribed out of Popish Authors; and this he seems to own, when he is so angry with us for proving these Misrepresentations, as he calls them, by appealing to their own private, but approved, Doctors, who have in plain terms asserterd those things, which poor Protestants must not repeat after them, without incurring the Censure of Misrepresenter.

Now
Now though we grant, that every Doctrine, which we find in Popish Authors, ought not to be accounted an Article of the Romish Faith, yet if such Books be published by the authority of Superiors, and when they are published and known in the World, escape the Inquisition and the Index expurgatorius, the Doctrines contained in them ought at least to be looked on, as licensed and tolerated Doctrines, and therefore consistent with the Romish Faith, not a Misrepresentation of it. For will a Church so strict and severe in its Discipline, and so jealous of Heresies, which cenfures all the Ancient Fathers, and expunges out of their Writings every passage, which in the least favours of Heresy; which will not entrust the People to use the Bible for fear of their learning Heresie from it; I say will such a Church suffer their own Doctors to publish such Opinions to the World, as Misrepresent her own Faith and Worship, without condemning, or passing the least cenfure on them?

And therefore though we cannot prove from these private Doctors, what the Faith of the Church of Rome is, and what all are bound to believe, who are of that Communio, yet by their Authority we may confute the charge of Misrepresentation. For no Protestant can be justly accused of Misrepresenting the Doctrines of the Church of Rome, who charges them with no Doctrines, but what are allowed to be taught in that Church, as all those Doctrines are, which are allowed by publick Authority to be Printed and Read in the Communion of that Church, especially, as I observed before, where the Press is kept under such strict Discipline, as it is in the Church of Rome.

We must not indeed charge all Papists with believing such Doctrines, because all are not bound to believe them, as they are to believe the Decrees and Definitions of their Councils; but we may say, that they are not contrary to the Faith of the Church, because all Papists are allowed to believe them, who will; for I premise all Men are allowed to believe that, which any Man among them is allowed to teach.

However I hope, it may be some excuse to the Archbishop, that he Misrepresents only at second hand, (since our
our Author will have it to be a Misrepresentation) and says no more than some Papists themselves say, and resolves all into the Credit and Authority of his Authors; and I cannot think it a greater fault in a Protestant to give an account of such pernicious Doctrines and Opinions, as are owned by some of their own Writers, than it is in the Church of Rome to suffer them to be published by Authority, and to pass without any Censure, if they dislike the Doctrine.

As for what he transcribes out of Doctor Beard and Mr. Sutcliff, I presume, he intended we should take it all upon his Authority; for he has not directed us, where to find any of those passages he has cited, and it is a little too much to read two great Books in Quarto to pick them out. Without looking on the Books we might easily perceive, that those saying he has transcribed out of them, do not concern Representing but Disputing, and I never undertook to justify every saying in Protestant Writers against Popery; but yet some things founded so harsh, that I vehemently suspected foul play, and therefore had the curiosity to examine, and found it to be, as I suspected. Some passages for which they produce their Authorities, and that very good Authorities as the World went then, are cited by the Protester, without any Authorities, as he dealt before with the Archbishop; or what they prove by variety of reasons, is nakedly Represented without any reason to back it; or their words are curtailed, or transplaced, which alters their sense and signification. I shall give some few instances of this out of Mr. Sutcliff, to let the World judge, who are the Misrepresenter.

Quotations out of Mr. Sutcliff in the Papists Protestings, &c.

Mr. Sutcliff’s Survey of Popery.

P. 12, They speak what they can in disgrace of the Holy Scriptures.

Finally they say, they are obscure and hard to be understood, they speak what they can in disgrace of the Holy Scriptures. P. 6.

They give the Office, &c. teaching that by their Merits Christians obtain
Angels and to Saints, they make also Saints our Redeemers.

They overthrow Grace, and ascribe the merit of our Salvation not to Gods mercy through Chrift, not to the merit of his Passion, but properly to our own Works and Merits.

They cut out the Second Commandment because it cannot stand with the Popish worship of Images.

They pray before Stocks and Stones, nay they put their trust in them.

Papists think they do God good service, when they murder true Christians.

By the Doctrine of Papists the Devils of Hell may be saved.

Papists blasphemously make Christ not only a desperate Man without hope, but also an Infidel without Faith. p. 13.

That Christ is not the Redeemer of all Mankind.

tain their desires, and are delivered out of Purgatory. Ibid.

Albeit they exclude not Grace from the work of our Salvation, yet making Grace a Habit or Virtue, they overthrow Grace, &c. p. 9.

They cut out the Second Commandment in the Offices of our Lady and their Primers, because, &c. Ib.

Nay they put their trust in them: for if this were not so, why should they hope for better success at the Image of our Lady of Loretto or Monferat, than at any other Image or form of our Lady? p. 10.

Proved from the cruel Executions in England, France, Germany, Spain. p. 23.

They teach, that the Devils of Hell may have true Faith, but our Saviour faith John 3. that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life. So it followeth by the Doctrine of Papists, that the Reprobates, and Devils in Hell may be saved. p. 28.

They take from Christ both Faith and hope. Aqu. p. 3. q. 7. art. 4. So that which they falsely objected to Calvin doth rightly fall upon the Papists—that they blasphemously make Christ, &c.

They affirm the Virgin Mary to be conceived without original Sin, &c. of which it follows, that Christ is not the Redeemer of all Mankind, for what needed they a Redeemer, who were not born sinners? p. 41. C. 2 They,
They make Christ inferior to Saints and Angels.

They prefer the Pope before Christ.

To the Images of the Cross and crucifix, they give as much honour as is due to God. p. 14.

They fall down like Beasts before the Pope, and worship him God, ascribing to him most blasphemously the honour due to Christ.

They give divine honour to Image, which they themselves cannot deny to be Idolatrous.

They say Masses in honour of Angels and Saints, but he, in whose honour a Sacrifice is offered, is greater than the Sacrifice: doth it not then appear, that while they offer Christ's Body and Blood in honour of Saints and Angels, they make Christ inferior to Saints and Angels? p. 42.

They prefer the Pope before Christ, for Christ's Body, when the Pope goeth in progress, is sent before with the Baggage, and when the Pope is near, goeth out to meet him, while all the Gallants of Rome attend on the Pope. p. 43.

To the Images, &c. — teaching their followers, that it is but one honour given to the Image, and the thing Represented by the Image. p. 74.

They fall down, &c. Paulus Amilius 1. 2. telleth, how the Ambassadors of Sicily cried thus to the Pope, Thou that takest away the sins of the World have mercy upon us. — Stapleton to Greg. 13. calls him supremum numen in terris: They call him Vicar of Christ, the Monarch of the Church, the Head, the Spouse, the foundation of the Church, ascribing to him most blasphemously the honour due to Christ. p. 72.

They confess it Idolatry to give divine honour to Creatures. But they give divine honour to the Sacrament, to the Cross, and to Images of the Trinity, which, I hope, they will not deny to be Creatures.
The Romish Church consists of a Pack of Infidels, p. 15.

Faith is of things (as the Papists say in their Catechism) only proposed to us by the Church; so that if the Church propose not to us the Articles of Faith, we are not to believe them, if these Men teach truth. Further this sheweth; the Romish Church consists of a pack of Infidels; for if the same believed not without the authority of the Church; then she did believe nothing of Christ, seeing the Papists acknowledge no other Church but that of Rome, and no Church can teach it itself. p. 178.

Spoken of the Schoolmen (not of all Papists) upon the authority of Ferdinando Vellozillo, p. 200.

This Opinion he attributes to Cardinal Bellarmine and cites de Eccl. milit. cap. 2.

They make more Conscience, &c. as their curiosity in keeping the Fast, and their cruelty in massacring Christians declares, p. 205.

He instances in forbidding Marriage, and commanding to abstain from meats, which he says are called in Scripture Doctrines of Devils, p. 213.

That the Papish Church hath no true Bishops, that Popery in many points is more absurd and abominable than the Doctrine of Mahomet: That Papists, that positively hold the heretical and false Doctrines of the modern Church of Rome, cannot possibly be saved, are the Titles of several Chapters, in which he endeavours to make good these charges, how well let our Author consider; but all men will see, that this is not Representing but Disputing.

This
This is abundantly enough to give the Reader a taste of the Protesters honestly in Representing, and how little I am concerned in these Quotations. If some Protesters have charged the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome with such consequences as they cannot justify, wiser Protesters disown it, and Papists may confute it, if they please, which will be a little more to the purpose, than to cry out so Tragically about Misrepresenting.

But to make good this charge of Misrepresenting against us, he concludes with several passages out of the Homilies, concerning the worship of Saints and Images. Now if our Church be guilty of Misrepresenting in her very Homilies, which we are all bound to subscribe, we must acknowledge our selves to be Misrepresenter. But wherein does the Misrepresentation consist? Do they not set up Images in Churches? And do they not worship them? Have they not a great number of Saints, whom they worship with Divine Honours? The matter of fact is plain and confessed, and therefore our Church does not misrepresent them. So that the only Misrepresentation he can complain of, is, that he does not like the judgment of our Church about the worship of Saints and Images, and we cannot help that. This is the belief of our Church, and this is our belief, and let him prove us to be Misrepresenter in this, if he can; for that is not proved meerly by his calling it Misrepresenting.

Only I would gladly know of this Author, what he takes the judgment of the Church of England to be about the worship of Images? Whether it be Idolatry or not? If he thinks our Church charges them with Idolatry in worshipping Images, (which I suppute he means when he complains of Misrepresentation, and picks out some passages, which look that way) there is the authority of Dr. Godden against him (unless he has changed his mind lately) who accuses Dr. St. with contradicting the Church of England in his charge of Idolatry upon the Church of Rome, and makes it a certain mark of Fanaticism to do so: and then however we may be thought to misrepresent the Church of Rome in this charge of Idolatry, we do not misrepresent the Church of England in it, which is some satisfaction to us, that we are not Misrepresenter on both sides. But these Men take great liberties in Representing the Faith and Doctrines of Churches. In one Kings Reign the Church of England does not charge the Church of Rome with Idolatry, in the next it does; though their Articles and Homilies be the same still: but they deal with the Church of England no worse than they do with their own Church; in one Age a Bellarmine truly Represents the Doctrine of their Church, in another a Bishop of Condom; and though the Council of Trent be but one
one and the same, the Faith of it alters very often, as it may be fit serve the interest of the Catholick Cause.

Our Author having expos'd the Protestant Character (as he calls it) of a Papist, which he always looked upon no other, than of a Papist Misrepresented, he falls a commending the zeal of Protestants against such Popery with great earnestness and passion, and therein we agree with him, as believing it to be very commendable; and do not doubt (as he says) but those Martyrs recorded by Fox, who for not embracing this Popery passed the fiery Tryal, had surely a glorious Cause, and that the Triumphs and Crowns of Glory, which waited for them in Heaven, were not inferior to what those enjoyed, who suffered under Decius or Dioclesian. I agree with him also, that there is no need of any longer disagreement, that there is no necessity of keeping up names of division; that Protestant and Papist may now shake hands, and by one subscription close into a Body, and join in a fair and amicable correspondence: For if (as he says) there is no Papist, but will give his hand for the utter suppressing this kind of Popery, I see no reason, why they may not join in Communion with the Church of England, which has suppressed it. But I am not of his mind, that all the Strife has been about a word; for the Dispute has been about the Worship of Saints, Images; about Transubstantiation, worshiping the Host, Communion in one kind, Service in an unknown Tongue, the authority and the use of the Holy Scriptures, the Sacrament of Penance, Indulgences, Purgatory, the Popes Supremacy; and several other material differences; which are something more than a mere Word; will they now part with all these Doctrines and Practices, since they have been informed by great and good authorities, what the nature and evil tendency of these things is? No! by no means, they will retain all these Doctrines and Practices still, but will renounce and abhor all that evil, which Protestants charge them with. They will pray to Saints, and worship Images still, but they will abhor all Heathenish Idolatry in such Worship, but what reason is this for Protestants to join with them in one Communion, while they retain the same Faith and Worship, which at first made a separation necessary, and we retain the same opinion of their Faith and Worship, which ever we had? If Papists be the same, & Protestants the same, that ever they were, if Separation were once:
once necessary, surely it is so still. What change is there now in Papists, which was not before, that should now invite us to embrace their Communion? Yes they abhor all that which Protestants call Popery. This is good news, but let us a little better understand it. Do they abhor the Worship of Saints and Images, and the Hoft? Do they abhor the Doctrines of Transubstantiation, Penance, Indulgences, Purgatory? Do they renounce the Popes Supremacy, &c. no such matter! but they abhor those Opinions, which Protestants have of these things; did they then ever believe that these Doctrines and Practices were so bad, as Protestants always did, and to this day, say they are? if not, what change is there in them, that should invite us now to a reconciliation? Did Protestants separate from Papists, because they believed, that Papists thought Idolatry lawful? If not, why is their abhorring Idolatry, while they do the same things, that ever they did, a sufficient reason for a re-union? Suppose some Common-wealths-men, who take up Arms against the King, should tell the Royalists, who fight for him, that they have all this while mistaken one another, that for their parts they hate Rebellion, as much as they can do, and have been greatly misrepresented by those who have called them Rebels; the strife has been only about a word, and therefore it is time for them now to join all together, not in their duty to their Prince, but in opposing him; though I dare not smile at our Author for fear of his displeasure again, yet I fancy a good Subject would entertain such a proposal with a very disdainful smile.

And therefore as for misrepresenting, our Author may complain on till he is a weary, but he can never prove us to be Misrepresenter, while they still own that Faith and Worship, which we charge them with, and if he thinks we censure their Doctrine and Worship too severally, let him vindicate it, when he can.

In my Reply I considered, what were the faults of his twofold Character of a Papist misrepresented, and represented, and shall now briefly examine, what he says to it.

As for the Character of a Papist misrepresented, I observed, 1. That he put such things into the Character, as no Man in his wits ever charged them with: As that Papists are not permitted
to hear Sermons, which they are able to understand, or that they held is lawful to commit Idolatry; or that the Papist believes the Pope to be his great God, and to be far above all Angels, which the Answerer calls Childish and wilful mistakes. And yet (says the Protestant, p. 19.) those very things almost in express terms, and others far more absurd, we see charged on them, as is showed above; that is in the Quotations out of the Archbishop and others. But I can see no such thing, unless the Supremum numen in terris (as Stapleton calls Greg. 13.) signifies that the Pope is their great God, and then I must beg his pardon, that I did not think any Man in his wits so silly, as it seems some of their own great Divines have been, for this is not a Protestant, but a Popish representation of them.

2. I found fault, That the Opinions of Protestants concerning Papist Doctrines and Practices, and those ill consequents which are charged and justly charged upon them, are put into the Character of a Papist misrepresented, as if they were his avowed Doctrine and Belief. For whosoever gives a Character of a Papist, ought only to represent, what his Faith and Practice is, not what Opinion, he, who gives the Character, has of his Faith and Practice: for this does not belong to the Character of a Papist, but only signifies his own private Judgment, who gives the Character; while we charge Papists only with matter of Fact, what they believe and what they practise, this is a true Character, and no Misrepresenting; but if we put our own Opinions of his Faith and Practice into his Character, this is Misrepresenting, because a Papist has not the same Opinion of these things, which we have, and this makes it a false Character.

To this the Protestant answers, p. 20. This is a pretty speculative quarrel, I confess, and might deservedly find room here, were it our business to consider the due method of misrepresentation in the abstract: But as our present concern stands, here's a quaint conceit lost for coming in a wrong place. For what had the Author of the Misrepresentation to do with these Rules? He did not intend to misrepresent any Body. This is very pleasant! a Man, who undertakes to make Characters, is not bound to consider, what a Character is, nor what belongs to representing, nor misrepresenting. Any Man would have thought so indeed, who had read his Characters, but I never expected, that he should have said so. But he did not intend to misrepresent any Body, and therefore had nothing to do with these Rules; but he intended, it seems, to give an account, how Papists are misrepresented by Protestants, and therefore ought to have understood, what is Misrepresenting, and not have called that Misrepresenting, which is not.
But his Province (he says) was only to draw forth the Character of a Papist; as it is commonly apprehended by the Vulgar or the Multitude, with the common prejudices and mistakes that generally attend such a notion. Now I would fain know, whether this Character, as it lies in the Peoples heads, is distinguished into antecedents and consequents: whether they, when they hear one declaiming against Popery for committing Idolatry, as bad or worse than that of the grosseft Heathens, worshipping Stocks and Stones for Gods, distinguisheth between the Doctrine of the Papists, and these interpretations and consequences charged against it.

Thus in short he tells us, The Character of a Papist Misrepresented was intended only, as the Author expresses himself in his introduction, for a Copy of Popery as painted in the imagination of the Vulgar, and if it be conform to that, it is exact and perfect; and if there be any faults in it, the blame must fall on those, who drew the Original. This is the sum of his excuse for putting such things into the Character of a Papist Misrepresented, as do not belong to Character-making, nor are in a strict and proper sense Misrepresentations. That the common People, who do not distinguish between Antecedents and Consequents, have such an idea and notion of a Papist, as he has described in the Character of a Papist Misrepresented. Well, suppose this, how does this mend the matter? If his Character of a Papist Misrepresented, be no Misrepresentation, then our People, who have this notion of a Papist, are not Misrepresenter. Now this is that, which I undertook to prove in my Reply. That there is nothing of misrepresentation, properly so called, in his Character of a Papist Misrepresented; It is a falle Character indeed, because it contains such things, as are not matters of Representation, but of Dispute, and therefore do not belong to a Character; but separate matters of Fact from matters of Opinion and Dispute, as I have particularly done in my Reply, and the Character of a Papist Misrepresented contains no matter of Fact, excepting some very few things, but what the Character of the Papist Represented owns. And therefore as far as it can be called a Character, it is a true one. And if this (as he says) be a Copy of Popery as painted in the imagination of the Vulgar, the Original can have no more of misrepresentation in it, than the Copy has.

But though the Protefter does acknowledge, that there is a real difference between Representing the Doctrines and Practices of Papists, and declaring our own Judgment and Opinion concerning them, he suspects the People do not distinguish between Antecedents and Consequents, between the Doctrines of the Papists and these interpretations, and consequences charged on it.
They swallow all down greedily in the lump, Antecedents and Consequents go down with them all at once. But what does he mean by this? that any Protestant People are so silly as to think that Papists believe as bad of their own Religion, as they believe of it? That Papists believe Idolatry to be lawful, as he tells us in the Character of a Papist Misrepresents; or that they believe the Worship of an Image to be Idolatry? no, I assure him, our People are taught, what Popery is in its genuine purity, as he speaks; they know in the most material points, what the Doctrine of the Church of Rome is, and are taught, what to think of it; and when they hear or read our Disputes against the Church of Rome, they are not so weak as to believe, that we and Papists have the same Opinions about Worshipping Saints and Images, and the Host, &c. and therefore are not in danger of affixing such Opinions on Papists, as they bear us charge on Popery. So that this is a very needless fear he is in, and if nothing else hinders, he may (as he promises) reform his Character of a Papist Misrepresents.

I must confess we are pretty positive in declaring to our People the evil and danger of Popery. We tell them what we think of it, not as thinking signifies doubtfulness and uncertainty, but an assured persuasion founded on Reason, Scripture, and the best Authorities: as he complains, that we go beyond thinking, and instead of saying we think so, we positively say, so it is. But if we are in the right, there is no hurt in this, and we shall believe so, till they can prove, that we are in the wrong; we do not indeed pretend to Infallibility, but we think our selves as certain, as those who do.

This is the sum of what he says in defence of his Character of a Papist Misrepresents, that though he acknowledges my distinction to be good between Matters of Dispute and of Representation; and consequently that his Character of a Papist Misrepresented has nothing of misrepresentation in it, truly so called; yet he says, this is the Idea of a Papist, as it is commonly apprehended by the Vulgar, who do not distinguish between Antecedents and Consequents, but whatever they hear said of Popery, they take to be the Faith of a Papist, without distinguishing what it is the Papists own, and believe, and practice, and what guilt Protestants charge them with for thus believing and doing: that when they hear the Papists charged with Idolatry for Worshipping Images, they as verily think, that Papists believe Idolatry to be lawful, as
they do, that they believe it lawful to Worship Images. If there be any among us so very silly, I dare say, they can neither Read nor Write, and therefore he might have spared his pains in writing and printing Characters for them; and if his Character of a Papist (as he says) be what he thought of a Papist, while he himself was a Protestant, it seems he was in a very low dispensation then, and could not himself distinguish between Antecedents and Consequences, but swallowed all down together, though he is now improved into a Writer of Characters; and may they never have any wiser Converts. However this does plainly yield the cause, that the Protestant Clergy, and understanding Gentry and Laity, who can distinguish between Antecedents and Consequences, are no Misrepresen-ters; and as for others, we fear, they have a great many more Misrepresen-ters on their side, than we hope, we have on ours.

Let us now consider his Character of a Papist Represented, and what the faults of that are. Now the general fault is, that whereas one might reasonably expect, that there should be some difference between the Character of a Papist Misrepresen-ted, and of a Papist Represented, and he has endeavoured to make his Readers believe, that there is, yet in truth there is none in most parts of the Character. For what does strictly belong to Representation, that is, all matter of Fact, is the same in both. For, 1. He having put the Opinions of Protestants concerning Papish Doctrines and Practices into the Char-acter of a Papist Misrepresented, as if they were his avowed Doctrine and Belief, in the Character of a Papist Represented he denies, that he believes those Interpretations and Consequences; and this he might very easily do, because (as he observes, p. 24,) no body charges him with that belief; and where-as he says, then he contradicts no Body, and he hopes there is no fault in that, he is so far in the right; but his fault is, that he imposes upon his Reader, with an appearance of a Misrepresen-tation, when there is none; and by his denying that he believe such things, would perivade the World, that Prote-stants charge Papists with believing all these ill things them-selves, which we lay of their Faith and Worship; a sign that he was hard put to it, to find out some Protestant Misrepresen-tations of Papists. And 2. As for matter of Fact, which alone is proper for a Character, he generally owns the Doctrines and Practices we charge them with; and his saying, how could this possibly be otherwise, if they charge us with none, but what we ex-
presently profess to own (in which he reflects upon what I had said in my Reply, that we charge them with believing nothing, but what they expressly profess to believe) is nothing to the purpose; for it is not absolutely what we charge them with, but what he himself makes us charge them with in his Character of a Papist Misrepresented, and calls us Misrepresenter for doing so, that he owns in the Character of a Papist Represented, as I particularly shewed in my Reply; now the question is, why he calls one Character a Misrepresentation, and the other a Representation, when the matter of Fact is the same in both?

But then (3.) I observed, that in some cases he disowns that to be the doctrine and belief of their Church, which manifestly is so, and has been proved on them, beyond all possibility of a fair Reply, by the learned Answerer. To which he答wers: then for all his word, we are in some cases charged with more than we expressly profess to believe. But he must know we do not take the profession of the Roman Faith from every private Character-maker, but from the authentick Records of their Church; and if they deny what their Church teaches, and requires them to believe, it is not indeed their Faith, but yet it ought to be so: and though he may 'huff at manifestly and proving,' I suspect, he will take a little time before he brings it to the Tryal.

This is a sufficient answer to his fresh complaint of Misrepresentations. I now proceed to the second part of the Reply. The rule of true Representing, or the Rule whereby the Doctrine of the Church of Rome is to be known. He appealed to the Council of Trent, and the Catechism ad Parochos, and these I acknowledged to be authentick Rules; but since Catholick Divines differ about the sense of the Council and Catechism, the question is, Why we must prefer his sense of the Council and Catechism before Cardinal Bellarmin's, or any other Divines of Note and Eminency in the Church of Rome, who lived since the Council of Trent, and may be presumed to understand the meaning of it, as well as the Representer; and therefore to remove this difficulty in his Reflections he appealed to the Bishop of Condom, as the Authentick Expositor of the Council and Catechism, and told us, how his Book had been approved by many Bishops, and Cardinals, and by the present Pope himself, and therefore has the authority of the See Apostolick.

To this I answered in my Reply (p. 44.) that the attestation given to Cardinal Bellarmin's Controversies was not inferior.
rior to that given to the Bishop of Condom's Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church; that it was Dedicated to Pope Siximus 5. and that with the Popes leave and good liking, which is not much inferior to a testimonial under the Popes hand; and why then are not Bellarmin's Controversies as authentick a rule for the Exposition of the Catholick Faith, as the Bishop of Condom's? But to this he thought fit to answer nothing.

And whereas he pretends that the Popes approbation gives it the authority of the Apostolick See: I acquainted him out of Melchior Canus: That the name of the Apostolick See does not signify the Pope in his private capacity, but in his Chair, or doing such things, and in such a manner, as belong to the Papal Chair, that is, not giving his own private sense, but proceeding in Council with the advice of good and learned Men; and therefore that is not to be accounted the judgment of the Apostolick See, which is given only by the Bishop of Rome, privately, maliciously, and inconsiderately, or with the advice only of some few of his own mind, but what he determines upon a due examination of the thing, by the advice and Counsel of many wise Men.

To this the Protester answers that it is only an ungrounded and ill-turned consequence, that because that is not to be accounted the judgment of the Apostolick See, which is given only by the Pope, privately, maliciously, and inconsiderately, or with the advice only of some few of his own mind, therefore this learned Prelates Exposition of the Catholick Faith is to be thrown by, as of no Authority, so that our Replier has here concluded without any more ado, that the approbation of this Book was only given privately, maliciously, inconsiderately, or else with the advice only of some few of the Popes own mind, otherwise the Consequence will not hold. But I thought Canus had told us, what was necessary to make the Popes approbation the judgment of the Apostolick See, as well as what hinders it from being so. That the Pope must give judgment according to the due form and method of proceedings belonging to the Apostolick Chair, in full Council, after due examination, and with the advice of many wise Men. Now I only desire to know, whether the Pope in a full Council of Cardinals, did give judgment ex Cathedra, that the Bishop of Condom's Book was a true Exposition of the Catholick Faith; For if he did not, though the Pope and all his Cardinals should singly for themselves give their own private judgment and approbation of it, according to Canus his rule, it is not
not the judgment of the Apostolick See; for it is a private judgment, whether it be malicious or not, which I was so far from concluding without more ado, that, as the Protefter observes, I did not so much as translate it, (though I put it in the Latine Quotation in the Margin, which is an argument I did not designedly conceal it) because I thought it was needless to my purpose: and yet the Consequence holds good without it, if it be not a judgment ex Cathedra, it is not the judgment of the Apostolick See, which was all I intended to prove; and our Author in his long harangue has said nothing to prove that it was, nay is so far from that, that he avoided the very mentioning of that, because he knew not what to say to it. Malitiously and inconsiderately were pretty words to declaim upon, but the Cathedra choaked him.

The truth is the principal Commendation, which is given to the Bishop of Condom's Book, is, that it is a new way of dealing with Hereticks, and that which they hope may be more effectual than Disputing has been; but there is none of them, that make it the Rule, much less the only Rule of the Catholick Faith. Cardinal de Buillon acquaints Cardinal Bona, that there are some (and he speaks of Catholicks) who find some fault in it; and Cardinal Sigismond Chigi in his Letter to the Abbot of Dangeau, though he highly commends him, yet is far from allowing his Book to be the Standard of the Catholick Faith, or the Authentick interpretation of the Council of Trent, when he tells the Abbot, certainly it was never his (Condom's) intention to give the interpretation of the Tenets of the Council, but only to deliver them in his Book right-ly explicated, in such sort, that Hereticks may be convinced: that is, he did not allow him to interpret the Council, but commends him for dealing with Hereticks in a new, and, as he thought, more advantageous method, than had been formerly used; and to this purpose the Pope commends him, that his Exposition of the Catholick Faith contains such Doctrine, and is composed in such a method, and with so much prudence, that it is thereby rendered proper to instruct the Readers clearly in few words, and to extort even from the unwilling, a confession of the Catholick Faith. Now to me this seems to fall very short of making the Bishops Exposition the Authentick interpretation of the Council of Trent; that what ever the Bishop of Condom says, is the sense of the Council, must be acknowledged to be so, though other, as good Catholick Divines, as famous in their Generation, and;
and whose Books have been received with as universal appro-
bation, are of another mind; and which signifies a little with-
us Protestants, where the plain words and reason of the
Council is against him.

I would desire our Author to tell me, whether the Pope, when
he approved the Bishop of Condons Book, did at the same time
condemn Cardinal Bellarmin's, or those other Divines and
Schoolmen, who give such a different explication of the Coun-
cil of Trent, from what this Bishop does; if he did not, what
authority he has given to this Exposition, more than any other
Catholic Doctor may challenge? Why may we not, if we
please, follow Bellarmin, or Suarez, or Vazquez, or Cajetan, as
well as Condons? Our Author thinks it the shortest and easiest
way to decide this Controversie whether he have truly Repre-
sented the Faith of a Papist, by making an experiment: Thus he concluded his Reflections, p. 19. Do but you, or any
Friend for you (though I did not know before, that the
Church of Rome would admit Proxies in the profession of
our Faith) give your assent to these Articles of Faith, as I
have Represented it, in the very form and manner as I have staled
them, in that Character of a Papist Represented; and if upon your re-
quest, you are not admitted into the Communion of the Roman Ca-
tholicks, and owned to believe aright in all those points, 'Tis then
confess, that I have abused the World; that my Representing is Mis-
presenting the Faith of the Papist. To this I answered in my
Reply, p. 40. that I did believe that his Representation was
the Faith of a Papist, excepting what concerned the deposing
Doctrine, and some few other points, which I had before
particularly remarked (not that this is the whole of what
Papist's believe, but that it is right as far as it goes) but we
did not like his Faith so well, as he had Represented it, as to
make the experiment. This I thought had been answer
enough for any reasonable Man, but in his Answar to the Re-
ply, he is still for new experiments, as being much easier than
Disputing, which he does not like, and now the trial is, That if
now withstanding my refusal to admit the deposing Doctrine, and the
Popes Infallibility, but as stated by the Representer (that is, not as
Articles of Faith) I be not judged sufficiently qualified as to these
points, to be received into the Communion of the Roman Catholicks,
then he will grant, that I have reason to charge the Representer not to
have done his part in these particulars, that is, not to have truly
Represented the Faith of a Papist.
Now in answer to this, I beg his leave, that I may take my turn too in making Proposals, and I will do it very gravely, without the least Smile, since I see he is offended at it; and that is this. Suppose I should resolve to be a thorough-paced Papist, and instead of assenting to his Representation, should rather choose that Representation, which Cardinal Bellarmine has made of the Faith of a Papist, who does not mince the matter, as to worshipping Images, and praying to Saints, and trusting in their aid and assistance, &c. who makes the Popes Infallibility and his Deposing Power an Article of Faith; should I be thought sufficiently qualified, as to these Points (wherein the Cardinal expressly contradicts and condemns our Authors, and the Bishop of Condom's Representation) to be received into the Communion of Roman Catholicks? If I should (and I will venture the Protestor to say, that I should not,) then if his Argument from Experience be good; it is plain, That Cardinal Bellarmine has made a true Representation of the Roman Catholick Faith; and thus we have Experience for both sides, for Cardinal Bellarmine, and for the Bishop of Condom, and our Representer; and yet it is somewhat strange, they should be all true Representers, especially in those points, wherein they contradict each other.

This the Bishop of Condom was aware of, and therefore concludes his Book with a Caution against it to those, who should think fit to answer it. That it would be a quitting the design of this Treatise, to examine the different Methods which Catholic Divines make use of, to establish or explicate the Doctrine of the Council of Trent, and the different Consequences, which particular Doctors have pois. p. 51. drawn from it. Which is a plain Confession, that other Catholic Divines do not agree with him in this Method, nor allow of those narrow Bounds, which he has set to the Catholic Faith; and therefore it was wisely done of him to persuade his Answerers, to take no notice of any such Disagreement, and it will be a great piece of Civility and good Breeding in them not to do it; but how other Catholic Divines will take this, I cannot tell.

This is enough in all Conscience concerning the Bishop of Condom's Authority, which I must still say is nothing, when we speak of an Authentick Rule of expounding the Catholic Faith, in which sense our Author appeals to him; though we will allow him the Authority of a wise and prudent man, whose writings are published and approved by Publick Authority, as the writings of other Catholic Doctors are, which is all the Authority we Pro-
testants give to our best Writers; and therefore the ProteSter has no reason to complain (as he does p. 27.) of an uneven kind of Justice and Reasoning in this matter, and whoever desires a more particular account of the Bishop of Condom's Authority, and those Glorious Testimonies which are given to his Book, if he be a reasonable man, may find Satisfaction in the Preface to the late Answer to the Bishop of Condom.

But the truth is, I know no reason there is for all this Dispute. I told the Reflector before, that I did not like his Faith, though it were as he has represented it; should we allow the Bishop of Condom's Exposition, and his Character of a Papist represented, to contain the true Catholick Faith, and that this is the whole of what the Council of Trent has determined, yet I can never be of this Religion; and since he was not satisfied with my bare telling him so, I will now give him some Reasons for it, and particularly shew him, what it is I dislike in Monsieur de Meaux the late Bishop of Condom his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church about the Object of Worship, Invocation of Saints, and worship of Images, and take the flourishes of his Introduction into the bargain. And I chuse these Heads, because these are the matters, wherein he principally appeals to the Bishop of Condom, and about which only he has offered any thing like an Argument, in his answer to my Reply: And I am as glad to take any opportunity of useful Discourse, as our Author seems cautious not to give any. And that neither he nor the Bishop may have any occasion of Quarrel, I shall observe the Directions the Bishop has given to those, who think fit to answer to his Treatise.

He tells us; To urge any thing solid against this Treatise (the Exposition) and which may come home to the point, it must be proved, that the Churches Faith is not here faithfully expounded, and that by Acts, which the same Church has obliged herself to receive; or else it must be shewn, that this Explication leaves all the Objections in their full force, and all the disputes untouched; or in fine it must be precisely shewn, in what this Doctrine subverts the foundations of Faith. As for the first of these, it is done already to my hand, in the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly represented, in answer to the Papist misrepresented and represented. And he must be as bold a man, who will attempt to mend that Author, as who attempts to confute him. The other two I will have in my eye in examining, as far as I am now concerned, Monsieur de Meaux late Bishop
Bishop of Condom his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church in matters of Controversie.

S E C T. I.

The Design of this Treatise.

Were it possible to reconcile the Differences between us and the Church of Rome, only by a fair Representation of matters in Controversie between us; I should think it an admirable Design; and this being all the Author professes to intend, I cannot but highly commend his good Meaning in it; whether he has shewn so much Skill and Judgment, in undertaking a Design in its own nature impracticable, I shall leave to the Reader to judge, when he has fairly heard both sides. Had I known no more of the matter, but that the Reformation was begun by men brought up in the Communion of the Church of Rome, and intimately acquainted with the Doctrines and Practices of that Church; that some of these Corruptions, both before and since, have been complained of by men of that Communion; that the Council of Trent, which was convened upon this occasion, condemns many Doctrines of the Reformers, as contrary to the Catholick Faith, and guilty of Heresie; that both before and after this Council, there have been many Volumes written, and many fine Disputes between Popish and Protestant Divines, who have been men of as great Learning and true Understanding in these matters, as any the Age has bred, who did all this while believe, that there was areal and substantial difference between them: I say, when I consider these things, I should not venture, for the reputation both of Papists and Protestants, especially of the Council of Trent, to say, That the Dispute has been only about Words; that Papists and Protestants, even the most Learned men among them, have mistaken each others Propositions; and that the only way to reconcile this Difference, is so to state the matter in dispute, that Papists and Protestants may understand each other. I doubt not, but fierce men on both sides, may have made this difference much wider than it is: but yet such a difference there is, as no Representing can cure, as I believe will appear by considering Particulars.
SECT. II.

Those of the Reformed Religion acknowledge, that the Catholick Church embraces all the Fundamental Articles of the Christian Religion.

That the Church of Rome does profess to believe all the Principal and Fundamental Articles of Faith, as the Bishop affirms, I readily grant; but yet he may hold Fundamental Errors, and destroy that Faith she professes, by other Doctrines destructive of the true Catholick Faith. That this is possible, he cannot deny, for men may believe inconsistent Propositions; and the Design of his Book is so to explicate the peculiar Doctrines of the Church of Rome, as to reconcile them with the Fundamental Articles of Faith, which the Protestant Explication of Popish Doctrines contradicts and overthrows; which had been a very needless Undertaking, were it impossible for men, who believe all the Fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith, to believe any thing contrary to it. He might then have spared his pains in vindicating and explaining particular Doctrines; for it had been evidence enough, that such Doctrines and Practices do not overthrow any Fundamental Article of Faith, because they are owned by that Church, which professes to believe all Fundamental Articles.

And therefore I cannot well guess, what advantage he promised himself from this. We may safely grant, that the Church of Rome believes all Fundamental Articles, and yet charge her with such Doctrines and Practices, as destroy and tear up Foundations.

He observes indeed from M. Daille, that we ought not to charge men with believing such Consequences, as they themselves do formally reject; nor do we charge any such thing upon the Church of Rome, but M. Daille never said, that we may not charge mens Doctrines and Practices with such Consequences, as they, who teach these Doctrines, disown; for M. Daille himself, in the place quoted by the Bishop, charges the Opinion of the Lutherans, and of the Church of Rome, about the manner of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament, with inferring the destruction of the Humanity of Jesus Christ: and therefore the Bishop concludes too much, when
he infers; *It is then a certain Maxime established amongst them, that they must not in these cases look upon the Consequences, which may be drawn from a Doctrine, but purely upon what he proposes and acknowledges, who teaches it. But the use M. Daille makes of it, is only this. That when such ill Consequences, as mens Doctrines are justly chargeable with, have no ill influence upon Worship, or as he speaks, no poison in them; if they disown such Consequences, this ought not to break Christian Communion. And therefore, though no man ought to be received into the Communion of the Church, who denies the Humanity of Jesus Christ; yet the National Synod at Charenton admits Lutherans to the Holy Table; because whatever might be inferred from their Doctrine, yet they expressly owned the Humanity of Christ; and this Doctrinal Consequence was a mere Speculative Error, which made no change at all in Acts of Worship; but when the Consequences are not meerly speculative, but practical, and do not so much concern, what other men believe, and think, as what we ourselves are to do, as it is in the Worship of Saints and Images, and the Host, &c. to say, that we must have no regard to Consequences, if the Church disowns them, is to say, that we must not consider the nature and tendency of our Actions, nor what they are in God's account, but only what the Church thinks of them: and therefore though we will not charge the Church of Rome, with believing any Consequences, which she disowns; yet if her Doctrines and Practices corrupt the Christian Faith and Worship, it is fit to charge her with such Corruptions; and if the Charge be just, though she disown it, it will justify our Separation from her Communion.

S E C T. III.

Religious Worship is terminated in God alone.

The account the Bishop gives of that Interior Adoration which is due to God alone, is very sound and Orthodox; that it consists principally in believing he is the Creator and Lord of all things, and in adhering to him with all the powers of our Soul, by Faith, Hope, and Charity, as to him alone, who can render us happy by the Communication of an infinite Good, which is himself. But there are two things I except against in this Section, as not fairly stated: First, con-
The Bishop very well knew, that this is the main Seat of the Controversie between us, and had he intended by his Exposition, to have put an end to our disputes; he should have taken a little more care about this Point; for as he has now stated it, he has left the matter just as he found it. We say, that all Religious Worship ought not only to terminate in God, as its necessary End; but that God is the sole and immediate Object of all Religious Worship, and that we must worship none besides him, as our Saviour expounds the Law. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve, Matth. 4. We have always denied any relative Worship to be due to Creatures; for to worship Creatures, is to make them Gods, and it is no honour to the Supreme God, to advance his own Creatures to divine Honours, to make more, though inferior, Gods for God's sake. We say, all external Acts of Religious Worship, are peculiar and appropriate to God, as well as Sacrifice; for since we must worship none but God, whatever can be called Religious Worship, must be given to none besides him; and the Bishop has not dealt plainly in this matter; he says, that Sacrifice can be offered to none but God, but he has not told us, what he thinks of other external Acts of Worship, whether they may be paid to some excellent Creatures: for since Sacrifice is not a natural but instituted Worship; if nothing but Sacrifice is peculiar to God, then all external natural Worship is common to God and Creatures, and then in the state of nature, there could be no external and visible Difference, between the worship of God and Creatures; nor had there been any under the Gospel neither, had not Christ instituted his last Supper, which the Church of Rome has transformed into a Sacrifice of his natural Flesh and Blood.

Thus when he says, that all Religious Worship ought to terminate in God, as its necessary end, this seems to me an ambiguous Expression.
Pression; for Worship properly terminates in the Object to which it is given; and in this sense, if all Religious Worship must terminate in God, then all Religious Worship must be given to God, and to none else; which is the true Catholic Faith, that God is only to be worshipped. But then what becomes of that Religious Worship which is given to the Virgin Mary, and Saints, in relation to God? Does not this Worship, which is given to them, terminate in them, and not in God? Are not they the immediate and proper Objects of that Worship, which is given to them? And does not the Object terminate the Worship? Is God the Object of that Worship, which they give to the Saints and Blessed Virgin? Then they either give that inferior Degree of Worship to God, which is proper for Creatures, which is an affront to his Majesty and Greatness; or they give that Worship to Creatures, which is proper to God, which is Idolatry. Which plainly shews, that that Worship, which is given to Creatures, is terminated in those Creatures to which it is given; and therefore if any degree of Religious Worship be given to Creatures, all Religious Worship does not terminate in God, as he said it must; and if all Religious Worship must terminate in God, then no Religious Worship must be given to Creatures, as he grants it may, to the Virgin Mary and Saints.

Yes, you will say, that Worship, which is given to the Saints and Blessed Virgin, terminates in God, because it is given them upon account of their Relation to God; but this is a great mistake; their Relation to God can only serve for a Reason why they are worshipped; but cannot terminate that worship on God which is given to them; because not God, but they themselves are the Object, and the ultimate Object of that Worship, which is given to them.

Though we should grant, that God is honoured by that Worship, which is given to some excellent Creatures, who are his Friends and Favourites, yet the Honour we do to God in this, is of a very different nature from that Worship, which we pay to Creatures; it does not consist in this, that the worship we give to Creatures is terminated on God, for it is terminated upon those Creatures whom we worship; but the Honour must consist in the Reason of our worship, that we worship them for God's sake: It is an Honour to God by Interpretation and Consequence, as we intend it for God's Honour, or as God is pleased to think himself honoured by it; but it is no act of Worship to God, and there-
therefore not terminated on him. The Worship can go no further than its proper Object, though the Reason of the Worship may: For there is a great deal of difference between an Object, and a Medium of Worship; a Medium of Worship, which is only a representative Object, receives our Worship, but does not terminate it, but convey it to that Being it represents; because it is worshipped only in the place and stead of another, as it is in that Worship, which is given to the Images of Christ and the Saints; which some Divines of the Church of Rome tell us, is not terminated on the Images, but on Christ or the Saints represented by those Images; but a proper Object of Worship, which receives worship in its own proper person, for whatsoever reason it is worshipped, it terminates the Worship; the Worship, which is given to it, goes not beyond it self, though the Reason of the Worship may reach farther, and be thought to reflect some Honour upon God, and to testify our Love and Reverence for him, by that Worship we pay to those, who are dear to him. So that if we do give Religious Worship to the Virgin Mary and Saints, such Worship is terminated on them, and then all Religious Worship is not terminated on God, as he says the Church of Rome teaches it must be, which yet teaches also the worship of Saints and the Blessed Virgin. Methinks he should have taken care, to have stated this matter a little plainer: For if he cannot reconcile the Doctrine and Practice of the Church together, I fear his Exposition will rather increase than end Controversies.

Thus how doubtfully does he speak; If the Honour she renders to the Blessed Virgin and to the Saints, may, in some sense, be called Religious, it is for its necessary Relation to God. Why does he not tell us plainly, whether this Honour the Church of Rome gives to Saints and the Virgin be Religious, or not, and in what sense it may be called Religious Honour? If he undertake to expound the Catholick Faith, why does he not do it? Why does he speak so cautiously? As if he were afraid to own, what the Faith of the Church is in this point? Which yet is a very material one, and very necessary to be truly stated. Thus I can understand, how the Honour, which is given to Creatures, may have Relation to God, viz. because we honour them for God's Sake, and upon account of their Relation to him; but I do not understand, how this relation to God, makes the Honour of Creatures a Religious Honour. For though we honour Creatures for God's Sake, yet the Honour we give to Creatures must be suitable to their own Natures,
tures, and therefore not that Religious Honour, which is proper to God only: As when we honour a man for the sake of our Father, or our Prince, we do not give him that Honour, which is proper to our Father, or our Prince, though we honour him for their Sakes. And therefore if the Church of Rome does give Religious Honour to any Creatures, it will not justify her, in giving religious Honour to Creatures, that she honours them for God's sake; for Creatures are Creatures still, though never so nearly related to God, and therefore not capable of Religious Honours.

So that I do not see, how this Explication, if it may be so called, takes off any Objection, that was ever made against the Church of Rome, about the Object of Religious Worship. For if by all Religious Worship being terminated on God, he means, that no other Being must be religiously worshipped but only God; then this is an invincible Objection against that Religious Worship, which the Church of Rome gives to the Blessed Virgin, and to Saints and Angels. If he means by it, that Religious Worship may be given to other Beings besides God, so it be all terminated in God, then all the other Objections, against worshipping any other Being besides God, are in full force still, notwithstanding his Explication: their Relation to God will not justify the Religious Worship of Creatures, and it is contrary to all Sense and Reason to say, That the Worship, which is given to Creatures, is terminated on God.

SECT. IV.

Invocation of Saints.

There are two great Opinions against that Worship, which the Church of Rome gives to Saints departed, who now reign with Christ in Heaven, as the Council of Trent teaches. 1. That it is to give them that Religious Worship, which is due only to God. 2. That it makes them our Mediators and Intercessors in Heaven, which is an Honour peculiar to Christ. Now M. de Meaux, and after him, the Author of the Character, think to remove these Objections, only by explaining the Doctrine of their Church about this matter; and I shall distinctly consider, what they say to each of these.

1. As for the first, That in praying to Saints they do not give them that Worship, which is due only to God, they think is evident
dent from hence, That the Council of Trent and the Catechism ad Parochos teaches them only, to pray to Saints to pray for them: The Bishop takes great pains to prove this to be the sense of the Council, and therefore, that in what terms soever those Prayers, which we address to Saints, are couched, the Intention of the Church, and of her Faithful, reduces them always to this Form. Now I will not dispute this matter at present, but refer my Reader to the Answer to a Papist misrepresented.

But let us suppose, that this is all the Church of Rome intends by it, that we should only pray to the Saints to pray for us, what advantage can they make of this? Yes, says the Advertisement before the Bishops Exposition, p. 12. To pray to Saints only to pray for us, is a kind of Prayer, which by its own nature, is so far from being referred by an Independent Being to himself, it can never be addressed to him: That is, we must never pray to God to pray for us; and therefore such a Prayer is no part of that Worship, which is due to God. And he adds, If this Form of Prayer, pray for us, diminished the trust we have in God, it would be no less condemnable to use it to the Living than to the Dead; and St. Paul would not have said so often, Brethren, pray for us: the whole Scripture is full of Prayers of this nature. Thus the Author of the Character, tells us.

In this he does not at all neglect coming to God, or rob him of his honour, but directing all his Prayers up to him, and making him the ultimate Object of all his Petitions, He only desires sometimes the just on Earth, sometimes those in Heaven to join their Prayers to his, that so the number of Petitioners being increased, the Petition may find better acceptance in the sight of God: and this is not to make them Gods, but only Petitioners to God: He having no hopes of obtaining anything, but of God alone.

This is the leaf that can possibly be made of that Worship, they give to Saints, which is not reconcileable with their practice neither; and if it should appear, that this (as little as it is thought to be) is to give that Worship to Creatures, which is due to God, they must e'en reject praying to Saints to pray for them, as they now do, trusting in their aid and assistances, and power to keep them.

Now I only ask, whether Prayer be not an Act of Religion, and a worship due to God? if it be not, why do they pray to God? if it be, then they give the worship of God to Saints, when they pray to them. For it is not so much, the matter of our Prayer, as the nature of Prayer, which makes it an Act of Religion. We may pray to God for those things, which men can give, viz. Food and
and Raiment, and yet these are as religious prayers, as when we ask such things of God, as none can give but himself; and by the same reason, though we pray to Saints only to do that for us, which a creature can do, that is, only to pray to God for us; yet our very praying to them is an Act of religious worship, which is due only to God.

The truth is, I am so dull, that I cannot see, what makes these new Reformers of the Roman-Catholic Doctrine and Worship, so shy of owning any other aid and assistance, which they expect from the Saints, but only their Prayers for them: for this makes no alteration at all in the nature of that worship, they pay to them. For suppose the Saints in Heaven (who now reign with Christ, as the Council affirms) were intrusted with the Guardianship of men, and the care of Saints on Earth, as Cardinal Bellarmine expressly says they are; might we not as lawfully pray to them to imploy that power, God has committed to them, for our good and happiness, as to use their interest with God for us by their prayers? Does one exalt you more above the condition of creatures than the other? May we not beg our Friends on Earth, to relieve our wants and necessities, as well as to pray for us? And if begging the prayers of our Friends on Earth, will justify our praying to the Saints in Heaven, to pray for us; our asking an Alms on Earth, will equally justify our begging the aid and assistance, as well as prayers, of the Saints in Heaven; and then we are just where we were. And if ever there were any good Arguments against praying to Saints, they are all good still, though they pray to Saints only to pray for them: which is my only business at present, to shew (according to the Bishop’s desire) that his Explication leaves all the Objections in full force, and all the Disputes untouched.

So that setting aside the matter of our prayers, or what it is we ask, which makes no alteration in this case, the inquiry is, Whether when we pray to Saints, we do not give that worship to them, which is peculiar and appropriate to God?

Now the Church of Rome, is so far from thinking such prayers to be the peculiar worship due to God, that she thinks it as innocent to pray to the Saints in Heaven to pray for us, as it is to desire the prayers of our Christian Brethren on Earth. The Bishop says, The Church is teaching us, that it is profitable to praying to Saints, teaches us to pray to them in the same spirit of Charity, and according to the same order of fraternal Society, which moves us to demand assistance of our Brethren living on Earth. The Character to the same purpose makes
makes our desiring sometimes the Saints on Earth, sometimes those in Heaven, to join their prayers with ours, to be Actions of the very same nature, and equally lawful. This is the true Pinch of the Controversie, and here it is we part with the Church of Rome; that we think, there is some difference between speaking to our Christian Brethren on Earth, whom we see, and converse with, and praying to the Saints in Heaven, with all the external expressions of religious worship and adoration: The first is to converse with them as men; the second is such a manner of Address, as is proper only for a God.

To pray to Saints, is somewhat more than to desire our Christian Friends to pray for us; it is suppliciter eos invocare, as the Council of Trent speaks, to invoke them, or call on them, in the manner of Supplicants; so that this must be acknowledged a worship of the Saints; and then it must be either a civil or religious worship; and which of these two it is, must be known by the manner of paying it. And therefore when all the circumstances of worship are religious, we must acknowledge the worship to be religious too: Such as praying to them in religious Places, in Churches and Chappels, and at consecrated Altars with bended knees, and hands and eyes lifted up, in a very devout manner, when they see no body to speak to, or to receive their Addresses, unless it be the Image of the Saint they worship. Thus some Nations worship their Gods, but no People ever paid their civil respects to each other in this manner.

But as I observed in my Reply (p. 66.) There is one infallible distinction between civil and religious worship, between the worship of God and men: That the worship of the invisible Inhabitants of the other World, has always been accounted religious worship. Civil respects are confined to this World, as all natural and civil Relations, which are the foundation of civil respects, are; but we have no intercourse with the other World, but what is religious. And therefore as the different kinds and degrees of civil honour, are distinguished by the Sight of the Object, to which they are paid, though the external acts and expressions are the same; as when men bow the body, and are uncovered, you know what kind of honour it is, by seeing who is present, whether their Father, their Friend, or their Prince, or some other Honourable Person; So the most certain mark of distinction between civil and religious worship is this, that the one relates to this World, the other to the invisible Inhabitants of the next. In this last Paragraph the Protester says (p. 35.) We have a Consequence and Comparison, and both so excellent in their kinds, that
that if any better connexion can be found in them, then between the Monument and the May-pole, it must be by one, who has found one trick more in Logick, than ever Aristotle knew. Sometimes indeed Aristotle's Logick does not do such feats, as one would expect; but a little natural Logick, called common sense, would have hewed him the connexion. For I think, there is some fence in saying, that as the different degrees of civil honour, though most of the external signs of honour be the same, such as kneeling, bowing the body, uncovering the head, may yet be distinguished by the presence of the Object, to which it is paid; whether it be our Father, or our Prince: So though the external signs of civil and religious honour, are in many instances the same, yet civil and religious worship may be visibly distinguished, by the object to which it is given: For civil worship can belong only to the Inhabitants of this World; but whatever worship is given to the invisible Inhabitants of the other World, is religious.

Now if this be so, then to pray to Saints, now they are removed out of this World into an invisible state, is to give religious worship to them; which makes a vast difference between praying to the Saints in Heaven to pray for us, and speaking to our fellow-Christians on Earth to pray for us.

The Protester is willing to grant, or at least suppose, that the honour or worship, which is given to the invisible Inhabitants of the other World, is religious worship; but still he says, it remains to be proved, that all religious respect and honour is so a divine honour, as to make a God of the thing, to which it is paid, at least constructively: This I think, is no hard matter to do; but I shall first consider his Arguments against it, and all that he says, is, That if it be true, it proves too much, and will bring myself in for a share with them, in giving religious worship to creatures, and so making Gods of them, at least constructively. He instances in that Custom of bowing to the Altar, or Communion Table, as he calls it, and bowing at the name of Jesus; but this shall be considered, when I come to the worship of Images. His other instances concern that religious respect, which we allow due to sacred places and things, and a religious decency to the bodies of Saints and Martyrs; but what is this to a religious worship. The respect we shew to such things and places, is no more than a civil respect, which consists in a decent usage, in seperating them from vile and common purposes; and it is called a religious respect, not from the nature of the respect, but from the reason, why we give it, viz. out of reverence to...
to God, to whose worship they are sepa rated. Thus that love and honour we pay to a living Saint, though it rise no higher than the expressions of a civil respect; may be laid to be religious, when we love and honour them for God’s sake; but this is an external denomination from the Cause and motive, not from the nature of the Act, and therefore cannot make Gods of them, because it is not religious worship; but to give proper religious worship to any Being, is to give it that worship, which is proper only to God, which is the only way to make any Being a God, which is not a God.

Now if this be a true notion, that all worship, which is given to the invisible Inhabitants of the other World, is religious worship, I will easily prove, that we must worship no other invisible Being, but God alone, and therefore cannot pray to Saints in Heaven, without giving the worship of God to them.

And my reason is this, Because God challenges all religious worship to himself; as our Saviour tells us, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve, Matth. 4. It seems to me a very needless dispute, what is the peculiar and incommunicable Worship, which must be given to none but the Supreme God, when God has appropriated all Religious Worship to himself, whatever act of religious Worship God requires us to pay to himself, must be given to none else; and therefore if all worship paid to invisible Beings, be in its own Nature religious Worship, we must worship no Invisible Being, but only God. For if all Worship of Invisible Beings be religious, and God challenges all religious Worship to himself, then we must worship no Invisible Being but only God; for to worship any other Invisible Being, is to give religious Worship to that, which is not God.

But the Protefter thinks I ought to have allowed, for the different Kinds and Degrees of Religious, as well as Civil Honour. Such I suppose as they call their Latria or Dulia, Supreme or Subordinate Absolute or Relative, Terminative or Transient Worship; but there is no place for these different Degrees and Distinctions of religious Worship, if we must worship no other Invisible Being, but only God; for if there be but one Object of religious Worship, there is no need to distinguish this Worship into different Kinds and Degrees, as Civil Worship is, which has very numerous and very different Objects. If we must give no Worship to any invisible Being besides God, it is ridiculous to dispute, what Degree of Worship we may lawfully give them, when we must give them none.

And
And it is a good Argument, that there are no different Kinds of Religious Worship; one which is Supreme and Soveraign, and due to the one Supreme God; other Inferiour and Subordinate Degrees of Worship, which may be paid to those Excellent Spirits, which are very dear to God, and the Ministers of his Providence; because there are no external and visible Signs, to distinguish between such different Degrees of religious Worship. As Civil Worship is confined to the Inhabitants of this World, and is thereby distinguished from religious Worship; so the Different Degrees of Civil Honour, though the External Signs and Expressions of it are the same, are distinguished by the visible Presence of the Object to which it is paid; for when a man bows or uncovers his head, we know what kind of Honour it is, by considering the Relation, or the Quality, of the Person, to whom it is paid, whether he be a Father, a Prince, or a wife and good man. But if there were more Invisible Beings than one to worship, though there might be different Degrees of Internal Honour and Worship paid to them, according to the different Apprehensions men had of their several Degrees of Perfection; yet the External Signs of Worship must be the same in all. And thus there would be no visible distinction, between the Worship of the Supreme God, and created Spirits, and Glorifyed Souls of dead men; and therefore if it be necessary to distinguish between the Worship of God and Creatures, we must worship no Invisible Being, but only the Supreme God.

The Protestant proposes some ways, whereby the different kinds and degrees of Religious Worship may be distinguished; as by the intention of the Giver; but this is not a Visible Distinction: For mens intentions are private to themselves, and there is no difference in the Visible Acts of Worship, to make such a distinction, or by some Visible Representation; that is, by Images: This I grant, would make as visible a Distinction between the Worship of God, and Christ, and the Virgin Mary, as the presence of the person distinguishes the Kinds and Degrees of Civil Honour; for when we see, whose Image they worship, we may certainly tell what Being they direct their Worship to; but the fault of this is, that it is forbid by the Law of God; of which more in the next Section; or by Determination of other Circumstances, but what these are, I cannot tell, and therefore can say nothing to it.

The Church of Rome indeed does appropriate the Sacrifice of the Mass to God, as his peculiar Worship, which must not be given to
to any other Being; and if this be so, then indeed we can certainly tell, when we see a Priest offering the Sacrifice of the Mass, that he offers it to the Supreme God; but there are a great many other Acts of Worship, which we owe to God, besides the Sacrifice of the Mass, and in every Act of Worship, God ought to be visibly distinguished from Creatures; and yet if all the other External Acts of Worship be common to God, and Creatures, where is the distinction? And yet the Sacrifice of the Mass can be offered only by the Priest, so that the whole Layety cannot perform any one Act of Worship to God, which is peculiar to him, and therefore can make no visible Distinction in their Worship between God and Creatures.

And yet the very Sacrifice of the Mass, is not so appropriated to God in the Church of Rome, but that it is offered to God in Honour of the Saints. This the Bishop of Condom (p. 7.) endeavours to excuse by saying; This Honour which we render them (the Saints) in Sacrificing, consists in naming them in the Prayers we offer up to God, as his Faithful Servants, and in rendering him thanks for the Victories they have gained, and in humbly beseeching him, that he would vouchsafe to favour us by their Intercession.

Now it is very true, according to the Council of Trent, the Priest offers the Sacrifice only to God, but they do somewhat more than name the Saints in their Prayers, for they offer the Sacrifice in Honour to the Saints, as well as to God, which the Bishop calls to Honour the Memory of the Saints: Now if Sacrifice be an Act of Honour and Worship to God, it founds very odly to worship or honour God for the Honour of his Saints, which seems to make God only the Medium of Worship to the Saints, who are the terminative object of it; and that the Saints are concerned in this Sacrifice appears from this, That by this Sacrifice they implore the Intercession of the Saints, that those whose Memories we celebrate on Earth, would vouchsafe to intercede for us in Heaven. The Bishop translates: imploret by Demand, for what reason I cannot tell; and makes this Imploring or Beseeching, to refer to God, not to the Saints, whose Patronage, Patrocinia, and Intercession they pray, they would vouchsafe them, contrary to the plain Sense of the Council, and I think to common Sense too: For I do not well understand offering Sacrifice to God, that he may procure for us the Intercession of the Saints; for if he can be persuaded to favour us so far, as to intercede with the Saints to be our Intercessors, he may as well grant our Requests without their Intercession; and yet
yet the Bishop was very sensible, that if we offer up our Prayers to the Saints in the Sacrifice of the Mafs, it does inevitably entitle them to the Worship of that Sacrifice, which, they fay, must be offered only to God. He alledge indeed St. Augustin's Authority, \textit{ut. Dei p. 8.} who understood nothing of this Mystery of the Sacrifice of the Mafs, and how far he was from thinking of any thing of this Nature, is evident to any man, who consults the place.

But the Church of Rome (as the Bishop observes p. 8.) has been charged by some of the Reformation, not only with giving the Worship of God to Creatures, when they pray to the Saints, but with attributing the Divine Perfections to them, such as a certain kind of Immensity and Knowledge of the Secrets of hearts; for if they be not present in all places, where they are worshipped, how can they hear the Prayers, which are made to them at such distant places at the fame time? If they do not know our thoughts, how can they understand those mental prayers, which are offered to them without words, only in our secret Thoughts and Desires? for even such Prayers are expressly allowed by the Council, \textit{voce velmente.}

Now to this he answers very well, that though they believe the Saints do by one means or other know the Prayers, which are made to them, either by the Ministry and Communication of Angels, or by a particular Revelation from God, or in his Divine Essence, in which all truth is comprised, yet never any Catholic yet thought, the Saints knew our Necessities by their own power, nor the desires which move us to address our secret Prayers to them. And to say a Creature may have a Knowledge of these things, by a light communicated to them by God, is not to elevate a Creature above his Condition. This I grant and therefore do acknowledge, that they do not attribute the Divine perfections of Omnificence and Omnipresence to the Saints, either in thought or word, but yet actions have as natural a signification as words; and if we give them such a worship, as naturally signifies Omnificence and Omnipresence, our worship attributes the incommunicable Perfections of God to them. For it is unnatural and absurd to worship a Being, who is not present to receive our worship; to speak to a Being, who does not, and cannot hear us; and since God has made us reasonable Creatures, to understand what we do, and why, he interprets our Actions, as well as words and thoughts, according to their natural signification. And herein the natural evil of creature-worship consists, That every act of religious worship does
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naturally
naturally involve in it a Confession of some excellency and perfection, which is above a created nature, and thereby (whatever the worshipper thinks or intend) does attribute the incommunicable Glory of God to creatures.

If the Saints are not present in all places to hear those Prayers which are made to them, and if they cannot hear in Heaven, what we say to them on Earth, by their own Power, then Prayer is a worship, which is not due to their nature, even in a glorified state. For no Being can have a right to our Prayers, who cannot hear them; and though we should grant, that God reveals our Prayers to them, yet to know by Revelation is not to hear. In this case all that can be reasonable for us to do, is only secretly to desire, that the Saints would Pray for us, which God can reveal to them, if he pleases, as well as our Prayers; but it can never be reasonable to Pray to those, who cannot hear us.

And if Prayer cannot be due to a created nature in its most exalted state, because no creature can be present in all places to hear our Prayers, then if it be a proper worship for Creatures, it must be so by a positive Institution of God; but then they must shew an express command for it, and when they can do that, we will dispute the reason of the thing no longer.

And this is a manifest reason, why we should worship no other invisible Being besides God, because no other invisible Being is capable of our Worship. God alone fills all places, and therefore may be worshipped, though we do not see him, for he is present every where to hear our prayers; but we cannot know, that any Being, of a limited presence, is present with us, unless we see it; and it is unnatural to pray to any Being, who is not present to hear us.

And though the Church of Rome does not directly and positively attribute any divine perfections to Saints, yet mankind are so naturally prone, to ascribe a kind of Divinity to immortal and invisible Spirits, that this is a sufficient reason, why God should not allow the worship of any invisible Spirits. For after all that can be said to the contrary, it is a mighty temptation to men, at least to make inferior Deities of those, to whom they constantly pay divine honours.

And though they do not attribute to Saints, a natural power to know our Thoughts, and to hear our Prayers, and to answer them; yet if this supernatural gift and power, whereby they do it, be as constant, and act as certainly as nature does, it is as great
great and adorable a perfection, as if it were natural: for since all created Excellencies are the gift of God, what mighty difference is there between a natural and supernatural perfection, or gift, if that which is supernatural, be as certain and lasting, and that which they can as constantly use, as that which is natural. As to take their own instance: Were the gift of Prophesie, which God bestowed on some in former Ages, as constant and certain, as natural knowledge; that they could use this gift, whenever they pleased, and as constantly foretel things to come, as they could reason and discourse; what difference would there be in this case, between a natural and supernatural knowledge of future things: truly no more but this; That a natural knowledge is a perfection, which God did originally bestow upon our nature: supernatural knowledge is an additional Perfection, but yet upon this supposition, as inseparably annexed to our natures, as natural knowledge, and always as ready for use as that; which I think, would make such a Prophet as truly venerable, as if Prophesie were natural to him.

Thus it is in this present case. If the Saints know our prayers, by what means for ever they do it, it must be as constant and lasting a gift, as if it were natural; that is, they must as certainly know when, and what we pray for, every time we pray, as if they were present to hear us. For if they do not always know our prayers, we can never know, when to pray, and can never have any security of their intercession for us; many thousand Ave Maries may be every day lost, and turn to no account; and if they do constantly know this by a supernatural gift, it is as glorious a perfection, as if this knowledge were natural. Mankind do not so critically distinguish between natural and supernatural gifts; in whomsoever these perfections are, they are divine, and such creatures have a supernatural kind of Divinity annexed to their natures; they are made Gods, though not Gods by nature, which is as much as any people believe of their inferior Deities, who believe but one Supreme and Sovereign God, who is a God by nature.

And yet the Author of the Character of a Papist represented, gives some instances, which would persuade us, that the Saints have a natural knowledge of our Prayers. Thus he tells us, That Abraham heard the petitions of Dives, who was yet at a greater distance, even in Hell, and told him likewise his manner of living, while as yet on Earth, (p. 4.) Now not to ask, how
This is the least that can be made of it, that the Mediation and Intercession of the Saints for us in Heaven, is no more than one Christians praying for another on Earth; and I fear this is not reconcileable with the practice of the Church of Rome in this matter. For can this (if it be no more) be thought a sufficient foundation, for all that pompous worship of the Virgin Mary, and other powerful Saints? Is this a good reason to erect Temples and Altars, consecrated not only to their Memory, but to their Honour; to set up their Images in Holy Places, and pay our humble Adorations before them; because they pray for us in Heaven, just as Christian Brethren pray for one another on Earth?

And therefore I must needs say, the Bishop has not truly expounded the Doctrine of the Church of Rome in this Point, which makes the Saints to be our Mediators in Heaven; not indeed Mediators of Redemption, which she acknowledges none to be but Christ, who has purchased us with his own Blood; but Mediators of Intercession, who have so much interest, and favour, in the Court of Heaven, as powerfully to recommend those to God, who put themselves under their Patronage. This I confess makes a great difference between the Mediation of Christ, and of the Saints, and yet leaves a great distance between the Prayers of Saints in Heaven for us, and the mutual Intercessions of Christians for each other on Earth, and the Church of Rome never taught, that they were of the same nature; for though the Catechism endeavours to prove, that the Mediation and Intercession of the Saints in Heaven for us, is not injurious to the Mediation of Christ; because the Prayers of Christians for each other on Earth, are very reconcileable with the Honour of Christ's Intercession: yet it never teaches, that there is no difference between the Prayers of Saints in Heaven, and Christians on Earth; and I think we ought to distinguish between the Doctrine and the Arguments of the Church. What she declares to be her Doctrine we must own to be so, but I think we must not grant every thing to be her Doctrine which ought to be supposed to make her Arguments good; because there is no necessity of granting, that all her Arguments must be good.

This Argument indeed, that the intercession of the Saints in Heaven, is no more injurious to the Mediation of Christ, than the Prayers and Intercessions of the Saints on Earth for each other, cannot be good without supposing, that the Intercessions of the Saints in Heaven are of the very same nature, with the Prayers
ers of Christians for each other on Earth; and the Bishop takes the advantage to represent this as the Doctrine of the Church, that she teaches us to pray to Saints in the same spirit of Charity, and according to the same order of fraternal society, which moves us to demand assistance of our Brethren living upon Earth. But this I think is not reconcilable with the express words of the Council of Trent, which founds the invocation of Saints upon their reigning with Christ; which makes a vast difference between their interest and authority in the Court of Heaven, and the humble supplications of Christians on Earth. And I think the spirit of Charity, and the order of fraternal society, does not require us suppliciter invocare, to pray to our fellow Christians on Earth as humble Supplicants to pray for us, as the Council teaches us to address our selves to the Saints in Heaven.

Christians indeed on Earth, and Saints in Heaven (since the Bishop has limited all their aid and assistance to their prayers) can do no more than pray for us; and are thus both of them distinguished from Christ, who is our Mediator of Redemption, who has bought us with his blood: But then we ought to consider, that there is a vast difference in prayers, and prayers may prevail upon such different Reasons, as may quite alter the nature of the Intercession. For is there no difference between the power and interest of a favourite, to obtain what he desires of his Prince, and the Petition of an ordinary Subject? A Prince may grant the Petition of a Subject for himself, or of one Subject for another, where there is reason and equity in the case, without any more powerful intercession; but acts of grace and favour must be dispensed by the intercessions of favourites; and yet it is all by way of prayer and Petition to the Prince; but though it is all but Petition and request, yet those who have any request to make to their Prince, place more confidence in the interest and power of one favourite, than in the joint Petitions of many ordinary Subjects.

Thus it is here; Christians on Earth pray for each other as common Supplicants, and the benefit they expect from such Prayers and Intercessions, is only from the prevalency of Faith and Charity, which inspire such prayers, and make them efficacious. God has commanded us to pray for one another, and has promised to hear our united, fervent, and importunate Prayers, for the merits of our common Saviour Jesus Christ: But those who pray to Saints in Heaven, pray to them as Favourites and Mediators, who prevail not merely by the force and efficacy of Prayer, but by
by their personal Merits and Interests with God; and this makes them just such Mediators as Christ is, who by their Power and Interest can recommend us and our Prayers to God's acceptance. No you'll say, Christ purchased us with his Blood, and mediates in the virtue of his Sacrifice, which makes his Mediation of a different nature from the Mediation of Saints, who mediate only by their interest with God, upon account of their personal Merits. But this alters not the case; for the general notion of a Mediator, is one who has Power and Interest with God, effectually to recommend us to his favour; and whether he mediates with, or without a Sacrifice, if his Mediation be powerful and efficacious, he is a true and proper Mediator; and to set up such other Mediators besides Christ, must be injurious to his Mediation, for then Christ is not our only Mediator; and after all the Apologies that can be made for it, it argues some distrust, either of Christ's Power, or good Will to help us, when we fly to other Patrons and Advocates.

2. And therefore Monsieur de Meaux has another Reserve; for in the second place he tells us from the Council of Trent, That to invoke Saints, according to the sense of this Council, is to have recourse to their Prayers, for obtaining benefits from God through Jesus Christ, so that in reality we do not obtain those benefits, which we receive by the Intercession of the Saints, otherwise than through Jesus Christ, and in his Name; seeing these Saints themselves pray in no other manner than through Jesus Christ, and are not heard but in his Name. After which we cannot imagine, that any one should accuse us of forsaking Jesus Christ, when we beseech his Members, who are also ours, his Children, who are our Brethren, and his Saints, who are our first-fruits, to pray with us, and for us, to our common Master, in the name of our common Mediator.

As for forsaking Jesus Christ, this we do not charge them with; the whoever considers, how much more frequent addresses are made in the Church of Rome to the Virgin Mary, and some other powerful Saints, than to Christ himself, will be tempted to think, that it looks very like forsaking him; but we only say, that they rob Christ of the glory of being our only Mediator and Advocate, by having recourse to the Prayers, and intercessions of so many Saints.

But how can the Intercession of Saints be injurious to the Mediation of Christ, when they themselves intercede in the Name and Mediation of Christ; which necessarily refers to Christ the
the glory of his Mediation entire, since the Saints themselves are not heard but in his Name?

Now rightly to understand this, we must consider the Nature of Christ's Mediation, which is to offer up all those Prayers to God in Heaven, which we make to God in his name on Earth. He is our Mediator in Heaven, our High-Priest, who is passed into the Heavens, who is made not after the law of a Carnal Commandment, but after the power of an endless life, who is made higher than the Heavens, who is not entred into the Holy Place made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into Heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us. So that as the High-Priest under the Law entred once a year into the Holy Place, which was a type and figure of Heaven, to make expiation and intercessions for the People; so the Office of Christ, as our High-Priest and Mediator, is to ascend into Heaven with his own Blood, and there to appear in the presence of God for us. His mediatory Office is confined to Heaven; there he presents our Prayers to God, in verue of his own Blood; and this is as peculiar and appropriated to him, as it was to the High-Priest under the Law, to offer the Blood of the Sacrifice, and make Attonement, and Intercession in the Holy of Holies.

So that to present our Prayers to God in Heaven is the peculiar office of Christ, who is our great High-Priest, and only Mediator in the immediate presence of God in Heaven; and to apply our selves to any other Mediators in Heaven, to present our Prayers to God, in what manner, or upon what pretence soever it be, is injurious to the Mediation of Christ, whose proper Office it is to present our Prayers to God in Heaven. And that pretence that the Saints pray for us only in the Name and Mediation of Christ, is no Apology in this case, for in what name soever they pray, they offer up our Prayers to God immediately in Heaven, which is the Office of our great High-Priest, for there is and must be but one Mediator in Heaven.

And if we consider, what is meant by Praying to God in the Name and Mediation of Christ, we shall see reason to think, that this is very improperly attributed to the Saints in Heaven. For when we pray to God in the Name of Christ, though we address our Prayers immediately to God, yet God does not receive them, as coming immediately from us, but as presented by the hands of our Mediator; which is the true meaning of Praying to God in the Name of Christ, that we offer our Prayers to God, not di-
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rectly from our selves, for then we should have no need of a Mediator, but by his Hands, whose Office it is to present them to God, to appear in the Presence of God for us, which is therefore called coming to God by him.

Now this is very agreeable to the state and condition of Christians on Earth, who are at a great distance from the immediate Throne and Presence of God, to offer their Prayers by the hands of a Mediator, who appears in the presence of God for them; and the reason, why we want a Mediator to appear for us, is because we are not yet admitted into God's immediate Presence our selves. But could every ordinary Priest, or Jew, have been admitted into the Holy of Holies, as the High Priest was, they might as well have offered their Prayers and Sacrifices there immediately to God, without the Minifttry and Mediation of the High Priest; and those who are in Heaven in the immediate presence of God, if they offer up any Prayers to God for themselves or others, they offer them immediately and directly to God, because they offer them to God in his immediate Presence; which is the true notion of Christ's Mediation, that he appears in the presence of God for us: And therefore whatever use there may be of the Name of Christ in Heaven; Saints in Heaven, who live in the immediate Presence of God, have no need of a Mediator to offer their Prayers to God, as Saints on Earth have, because they are admitted to the immediate Vision of God themselves. To offer up our Prayers to God, in the Name and Mediation of Christ, supposes, that we are at a distance from God, and not admitted into his Presence to speak for our selves; but those Prayers, which are offered to God in his immediate Presence, need no Mediator to present them. And yet to say, that the Saints in Heaven offer their Prayers to God in the Name and Mediation of Christ, is to say, that when they are admitted to the immediate Presence of God themselves, they still need a Mediator; that the Prayers they offer to God, in his immediate Presence, they do not offer immediately to him, but by the hands of a Mediator; which if it be Sense, I am sure, is no good Divinity, as neither agreeing with the Types of the Law, nor with the Gospel-account of Christ's Mediation. And therefore if glorified Saints appear for us in the presence of God in Heaven, they are as much our Mediators as Christ is; for this is the most essential Character of this Mediation, that he appears in the presence of God for us. The only Objection I can foresee against this, is, that some of the ancient Fathers, though they did not
not pray to Saints to pray for them, yet were inclined to believe, that Saints departed did pray for the Church on Earth, especially for their particular Friends, which they left behind them, and therefore to be sure did not think this any injury to the Mediation of Christ. But then we must consider, that as they spoke doubtfully of this matter, so those very Fathers did not believe, that Saints departed were received up into the highest Heaven, into the immediate Presence and Throne of God; though they thought them in a very happy state, yet not perfect, till the resurrection; and therefore they prayed for Saints departed, as well as believed, that Saints departed prayed for them. Now any Mediation and Intercession on this side Heaven, is very consistent with the Mediation of Christ in Heaven; but to intercede in Heaven is his peculiar Office, which no other Creature can share in, since his Resurrection and Ascension. This, I think, is sufficient to prove, that Monsieur de Meaux his Exposition cannot reconcile Praying to Saints to Pray for us, either with the peculiar Worship of God, or with the Glory and Dignity of our great and only Mediator and Advocate Jesus Christ.

The Character of a Papist Represented.

3. Of addressing more Supplications to the Virgin Mary than to Christ.

Monsieur de Meaux takes no notice of that peculiar kind of Worship, which is paid in the Church of Rome to the Virgin Mary, as being sensible how hard it is to reconcile this with his bare Ora pro nobis; but the Representer, who pretends to follow the Bishops Pattern, but wants his Judgment and Caution to manage it, undertakes to Apologize for this too; and it is worth the while to consider what he says.

The Papist Mis-represented is said to believe the Virgin Mary to be much more powerful in Heaven than Christ, and that she can command him to do, what she thinks good, and for this reason he honours her, much more then he does her Son, or God the Father, for one Prayer he says to God, saying ten to the Holy Virgin. Let us then consider how much of Mis-representation there is in this; and I shall begin with the least first, because men's Actions are the best Interpreters of their Thoughts and Belief.

The Papist for one prayer he says to God, says ten to the Virgin Mary: Is this mis-represented? Let him but tell over his Beads,
and see how many Ave Maries and Pater nosters he will find upon a string, which are exactly ten for one. This he confesses, and thinks it as innocent to recite the Angelical Salutation now, as it was for the Angel Gabriel and Elizabeth to do it. But did the Angel use it as a Prayer to the Virgin Mary? Is Hail thou that art Highly favoured, the Lord is with Thee, blessed art thou amongst Women, when spoken to the Virgin, who was then present to hear it, a friendly Salutation, or a Prayer? Was it delivering a Message, or an act of Devotion? Or is this the Ave Maria now in use in the Church of Rome? As I remember, there are two or three little words, Ora pro nobis, added to it, which make it a Prayer; not the Angelical Salutation: And we do not read, that the Angel said, Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners, now and in the hour of Death.

Indeed were it lawful to pray to the Virgin Mary, I should have less to say against the frequent repetition of this prayer; but yet a man might enquire, why the prayer to the Virgin Mary, is repeated so much oftener than the prayer to God; is not this to honour her much more then he does her Son, or God the Father? For is not Prayer an act of Honour and Worship? And do we not then honour that Being most, to whom we pray oftener? No, says the Representer, for he does not at any time say even so much as one Prayer to her, but what is directed more principally to God. Surely there must be some Mystery in this. For do they not say a great many Prayers, immediately directed to the Virgin Mary, and not at all directed to God? Is not their Ave Maria such a Prayer, and do they principally pray to God in those Prayers, which are immediately directed to the Virgin Mary? When they pray to the Virgin Mary to pray to them, is this Prayer principally directed to God Almighty? What when the Virgin is only named; And the matter of the Prayer is such, that it cannot be directed to God Almighty, unless they think it proper to pray to God to pray for them? Yes, these Prayers to the Virgin are offered up as a thankful Memorial of Christ's Incarnation, and an acknowledgement of the Blessedness of Jesus the fruit of her Womb. The meaning of which can be no more than this, That when they Pray to Mary the Mother of Jesus, it is a tacite acknowledgement, that Jesus was born of her, and that the Son must be a very Glorious Prince, when the Mother is so highly exalted upon account of her Relation to him, as to have so many devout Prayers and Hymns offered up to her. But does this prove,
prove, that the Prayers, which are immediately directed to the Virgin Mary, are principally directed to Christ, because Mary was his Mother; which is the whole Mystery of the business. Suppose Christ should think himself honoured by those Prayers, which are offered to his Mother, yet is there no difference between praying to Christ, and that Honour we do him in praying to his Mother? A late Author indeed tells us, that the Veneration, which we give to Mary, redounds to Jesus: All Honour given to the Mother, tending to the Glory of the Son; for as he communicates with her in Flesh and Blood; so also doth he partake with her in her Qualities and Perfections, and therefore he is a sharer in that Homage and Observance, that is made to her. This is a new sort of Consubstantiation, and Communication of Properties; but yet how much soever we honour Jesus, when we pray to Mary, yet we do not pray to Jesus, when we pray to Mary; and therefore these Prayers are principally and immediately directed to Mary, not to God or Christ; and therefore to offer ten Prayers to Mary, for one to God, look very like honouring Mary much more than her Son, or God the Father.

Well, but she is the Mother of God, and Blessed amongst Women; but how does her being Christs Mother entitle her to a greater share in our Prayers and Devotions than Christ himself? It is indeed a great Honour to her to be the Mother of Jesus, but does this entitle her to that Worship and Homage, which is due to her Son? She is the happiest Mother among Women, but does this advance her above Angels and Arch-Angels? For my part I see no reason to think, that her bearing Christ in her Womb, which was a singular Favour conferred on her, but has nothing of Merit in it, should advance her above the most Eminent Apostles and Martyrs, who with undaunted Courage and unwearyed Industry propagated the Gospel throughout the World, and were the great Ministers of his Kingdom: I am sure our Saviour does not seem to attribute any such mighty Virtue to the Maternity of Mary, when a certain Woman said unto him, Blessed is the Womb that bare thee, and the Paps which thou hast sucked; he answered, yea rather Blessed are they, who hear the Word of God and keep it. And in another place, when some told him, behold thy Mother and thy Brethren stand without desiring to speak with thee, he answered and said unto him, that told him, who is my Mother? And who are my Brethren? and he stretched forth his hand towards his Disciples, saying, behold my Mother and my Brethren, for whosoever shall do the Will of my Father, which is in Heaven, the same is my Mother, and Sister,
and Brother. Which prefers his meanest Disciples before the Mo-
ther of his Flesh, considered only as his Mother; which he would
not have done, had the bare Maternity of Mary advanced her a-
bove all other Creatures.

Well, but she is most acceptable to God in her Intercession for us.
Did the Angel tell them this too, as well as that she is Blessed a-
mong Women? Whence then do they learn it? Is it only because
she is a Mother? Have all Mothers then such a natural Authority
over their Sons, even when they are Soveraign Princes? Cannot
the Eternal Son of God choose an Earthly Mother, but he must
admit her into the Throne with him, and govern his Kingdom, if
not by her Commands, yet by her Importunities and Requests?
This is thought a great weakness in Earthly Princes, and usually
proves fatal to their Government; and yet it is much more tole-
rable in Earth than in Heaven. What has the Mother of his Flesh
to do, to intermeddle in the affairs of his Spiritual Kingdom, which
she is not capable of managing? She had no Authority in the
Church, while she was on Earth, which methinks her Maternity
might give her as much Right to, as to be Queen-Regent of Hea-
ven. When Christ was a Child he lived in Subjection to Mary and
Joseph, though he began early to give them a Specimen of a Su-
periour Power he had, and such a work to do, as discharged him
from Subjection to Earthly Parents. When he was but twelve
years old, he told his Mother, how was it, that ye sought me, wile
ye not that I must be about my Fathers business? When his Mother at
the Marriage in Cana of Galilee acquainted him, that their Wine
was spent, and instinuated her desire, that he should help them,
he rebukes her for it, Woman what have I to do with thee? my
hour is not yet come. She was not to direct him, what to do in
such matters; and can we think then, that now he is advanced
to the Right Hand of God, he will suffer her to intermeddle in
the administration of his Kingdom.

But our Author believes it damnable, to think the Virgin Mary more
powerful in Heaven than Christ, or that she can in anything command
him. It is well the Impera Redemptori, command the Redeemer, is
at last disowned by them, though it may be some may think it
a little too much to call it damnable; because whatever Papists
believe now, there was a time, when this was used in the Millals
of the Roman Church; and will he say, that it was damnable
then to use that Hymn?

I believe no Papist ever thought the Virgin Mary to be Omni-
potent,
potent, much less, that she can do more than Christ can, or can
command him by a direct and Superior Authority; nor did
any man, that I know of, ever charge them with this: and if it
be only in this sense, that he denies the Virgin to be more power-
ful in Heaven than Christ, it is nothing to the purpose; for it is
possible for a Subject to be more powerful than his Prince,
though he cannot command him, and can do nothing but by his
Princes favour; but if he have so much the ascendant of his Prince,
that he can deny him nothing, that he does whatever he will
have him, and such things as no other consideration should in-
cline him to do, but the desire of such a powerful Favourite; this
man is really more powerful than the Prince, because he has
the direction and Government of the Princes Power: He has the
Prince himself in his Power, and therefore is more powerful
than he. And if this be the case of the Blessed Virgin, that she
has the Disposal of Christ's Grace and Mercy, though not by a
direct Authority, yet by her Interest in her Son, if he never de-
nies that which she asks, but grants that at her Intercession,
which he would not grant without it; if the Papists believe
this, they believe her to be more Powerful than Christ, and
they have then good reason, as they do, to put up more fre-
cquent Prayers to her, than to God or Christ himself. And wheth-
her they do not believe this, and that at this very day, let any
one judge, from these passages in the Contemplations of the Life,
and Glory of the Holy Mary, which is lately published in En-
lish, Permissu Superiorum. "There p. 7. he tells us, that God
hath by a Solemn Covenant pronounced Mary to be the Treas-
ury of Wisdom, Grace, and Sanctity under Jesus. So that
whatever Gifts are bestowed upon us by Jesus, we receive them
by the Mediation of Mary: No one being gracious to Jesus,
who is not devoted to Mary, nor hath any one been specially
confident of the Patronage of Mary, who hath not through
her received a special Blessing from Jesus. Whence it is one
great mark of the Predestination of the Elect, to be singularly
Devoted to Mary, since she hath a full Power, as a Mother, to
obtain of Jesus, whatever he can ask of God the Father, and
is comprehended within the Sphere of man's Predestination to
Glory, Redemption from Sin, and Regeneration by Grace. Nei-
ther hath any one petitioned Mary, who was refused by Jesus,
nor trusted in Mary, and was abandoned by Jesus.
A little after he directs the Devotes of the Virgin, to have a firm and unshaken confidence in her Patronage, amidst the greatest of our inward Conflicts with Sensuality, and outward Tribulations from the adverse Casualties of this Life; through a strong Judgment of her eminent Power, within the Empire of Jesus, grounded upon the singular Prerogative of her Divine Maternity; for by vertue there of no State of man can be so unhappy, through the malice of Satan, the heats of our Passions, or the Enormity of Sin, which exceeds her Love towards the Disciples of Jesus, or the efficacy of her Mediation for us unto Jesus: So that though the condition of some great Sinners may be so deplorable, that all the limited Excellency, Merits and Power of all the Saints and Angels, cannot effectually bend the Mercies of Jesus to receive them, yet such is the acceptableness of the Mother of Jesus to Jesus, that whoever is under the Verge of her Protection, may confide in her Intercessions to Jesus. He denying no Favour to her, whereby the Wonders of man's Predestination and Redemption through Jesus, may be magnified and promoted. So that the Blessed Virgin is more Powerful than all the Saints and Angels in Heaven; she has all the Power of Christ, all his Grace and Mercy in her hands, and can dispense it to such Sinners, whom Christ would not pity and relieve without her, and therefore is a more powerful Patroness of Sinners, than Christ himself is. And therefore he might well add in the next place, that all these Blessings flow from Jesus to all through Mary, and may therefore justly refer them all to her, as to the most effectual Instrument, Channel, and Conveyance of all. Now if this be true Representing, it is no Mis-representation to say, that a Papist believes the Virgin Mary, to be much more Powerful in Heaven than Christ; not that she has any Power of her own, but that she can more powerfully and effectually bend the Mercies of Jesus to relieve Sinners, than the mercies of Jesus can bend themselves without her.
THAT the Worship of Images, as it was practised by the Heathens, is Idolatry, Monsieur de Meaux and the Representer suppose; and therefore their Business is, to give such an account of the Worship of Images, as practised in the Church of Rome, as to distinguish themselves from Heathen Idolaters. To this purpose the Bishop tells us, *The Council of Trent forbids us expressly to believe any Divinity or Virtue in them, for which they ought to be reverenced, to demand any favour of them, or to put any trust in them; and ordains, That all the Honour which is given to them, should be referred to the Saints themselves which are represented by them. That the Honour we render Images, is grounded upon their exciting in us the remembrance of those they represent. That by humbling our selves before the Image of Christ crucified, we shew what is our submission to our Saviour. So that to speak precisely, and according to the Ecclesiastical Stile, when we honour the Image of an Apostle or Martyr, our intention is not so much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apostle or Martyr in the presence of the Image. Thus the Pontifical tells us, and the Council of Trent expresses the same thing, when it says, The Honour we render to Images, has such a reference to those they represent, that by the means of those Images which we kiss, and before which we kneel, we adore Jesus Christ, and honour the Saints, whose Types they are. To the same purpose the Representer speaks, and almost in the same words. So that the Sum of their Apology is this, That they do not believe Images to have any Divinity in them, or to be Gods, and therefore do not pray to, nor put their trust in the Image, nor so much honour the Image in those external Expressions of Reverence they pay to it, by kissing it, and kneeling before it, as Christ, or the Saint whom the Image represents; and the usefulness of Images to excite in us the remembrance of those whom
we love and honour, is a justifiable Reason of that Honour we pay to them.

This is a Matter of very great consequence, and deserves to be carefully stated; and therefore I shall strictly examine, Whether this Exposition will justify the worship of Images, and sufficiently distinguish the Worship of the Ch. of Rome, from that Worship which the Heathens gave to their Images.

Monsieur de Meaux pretends, by his Exposition of the Doctrines of the Church of Rome, to cut off Objections and Disputes; that is, so to state the Matter, that there may be no place for those Objections which Protestants commonly urge against worshipping Images. But I do not see, that he has made any Effay of this Nature in the Point of Image-Worship, but has left both all the Disputes among themselves, and with Protestants, untouched.

The Objections which Protestants urge against the Worship of Images, as taught and practised in the Church of Rome, are principally these four.

1. That it is expressly forbid by the second Commandment, without any limitation or exception.

2. That the Heathens are in Scripture charged with Idolatry in the Worship of Images.

3. That it is a violation of the Divine Majesty, crimen lese Majestatis, to represent God by a material and sensless Image or Picture.

4. That a visible Object of Worship, though considered only as a Representation, is expressly contrary to the Law of Moses, and especially to the spiritual Nature of the Christian Worship.

Now I do not see, how the Bishop's Exposition takes off any of these Objections, which after all that he hath said, are in full force still, as I shall particularly shew.

1. Then he tells us, That the Council of Trent forbids us expressly to believe any Divinity or Virtue in Images, for which they ought to be reverenced. We grant, the Council does forbid this; and he knows that we never charge them with it; though there are some practices of the Church of Rome, which look very suspiciously that way: but then we say, the second Commandment forbids the worship of all Images, without
without any such limitation; for there is not any one word in the Commandment to limit the Prohibition of worshipping Images, to such Images, as are believ'd to have any Divinity in them. The words of the Commandment are as general as can be, Thou shalt not make to thy self any Graven Image, nor the likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath, or in the Water under the Earth; thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them. The Commandment takes no notice of any Divinity which is supposed to be in these Images, but only of the Representation made by them, that they are the Likeness or Representation of things in Heaven, or things on Earth, or things under the Earth; and therefore the whole Dispute between Papists and Protestants about the sense of the second Commandment, and the strict notion of an Idol, is left untouch'd by this Exposition.

The Roman Doctors indeed tell us, that the Heathens worshipped their Images as Gods, and did ascribe Divinity to them; upon which account Monsieur de Meaux tells us, All Pag. 9. these words of the Council are like so many Characters to distinguish us from Idolaters; seeing we are so far from believing with them any Divinity annexed to the Images; that we do not attribute to them any Virtue, but that of exciting in us the remembrance of those they represent. But he knew very well, that Protestants deny, that the Heathens took their Images for Gods any more than Papists do; their Philosophers despised the charge, and made the same Apologies for themselves, which the Divines of the Church of Rome now do; and we may suppose, that common Heathens had much such Apprehensions about them, as common Papists have: Those who had any sense could not believe them to be Gods; and those who have none, may believe any thing: but there is no great regard to be had to such Mens Faith, whatever their Religion be, who are void of common Sense. However this Dispute, whether the Heathens did believe their Images to be Gods, or to have any more Divinity in them, than Papists attribute to their Images, is a Dispute still, and Monsieur de Meaux has not said one word to prevent it; and therefore the Condemnation of the Heathens for worshipping Images is still a good Objection against the worship of Images in the Church of Rome, till he prove
as well as assert this difference between them.

But indeed, tho I readily grant that the Church of Rome does not believe that there is any Divinity in their Images, and that the Heathens did believe that Consecration brought down the Gods, whom they worshipped by such Representations, and tied them by some invisible Charms to their Image, that they might be always present there to receive their Worship; yet this makes no material difference in their Notion of Images.

The reason why the Heathens thought it necessary by some Magical Arts to fasten their Gods, or some Divine Powers to their Images, was not to incorporate them with their Images, but to secure a Divine Presence there, to hear their Prayers, and receive their Sacrifices, without which all their Devotions paid to an Image were lost; which was very necessary, especially in the Worship of their Inferior Demons, whom they did not believe to be present in all places.

As Elijah mocked the Priests of Baal, and said, Cry aloud; for he is a God: either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a Journey, or peradventure he sleepest, and must be awaked. But now, those who believe that God is every where present to see and hear what we do; and that the Saints, who are not present in their Images, yet do certainly know (by what meanssoever it be) what Prayers and Homages are offered to them at their Images, need not call down any Divine Powers constantly to attend their Images, but only to procure their acceptance of those Devotions, which are paid to them at their Images. And this is the difference between the Consecration of Heathen and Popish Images: The first is to procure the Presence of their Gods in their Images; the other to obtain the Favour of Christ, and the Saints, to accept those Prayers and Oblations, and other Acts of Devotion which are offered to them at their Images; as to give but one Instance of it in a Prayer used at the Consecration of the Cross. Sanctificetur lignum istud in nomine Pa-|tris & Fii-|lii, & Spiritus Sancti, & benedictio illius ligni in quo membra sancta salvatoris suspensa sunt, in quo o-|rantes inclinantesq; se proper Deum ante istam crucem inveniant Corporis & Anima sanatae. Let this Wood be sanctified in the name
name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and let the Blessing of that Wood, on which the holy Members of our Saviour hung, be on this Wood; that those, who pray and bow themselves before this Cross, may obtain Health both of Body and Soul.

This peculiar Virtue which Consecration bel lows on Images to obtain the Favour of Christ and his Saints, to those who pray and worship before them, is all that the Heathens intended in calling down their Gods to attend their Images to hear and receive their Prayers and Sacrifices. They did not believe their Images to be Gods, but Silver, or Gold, Wood, or Brafts, or Stone, according to the Materials they were made of, as the Church of Rome does; but they thought their Gods were present to hear the Prayers they made before their Images; as the Church of Rome also believes, that Christ and his Saints have a peculiar regard to those Prayers which are made before their Images, as is evident from their forms of consecrating Images to such an use. The Heathens did not put their trust in an Image of Wood and Stone, but in that God, who was represented by that Image, and was there present to help them. And thus, tho' the Church of Rome does not demand any Favour of Images, nor put any Trust in them, yet she expects the Relief and Acceptance of Christ and the Saints for that Worship she pays to their Images; and I would desire any Man to show me the difference between these two, especially when we consider how much greater Virtue is attributed to some Images of the Blessed Virgin in the Church of Rome, than there is to others; as to the Image of the Lady of Loretto, &c., which can signify nothing less, than that the Virgin is more pleased with, and will more graciously accept our Worship before such an Image, than any other; or else me-thinks the Devotees of the Virgin should not go so many Miles in Pilgrimage to the Lady of Loretto, as they often do, if they believed the Images of the Virgin which they had at home to be of equal Power: which is as much trusting in Images, and attributing a Divine Virtue to them, as ever the Heathens were guilty of. For me-thinks those who strictly adhere to the Letter of Scripture to prove that the Heathens believed their Images to be Gods, and did put their Trust in them, because the Scripture
ture expressly says so, should consider also, that the Scripture expressly tells us, that the Idols of the Heathens are Silver and Gold, the Work of Men's hands; they have Mouths, but they speak not; Eyes have they, but they see not; they have Ears, but they hear not, neither is there any Breath in their Mouths: and therefore we have as much reason to conclude, that the Heathens did not put their Trust in the material Images, which they knew to be no better than stupid senseless matter, which could not of themselves hear or help them, as to confess, that in some sense they made Gods of them. For if the Heathens did not believe them to be dead senseless Images, which could neither speak, nor see, nor hear, but that they were really animated by invisible Spirits; they were not such dull and sottish Idolaters, as the Psalmist represents them; and if they did (as the Psalmist takes it for granted they themselves acknowledged) than it is certain they could not believe the material Images to be Gods, nor the Objects of their Hope and Trust, and therefore might (as some of their Philosophers in effect did) as safely renounce believing any Divinity or Virtue in their Images, for which they ought to be reverenced, or demanding any Favour of them, or putting any Trust in them, as the Council of Trent does. So that their not believing any Divinity in their Images, does neither excuse them from the Breach of the second Commandment, nor sufficiently distinguish the Church of Rome's worshipping Images, from that Worship which the Heathens gave them; at least the Bishop has said nothing to answer or prevent these Objections against Image-worship, which he pretends to be the design of his Exposition.

2. As a fuller Explication of the Doctrine of the Church about Image-worship, Monsieur de Meaux adds, that the Council of Trent ordains, That all the Honour which is given to them (Images) should be referred to the Saints themselves, which are represented by them: Or, as the Council expresses it, The Honour we render to Images has such a reference to those they represent, (ad Prototypa quae illæ representant, to the Prototypes which they represent) that by the means of those Images (per Imagines, by those Images) we kiss, and before which we kneel, we adore Jesus Christ, and honour the Saints, whose Types they are. Quorum
Quorum illa similitudinem gerunt; Whose likeness they are, 
or whom they represent.

Hitherto we have no Exposition at all of the Doctrine of 
the Church about Image-Worship, but only a bare relation 
what the Council says, that Images must be worshipped only 
upon account of their Representation; and that the Wor-
ship which is given to the Image, is referred to the Proto-
type: This all Roman-Catholicks agree in; but yet there is 
an endless Dispute among them, about the Nature and De-
gree of this Worship, and it will be necessary to take a short 
view of it.

They are all agreed, that at least the external Acts of Ad-
oration are to be paid to Images, such as Kissing, Kneeling, 
Bowing, Prostration, Incense; this Durandus, and Holcot; 
and Picus Mirandula allowed; they all agreed, that the Wor-
ship which was given to Images, is upon account of Re-
presentation, or as Christ and his Saints are represented by 
them, and worshipped in that Worship, which is given to 
their Images; but then there was a threefold difference be-
tween them.

1. That some would not allow this Worship in a proper 
sense to be given to the Images, but improperly and abusively; 
because at the presence of the Image, which excites in us 
the remembrance of the Object, we worship the Object rep-
resented by it, Christ or his Saints, as if they were actual-
ly present; this was the Opinion of Durandus, Holcot, and 
Picus Mirandula, who could hardly escape the censure of 
Heresy for it; and that which excused them, as Vasquez 
says, was, That they agreed with the Catholic Church in 
performing all external Acts of Adoration to Images, and 
that they differed only in manner of speaking from the 
rest.

2. Thomas Aquinas, and his Followers, and several great 
Divines since the Council of Trent, teach, That the same 
Worship is to be given to the Image, which is due to the 
Prototype; and therefore as Christ must be worshipped 
with Latria, or a supreme Worship, so must the Image of 
Christ, because the Image is worshipped only on account of 
its Representation, and therefore must be worshipped with 
the
the same Worship with the thing represented: and the motion of the Mind to an Image, as an Image, is the same with the motion to the Thing represented. Which seems the most reasonable Account; for if I worship Christ by his Image, I must give that Worship to the Image which I intend for Christ, because in that case the Image is in Christ's place and stand to me.

3. The third Opinion is, That though we must worship Images, yet we must not give the Worship of Latria to them, no not to the Image of Christ himself, but an inferior degree of Worship. This some Divines asserted on the Authority of the Council of Nice, which expressly determined, that Latria is not to be given to Images. But this is the most absurd Opinion of all; for if we must worship Images only upon the account of their Representation, we must give that Worship to them, which is due to the thing represented by them; and if we give any other Worship to them, we must worship them for their own sakes. And what is that Worship which is due to them as separated from the Prototype? What Worship is due to carved and polished Brass and Stone? Whoever desires to see these three different Opinions, with the proper Reasons of them, explained more at large, may consult Dr. Stillington's learned Defence of his Discourse of Idolatry, Part 2. Chap. 1. pag. 575, &c. Now the Council of Trent only determines, that the Honour we give to Images, must be referred to the Prototypes, that we must adore Christ and his Saints in that Worship which we give to their Images: which seems to countenance the second Opinion, That the Worship of Latria is to be given to the Image of Christ, because that is the Worship which we must give to Christ: But then the Council refers to the second Council of Nice; which determines the quite contrary; and I dare not undertake to reconcile the Council with itself, since the Fathers of that Council would not plainly decide this Controversy among their Divines.

Let us then try, if we can discover, what Monsieur de Meaux thinks of this Matter; what Worship that is which he allows to be given to Images.

Now,
Now, as far as I can guess, he is of Durandus his Opinion, That all External Acts of Adoration are to be performed before the Image, but that the Image is not to be properly worshipped, but only Christ in the presence of his Image, as representing his Person to us, and exciting in us the remembrance of him. Thus he tells us, That while the Image of Christ crucified, being present before our Eyes, causes so precious a remembrance in our Souls, we are moved to testify by some exterior signs, how far our gratitude bears us; and by humbling our selves before the Image, we show what is our Submission to our Saviour. So that he allows of humbling our selves before the Image, that is, of paying the External Acts of Worship before it. Well! but is this to worship the Image? For that he tells us, to speak properly, and according to the Ecclesiastical Stile, (I suppose he means a new Modern Stile, for the old Ecclesiastical Stile did somewhat differ) when we honour the Image of an Apostle or Martyr, our Intention is not so much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apostle or Martyr in the presence of the Image: that is, this is not properly, but improperly and abusively called the Worship or Honour of the Image: but Christ, or his Saints, are properly worshipped before, or in presence of their Images, as representing them to us; which was exactly the Opinion of Durandus.

This certainly is the least that can be made of the Worship of Images; and yet as far removed as this Opinion seems to be from the Opinion of St. Thomas, who affirms, that the Worship of Latria is to be given to the Image of Christ; I take them to be the very same, though very differently expressed. The right stating of this, will mightily tend to clear this perplexed Controversy; and therefore I shall do it with all the plainness I can.

1. Then I observe, that to pay the external Acts of Adoration to, or before, or in presence of a representative Object as representing, signify the very same thing; it is all one kind of Worship, because the formal Reason is the same in all; and that is, the Representation. When I bow to the Image of Christ, I bow to it as representing Christ to me, who is the ultimate Object of my Worship; when I
bow before, or in the presence of the Image, I do the same thing, tho' I give it a new Name; I bow before it, as representing Christ to me, as if he himself were there personally present in the image. When I bow to the Image, I do not bow to the Wood or Stone, but to Christ as represented in the Image: when I bow to Christ before the Image, I do the same thing, I bow to Christ as represented in the Image which stands before me. For suppose Christ were there present instead of the Image, would it make any difference in my Worship, to say, That I bow to Christ, or before him, or in his presence, when they all signify, that I direct my Worship to him as personally present; no more difference is there in bowing to, or before, or in the presence of the Image, when I direct my Worship to Christ as represented by the Image. There may indeed be a great difference between bowing to my Prince, and in the presence of my Prince, when these Expressions signify different Objects: for I may bow to another Man in the presence of my Prince, and in that Act I do not bow to my Prince; but when to, and before, and in presence, do not distinguish the Objects, the Act is the same: If the presence of the Image were an accidental thing, and had no relation to that Worship which we pay to Christ or the Saints, where such Images are present, there would be a great difference between bowing to, and in presence of the Image; but if these Images be on purpose set up in Consecrated Places, and are themselves consecrated for that use, to represent Christ and the Saints to us; whether we say we bow to them, or before them, we do the same thing, and with the same intention, to worship Christ and his Saints as represented by them. So that if we own, as the Bishop does, that the Honour done before the Image, goes to the Prototype, to Christ, or the Saints represented by such Images, we need not dispute about the manner of expressing it; he may take his own way of speaking, that he honours Christ in the presence of his Image, so he honours Christ as represented by the Image; and therefore, in Scripture, to fall down before and to the Image, and to worship the Image, are all equivalent Expressions.
There is indeed a vast difference between bowing to, or before an Image, which represents God, or Christ, or some Divine Being to us, as the Object of our Worship; and bowing towards a Place, or worshipping God towards a Place, as the Jews worshipped towards the Temple, and in the Temple towards the Mercy-Seat; the one was absolutely forbid by the Jewish Law, the other allowed and practised by the devoutest Worshippers of God: which argues, that there is some difference between them; and it is not hard to say, wherein the difference consists, that one is a representative Object, the other only a Circumstance of Worship. To bow to, or before an Image, is to worship the Image, or God or Christ by the Image, which makes the Image as representing the Prototype, the Object of our Worship; but which way soever we look or bow, towards the East, or towards the West, God alone is the immediate Object of our Worship, the Place only the Circumstance of Worship; whenever we bow to God, we must bow towards some Place or other: but the Place does not represent God to us as an Image does, and therefore is no Object of Worship: which shows what little reason the Protestor had to compare bowing to the Altar, and kneeling to the Sacrament, as he calls it, with bowing to an Image. There is no Man of the Church of England, that I know of, who bows to the Altar; I am sure the Church no where teaches any such Practice. She only recommends to her Children bowing of the Body to God, when they come in and go out of his House; and though the Communion Table, or Altar, is generally so situated at the East end of the Church, as to be opposite to the entrance of it; for which reason some have called it, bowing towards the Altar; yet our Church teaches us to have no regard at all to it. And Arch-Bishop Laud, in his Speech in the Star-Chamber, declares, That if there were no Table standing, he would worship God when he came into his House: So that there is no need to find any Hole, as the Protestor speaks, to get out at with the Altar, for that was never in yet, as far as this Controversy is concerned; and therefore I am like to make no breach for him to follow at with his Image. Nor does any Man kneel to the Sacrament, but only
receive the Sacrament kneeling; and if he cannot distinguish between an Act of Worship to the Sacrament, and a devout Posture of receiving it; yet the meanest Son of the Church of England can. Why does he not as well say, that when we kneel at Prayers, we worship the Common-Prayer Book which lies before us, and out of which we read, as that we worship the Bread, when we receive and eat it with devout Passions upon our Knees.

But to return to the Exposition.

2. I observe, that there is a great difference between a memorative Sign, and the Representation of an Image: both of them indeed excite in us the remembrance of something, but in such different manners, as quite alter the nature of them. It is necessary to take notice of this, because I find Monsieur de Meaux, and after him the Representer, very much to equivocate in this Matter: it is a very innocent thing to worship God or Christ, when any natural or instituted Sign brings them to our minds, even in the presence of such a Sign: As if a Man upon viewing the Heavens, and the Earth, and the Creatures that are in it, should raise his Soul to God, and adore the great Creator of the World; or upon the accidental sight of a natural Cross, should call to mind the Love of his Lord, who died for him, and bow his Soul to him in the most submissive Adorations; because, I say, this is very innocent, the Bishop would persuade his Readers, that this is the only use they make of Images, to excite in us the remembrance of those they represent; and mightily wonders at the little justice of those, who treat with the term of Idolatry, that religious Sentiment, which moves them to uncover their Heads, or bow them before the Image of the Cross, in remembrance of him who was crucified for the Love of us. And that it is sufficient to distinguish them from the Heathen Idolaters, That they declare, that they will not make use of Images, but to raise the mind towards Heaven, to the end that they may there honour Jesus Christ or his Saints, and in the Saints God himself, who is the Author of all Sanctity and Grace.

Now it is certain, an Image will call to our remembrance the Person it represents, as the presence of the Person himself will make us remember him; but this vastly differs from a:
a meer memorative Sign. For the use of Images in the Church of Rome, is not primarily for Remembrance, but for Worship, as the Council of Trent expressly teaches. That the Images of Christ, and the Virgin the Mother of God, and other Saints, are especially to be had and kept in Churches, and due Honour and Veneration to be given to them—because the Honour given to them, is referred to the Prototypes, which they represent; so that by the Images, which we kiss, and before which we uncover our Heads, and prostrate our selves, we adore Christ, and venerate the Saints, whose likeness they bear. These are the words of the Council, and it would be a very odd Comment upon such a Text to say, that Images serve only for Remembrance.

A meer Sign, which only calls Christ to our Minds, can deserve no Honour or Worship; but a representing Sign, which puts us in mind of Christ by representing his Person to us, as if he were present, whether it raises our hearts to him in Heaven or not, yet according to the Council of Trent, it must direct our Worship to him, as represented in his Image. When Men go to Church to worship Christ, or the Virgin Mary, before their Images, it may be presumed they think of them before they see their Images, and therefore do not go to be put in Remembrance of them by their Images, but to worship them before the Images, in that Worship which they give to the Images. And therefore when the Bishop speaks so often of the Virtue of Images, to excite in us the remembrance of the Persons they represent, to reconcile him with himself, and with the Council of Trent, which he pretends to own, we must not understand him as if Images were of no use but to be helps to memory, and are honoured for no other reason, (which is no reason at all) as the unwary Reader will be apt to mistake him; but that these visible Images represent to us the invisible Objects of our Worship, and give us such a sense of their Power and Presence, as makes us fall down and worship them before those Representations, which we honour for their fakes; that is, tho they serve for remembrance, yet not as meer memorative Signs, but as memorative or representative Objects of Worship.
3. I observe, that it is the very same thing whether we say, that we worship Christ as represented by the Image, or worship the Image as representing Christ; for they both signify that Christ is worshipped in and by his Image, that the Honour and Worship is given to the Image, and referred to the Prototype. If Christ be worshipped as represented by the Image, then the Worship which is intended for Christ is given to the Image in his Name, and as his Representative; if the Image be worshipped as representing Christ, then the Worship which is given to the Image, is not for itself, but for Christ, whom it represents; which differ just as much as a Viceroy's being honoured for the King, or the King's being honoured in his Viceroy. And therefore I wonder, that any Man of Understanding and Judgment, as Monsieur de Meaux certainly is, should think there is any great matter in saying, When we honour the Image of an Apostle or Martyr, our Intention is not so much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apostle or Martyr in the presence of the Image; that is, in and by the Image, as I have showed that Phrase signifies, when it is referred to a Representative Object: for it is the very same thing to say, we honour the Image as representing the Martyr, or we honour the Martyr as represented by the Image.

Having premised these things, let us now compare the Opinion of Monsieur de Meaux, with the Opinion of St. Thomas Aquinas about the Worship of Images; and tho' the first is thought by some Men to say a great deal too little, and the other a great deal too much; yet it will appear, that their Opinions in this matter are the very same.

They both agree, That Christ and his Saints are represented by their Images; they both agree, that Christ and his Saints are worshipped in their Images, as represented by them; they both agree, that no other Worship is to be paid to, or before, or in presence of the Image, but only that Worship which is due to the Prototype, to Christ or his Saints represented by such Images: Hence Thomas affirms, that the Image is to be worshipped with that Worship which is due to the Prototype; the Image of Christ with Latria, because that is due to Christ; and the Images of the Saints with Dulia.
Dulia, because that degree of Worship is proper to them; and the Bishop teaches, That when they honour the Image of an Apostle or Martyr, their Intention is not so much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apostle or Martyr in presence of the Image: that is, they perform no other Act of Worship in the presence of the Images, but that which is proper to the Apostle and Martyr; and therefore they both agree, that there is but one motion of the Mind to the Image, and to the Prototype represented by it; that is, as the Bishop speaks, they have but one Intention, and that is to honour the Apostle or Martyr in the presence of the Image: and yet after all, they seem valtly to differ; for Thomas says, that they give the Worship of the Prototype to its Image; that is, that they worship the Image of Christ with Latria, which is the Worship due to Christ; but the Bishop will not own, that they properly give any Worship at all to Images, but only worship Christ, or the Saints in the presence of the Images; Christ indeed with Latria, and the Saints with Dulia, but their Images properly with neither: and yet this difference is only in words, as Vasquez confesses concerning Durandus and Holcot, whom Mr. de Meaux follows, that they agreed with the Catholic Church, in performing all external Acts of Adoration to Images, and that they differed only in manner of speaking from the rest.

For, as I have already shewn, to worship the Image, or before, and in the presence of the Image, when it signifies a Representative Object, is the same thing; and there is no difference between worshipping the Image as representing Christ, and worshipping Christ as represented by the Image; and yet this is all the difference between Mr. de Meaux and Thomas Aquinas: Tho I think Thomas speaks most properly; for if Christ be worshipped in his Image, we must give the Worship to the Image, which we intended for Christ, because Christ is worshipped in that Worship we give to his Image; and therefore he cannot be worshipped by his Image, if his Image be not worshipped; of which more particularly.

Durandus indeed, whose Opinion Mr. de Meaux seems to follow, did in words oppose the Doctrine of Thomas, that the Worship of the Prototype ought not to be given to an Image,
Image, because the Image and the Prototype were two distinct things; and therefore what belonged to the Exemplar could not be attributed to an Image, however considered as an Image; and so the Worship due to the Exemplar could not be given to the Image: but yet he plainly grants all that Thomas intended by it; that the Image may be said to be worshipped with the same Worship with the thing represented; because as the presence of the Image, we worship the Object represented by it, as if he were actually present.

But I have a better reason than this to believe that they were both of a Mind, tho they expressed themselves very differently; and that is, because their Arguments, whereby they confirm their several Opinions are the same, and then it is not likely that their Opinions should much differ.

Durandus proves, That the Images are not to be worshipped, but only improperly and abusively; because at their presence we call to mind those Objects represented by them, which are worshipped before the Images, as if they were present, by such Arguments as these: that Worship properly belongs only to that Being in whom the cause of Worship is, and that only to his Person, upon account of his adorable Perfections, which are the cause of that Worship; and therefore Latria, or Suprem Worship can be due only to God, upon account of his Deity. But that which is no Subject capable of Holiness and Vertue, cannot in itself be the term of Adoration; and therefore proper Worship can never be due to the Image of Christ, or to his Cross; for tho Christ be represented by his Image, there is a real difference in the thing, and in the conception between the Image and the thing represented; and therefore, properly speaking, the same Worship is never due to the Image, that is to the Object represented by it.

Thomas Aquinas on the other side proves, that the Image must be worshipped with that Worship which is due to the Prototype, or the thing represented by it, by much the same Arguments.

1. That no irrational Creature is capable of Worship, but with a respect to a rational Being, which answers to Durandus his reason, that Worship properly belongs only to that Being, in whom the cause of Worship is; and that which is no Subject capable
capable of Holiness and Vertue (as no inanimate, or irrational Creature is, and therefore no Image) cannot in itself be the term of Adoration. From which it appears that they must agree, that no proper Worship can be given to Images. 2. Because Images are to be worshipped upon account of their Representation; therefore they are to be worshipped with the same Worship of the thing represented. 3. Because the motion of the Mind towards an Image, as an Image, is the same with the motion towards the thing represented. So that Thomas plainly allows, that the Image is not to be worshipped at all upon its own account, but only as it represents; and to worship the Image as it represents, is the very same act with worshipping the Object as represented by the Image; because the motion of the Mind towards an Image, as an Image, that is, as it represents, is the same with the motion towards the thing represented: That to worship an Image as representing Chrift, is the same thing with worshipping Chrift as represented by the Image; and therefore the same Worship which is due to Chrift, must be given to his Image, as representing him; or to him as represented by the Image. So that according to Thomas his reasoning, there is no difference between his giving the Worship of Chrift to his Image, as representing him, and Durandus his worshipping Chrift before his Image, as represented by it, as if he were actually present. Thomas could not have quarrelled with Durandus, because he owns it is the same thing, tho Durandus quarrels with Thomas.

And therefore Vasquez, who seems to understand the Vasquez Disp. Doctrine of Thomas as well as any Man, acknowledges that 106. c. 1. Durandus and Holcot differed only in manner of speaking from the rest; and freely declares his own Opinion to be, that an Image cannot be lawfully worshipped any other way than as in 108. c. 3. and by that the Exemplar is made the term and next material Ob- ject of Adoration; and he gives this Reason for it, because no inanimate thing is of itself capable of Worship; but an Image con- sidered as an Image, but without the Exemplar, is an inanimate thing. This is the Doctrine of Thomas according to Vasquez, which allows no more Worship to an Image, considered in it self, than Durandus does, and yet he says, that it may be delivered
Dif. 109. c. 1. delivered absolutely, that Images are to be worshipped with Latria, if by that be meant the same Worship, which is given to the Exemplar: And therefore Bellarmine tells us, That to give the Worship of Latria to the Image of Christ, as representing Christ, is to worship the Image but improperly, and per accidens; and this reconciles Thomas and Durandus, who grants that the Image may be said to be worshipped improperly and abusively, as in presence of the Image, the Object is worshipped represented by it, as if it were actually present.

As for Durandus his Argument against Thomas his Doctrine, that the Worship of the Prototype is to be given to the Image, That there is a real difference in the thing, and in the conception between the Image and the thing represented; and therefore, properly speaking, the same Worship is never due to the Image, that is to the Object represented by it. I think, if any Worship of Images were justifiable, this Argument were early answered. For tho' there be a great difference indeed in the nature of things, between the Image and the Object, between Christ supposes, and his Image which represents him; yet in this case there is none in the Conception; for an Image when it receives our Worship in the place and stead of the Prototype, does not represent according to the usual nature of an Image by its likeness and similitude; for so both in the thing and in the conception the Image differs from the Object it represents; but it represents as a Proxy and Substitute, who in the eye of the Law, is the same Person with him, whom he represents. Thus Thomas must understand the Representation of an Image, when he says, that it is the same motion of the Mind to the Image, and the exemplar represented by it; that is, that the Image is supposed to supply the place of Christ, and represent him present to us; and therefore we worship the Image as Christ's Representative with that Worship we would give to him were he actually present; this is not indeed the natural use of Images, nor is it natural to worship them, but this is the true Interpretation of Thomas his Doctrine; and therefore Gregorius de Valentia expressly tells us, that the Image is worshipped in Christ's stead: And Cardinal Cajetan says, That Christ himself is the reason of the Worship of the Image; and his being in
the Image is the condition by which the reason of the Worship doth excite Men to worship and terminate it: that is, Christ is in his Image, as a King is in his Viceroy, or any Man in his legal Proxy: This is what Suarez meant by the esse reali, and esse representativum of the Prototype; that tho' the Image does not contain Christ in the first sense in his own proper Person, yet it does in the second sense as his legal Proxy, and Representative. And this Durandus himself must acknowledg, if there be any sense in his words, That at the presence of the Image, we worship the Object represented by it, as if he were actually present. For why should he in the presence of the Image, worship Christ represented by it, as if he were actually present, unless he account the Image the Substitute and Representative of Christ, as if he were actually present; and this, I think, reconciles that appearance of difference between Thomas and Durandus, occasioned by a Mifapprehension of Thomas his Doctrine. Durandus owns the Worship of Christ in the presence of the Image, as he is represented in the Image, as if he were actually present, which is Mr. de Meaux his Opinion also in this matter; but he will not allow this, but only in an improper and abusive sense, to be the Worship of the Image, because the Image is not Christ, but both in the thing and in the conception is distinguished from him; and therefore to worship the Image of Christ, would be to worship Wood or Stone, with the Worship of Christ: Whereas Thomas considers the Image not as to its external matter or form, upon which account he denies any Worship to be given to it, but as the Proxy and Representative of Christ; and thus it is Christ represented in the Image, and not the material Image, which is worshipped; which is the very same with Durandus his way of worshipping Christ as represented in the Image, in the presence of the material Image; that is, he worships before the material Image, but worships only the Person of Christ, as represented by the Image.

But this will be better understood by considering the nature and capacity of a legal Proxy or Representative. Suppose A were to all intents and purposes a legal Proxy for B, to do, and to receive whatever B might do and receive
in his own Person; in this case A is not considered as A, in his own personal Capacity, but A is B, as his Proxy and Representative. Suppose now that C owes a Sum of Mony, or a certain Homage to B, and pays it to A as B's Proxy; that is, not as he is A, but B. When C worships A as representing the Person of B, he is properly said not to worship A, but B; because he worships A not as A, but as A is B, in his Representative Capacity. Now if you will suppose A to be the Image, and B to be Christ, this explains in what sense Thomas worships the Image for Christ, not as the Image is Wood or Stone, but as it is the Representative of Christ's Person. Now suppose D should scruple paying the Worship of B to A, because A is a distinct Person from B, and has no right to the same Worship; and therefore should only worship B in the presence of A, as representing him; would not all the World see, that D and C meant and did the same thing, worshipped A as the Representative of B, tho D is pleased to phrase it otherwise, and more improperly than C does; for the personal Capacity of A is not considered at all, when it is worshipped for B, but only his Representative Capacity; and this is the only difference between Thomas and Durandus. Thomas worships the Image in Christ's place and stead, as representing Christ, without considering its natural Capacity as an Image of Wood or Stone; as C worships A as B's Proxy, without considering A's personal Capacity: but Durandus worships Christ as represented by the Image (which is the same with the Image representing Christ) in the presence of the Image considered in its natural Capacity; as D worships B as represented by A, in the presence of A, considered in his personal Capacity; that is, he worships representative A in the presence of personal A, which is the same thing that C does, but is a more uncouth and absurd way of speaking.

Thus to proceed, When C worships A as B's Proxy, in his name and stead, does he worship A or B? he worships A indeed, but considered as B; and therefore the Worship given to A in the name of B, is not the Worship of A, but of B; And will any Man say that A and B are two Objects of Worship? when in this sense, A is B, and is considered only
only as B, that is, as B's Proxy; and therefore A considered as A, in his own personal Capacity, is not worshipped at all, neither absolutely nor relatively, per se, nor per accident; but if A be worshipped only as B, to say, that A is worshipped relatively, or per accident, is to say that B, who is worshipped in A, is worshipped both absolutely and relatively, properly and improperly, per se and per accident; which are some of the Objections which Catharines and others use against Thomas.

Much at the same rate others compare Thomas his Doctrine of worshipping the Image with the Worship of the Prototype, as represented by it, with worshipping a Sign, and the Thing signified; or worshipping the King and his Robes, which are very remote from the Business, and perplex and confound a Doctrine, which is very easy to be understood, and easily rescued from those Scholaftick Absurdities which are charged on it, if that were its only fault: For the true Representation of it, is by considering the Nature of a Proxy, and legal Representative, which acts in another's name and stead.

Having thus considered what is the Notion of Image-Worship, according to Thomas, and Durandus, and Monsieur de Meaux, that it is a worshipping the Image in the name and stead of the Prototype, as its Proxy and Representative, worshipping the Image as representing Christ, as Thomas speaks, or worshipping Christ before his Image as represented by it, as Durandus and M. de Meaux speak. We have now some Foundation to build on; and I think they have no reason to complain that I have stated it in this manner, which grants them all they can desire or ask for, viz. That they do not worship Images, as an Image signifies a Figure of Wood or Stone; but they worship the Image as representing Christ; or if they like that better, Christ as represented in his Image; That when they honour the Image of an Apostle or Martyr, they do not so much intend to honour the Image, as the Apostle or Martyr in the presence of the Image. Let us then consider whether this will justify them; and if this will not, I doubt their Cause is desperate. And in order to this, I shall do these three things.

1. Show
1. Show you, that this is the only intelligible Notion of worshipping God, or Christ, or the Saints, by Images; that Images are a kind of legal Proxies and Representatives, to receive our Worship in the name and stead of Christ, or the Saints.

2. That this is the Scripture Notion of Image-Worship; and that in this sense it is the Scripture condemns the worship of Images, as practised by the Heathens.

3. I shall show, wherein the Evil of worshipping Images according to this Notion consists.

The Reason of worshipping Images, is to do Honour to some Divine Being represented by these Images: for the true occasion of Image-Worship, is that fondness Men have for a visible Object of Worship; and because they cannot see the Gods they worship, therefore they set up Images, as visible and representative Deities, to receive their Worship in the name and stead of their Gods. Now if we grant, that Men intend to worship their Gods, in that Worship they pay to, or before their Images, we must grant that these Images are instead of visible Gods to them, or supply the place of their Gods, and receive Worship in their Names.

For to worship God, or any Divine Being, by an Image, can signify neither more nor less, than to worship God, or Christ, or the Saints, in that Worship which we give to their Images: for God cannot be worshipped in an Image any otherwise, than as the Worship which is given to the Image is his Worship, and given in his Name: for B can be worshipped in A, only as A is B's Representative, and is worshipped in his name and stead. To worship any Being, is to worship his Person; and therefore we must either worship him in his own natural Person, or in his Representative, who is his legal Person.
As to shew you this particularly.

If any Men were ever so sottish as to believe their Images themselves, that is, the visible Figures of Wood, or Stone, or Brass, to be Gods, and to worship them as Gods, such Men cannot be said to worship God by an Image, but to worship an Image-God; for the Image itself is their God, and the Worship terminates on the Image as God. They may be said to worship false Gods, Gods, in a strict and proper sense, of Wood and Stone; but to worship God by an Image, and to worship the Image itself for a God, are very distinct things: and if the Scripture forbids the Worship of God by an Image, it will not justify Image-Worship, to say, that some Heathens were such Sots, as to believe their Images themselves to be Gods; for Men who are not such Sots, may Worship their Gods by Images, as all those Heathens did, who acknowledged their Images to be only Symbols and Representations of their Gods, and therefore not to be Gods themselves; for the same thing cannot be a Symbol and Representation of itself; which is as good sense as to say, that a Sign, and the thing signified by it, is the same.

To give a proper, though inferior degree of worship to Images themselves, is not to worship God or Christ by his Image, because in this case, the Worship they give to the Image of Christ, is not such a Worship as is proper for Christ, and is terminated not on Christ, but on his Image. No Worship is proper to be given to Christ, but the Worship of Latria, or supreme and sovereign Worship: but the Roman Doctors, who embrace this Opinion, deny with the second Council of Nice, that Latria may be given to Images, and in general reject the Doctrine of Thomas, that the Image is to be worshipped with the Worship due to the Prototype: And how then can Christ be worshipped in his Image, if no Worship is given to the Image, which is fit for Christ to receive? when the Image has no Worship given it, but such as is proper to itself, considered as Christ's Image, will they call this the Worship of Christ? especially since this Worship which is given to the Image, is terminated on the Image as its own proper and peculiar Worship, as Ca-
tharine and Bellarmine, and all of this way acknowledge; who reject Thomas his Doctrine of worshipping the Image, with the worship of the Prototype represented by it; because this is not properly the Worship of the Image, but of the Prototype; and therefore that the Image may be sure to be worshipped, they give it an inferior degree of Worship, which terminates on itself. Now how Christ should be worshipped in that Worship which terminates on his Image; that is, how that Worship which ends in the Image, and goes no farther, should pass through the Image, and end in Christ, as it must do, if Christ be worshipped in the Image, is past my understanding, as all Contradictions are.

But they refer the Worship of the Image to the Prototype. But it is worth enquiring how they do it; Do they intend the Worship they give to the Image for Christ? that is, Do they intend to worship Christ in that Worship they give to his Image? No: they can’t do that, because they give only an inferior degree of Worship to the Image, which is not worthy of Christ; not a Worship proper for him, but only for his Image: but they worship the Image for the sake of Christ; and this they take to be an Honour to Christ to worship his Image: but this is not to worship Christ in or by his Image; for in this way Christ is not worshipped in that Worship we give to his Image, but it is to worship the Image for Christ’s sake, which is, by interpretation, an Honour to Christ; as any respect we shew to the Image of the King, argues our Esteem and Honour for our King, whose Image it is: but these two differ as much as to honour Christ in our Actions, and to worship him, as to do something which is, by interpretation, an Honour to Christ, and to make our immediate Addressses, to offer up our Prayers and Thanksgivings to him. Every thing we do for the Honour of Christ, is not presently an Act of Worship; and therefore though we should grant, that we honour Christ in the Worship of his Image, it does not follow, that therefore we worship him in worshipping his Image, when we give no Worship at all to him, but only to his Image; which plainly shows, that in this way they do not worship Christ.
by his Image, but only worship the Image for Christ's sake. Which is a plain Argument to me, that though this Way has very great and learned Advocates, yet it cannot be the meaning of the Council of Trent, because it is not reconcileable with the Practice of the Church of Rome; which prays every day to Christ, and the blessed Virgin, to Saints and Martyrs, before their Images, in such terms as are proper only to be used to themselves; which besides the other Faults of it, is horrid Non-sense, if they do not intend to worship Christ and the Saints in their Images.

Much less do those worship the Prototypes in their Images, who only use Images as helps to Memory, and to excite devout Affections in them, that at the sight of the Image they may offer up more fervent Prayers to God or Christ: for though this practice may and has a great many other Faults in it, yet this is neither in the intention of the Worshipper, to worship the Image, nor the Exemplar by the Image. Monsieur de Meaux, by some Expressions he uses, would persuade his Readers, that this is all the Church of Rome intends in the use of Images; and yet he owns the Doctrine of the Council of Trent, That the Honour of the Image is referred to the Prototype, because by the Images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our Heads, and prostrate our selves, we adore Christ, and worship the Saints, whose Likeness they bear. Which plainly signifies, that we worship Christ and the Saints in the worship of their Images; and therefore though Images may be helps to Memory also, yet they must be honoured and worshipped, that Christ and his Saints may be worshipped in them, and by them; which is a very different thing from being bare Signs to help our Memories, and quicken our Devotions. There is no need of Consecration for this End; and the Church takes no notice of this use of them in her Forms of Consecration. These are all the Pretences I have met with for the use of Images in Religious Worship: and it is evident from what I have said, that there is no other sense, wherein God or Christ can be said to be worshipped by an Image, but only as the Image receives the Worship due to Christ in his Name and Stead, as if it were his legal Proxy and Representative; which, as I
have shewed, is the true Interpretation, both of the Doctrine of Durandus, and Monsieur de Meaux, and Thomas in this Matter.

2dly. I am now to show, that it is in this Notion the Scripture forbids the worship of Images, as the Representatives of God, or any Divine Being, to receive our Worship in God's Name and Stead. It is true indeed, the 2d Commandment, which forbids the worship of Images, takes no notice of the Distinctions of the Schools, in what Notion an Image is worshipped, or what kind and degree of Worship is given to it; but the words are so large and general, as to exclude all use of Images in Religious Worship. The Worship which is expressly forbidden in the Commandment to be given to Images, is only the External Acts of Worship, such as to bow down to them; which is the very least that can be done, if Men make any use of Images in Religious Worship: The Images which are forbidden to be worshipped, are all sorts of Images whatever; The likeness of any Thing which is in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath, or in the Water under the Earth. And how extravagant soever Mens Fancies are, they cannot well form any Image, but must be like to some of these things, either in whole or in part. But the Commandment takes no notice of Mens different Opinions about Images, whether they look upon them as Gods, or Representatives of God, or helps to Memory and Devotion: for since the design of the Commandment is to forbid the use of Images in Religious Worship, it was dangerous to leave any room for Distinctions; which is to make every Man judge, what is an Innocent, and what is a sinful use of Images; which would utterly evacuate the Law: for Men of Wit can find out some Apology or other for the grossest Superstitions.

As for instance;

I find a notable Criticism in the Advertisement to Monsieur de Meaux his Exposition, (p. 14.) That the Images forbidden in the second Commandment, are those which are forbidden to be made, as well as to be worshipped. The Consequence of which is, That the Worship of such Images as may be lawfully made, is not forbidden in this Law; and then indeed
indeed there is room enough for the Worship of Images: unless he will say, That it is unlawful to make the Images of any thing in Heaven or Earth, or under the Earth; but then they can have no Images to worship. Tertullian indeed, and some others, condemned the very Arts of Painting and Carving Images, as forbid in the second Commandment: and it is certainly unlawful to make any Image in order to worship it. But I desire to know of this Author, whether it be lawful to make an Image or Picture of the Sun, and Moon, and Planets; of Birds and Beasts, of Men and Women, which are the Likenes of Things in Heaven, and Things on Earth? If it be, then the making of those Images is not forbid in the second Commandment, and then the worship of them is not forbid neither. But he says, He means such Images as are made to represent God, and those which are made to show him present, and which are worshipped with the same intention as full of his Divinity. But is this the Work of the Carver, or the Painter, to make a God? Can the Pencil, or the Knife, put Divinity into a Picture or Image? This is the work of him that Consecrates, and him that Worships.

\textit{Qui singit Sacros auro vel marmore vultus
Non facit ille Deos, qui colit, ille facit.}

He had forgot the Brazen Serpent which Hezekiah broke, the making of which, I suppose, was not forbid in the second Command, but it seems the worship of it was... But to return:

Though the second Commandment forbids the worship of all sorts of Images, and every act and degree of Worship, without leaving room for any Exceptions or Distinctions, yet we may learn from Scripture, what was the currant Notion of Image-Worship at that time, viz. That they worshipped their Images, not for Gods, but for Symbols and Representations of their Gods; that is, they set them up as visible Objects of Worship, to receive their Worship in the name and stead of their Gods: They did not worship the Images themselves, but their Gods in and by their Images.
Indeed, this is the only Notion of Image-Worship that any Men ever had, till Christians began to worship Images, and then were forced to defend it, and to distinguish away the Idolatry of it.

This is the Account the Heathens gave of their Worship of Images, That they did not believe them to be Gods, but only worshipped their Gods in their Images. Thus Cicero ascribes the making Images of their Gods in humane Shape, to their Superstition, *Ut essent simulacra*, *qua venerantes deos ipsos se adire crederent*, that they might have Images to make their Address to, as if the Gods themselves were present.

And *Maximus Tyrius* gives a large Account of their Images to the same purpose, That they are all but so many Pictures and Representations of the Deity, to bring us to the conception of him; and it matters not what the Image be, so it bring God to our Thoughts, and direct our Worship to him; *θεόν εἰς ζωάμων έτοι μόνον*. Celsus and Julian deny that they thought their Images to be Gods; and so did the Heathens in *Arnobius*, *Athanasius*, and St. *Austin*, as those Fathers acknowledg. And Julian tells us, That a lover of God loves the Representations of the Gods; and beholding their Images, doth secretly fear and reverence them, which although invisible themselves, do behold him. And *Dio Chrysostom*, in his Olympick Oration, gives this Account why Men are so fond of Images, which they know cannot express the invisible and inexpressible Nature of God, *Because Mankind doth not love to worship God at a distance, but to come near and feel him, and with assurance Sacrifice to him, and Crown him*. Nay, those very Heathens who believed that some invincible Spirits after Confecration were, not incorporated with their Images, (which it does not appear to me; that any of them thought) but present in them; did not therefore worship the material Figure, but through the visible Image, worshipped those invisible Spirits which were hid in it. *Nam hoc visible colo, sed numen quod illic invisibiliter habitat*. And therefore *Arnobius* says, That they formed the Images of their Gods, *Vicariù substitutione*, that is, to set them in the place of God; to be a vicarious Object of Worship, to receive their Worship in the name of their Gods.
Gods; and that God receives their Worship by Images, per quædam fidei commiffa, by way of Trust; as if they were intrusted to receive their Worship for God in his stead. Hence St. Austin tells us, that no Image of God ought to be worshipped, but only Christ, who is what he is; and he not to be worshipped instead of God, but together with him; which shows plainly what Notion the Father had of proper Image-worship; that it is to worship the Image instead of God: and therefore tho Christ be such an Image of God as must be worshipped, yet he must not be worshipped as an Image; that is, not in the stead, but together with God. And St. Hierom on Rom. 1. gives the same notion of Image-worship, Quomodo invisibilis Deus per simulacrum visibile colere tur; that it is to worship the invisible God by a visible Image: and therefore falling down before their Images is called by Arnobius, Deorum ante ora prostrati, prostrating themselves before the Face of their Gods; which is aptly expressed by Cæsar, ante simulacra proiecti victoriam a Diis expofcerent, Cæsar de Bello falling down before their Images, they begged Victory of their Gods. And in those days before they were acquainted with School-Difficulties, to pray to their Gods before their Images, and fixing their Eyes on them, was thought to be Image-worship; thus St. Austin expresses it by adorat vel orat inuenis simulacrum, adoring, or praying, looking upon an Image: and so does Ovid, Summisfoqs genu vultus in imagine Ovid. Fast. 4. Divinefixit, with bended Knees he fixes his Eye upon the Image of the Goddess: and indeed all the Arguments of the ancient Fathers against the Worship of Images are levelled against this Notion of it, that they worshipped their Gods by Images, not that they thought their Images to be Gods. This then being the received Notion of Image-worship among the Heathens, in which they all agreed, as far as we have any account of their Opinions, and being the only intelligible account that can be given of the Worship of Images, we have reason to believe, that the second Commandment, which forbids the Worship of Images, had a principal regard to it; but I have other Arguments from the Scripture itself to confirm this Opinion.
1. The first is from the first Example of Image-worship among the Israelites after the giving this Law; that is, the Worship of the Golden Calf, which Aaron made while Moses was in the Mount: That this Calf was intended only as a Symbolical Representation of the God of Israel, and that they worshipped the Lord Jehovah in the Worship of this Calf, is so evident from the whole Story, that I confess I do not think that Man fit to be disputed with, who denies it; for he must either want Understanding, or Honesty, to be convinced of the plainest matter, which he has no mind to believe. The occasion of their making this Calf, was the absence of Moses, who was a kind of a living Oracle, and Divine Presence with them. They said to Aaron, 

Up, make us Gods, which shall go before us: for as for this Moses, the Man who brought us up out of the Land of Egypt, we will not what is become of him: So that they wanted not a new God, but only a Divine Presence with them, since Moses, who used to acquaint them with the Will of God, and govern them by a Divine Spirit, was so long absent, that they thought him lost; when the Calf was made, they said, These be thy Gods, O Israel, which brought Thee out of the Land of Egypt: Which they could not possibly understand of the Calf, which was but then made. For tho we should think them so silly, as to believe it to be a God, it was impossible they should think that the Calf brought them out of Egypt, before it self was made: Nor could they think any Egyptian Gods delivered them out of Egypt to the ruine and desolation of their own Country; especially, since they certainly knew, that it was only the Lord Jehovah, who brought them out of Egypt by the hand of Moses; and therefore Aaron built an Altar before it, and proclaimed a Feast to the Lord, or to Jehovah, as the word is: which makes it very plain to any unprejudiced Man, that they intended to worship the Lord Jehovah in the Worship of the Golden Calf, which they made for a Symbolical Representation and Presence of God; which no doubt was very agreeable to the notion the Egyptians had of their Images, from whom they learnt this way of Worship; and I need not tell any Man how displeasing this was to God.

2. Ano-
2. Another Argument of this, is, That Images are called Gods in Scripture; Isa. 44. 10. Who hath fashioned a God, or molten a Graven Image, which is profitable for nothing. — He maketh a God, and worshippeth it; he maketh it a Graven Image, and faileth down thereto. — The residue thereof he maketh a God, even his Graven Image, and worshippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and faith, Deliver me, for thou art my God. I need not multiply places for the proof of this; for this is own'd by all the Advocates of the Church of Rome, and relied on as the great support of their Cause. From hence they say, it is plain in what sense God forbids the Worship of Images, viz. when Men worship their Images for Gods, as the Text afferts the Heathens did. But tho the Church of Rome worships Images, yet she does not worship them for Gods, but only worship God, or Christ, or the Saints in and by their Images. This is the reason of their great Zeal to make the first and second Commandment but one: because the first Commandment forbidding the Worship of all false Gods, if that which we call the second Commandment, which forbids the Worship of Images, be reckoned only as part of the first, then they think it plain in what sense the Worship of Images is forbid viz. only as the Worship of false Gods; and therefore those cannot be charged with the breach of this Commandment, who do not believe their Images to be Gods.

Now besides what I have already said, to prove that the Heathens did not believe the Images themselves to be Gods, which is so foolish a Conceit, as no Man of common Sense can be guilty of; I have several Arguments to prove, that the Scripture does not understand it in this Sense.

1. The first is, That the Golden Calf is called Gods of Gold, Exod. 32. 31. and yet it is evident, they did not believe the Calf to be a God, but only a Symbol and Representation of the Lord Jehovah, whom they worshipped in the Calf.

2. The very name of an Image, which signifies a Likeness and Representation of some other Being, is irreconcilable with such a Belief, that the Image itself is a God; that the Image is that very God, whom it is made to represent; which.
which signifies, that the likeness of God, is that very God whose likeness it is: Especially, when the Scripture, which calls such Images Gods, calls them also the Images of their Gods.

Which is proof enough, that tho' the Scripture calls Images Gods, it does not understand it in that sense, that they believe their material Images to be Gods: for it is a contradiction to say, that the Image of Baal, is both their God Baal, and his Image at the same time; for the Image is not the thing it represents.

3. The Arguments urged in Scripture against Images, plainly prove, that they were not made to be Gods, but only Representations of God. One Argument is, because they saw no similitude of God when he spoke to them in Horeb out of the midst of the Fire: another, that they can make no likeness of Him. To whom then will ye liken God, or what likeness will ye compare to Him? —To whom then will ye liken Me, or shall I be equal, saith the Holy One? Thus St. Paul argues with the Philosophers at Athens; For as much as we are the Offspring of God, we ought not to think the Godhead to be like to Gold, and Silver, and Stone graven by Art, and Man's Device. Now what do all these Arguments signify against making a God? for if they can make a God, what matter is it who their God be like, so he be a God? It is a good Argument against making any Image and Representation of God, that it is impossible to make any thing like him; but it is enough for a God to be like itself.

In what sense then, you'll say, does the Scripture call Images Gods? there is but one possible sense, that I know of, and that is, that they are vicarious and substituted Gods; that they are set up in God's place, to represent his Person, and to receive our Worship in his name and stead, and so are Gods by Office, tho' not by Nature. They are visible Representations of the Invisible God, they bear his Name and receive his Worship; as the Golden Calf was called Jehovah, and the Worship of the Calf was called a Feast unto the Lord: And this is some reason for their being called Gods; as the Proxy and Substitute acts in the name of the Person he represents: Which proves that this is the Scripture
tute notion of Image-worship, that the Image is worshipped in God's name and stead. And to this purpose I observe, That tho' εἰδωλος, or an Idol, signifies a fald god; yet it signifies such a false god as is only the image and figure of another god; for so εἰδωλος, signifies εἰκών and εἴδωλος, a likeness or simi-
itude. Thus Tertullian tells us, corum imaginis Idola, ima-
ginum consecrato Idolatria. That their Images are Idols, and the Confecration of them is Idolatry. Thus the Author of the Book of Wisdom attributes the original of Idolatry, to Fathers making images for their children who were dead, and appointing so-
lemnities to be kept before them as if they were gods; and thus by degrees Princes passed these things into Laws, and made men to worship graven images; and thus either out of affection or flattery the worship of Idols began. Which shews what he means by Idols, Images consecrated for the worship of God. And therefore he distinguishes the worship of Idols, from the worship of the Elements and heavenly bodies, when this was done without an Image: And therefore no God is in Scripture called an Idol, but with respect to its Image. Thus Idols and Molten Gods are join'd together, as expounding each other. And the Pfalmift tells us, The Idols of the Heathens are Silver and Gold, the work of men's hands. So that an Idol is a false God, as it signifies a material Image made to represent some God, as a visible object of worship, to receive the worship of that God whose name it bears, in his place and stead.

To the same purpose the Scripture charges these Image-wor-
shippers with changing the Glory of God into the likeness and similitude of those creatures whereby they represented him. The Israelites made the Image of a Golden Calf, as the sym-
bolical representation and presence of the Lord Jehovah; and the Pfalmift tells us, that by so doing, they changed their glory (i. e. the Lord Jehovah, who was the glory of Israel) into the similitude of an Ox which eateth grass. Which necessarily sup-
poses, that they intended to represent the Lord Jehovah in the Image of the Calf; not that they thought their God to be like the Calf, but as they made a vicarious and visible God of it, and worshipped it in the name of the Lord Jehovah. Thus St. Paul describes the Idolatry of the Heathens, That they changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into an image made like to cor-
ruptible
ruptible man, and four footed beasts, and creeping things. But of this more presently; this is sufficient to show, what the Scripture notion of Image-worship is, and in what sense it condemns it.

3dly. Let us now consider wherein the evil of this Image-worship consists, which will greatly contribute to the right understanding of this whole dispute. Now the account of it in general is very short and plain, That the evil of Image-worship when we worship the true God by an Image, does not so much consist in the kinds, or degrees, or object of worship, as in representation; and if this prove the true account of it, as I believe it will appear to be to all considering men, before I have done, it will quite alter the state of this controversy, and put M. de Meaux, and the Representer, to find out some new Expositions and Representations of their Image-worship.

1. That the evil of Image-worship when men worship the true God by an Image, does not principally consist in the kinds, or degrees, or object of worship. Such men indeed are said in Scripture to worship Images, and Idols, and Molten Gods, and that their Idols are silver and gold, wood and stone; for when they worship God by an Image, they must worship the Image; or else they cannot worship God in it, tho' they worship the Image not for itself, but for the Prototype, as the Council of Trent determines, which is more properly worshipping God or Christ in or before his Image, as M. de Meaux expounds it, than worshipping the Image; and they are said to worship Images rather with respect to the manner than to the object of worship, as you shall hear more presently. The Church of Rome indeed, as her doctrine and practice is expounded by her most famed Divines, may justly be charged with worshipping Images in the grossest sense; as that signifies giving Religious worship to the material image of wood and stone, which is strictly to worship stocks and stones as Gods. This charge may be easily made good against all those who teach that the Image is to be properly worshipped, and that either a relative latria, or some proper inferior worship is to be terminated on the Image as its material object; and yet most of the Roman Doctors attribute one or t'other to the Image, as distinct from that worship they give to the Prototype; and dispute very learnedly, that this is the
the Doctrine both of the second Council of Nice, and of the Council of Trent. That a proper worship must be given to the Image, distinct from that worship which is given to the Prototype; but they cannot yet agree, whether it be a relative improper analogical latria, which must be given to the Image of Christ, or only dulia, or an inferior degree of Religious worship.

This has hitherto been the chief feat of the Controversy between Protestants and Papists about Image-worship; and M. de Meaux seems very sensible, That attributing a proper worship to Images, so as to terminate it on them, gives too just occasion for the charge of Idolatry, and puts them to hard shifts to vindicate themselves from it; and therefore he owns no worship due to the Image for itself, but only as it represents the Prototype, which therefore is not so properly the worship of the Image, as of the Prototype by the Image; and here I perfectly agree with him, That the true notion of Image-worship is not to worship the Image at all, considered in itself, as a material figure of Wood and Stone, but only to worship God or Christ in the Image. And therefore I shall set aside this dispute, in what sense, or how far a Papist may be charged with worshipping the material Image, which has occasioned eternal wranglings, and yet does not properly belong to the controversy of Image-worship. To worship a material Image, is to give the worship of God to Creatures, to Wood and Stone; but Image-worship is in its strict notion, not giving Divine worship to Images, but worshipping God in and by the Image which represents him, which in Scripture is called worshipping Images: And therefore tho we should grant, that M. de Meaux his exposition avoids the first charge of giving Religious worship to Wood and Stone, because he denies that they properly worship the Image, but only the Prototype in the Image; yet the whole guilt of Image-worship, as that signifies the worship of God by Images, not the worship of the material Image, is chargeable upon him still, that is, the worship of the Prototype by the Image, which is all that is forbid in the second Commandment.

This, it may be, will be thought a giving up the Cause, to grant, that the Church of Rome may worship God or Christ

by
by Images, and yet not be chargeable with worshipping the Images themselves, or the material figures of Wood or Stone; and therefore it will be necessary to shew, that the true Notion of Idolatry or Image-worship is not giving Religious worship to the Images themselves, but worshipping God by Images, and what the difference between these two is.

1. And the first thing I shall observe to this purpose, is the difference between the First and Second Commandment, which all Protestants own and defend against the Church of Rome, which makes the Second Commandment only a Branch and Appendix of the First. Now the First Commandment forbids all false objects of worship, the worship of all creatures and fictitious Deities, and therefore the worship of all Beings besides God, whether rational, animate or inanimate, is a breach of the First Commandment, and must be reduced to it; and consequently the Second Commandment which forbids the worship of Images, cannot forbid them as false Objects, (for all such are forbid in the first Commandment) but as a false and corrupt way of worship; and therefore Image-worship as it is forbid in the Second Commandment, cannot signify worshipping the Image itself, as distinguished from the Prototype, for that would make it a false object of worship against the first Commandment; but only a false and superstitious way of representing and worshipping God by an Image.

2ly. And therefore I observe, that an Image does not alter the object of worship, which yet it must necessarily do, if it were essential to the Notion of Image-worship to worship the Image itself, which would make the Image a new object of worship. Now it is plain, that men who do not dispute themselves into endless subtleties and distinctions, intend no more in the worship of Images, than to worship that God whose Image it is, and therefore the object of worship is the same with or without an Image. They who worship the True God with an Image, and they who worship him without an Image, worship the same God though in a different manner; and besides what judgment men make of their own actions, and what they intend to do, the Scripture itself acknowledges this. When the Israelites made a golden Calf, Aaron proclaims a Feast to the Lord Jehovah, which proves that they intended to worship the same God still in the golden
golden Calf, which they did before without it. Thus the Two Calves which Jeroboam set up, were made in imitation of the golden Calf, and for Symbolical representations of the God of Israel, who was worshipped by them; for it is plain that Jeroboam did not intend to change their God, but only to prevent their going up to Jerusalem to worship. God there; and therefore he tells them, It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem, behold thy Gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt; that is, the Lord Jehovah. Now we may observe, that God himself, though he was grievously offended with the Sin of Jeroboam, yet he makes a great difference between the Sin of Jeroboam and the Sin of Abab, who introduced the worship of Baal a false God, whereas Jeroboam retained the worship of the true God, though he worshipped him in a false and Idolatrous manner. If the Calves of Dan and Bethel had been false Gods, as Baal was, the Sin had been equally provoking; but the worship of the Calves did not change their God, as the worship of Baal did; and therefore Elijah distinguishes the Israelites into the worshippers of God and of Baal. How long halt ye between Two Opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him; and yet most of those who are said to be worshippers of God, did worship God at the Calves of Dan and Bethel, which was the established Religion of the Kingdom. And thus Jehu, tho' he departed not from the Sin of Jeroboam, the golden Calves in Dan and Bethel, yet he calls his Zeal in destroying Baal out of Israel, his Zeal for the Lord Jehovah.

Now if the worship of an Image do not change the object of our worship, neither in the intention of the worshipper, nor in the account of Scripture, as I have now proved, it evidently follows, that the Image is not worshipped as an object, but as a Medium of worship; it receives no worship for itself, but only for God whom it represents. And that which is so offensive to God in it, is not that they set up any Rival and Opposite gods against him, but that they worship him in a reproachful and dishonourable manner, which makes him abhor and reject the worship; and because he will not receive this worship himself, he calls it worshipping Idols and graven Images, and molten gods, that is, vicarious and representative gods, which though they receive the worship in God's Name, yet are an infinite reproach to
to his Majesty by that vile and contemptible Representation they make him. This is the strict Notion of Idolatry, not the giving the worship of God to Creatures; which is the Breach of the First Commandment in making new Gods, but the worship of God by an Image, which makes such Images Gods by Representation, but not the objects, but only the Medium of worship; and therefore though we should grant M. de Meaux that he does not worship Images, but only Christ and the Saints in or before their Images, this does not excuse him from Idolatry, which does not signify worshipping an Image in a strict sense; but only worshipping God in an Image, which terminates all the worship not on the Image but on God.

2½. Let us now consider wherein the Evil of this Idolatry or Image-worship does consist; and that I said was in Representation; which I shall briefly explain in these particulars. 1. That it is an infinite reproach to the Divine Nature and Perfections, to be represented by an Image: To whom will ye liken God? Or what likeness will ye compare to him? The workman melteth a graven Image, and the Goldsmith spreadeth it over with Gold, and casteth Silver Chains. He that is so impoverished that he hath no Oblation, chuseth a Tree that will not rot: he seeketh unto him a cunning Workman to prepare a graven Image that shall not be moved. Have ye not known? Have ye not heard? Hath it not been told you from the beginning? Have ye not understood from the Foundations of the Earth? It is he that sitteth upon the Circle of the Earth, and the Inhabitants thereof are as Grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the Heavens as a Curtain, and spreadeth them out as a Tent to dwell in. How incongruous and absurd is it, to make a Picture or Image of that God who is invisible? to represent a pure Mind by Matter, dull senseless Matter! to give the shape and figure of a Man, or some viler Creature, to that God who has none! To make an Image for the Maker of the World, and to bring that Infinite Being to the scantlings and dimensions of a Man, who fills Heaven and Earth with his presence! If it be the Glory of God to be what he is, a pure, infinite, eternal, invisible Mind! it is a contradiction and dishonour to him to be represented by a material visible Image like to some of his own Creatures; but inferior to the meanest living Creatures, because without Life and Sense: Thus St. Paul argues, Acts 17.29.

For-
Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think, that the Godhead is like unto Gold or Silver, or Stone graven by art, and men's device. If we think God to be like to such Images, we know nothing of him; and if we make such Images as we know are not like to God, nay a reproach to his Nature and Perfections, we wilfully affront him. And tho' Christ conversed in this World in human Nature, which is representable by an Image, yet an Image is not a proper Representation of Christ, as the object of Worship, because it cannot represent the Divine Nature, which is the Reason and Foundation of Worship. And as for Saints, they ought not to be worshipped at all, and therefore not worshipped by Images: And indeed, that very Law which forbids the worship of Images without any Exception, and yet upon such Reasons as are peculiar to the infinite Nature of God, are a plain Argument to me, that no Being which is representable by human Art, is an Object of Worship.

2. To set up an Image in the place of God, has a great appearance and suspicion of worshipping a material and visible God, of giving Divine Honours to Gold and Silver, and the work of men's hands; for tho' the men pretend to Worship God in the Image, yet how does the Image come to be worshipped for God? What likeness? What Relation is there between them? How easily may men slip into the worship of Images themselves, and forfake God, or never mind him, for the sake of a fine Picture, or some beautiful or wonder-working Image? for tho' there is a great deal of difference between worshipping God by an Image, and worshipping the Image itself, yet to all appearance they are so like one another, and there is so easie a passage from one to the other, that Gods displeasure against this Sin is expressed in Scripture by Jealousie; a Passion which expresses both Suspicion and Caution; while they profess to Worship God by their Images, they do not change their God, but yet their worshipping a visible Image, looks very like it, and is an easie introduction to it. Thus in the second Commandment, the Reason with which God inforces his Prohibition against worshipping Images is, For I the Lord thy God, am a Jealous God. Thus Psal. 78. 58. for they provoked him to anger with their high places, and moved him to Jealousie with their graven Images. And therefore he expresses
presses himself with some Passion and Concernment in this matter. I am the Lord, that is my Name, and my Glory will I not give to another, neither my Praise to Graven Images, Is. 42. 8. The Church is called Gods Spouse, and the worship of false gods is called Whoredom and Adultery, going after other gods; and the worship of the true God by Images, tho it be not Whoredom, yet it is such a kind of spiritual Wantonness and Incontinency, as excites his Jealousie.

3. Especially when we consider, that the Worship of Images does naturally expose us to the Cheats and Impostures of wicked Spirits; for this reason I observed before, God forbrids the Worship of any other Invisible Being but himself; for if men were allowed to Worship inferior Spirits, bad Spirits who inhabit these lower Regions, would soon have the greatest share in their Worship; and thus it is with Images, which are such an offence and dishonour to God, that we cannot expect that he will ever shew himself present in them, or guard them from the possession of evil Spirits. It is evident that in the Heathen World, evil Spirits possessed their Images, and abused mankind with their lying Wonders, and lying Oracles; and I have some reason to believe, that if any Miracles are wrought still at Images, they are not by good Spirits, because Images are an Abomination to God; and therefore, Rom. 1. St. Paul attributes the general corruption of mens lives and manners to the Worship of Images; They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things; wherefore God gave them up to uncleanness—for this cause God gave them up to vile affections—and even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind to do these things which are not convenient. The meaning of which is, That God gave them over to the delusions of wicked Spirits, who lurked in their Images, and first corrupted their Religion, and then their Lives by impure and barbarous Rites of Worship.

4. If there were no other hurt in Image-worship, yet it debases human Nature to fall down before a senseless Image: As it is a dishonour to God to be worshipped by an Image, tho the Worship be intended for himself, and not for the Image, because it makes so mean and vile Representation of him; so it is a reproach
proach to a man, who is a reasonable Creature, and made after the Image of God, to fall down before Stocks and Stones, with all external Submissions and Adorations, tho he intends not to worship the material Image, but God by it; because the visible Object before which we pay our Worship, is so much below the honour and dignity of humane Nature, is a reproach to the understanding of a man to think that a material Image is a decent Representation of God, and a fit medium of Worship; and he must have a mean and beggarly Spirit, who can be contented to bow down before it: Thus Arnobius aggravates the madness of this: Supplicare tremebundum factitatae abs te rei; Arnob. 1. 6. To fall down trembling, and to supplicate that which thou thyself hast made. And a greater than Arnobius tells us, They that make them, are like unto them, so is every one who putteth their trust in Psal. 135. 18. them.

63. The Worship of God by Images is contrary not only to the Law of Moses, but to the reason of Mankind; it gratifies indeed a fleshly and sensual Mind to have a visible Object of Worship, but God is the only natural Object of Worship; and reason tells us, that God is invisible; and Reason will tell us, that it is contrary to the nature of an invisible Being, to be worshipped under a visible Representation; it is not only a Reproach to the Divine Nature, but an absurd and unreasonable Worship. For what considering man can think it reasonable to worship a visible Image instead of an invisible God? Reason can never justify a worship so contradictory to the Divine Nature, and therefore Reason can never teach men to Worship an Image. For what is it they intend by worshipping Images? Have they a mind to see the God they Worship? But how unreasonable is this, when they know he is invisible, and would not be a God if he could be seen? And how absurd is it to Represent him by an Image, when they know they can make no image like him? No worship can be natural, which contradicts the nature of that Being whom we Worship; and if it be not natural, it must be instituted Worship; and then, tho it were forbid by no Law, it must be commanded by some Law to make it reasonable, at least if it be possible that a Law could make that an act of Honour and Worship, which is a Dishonour to the Divine Perfections.
6ly. It is more especially contrary to the nature of the Christian worship, which teaches us to form a more spiritual Idea of God, and to worship him in Spirit and in Truth; in opposition not only to all sensible Representations, but to all Symbolical Presences. There are two things principally, for which Images are intended, to be visible Representations, and a visible Presence of the Deity. The first of these is so great a Reproach to the Divine Nature, that it was forbid by the Law of Moses, which was at best a less perfect Dispensation, as being accommodated to the carnal State of that people; but as to the second, God himself gratified them in it, for he dwelt among them in the Tabernacle, and afterwards in the Temple of Jerusalem, where he placed the Symbols of his Presence. But now when the Woman of Samaria asked our Saviour about the place of Worship, whether it was the Temple at Jerusalem, or Samaria: He answered, The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father. But the true worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in Truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in Spirit and in Truth. Where Christ opposes worshipping in Spirit and in Truth, to worshipping in the Temple, not as a Temple signifies a place separated for Religious Worship, which is a necessary Circumstance of Worship in all Religions; but as it signifies a Symbolical Presence, a Figure of God's Residence and Dwelling among them, in which sense the Primitive Christians denied that they had any Temples. For God dwelling in human Nature, is the only Divine Presence under the Gospel, of which the Temple was but a Type and Figure. Now if the spiritual Worship of the Gospel does so withdraw us from sense, as not to admit of a Symbolical Presence, much less certainly does it admit of Images, to represent God present to us, which is so gross and carnal, that God forbad it under the Legal Dispensation. We must consider God as an infinite Mind, present in all places to hear our Prayers, and receive our Worship, and must raise our hearts to Heaven, whether Christ who is the only visible Presence of God is ascended, and not seek for him in carved Wood or Stone, or a curious piece of Painting.

7ly. But
74. But since M. de Maup, and the Representer think it
sufficient to justify the worship of Images, that they are of
great use to represent the object of our worship to us, and to
affect us with suitable passions; it will be needful briefly to con-
consider this matter. For I confess I cannot see how a material
and visible Image should form a true Idea in us of an invisible
Spirit; it is apt to corrupt mens notions of God and Religion,
and to abate our just reverence, by representing the object of
our worship under so contemptible an appearance. An Image
cannot tell us what God is; if we are otherwise instructed in
the nature of God, we know that an image is not like him, but
a reproach to the Divine perfections; if we are not better in-
structed, we shall think our God like his image, which will
make us very understanding Christians.

But the Representer has drawn this Argument out at large,
and therefore we must consider what he says of it. That Pi-
ctures and Images serve to, 1. Preserve in his mind the memory
of the things represented by them, as people are wont to preserve
the memory of their deceased Friends by keeping their Pictures. But
I beseech you, the memory of what does a Picture preserve?
Of nothing that I know of, but the external lineaments and
features of the face or body; and therefore the Images and
Pictures of God and the Holy Trinity (which yet are allow-
ed in the Church of Rome) cannot serve this end, unless they
will say, that God has an external shape as Man has. And
suppose we had the exact Pictures of Christ and the Virgin
Mary, the Apostles and other Saints and Martyrs, this might
gratify our curiosity, but of what use is it in the Christian Reli-
gion? To remember Christ, is not to remember his face, which
we never saw, but to remember his Doctrine and his Life; to
call to mind his great Love in dying for us; to remember him
not as a Man, but as a God incarnate, as our Mediator and
Advocate, as our Lord and Judge; and therefore the Gospels
which contain the History of his Life, are a much better Pi-
cure of Christ, than any drawn by the most curious Pencil;
and I doubt, the Christian Religion will not gain much by taking
the Gospels out of peoples hands, and giving them a Picture to
gaze on.
Yes, says our Author, 2. He is taught to use them by casting his eye upon the Pictures or Images, and thence to raise his heart to the Prototypes, and there to employ it in Meditation, Love, Thanksgiving, Imitation, &c. as the object requires. But he is a very sorry Christian, who never thinks of Christ, but when he sees his Picture. And how can the sight of a Picture raise our hearts to the Love of Christ? The sight indeed of a lovely Picture may excite a sensible passion, but not a Divine Love; The sight of his Picture can only put us in mind, that there was such a person as Christ in the world; but if we would affect our hearts with his love and praise, we must not gaze on his Face, which is all that a Picture can show us, if it could do that; but meditate on what he has done and suffered for us, which may be done better without a Picture, than with it. If they want something to put them in mind, that there is such a person as Christ, which is all that his Picture can do, the name of Christ written upon the Church Walls would be more innocent, and altogether as effectual to this end.

But Pictures are very instruitive, as that of a Death's-head and Old Time painted with his Forelock, Hour-glass, and Sythe; and do inform the mind at one glance, of what in reading requires a Chapter, and sometimes a Volume; Which is so far from being true, that a Picture informs a Man of nothing, but what he was informed of before. The Picture of a Crucifix may put a man in Mind of what he has heard or read of Chrifts dying upon the Cross; but if he know nothing of the History of Christs Sufferings, the bare seeing a Crucifix can teach him nothing. Children may be taught by Pictures, which make a more strong impression on their fancies than Words; but a Picture cannot teach; and at best this is but a very childish way of learning.

3. But devout Pictures are of great use in Prayer, the sight of which cures distractions, and recals his wandering thoughts to the right object, and as certainly brings some good things into his mind, as an inspofite Picture disturbs his heart with naughtiness. But can men read their Prayers, as well as learn the Articles of their Creed, in a Picture too? For even good thought are a distraction in Prayers, when they call us from attending to what we ask of God; and it is to be feared then, that Pictures them-
themselves may distract us, unless we are sure they will suggest no thoughts to us at such a time, but what are in our Prayers; the Church of Rome indeed teaching her Children such Prayers as they do not understand, and therefore cannot imploy their thoughts, may make Pictures very necessary to entertain them; but if our thoughts and our words ought to go together, as it must be if the Devotion of Prayers consists in praying devoutly, an Image which cannot speak, and a Prayer which is not understood, are like to make Men equally devout; should Men when they look upon a Crucifix, run over in their Minds all the History of our Saviours Sufferings! should the sight of our Saviour hanging on the Cross affect us with some soft and tender Passions at the remembrance of him! (which it is certain the daily and familiar use of such Pictures cannot do) yet what is this to Prayer? Such sensible Passions as the sight of a Picture can raise in us, are of little or no account in Religion, true devout Affections must spring from an inward Vital Sense, which the Picture cannot give to those who want it, and is of no use to those who have it.

Thus I have, as briefly as the Subject would permit, examined the Doctrine of Praying to Saints, and Worshipping Images according to the Exposition of the Bishop of Condom, to whom our Author appeals in these Points, and this I hope will satisfy him; what we think both of the Bishops Authority and his Exposition, and how little we like Popery in its best dress. And now it is time to return to our Protester.

And I hope by this time he sees that there is something more needful to clear the Matters in Controversie between us, than barely M. de Meaux his Authority; and therefore he resolving not to look beyond the Exposition delivered by this Prelate, I might here very fairly take my leave of him; but I cannot do this, tho' he be a perfect Stranger to me, without dismissing him civilly with a Complement or two more.

1. Then as to the Invocation of Saints, he observes that I deny the Bishop has limited it only to their Prayers, which I own is a mistake; and this is such a Complement as must never be expected from a Doctor of the infallible Church, for he had occasion enough for it, had he had a Heart to do it; but I hope I have abundantly made amends for this now.
now by a fair and particular Examination of the Bishops Exposition as to that Point; and indeed M. de Meaux himself gave the occasion for this, by not owning it in its due place, when he expounded the Decree of the Council, which teaches them to fly to the aid and assistance of the Saints as well as to their Prayers, but stuffing it into the middle of a sentence at some distance, where no Man would expect it: When Expositors dodge at this rate, they may thank themselves if they are mistaken.

2ly and 3ly, He takes Sanctuary again in the Bishops Authority to justify his renouncing the Popes personal Infallibility, and the Deposing Doctrine, as no Articles of Faith: But tho' the Bishop indeed do wave some things, as he says, which are disputed of in the Schools, as no Articles of Faith, yet he does not say what they are, much less name the Popes personal Infallibility, and the Deposing power; and one would think he could not mean the Deposing power, which is determined by General Councils, and therefore must be an Article of Faith. The Truth is, the Bishop has here plaid a very cunning Game, and men may make what they please of his words, as their interest or inclination leads them; if Protestants object the Doctrine of the Popes infallibility and Deposing power, he can easily tell them that these are School disputes, and not Articles of Faith; if the Pope or Roman Doctors quarrel at it, he has then said nothing in disparagement of the Popes infallibility and Deposing power, but has taught that Fundamental Principle on which these Doctrines depend, as in Truth he has, when he makes the Primacy of Peter, the Cement of Unity, and gives this Primacy to the Bishops of Rome, as Successors of the Prince of the Apostles, to whom for this cause we owe that Obedience and Submission which the holy Councils and Fathers have always taught the Faithful; though they have not said one word till of late of any such obedience and submission due to them; especially when we consider what he means by the Primacy of the Pope, that he is a Head established by God to conduct his whole Flock in his paths; which gives him a Supremacy over Bishops and Secular Princes; and how naturally this infers infallibility, and a power of deposing Heretical Princes, every one sees, and we have reason to believe the Bishop expounded his Doctrine to this Orthodox Sence
Sence in his Letters to the Pope, from the Popes Testimonial, that his Letters shewed his submission and respect to the Apostolick See.

As for the Popes personal infallibility, our Author in his Reflections (p. 8.) denies it to be an Article of Faith, because it is not positively determined by any General Council; in my reply (p. 47.) I told him this is no proof, that it is not an Article of Faith, because the infallibility of the Church itself, which they all grant to be an Article of Faith, was never positively determined by any General Council; and therefore some Doctrines may be Articles of Faith, which never were determined by any General Council; and I added, that if the Church be infallible, the Pope must, if he be the Head of the Church; for infallibility ought in reason to accompany the greatest and most absolute Power; but our Author thought fit to let fall this dispute, and to resolve all into the Bishop of Condoms Authority.

His Proposal which follows, I have already answered without a smile, but I cannot forbear smiling once more to hear him complain of disputing; which he says belongs not to the Representer, who being to represent and not to dispute, is not concerned with those tedious Arguments. The Case is this; In the Character of a Papift Represented, he had denied the deposing Power to be an Article of Faith; the Answerer proved it was an Article of Faith, because it was decreed by General Councils; to this, in his Reflections he answers, that every thing approved in General Councils, is not an Article of Faith, but only Doctrinal Points, and those decreed with an Anathema; and therefore the Deposing Power not being declared as a doctrinal point, and the decrees relating only to Discipline and Government, and not being decreed neither with an Anathema, it does not appear to be an Article of Faith: In Answer to this, in my Reply (p. 49.) I proposed three Enquiries, 1. Whether nothing be an Article of Faith, but what is decreed with an Anathema? 2. Whether the deposing Decree be a doctrinal Point, or only matter of Discipline and Government? 3. What Authority general Councils have in decrees morum, or such matters as concern Discipline and Government? This is the disputing he complains of, and I confess he has some reason for it; for Arguments that cannot be answered, how short soever they are, are very tedious; but how I could answer his argument with
without disputing, or how he comes to be unconcerned to defend his own arguments, I cannot tell; but the disputing is not his Province, yet in civility he will go out of his way with me, and in Civility I will keep him company.

1. He confesses, I prove at large that all definitions of Faith declared in General Councils are not concluded with Anathema's, and in this he willingly agrees with me. But this does not at all prove, that whatsoever is declared in such a Council without an Anathema, is an Article of Faith; and therefore nothing against us deserving any farther answer. And thus he has very prettily altered the state of the question; he said the Deposing doctrine tho approved by General Councils, was not an Article of Faith, because not decreed with an Anathema: now if this argument be good, then nothing must be accounted an Article of Faith, but what is decreed with an Anathema: In opposition to which I proved that several Doctrines which they themselves account Articles of Faith, have been decreed by general Councils without Anathema's; and he grants that I have proved this; and if I have, I am sure his argument is lost, for then the depoing Doctrine may be an Article of Faith, tho' it be not confirmed with an Anathema: and now instead of proving, that no Doctrine is an Article of Faith which is not decreed with an Anathema, he complains that I have not proved that every Doctrine which is decreed without an Anathema, is an Article of Faith, which is nothing at all to the purpose: We knew not where to find the Articles of the Romish Faith, but in the decrees of their Councils; and finding the Popes power to depose heretical Princes there, we took it for an Article of their Faith: no, says the Refleeter, that is a mistake, it is no Article of Faith, because it is not decreed with an Anathema: we examine the matter, and find it otherwise, that Articles of Faith are decreed without Anathema's: yes, says the Protefter, this may be, but you must prove still that every Doctrine which is decreed without an Anathema is an Article of Faith; which is a very easie matter to do after this; for if being decreed with or without an Anathema, make no distinction as to this matter, then the Decree it self in doctrinal Points must make an Article of Faith; if some Doctrines which are acknowledged to be Articles of the Romish Faith are decreed without Anathema's, then it is no argument against
against any Doctrine, being an Article of Faith, that it has no
Anathema annexed to it; so that our Author is wonderful uncer-
certain what to call an Article of Faith; if we call the decrees
of their Councils Articles of their Faith, No, says he, every De-
cree is not an Article of Faith, but only what is decreed with
an Anathema; if we confute this distinction, and prove that
Articles of Faith are decreed without Anathema's, then he can
distinguish no further; but requires us to prove, that every
Doctrine decreed without an Anathema is an Article of Faith,
that is, that the decree of their Church makes an Article of
their Faith: And if that don't, I would desire to know of him,
what does. And had I not reason then to say, that it is wonder-
ful hard to know what their Faith is, when he himself cannot
tell what it is that makes an Article of Faith, and their most
Learned Divines so much differ about this matter; some al-
lowing that to be an Article of Faith, which others reject.

2ly. The second enquiry was, Whether the Deposing decree
be a Doctrinal point, or only matter of Discipline and Govern-
ment; and in answer to this I told him, That a Decree what
shall be done, includes a virtual Definition of that Doctrine on
which that Decree is founded. To this he opposes what I say
under the next head, That in the Council of the Apostles at Jeru-
salem, there was a Decree of Manners, yet it contained no Defini-
tion of Doctrine. Not expressly indeed, but virtually it does, as I
said before. My business there, was to vindicate the Authority
of Councils in those Decrees which relate to Manners, as not
less Obligatory than the Decrees of Faith; and I observed that
the only Apostolical Council we have an account of in Scripture,
Viz. the Council at Jerusalem, Acts 15. was of this nature;
for the only Decrees made in it, were to abstain from Meats
offered to Idols, and from Blood, and from things Strangled,
and from Fornication; and I observed, they might as well ob-
ject here, (to invalidate this Decree) as they do against the
Deposing Decree, that there is no point of Doctrine determi-
ned in it. And how does this contradict what I before af-

ered? That a Decree what shall be done, includes a virtual
Definition of that Doctrine on which that Decree is founded.

But however he faies, This Decree of what was to be done, did
not include a virtual Definition of that Doctrine on which the De-

P
ere was founded: for if it had, then the Doctrine of abstaining from Blood and Strangled meats, had been an Article of Faith. But what does he think of abstaining from Fornication, and from Meats offered to Idols, which are contained in the same Decree? is not that a necessary Doctrine, and virtually contained in that Decree? I never said, That every Decree of Manners must be immediately founded on an Article of Faith: but I said, every Decree of Manners is founded on some Doctrine, (whether it be in a strict sense an Article of Faith, or not) and includes a virtual Definition of that Doctrine. The Decree to abstain from Fornication includes this Doctrine, that Fornication is unlawful under the Gospel; and the Decree for Gentile Converts to abstain from meats offered to Idols, supposes the same; and the Decree to abstain from Blood, and from things Strangled, includes this doctrinal Definition, That it was unlawful for Gentile Christians at that time to use their Christian Liberty in those matters, to the offence and scandal of believing Jews. The matter in short is this: Every Decree which commands the doing any thing, must contain a virtual Definition that such a thing may be lawfully done: and every Decree which forbids the doing any thing, does withal define, that such a thing is either absolutely unlawful in itself, or highly inexpedient, and therefore unlawful in such Circumstances to be done: this is as necessary as it is to command nothing but what is lawful, and to forbid nothing but what is either unlawful, or highly inexpedient. And therefore when the Church of Rome Decrees the deposing Heretical Princes, or the favourers of Heretics: She virtually defines, that it is lawful to depose Princes, which is a doctrinal Definition, and may in a large sense be called an Article of Faith, as that signifies all Doctrinal points proposed to us to be believed, as I observed in my Reply (p. 52).

3. The third Enquiry was, Whether the Authority of the Church be not as sacred in decrees of Manners, as in Articles of Faith? for the proof of which, I urged the Council at Jerusalem, and shew'd, That Rules of Discipline and Government to direct the lives and manners of men, is the only proper subject of Ecclesiastical Authority, P. 55. And here where he should have taken notice of the Council of Jerusalem, he says nothing of it, but only says, (p. 32.) that I urge out of Canus and Bellarmine, that

General
General Councils cannot err even in such decrees, when they relate to things necessary to salvation, and which concern the whole Church. And when I have proved the Deposing Decree to be of this nature, and esteemed as such by their Church, I may then deserve a farther consideration. What their Church will esteem, if he may be the Expounder of it, is nothing to the purpose, for we argue not from their private esteeming, but from their publick Definitions; and if a General Decree for the government of the whole Church, concern the whole Church, and if to command a sin concerns mens salvation, then the Deposing decree does; for if it be unlawful to depose Heretical Princes, it is more than a single sin to do it: and if they will grant, that General Councils cannot command a sin, then they must grant, that it is lawful to depose Heretical Princes: and I agree with him, that this does deserve a farther Consideration, and shall be glad to hear his thoughts of it.

This Author in his Reflections (p. 10.) proves that Popes themselves own, that the deposing power is no Article of Faith, in letting so many open and positive asserters of the no-deposing power pass without any censure of heresy. This in my Reply (p. 57.) I attribute to their want of power. For Princes will not be deposed now, nor suffer those to be censured who deny the deposing Power. This in his protestation (p. 32.) he says, Is spoke like an Oracle, but he expects some better Argument than my bare assurance of what the Pope would do if he had power. And I thought I had given him a better argument than my bare word for it, viz. the experience of former Ages, what Popes did when they had power: for tho the infallible Chair may dissemble a little, when circumstances of affairs require it, yet sure it is not given to change.

What follows about the worship of Saints and Images, I suppose has been sufficiently answered already, but I cannot but observe a very pleasant argument he has against what I assert, That no intention can alter the nature of actions, which are determined by a divine or human Law. Wherewith I prove, that if they do such things, as in the account of the Divine Law are idolatrous, their intention not to commit Idolatry will not excuse them. This he says (p. 36.) a Quaker might as reasonably make use of for the justifying his yea’s and his nay’s, and his other points of Quakerism. For if he should say, No intention can alter the nature of actions, which are determined by a divine or human law, but Swear...
not at all, neither be ye called Masters; and let your communication be yea, yea, nay, nay, are actions or things determined by the divine law, therefore the intention of doing no evil in them, cannot excuse the doing otherwise than is there determined, from the guilt of sin. But will our Prophet ever say, that the Divine Law does forbid all swearing? then I grant that the Quakers are in the right, and no intention will justify swearing; but St. James must be expounded so as to reconcile his words with other passages in Scripture; which allow of swearing; and could he show us where bowing, and kissing, and kneeling, and praying before an Image is in any fence allow'd in Scripture, then we would grant also, that the direction of the intention would justify such a use of these actions, as the Scripture allows: but what is absolutely forbid to be done, no intention can excuse, which is our present case here: He concludes all with two or three Requests, which must be briefly consider'd.

1. That be (the Replier) will use his interest with Protestants, to bold to what be saies they do, and charge us with nothing but what we expressly profess to Believe and Practice. Now I can assure him there is no need of using my interest with Protestants to do this, for I hope they are naturally inclined to be honest: but there are so many us's among them, that possibly some Protestants may mistake one us for another: They practice indeed generally much alike, but they believe differently, and they represent differently, and they expound the Doctrine of their Councils differently; and I hope Protestants may without any offence say how and wherein they differ, and I think we cannot be justly charged with misrepresenting, while we relate matter of Fact truly, what their practice is, and what their different sentiments and opinions are about those matters.

2. That they (Protestants) pick not up the abuses of some, the vices and cruelties of others, the odd opinions of particular Authors, and bold these forth for the Doctrines and Practices of our Church; and that in charging any practices, they charge no more than are concerned. Now this is very reasonable, if he speaks of such abuses as are not allowed and countenanced by the Church; and of such cruelties as are not practised, encouraged, commended by the Governors of the Church; and justified by the Decrees and Canons of Popes and Councils; or of such
odd opinions of particular Authors, as steal into the world without publick authority, and are cenfured as soon as they are known; but as far as the Church gives any countenance and authority to such abuses, cruelties, odd opinions, I see no reason why Protestants may not complain of these things, and charge the Church of Rome with them, and not like that Church ever the better, which suffers such abuses, and applauds such cruelties, as Papists themselves, who have not put off all humanity, cannot but abhor.

3. That as often as they tell, what they think of our Doctrines and Practices, they would likewise at the same time inform their hearers, that those thoughts are, as the Replier says, Opinions, Interpretations, and Consequences of their own concerning our Doctrine, and not our avowed Doctrine. But this is a very needless caution; as I observed before; for our people do not think, that the Papists themselves believe all that ill of their own Doctrines and Practices which we charge them with; and I cannot easily see, how our disputing against the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome, and answering the Arguments whereby they justify themselves, should betray people into such a mistake; for it is no natural proof, that two men are of the same mind because they dispute against one another.

Thus much for the Protefter. And to conclude the whole, I shall give my Readers a short view of the whole progress of this dispute, that they may see what shuffling Adversaries we have to deal with.

When the Book entituled, A Papist Misrepresented and Represented, was expos'd to publick view, and mightily applauded by those of the Roman Communion, and industriously dispersed, and earnestly recommended to the perusal of Protestants, a very learned and charitable hand undertook to make a true representation of the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome, which he performed with such full and plain evidence, that the Misrepresenter hath not so much as attempted to charge him with any one false Citation, nor to shew in any one particular, that he has misrepresented their Doctrines and Practices; but instead of this, in his Reflections on the Answer (if the Re-
fleeter and Mifreprefenter be the same person, as he owns himself to be) he makes fresh complaints of Protestants misrepresenting Papifts; which if it had been true, is no confutation of that representation which the Anfwemer had made of Popery. The question then was, Whether the Church of Rome believes and practises, as the Answerer says she does, and proves by unquestionable authorities that she does. But this was too plainly proved, to be a question any longer, and therefore he rather chose to debate that general question about the Rules of Representing, and how we must know what is the Faith of the Church of Rome, and whether the Bishop of Condem's Explanation have not a sufficient authority given to it by the Pope and Cardinals, and Bishops of France, and what the authority of private Doctors is, and the like; but has not in any one particular shown wherein the Answerer has misrepresented them, that the authorities he alleages are not good, that he has put any forced and unnatural fene upon the words of their Council, or Catechifm, or Doctors, or that their Church has by any publick acts contradicted what he charges to be her Doctrine or Practife. This he has not done, and therefore we have reason to believe this he could not do, and this is reason enough to conclude, that the Answer contains a true Representation of the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome.

I did not think such Reflections as these worth the notice of the Learned Answerer, and therefore undertook to reply to them my self, and particularly examined every thing he had faid; in return to this, he publishes another Answer, which he calls Papifts Protefting againft Protestant Popery; and I thought it would come to bare protesting at last, for his Reason and Argument run very low before; this I have now considered, and I think have not suffered any thing to escape without an answer; but that the Reader may the better understand what a formidable Adversary this is, I shall briefly compare the Reply with his Answer, and then leave him to judge of the ingenuity and honesty of the Protefter.

In answer to his fresh complaint of Misrepresenting, in my Reply I considered what it is to Misreprefent, viz. To charge them
them with such Doctrines and Practises as the Church of Rome disowns; and proved from his own Character of a Papist Misrepresenter, that we are no Misrepresenter; for what he makes us charge them with believing and doing, in the Character of a Papist Misrepresenter, that he owns and defends in the Character of a Papist Represented, and the only difference in most Cases between these two Characters is this, That in the Character of a Papist Misrepresenter he puts in all the ill things which Protestants say of their Faith and Worship, and in the Character of a Papist Represented he says all the good things he can of it; but this I told him does not belong to Representation, but Dispute, and therefore whatever guilt we charge their Doctrines and Practises with, this is not to misrepresent, while we charge them with nothing but what is their Faith and Practice; to Represent in this sense is only to report matter of fact; and he who reports truly, cannot misrepresent. If we charge them with any guilt, which they think they are not chargeable with, this becomes matter of dispute; and it is not enough to confute such a charge, to tell the World, that they do not believe so ill of their own Doctrines and Practises as we Protestants do. By this Rule I examined the Thirty seven particulars of his Character, and carefully distinguished between matters of representation and dispute, and all this he grants, and yet in his Answer falls a protesting against Protestant Popery, as if we had made a new Religion for them; whereas we only tell them what the faults of their Religion is; and this he calls Protestant Popery, That is, the judgment of Protestants concerning Popery; and this he protests against, which is a much easier way than to confute it.

And now instead of defending his own Characters, wherein he had charged us with misrepresenting Papists, and which I had proved, and he in effect granted to be no misrepresentation; he seeks about to find out some new Protestant Misreprersers, and fills up several Pages with Citations out of the Manual of John Archbishop of York, Mr. Sutcliff, and others. Now in the first place he ought to have shown, that the distinction between matters of representation and dispute, by which I answer’d his own Characters, will not justify these Misrep-
Misrepresnters also, as most certainly it will, and a Hundred more if he can find them; but he saies not one word of this, but only cites their words, and calls it misrepresnting. But besides this, he has used very foule play to make Misrepresnters of them; The Archbishop only transcripts out of Popift Authors, and cites his authorities; the Protefter s[2] all down as the Archbishops words, without letting his Reader know that Papifts teach these things, and that the Archbishop only repeats them after them. But besides concealing the Popift authorities to which they refer, he has taken another course with Mr. Sur[3]cliff, has set down only half sentences, and concealed both the authorities and the reasons he allidges for what he saies, which is in a strict and proper sense to misrepresnt. All that he answers to that distinction between representing and disputing, which he allows to be good, is this, That the common people do not distinguish these matters, but look upon all to be equally the Faith of Papifts; That is, if they hear any man call the worship of Images Idolatry, they do as verily think that Papifts believe Idolatry lawful (as he saies in his Character) as that they worship Images, risum tereat & thus much for Representing.

The next dispute is about the rule of Representing. In his Introduction to A Papift Misrepresented, &c. he appeals to the Council of Trent, and Catechism ad Parochos; this the Answerer likes well, but tells him, 1. That he shows no authority he hath to interpret that Rule in his own sense, against the Doctrine of many others as zealous for their Church as himself, as he does in the Popes Personal Infallibility, and the Depositing Power, which he saies, are no Articles of Faith, though other zealous Papifts say they are, and asks what authority he has to declare the sense of the Council of Trent, when the Pope has expressly forbidden all Prelates to do it, and reserved it to the Apostolical See. 2. The Answerer tells him, That he leaves out, in the several particulars, an essential part of the character of a Papift since the Council of Trent, which is, that he doth not only believe the Doctrine there defined, to be true, but to be necessary to Salvation. 3. That he never sets down what it is, which makes any Doctrine to become a Doctrine of their Church. 4. That he makes use of the Authority of particular Divines, as delivering the sense of their
their Church, when there are so many of greater Authority against them: whereas, if we proceed by his own rule, the greater number is to carry it. These were all very material objections, and did deserve to be considered; but as for the three last, he takes no notice of them in his Reflections, and says very little to the first.

The Anwserer had asked, How the Council of Trent comes to be the Rule and Measure of Doctrine to any here (in England) where it was never received? (p. 4.) To this he answers in his Reflections, (p. 5.) That the Council of Trent is received here, and all the Catholick World, as to all its Definitions of Faith. But I told him in my Reply, (p. 51.) that the meaning of that Question was not, Whether it was owned by private Catholicks, but by what publick Act of Church or State it had been received in England, as it had been in other Catholick Countries; and this he says nothing to, and therefore might as well have let it alone at first.

I reinforced the Bull of Pope Pius 4th, against any private mans interpreting the Council according to his own private Sense; shewed the Reason and Policy of it, and what a presumption it is for a private man, when their Divines differ in their Opinions about any Doctrine, to call one Opinion Popery Represented, and the other Popery Misrepresented, as our Author has done in the Articles of the Popes personal Infallibility, and the Depositing Power, as if Bellarmin and Suarez must not pass for good Catholicks, but for Misrepresenter, because they do not believe in these Points, as our Representer does? and this he takes no further notice of.

But to prove that he has not interpreted the Council according to his own private Sense, he appeals to the Bishop of Condom's Exposition, which is approved by the Pope himself, and Reflect. p. 70, therefore has the Authority of the See Apostolick. To this I answered, that Bellarmin's Controversies had as great an Attestation from Pope Sixtus 5, as the Bishop of Condom's from this Reply, p. 44, present Pope; to which he gives no Anwser; and I observed from Camus, that the Popes private Approbation is not the Authority of the See Apostolick, but only his Judgment, ex Cathedra; and to this he gives no Answer, but Shuffles a little about.
a private, malicious, and inconsiderate Judgment, which I have now answered, and makes a new Flourish about the several Translations, and great approbation which has been given to this Exposition, which I have again said something to, tho' I need not have said any thing, had I before seen the Preface to the Answer to the Bishop of Condom, and I guess our Author will never mention it more, and then what becomes of his Characters.

He denied the Popes Personal Infallibility to be an Article of Faith because not positively determined by any General Council. In answer to which I told him, that other Roman Divines did believe it an Article of Faith. That the Churches Infallibility was not determined by any General Council, no more than the Popes Infallibility, and yet was owned by them as an Article of Faith; that if there be any Infallibility in the Church, the Pope as the Supreme Pastor, has the fairest pretence to it. For Infallibility ought in reason to accompany the greatest and most absolute Power; and this he has passed over silently.

Next comes the Deposing Power, which has as evidently been declared in General Councils, as Transubstantiation; and how comes this to be no Article of Faith? To this he answers, that it wants an Anathema, and that it is not decreed as a Doctrinal point, but as a matter of Discipline and Government.

This I examined at large in my Reply, and he is much concerned at it, that I put him out of his Representing humour by disputing; but he thought himself bound in Civility to say something to it, and truly he has been wonderfully Civil, as appears from what I have already said in Answer to him.

The Answerer in his Introduction had proved the Deposing Doctrine on him, from two sayings of his own, That the orders of the supreme Pastor are to be obeyed whether infallible or not, and that Popes have own'd the Deposing Doctrine, and acted according to it: and others are bound to obey their Orders, and confe-
the Orders of the Pope must be obey’d, as it would be to say, that Subjects must obey their Princes in every thing they command, whether it be good or bad: and this I told him in my Reply, I would acknowledge to be a good answer, if he would grant the Depositing Doctrine to be a sin: But this I suppose he was unwilling to do, and therefore we hear no more of this matter.

In the next place in his Reflections he finds great fault with the Answerers way of proceeding, which I reduced to Four Heads, 1. That the Answerer in some Points owns the Doctrine (which he has Represented to be the Faith of a Roman-Catholic) to be the established Belief of the Church of England. This I proved not to be true, by a particular Examination of those instances he gave. 2. He charges the Answerer with appealing from the definitions of their Councils, and sense of their Church, to some expressions found in old Mass-Books, Rituals, &c. This I showed also, that the Answerer has not done.

3. That he appeals from the Declarations of their Councils, and sense of their Church, to some external action, as in case of respect shown to Images and Saints, upon which from our external adoration you are willing to conclude us guilty of Idolatry. Whereas he thinks we must not judge of these actions without respect to the intention of the Church who commands them, and of the person who does them. 4. That he appeals from their Councils and sense of their Church, to the sentiments of their private Authors. These Objections I answered at large in my Reply, but he has returned not one word to any of them, excepting the third, and how he has answered that, you have already heard.

This is the new way of answering Books a la-mode of Rome; but the greatest Wits can do no more than the Cause will bear, tho a little prudence would teach men to say nothing in such a Cause as will admit of no better a defence.
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AN Amicable Accommodation OF THE DIFFERENCE Between the REPRESENTER And the ANSWERER.

HERE is a strange Voluminous ado about the Papist Misrepresented and Represented. First, almost Twenty Sheets by way of Answer to it; then, Ten in a second Reply; and now, Fifteen in a Rejoynder: And after all this bother and noise, the upshot of the Matter is come to this, That the Word Misrepresented is an improper Expression; That the Character of a Papist Misrepresented cannot be called a Misrepresentation in a strict and proper sense, as our Antiprotester has it often in his last Reply: where yet he owns the proving this, to Pag. 2. 4.
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have been the main drift of his former Ten Sheets, and a great part of these last Fifteen. Surely he has taken a great deal of pains; but to what purpose, I expect to hear in other Ten Sheets yet to come: for really, I do not yet know that I am much concern'd, whether it be a Misrepresentation in a strict and proper sense, or no. And therefore, since he has pitch'd upon so civil a way of confuting my Book, I think I may, in return to his Civility, and without wrong to my Cause, grant him the whole of his Pretensions, and then sit down and smile with him a while; to see, how being so near of a mind, we have yet been so long clashing Quills, as Adversaries. I am really for Peace, and a good Correspondence; and upon a serious Consideration of this last Answer, having great reason to think, that the most considerable part of the Contention between us, has been about a Word, and for want of a fair Understanding, I'le endeavour to lay open my Mind farther to him, so to remove all Misrepresentation from between us, (I hope he'll pardon the Expression, tho' it be not in its strict and proper sense) and by this means accommodate our Affair, without letting it swell farther into a Quarrel of yet greater Volumes.

And First, To take up the Matter from the beginning, If he had duly consider'd all I said in the Papist Misrepresented and Represented, he might very well have excus'd entering the Field against me. For tho' I there complain'd of Papists being Misrepresented to the World, that their Faith is expos'd in a Disguise, and many things imputed to their Belief and Doctrine, which they disown and abominate: Yet in all this Complaint I nam'd no body, I advance'd no Accusations against any particular Party. And
And tho' I could have fill'd my Margins with numbers of Authors, urging much blacker Calumnies than I there insert'd; yet still I suppress'd all Names, consulting Modesty, and in regard of Peace. Now what need here of any singling themselves, or a Party out, to Engage with me? I left every body to to their own Conscience; and had those who felt themselves touch'd, conceal'd the Sting within their own Breast, there had been still a Peace betwixt us. If a Man wipes the Dirt off his Face, that has been thrown at him in the Street, I hope he may do it without any affront to the Passers-by. His Complaint in general of being abus'd, is only a Natural Right; those that are innocent need not be much concern'd to clear themselves from the Charge; and such as are guilty avoid all Quarrel, if they but hold their Tongues. The Papist therefore Misrepresented and Represented might very well have pass'd without moving of Choler, if those who will have themselves not concern'd at all, had not been too much concern'd to wipe off the Imputation. This had been a means of preserving a mutual Peace from the beginning.

But Secondly, Tho' contrary to this Method, much Dust has been rais'd, and not without some Heat in the Quarrel; yet I am still persuaded our Differences may be compounded, if a fair Condescension can win any thing upon my Adversary, and he'll allow me to purchase his Good-will by almost an entire Submission to the Chief of his Pretensions. I'le beg his leave to state the Occasion of our Debate, and the Reader shall soon see how much I can oblige him by my yielding.
The Occasion of my writing the *Papist Misrepresented and Represented*, was this; I found that the People in England had a very false Notion of Popery, or of the Faith and Doctrine of Roman Catholicks; that there was scarce any one Article of their Creed, any one Practice of their Church, which was not falsely drawn in the Imagination of the Vulgar, either blackened with Calumnies, or disfigur'd with prejudic'd Interpretations or malicious Misconstructions; that hence arose so great a hatred against all of that Communion, that the Comprehensive Precept of Loving ones Neighbour, seem'd now to admit with the Zealous of a necessary Exception against all of that Profession; and the Design of rooting out Popery, a sufficient Dispensation for the violating all other Duties, both to God, the King, and our Neighbour.

This Uncharitable Temper I could not but look upon as ill becoming a Christian Name; and that to endeavour to remedy it, would not be only acceptable to Catholicks, but even to Protestants too; who, I presum'd, would be as willingly prevented from doing an Injury to their Neighbours, as the others would be willing not to be injur'd: it being a greater Concern of a Church not to do an Injury, than to receive one.

For the removing therefore this Scandal from Christianity, and hindring Men from maligning and railing against their Neighbours, for the false Con- ceits of their own Imaginations, by what means ever taken up by them, I thought it no ill Expedient, to declare sincerely what is really the Faith of a Catholic: and to shew more clearly how different it is from what it is vulgarly said to be, I drew out two
two Descriptions or Characters of Popery; the one being an Idea of Protestant Popery, or as it is generally conceiv’d by Protestants, and painted in the Imagination of the Vulgar of that Communion: The other being a Draught of the Faith of Roman Catholics, as deliver’d and prescrib’d by their Church. The former of these Characters I call’d A Papist Mis-represented, and the latter A Papist Represented. And I thought these Titles justifiable enough, in as much as the one describes a Papist otherwise than he really is, disfigur’d with false Colours, and artificially turned into a Monster, by a deform’d Dress, thrown over him by such, who through ignorance or malice are willing to render him Ridiculous: While the other sets him out divested of this Bugbear Habit, and shews him in his own genuine Shape and Complexion.

This inoffensive proceeding of mine, as I thought and meant it, pass’d not long without an Adversary, who proclaim’d to the World that he had Answered and Confuted the Book: But what, and how has he done it? He says, he has prov’d that the Character of a Papist Mis-represented contains nothing in it, which in a STRICT and PROPER sense can be call’d a Mis-representation: That it contains no Misrepresentation PROPERLY so call’d. That there is nothing of Misrepresentation PROPERLY so call’d. This is the way he has answer’d and confuted it: and for this he is set up upon every Stall, as bidding me defiance, and with the Character of an Adversary.

But really the World is over hasty in proclaiming men at Odds. I love Peace too well, to fall out about such Trifles. Let those who have a mind to it, fight for a Word; for my part, I shall never be my Enemy, my
my, who demands no more of me than this: He willingly yield my right in such a Point as this, rather than make an Adversary of one, who is so civil to ask no more. Nay rather than fail of obliging my Answerer, Ile e'en crave his pardon, for putting him to the trouble of reinforcing his proofs a Second time. He says here (p. 2.) He hop'd the talk of Misrepresenting would have been at an end: After he had prov'd, to wit, in his Former Reply, that the Character of a Papist Misrepresented contain'd no Misrepresentation properly so call'd, in its strict and proper Sense. And really 'twas only through mistake, and not design, that I have been so troublesome to oblige him even to the talk of Misrepresenting beyond his expectation. For had I but imagin'd that that had been the utmost of his design in his last Ten Sheets, I should certainly have so far condescended to so Gentile an Adversary, as to have spar'd him the Charges and Sweat of laying down his Proofs again.

And therefore that he may not be importun'd with any farther talk of Misrepresenting for the future, I do here in compliance with him solemnly declare, that the Title of the Papist Misrepresented, is not to be taken in its strict and proper Sense, as Misrepresenting signifies only downright Lying, or falsely charging matter of Fact; the whole Character being not indeed of this Nature: But in its larger or less proper Sense; as it comprehends both Lying, Calumniating, Misinterpreting, Reproaching, Misconstruing, Mis-judging, and whatever else of this kind; For in this Sense I don't find the Answerer has any dislike to it. But in case this should not please him neither, Ile yield one step lower, and will have Misrepresenting quite blot-
ted out. But then he must give me leave to see, if I can please him with something else in its stead. And what if I should try if something borrow'd from the French, would be more suitable to his humor? That Nation speaks very politely and quaintly, it may be a Title a-la-mode de France may be as acceptable as their Fashions. What then if I should take Copy from the Acts of the General Assembly of the French Clergy lately Published; and instead of that Improper English word of Misrepresenting, prefix to my Book what they have done to their Complaint, viz. The Calumnies, Injuries and Falsities, which the Pretended Reformed publish in their Books and Sermons against the Doctrine of the Church? If this will agree to the Character in a more strict and proper sense, than Misrepresenting, let me but know his Sentiments, and we'll never fall out for want of such a Reformation.

But however that he may be sensible, how much he's to be engag'd to me for this condescension; I must assure him, that whatsoever I yield in this kind, is purely out of good nature, and for the love of Peace; and not as oblig'd to it by force of his Arguments. For really to speak freely and betwixt Friends, I do not think he has advanc'd any thing in the whole matter, that has the face of a Proof; but proceeds all along upon a Principle, suppos'd to be certain indeed, but without the support of either Authority or Reason.

His Principle is this, That there can be no Misrepresenting, where there's an agreement about matter of Fact; which to me has more of the Counterfeit in it, than true Standard.
For were the Anti-Protefler put to prove, that there can be no proper Misrepresentation, where there's an agreement about matter of Fact, I believe 'tis not every ordinary Topick would find him matter for a Demonstration.

For Misrepresenting seems to stand in opposition to Representing; and proper Representing being nothing more, than the Describing or shewing a thing as it is in it self: As many ways as a thing can be shewn otherwise than it is in it self; so many ways may it be properly Misrepresented. Now 'tis certain that for the description to bear an exact resemblance with the thing; it must not only agree with it in matter of Fact; but likewise in every other respect, which it pretends to declare, as in Motive, Circumstance, Intention, End, &c. The disagreement in any one of these, being enough to quite change the nature of the thing, notwithstanding the matter of Fact being still the same. Nay many times even a Grin, a Wry Face, a Shrug or a Frown is enough to Misrepresent any man, without belying him in matter of Fact. 'Tis certain the Children of Reuben, and of Gad, and the half Tribe of Manesfeth, had been fouly Misrepresented, if upon sight of the Altar raised by them on the Brink of Jordan, they had been presently declar'd as Rebels against God, by the other Ten Tribes, as Prevaricators of the Law of MOSES, and as Setters up of an Altar against the Altar of God and of Israel. This I say had been certainly a Misrepresentation of the Two Tribes and a half; because tho' the matter of Fact, viz. the building an Altar, was true beyond all exception; yet because they raised this Altar, not for Burnt Offerings or for Sacrifice; but to be a Testimony to their Children to come, that they had a part
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part in the Lord; the branding them with the Title of Rebels against God, and as Schismatics from the Altar of the Tabernacle, had been altogether unjustifiable, and a Representing them to their Fellow-Tribes, otherwise then they were, which is properly Misrepresenting.

And had not Hannah been Misrepresented too, if Eli had set her out amongst her Neighbours, for a Drunken Gossip, and a Prophaner of the House of the Lord, when he saw her muttering over her Prayers, without hearing her voice?

I know if Our Answerer had been by, neither the two Tribes, nor Hannah must have complained in this Case of being Misrepresented. He would have told them, whilst there was an agreement about matter of Fact, there could be no Misrepresentation in a strict and proper Sense; that therefore they might rest contented with this infamy upon them, since by this one Principle they had a full Answer and Conutation of their Complaint.

And is not this an admirable expedient now for the Honeftest Man in the World to be blasted in his Credit and Reputation, and yet not to be Misrepresented neither? If Envy or Malice can but be ingenious enough, to invent something like a Proof against him, and with Confidence insinuate it into the populace; 'tis no Misrepresenting him, to set him out for a Fool or a Knave. Let there be only some matter of Fact, which ill Will can but interpret into a Crime, and his Reputation is forthwith brought to the Stake. For tho' barely to defame an Honeft Man, would be a Misrepresentation, and a Sin: yet to Preach and Post him up for a Rogue and a Villain, and to stand to it, and run down his Credit with a Proof,
Proof, is no proper Misrepresentation at all. If the Two Elders had cried down Susanna for a Harlot, without offering to prove their aspersion, they had Misrepresented her then, it seems, according to our Answerer's Doctrine: But because their own Villany prompted them with a Proof against her Innocence, this so alter'd the Case, that a Vertuous Woman was painted out and decried for a Strumpet, and yet the Two Elders no Misrepresenters all the while. No, by no means; this is too foul a Character for them to bear, and they might be reasonably concern'd to wipe off the imputation; they have a Proof for what they urge, they have a matter of Fact of her being Alone and Naked in the Garden: and this makes her Credit a Subject of Dispute, and not of Misrepresentation. This is admirable I confess, and tho' that young youth Daniel laid open the two Sages, for Perjury and False Accusation; yet they are beholden to this nicking Principle of our Anti-protestor, for discharging them from the Infamy of Misrepresenting.

And 'tis not only these Two Old Sinners are indebted to him for his Assistance: As many as have ever made use of those Fashionable Topicks of Calumny and Slander, and maliciously plotted against Innocence by Perjury and Defamation, must come and acknowledge their obligation, for his having found them out a method, by which tho' they have turn'd White into Black, shewn Honest Men for Knaves, stamp'd Vice upon Virtue, made Wise men pass for Fools, and always endeavour'd to represent things otherwise then they were; yet they may still plausibly quit themselves from the charge of proper Misrepresenting.

And first let the Jews come; for tho' they clamour'd...
mour'd against our Saviour, and painted him out, as a Breaker of the Sabbath, as a Glutton, as a Friend and Companion of Publicans and Sinners, and that in Belzebub the Prince of the Devils he casted out Devils; yet this was no Misrepresenting of Christ, it seems; for as long as there was a matter of Fact in all these cases, 'twas no Misrepresenting, thus fouly to blacken Innocence, and to Represent Christ otherwise than he was.

And may not all after Jews, Infidels, and Turks come in too? For tho' they branded the Apostles as Troublers of the City, and movers of Sedition: Tho' they defam'd the Christians, as Superstitious Foolish and Bloody; tho' they decried them for Murdering Infants, and eating their Flesh in their Assemblies, for Worshipping the Sun, and adoring an Asses head for God; and teaching a thousand other Absurdities and Abominations. Yet if any one be so Bold as to call these Misrepresenters of the Christians and of their Faith, the charge is not likely to pass many days, without a return of something which will be certainly call'd an Answer.

Nay let none stay out from acknowledging their share in this favour, excepting only such Dull Souls, who have Malice enough to calumniate, but want wit to give a Reason for what they do, or can find no matter of Fact on which to ground their Scandal, or which they are not able to make Criminal by Interpretation. For as for all others, who carry on their Business by Calumny and Scandal, and can give a reason for it, they may go on as to this point; this Salvo is a General discharge, by which they may securely take away any man's Good name for the future, without being Misrepresenters.

And
And'tis by this admirable Plea, the Anti-protestor has absolv'd all the Antient and Modern Protestant Character-drawers of Popery, from the infamy of Misrepresenting. For tho' they expose a Lilt of pretended Popish Doctrines to the People, ulser'd in with They teach this, They Believe that, They say this, They affirm that, and under these Preambles charge the Papists for asserting and believing such Blasphemies and Abominations, which they would sooner lose their Lives than assent to: Yet these are no Misrepresenter, as long as they can find some matter of Fact, on which to ground these charges. But whether it be with reason or without reason, that's no matter, only distinguish, says he, (p. 4.) between matters of Representation and Dispute: And if the matter of Fact they charge the Papists with be true, they are no Misrepresenter; as for their Reasons and Arguments, I will not undertake to defend all the Reasonings of Protestants. So that let them traduce the Papists and their Doctrine never so odiously, yet they are no Misrepresenter, as long as they charge them with matter of Fact, and can say something they call a Reason for't, tho' it be no Reason at all.

This is the Doctrine of the Answerer; and thus is the Papist Misrepresented confuted. So that for the future the Papist, tho' he be expos'd in the most monstrous and horrid shape imaginable, must never complain of being Misrepresented, especially as long as those that make the show have Wit and Malice enough to give a Reason for what they say, and can fix it upon some matter of Fact, but whether right or wrong, that's all the same.
But now I would willingly know, whether this Explication of Misrepresenting be absolute and universal, in regard to all Nations, Judgments, and Professions; or only Calculated for the Elevation of Popery: So that only Papists must not think themselves Misrepresented, when they are thus represented otherwise than they are; but not any others in the like Circumstances.

I have a little Scruple in this Matter, and therefore will explicate my self a little, that I may be better inform'd concerning the nature of Misrepresenting. I will for that end beg leave of my Answerer, to propose an Example or Two, which may serve to give me some Light into this Affair. Suppose therefore that some Zealous Brother, that had Separated from the Church of England, having now his Honour and his Interest engag'd in the Schism, to prevent the Re-union of his Flock, should make it his daily Business to animate his Followers against the Establish'd National Church, by exposing her Doctrine and Practices, and rendring them as odious as he can; would it be Misrepresenting or no? As now, if he should thus in the fervour of Spirit address himself to his Congregation:

Beloved, beware of the Whore that fits upon the Seven Hills; flie from the Abomination of Babylon; get out of the reach of the Dragon; be not contented to get from under his Feet, but stand afar off, afar off, Beloved, out of the Swing of his Tail: Oh, he has a long Tail, Beloved, C a long
a long Tail; and, do ye mark me now? there's as much Poison in his Tail, as in his very Teeth. I must explicate to you this Mystery. The Dragon's Seat is upon the Top of the Hills, and the poor Papists lie under his very Nose. There are some others, who have had thoughts of withdrawing themselves from this Place of Iniquity, and have stepp'd a little aside, but could never yet bid Adieu to their Captivity, and these are such who call themselves Men of the Church of England; who tho' they have retir'd a little from the Top of the Hill, and are got from under the Dragon's Feet, yet they are not the half-way down, but stick in the way, and are as much under the Power of the Dragon, as if they were under his very Belly. For, mark ye, Beloved, he has such a Sweep with his Tail, that as many as are on the Sides of the Hills are still under his Command, and breath nothing but the Air of the Dragon. Smell to 'em a little, my dearest Saints, and you'll soon perceive them rank with Popery, and that their Delight is in the Popgeries and Abominations of the Whore, and their Marks are the Marks of the Beast. For
For see what they are, behold their Character, Beloved.

1. They allow and maintain an intolerable Pride in their Prelates, setting on them large Revenues and State, contrary to the Example of the Apostles, who were poor and humble, and by the Work of their Hands got Bread for themselves and their poor Neighbours. And these Prelates are verily nothing but Popish Prelates, and are commanded by their Church to wear the Miter and the Crofier, and the Cope, the most solemn Rags of the Whore: and tho' they generally dissemble this Popery in their Life-time, excepting only on their Coaches, so to try if they can gain us; yet you may see their Claim to it at their Death; there being scarce any of 'um buried, but with the Miter and Crofier on their Tombs.

2. They make Gods of Dead Men, erecting Churches in their Honour, and Dedicating them to their Names. Nay, they honour them more than God himself; of the Hundred and thirty seven Parish-Churches of the Weekly-Bill of London, there being only Five in Honour of Christ,
or the Blessed Trinity. And how much they honour the Virgin Mary more than Christ, you may see in the same Weekly Bills, in which Mary has Nineteen Churches Dedicated to her Name, and Christ only Three. And is not this to place Mary above Christ, and to make a Goddess of her? Is not this to worship her more than God? For, what more Sovereign and Divine Honour can there possibly be paid to any, than to raise Temples and Churches to their Names? This is an Honour and Worship to which all others of Bowing, Kneeling, and Praying, are much inferior. For these Actions we lawfully use to Creatures, we Bow and Kneel to our Prince, and by humble Petitions beg his Assistance: But to build Temples and Churches to the Honour and Name of any Creature, is Blasphemy and Idolatry, 'tis to make Gods of them; and nothing better than an Imitation of the Heathens: And therefore as they had their Temples Dedicated to their Demy-Gods, Hercules, Vespasian, Trajan, and Diana, &c. so amongst our Brethren you see one Temple rais'd to Martin, another to Dennis, another to Bennet, another to Catherine.
Catherine. For this the Papists were Idolaters, and for this the Church of England are Idolaters, and this Idolatry they inherit of the Papists; for tho’ these Churches were built first by the Papists, yet the Church of England rais’d them out of their Ashes, and rebuilt them with the same Titles, Invocations, and Dedications.

3. They teach and practise Idolatry on another account, and that is their Image-Idolatry. For tho’ they pretended an hatred to Images for some years, yet that was only Dissimulation. For now at last they speak plain, and have given that Abomination a place in every Leaf of their Bibles. They may pretend they do not honour and respect them as the Papists do; but this is only before us Schismatics: for, believe me, my Flock in Christ, they honour them in their Hearts more than the rankest Papist in the World. For I appeal to you now, be you Judges; What greater Honour can there be imagin’d, than to give a thing place even in the very Word of God? You understand very well, that to place an Image in the Throne of a King, is to give it Kingly Honour, and to
to place it in the Imperial Seat, is to give it Imperial Honour: What then, Beloved, is it to place Images and Pictures in the Bible, in the very Word of God, but to give them Divine Honour, and to respect them as Gods? For certainly the Word of God is of God, and all Divine; and to give any Image place there, is the greatest Argument of Sovereign Honour, and open acknowledgment of its Divinity.

But this is not all, my Brethren; for besides this Abomination of thus honouring Images and Pictures, they likewise Pray to their Pictures, as you may see them in their most solemn Devotion of the Common Prayer. For they have them not only on the Walls in some Churches; but look but over their Shoulders, and you'll see them in the very heat of their Devotion under their very Eyes, in the Leaves of their Common-Prayer Books.

Nay, their Altars have their Images too, and this in a more prophane manner than the Papists; for these have none but Images of Christ, of the Apostles, and their Followers; and if any were tolerable, it ought to be These at a Christian Altar: but
but to throw down these of Christ, and set up Moses and Aaron in the place, is an Idolatry beyond all Excuse. God hid Moses’s Body, and they set up his Likeness over their Altars.

And mark ye now, Beloved, how all this is in defiance to the Commandment of God; For the Lord has said, Thou shalt not make to thy self any Graven Image, nor the Likeness of any thing in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath: So that did they not honour, worship, or pray to these Pictures, yet the very Making them is expressly forbidden by God. And let their Intention be what it will in so doing, 'tis certain, there's no Intention can alter the Nature of Actions which are determin'd by a Divine Law; For then Men might Murder, or Steal, or Forswear themselves, and yet avoid the Guilt of such Actions, by intending to do no Evil in them. 'Tis therefore a very prophane Absurdity, Beloved, to see the Commandments set up in Churches, in order to the keeping them, and yet with Moses and Aaron on each side, which is a flat Contradiction to the very Second of them, which says, Thou shalt not make the
the Likeness of any thing in Heaven above, &c. What think you now, my Brethren, do these Men love Images and worship them, or no? They profess'd a hatred to Image-worship in the beginning, for the more plausibly turning the Papists out of doors, when they pursu'd them with the Communion in their old Common-Prayer-Books, of Cursed be all Worshippers of Images: but afterwards succeeding to the Errors of the Papists, as well as to their Revenues, they no longer dar'd to curse the Worshippers of Images, knowing the Curse would light upon their own Heads; but instead of that, reform'd their Prayers, and have it now, Cursed are ye Idolaters.

4. They worship Saints and Angels. For see, Beloved, besides the building Churches to the Honour of their Names, and setting up their Pictures in them, which are as great external Acts of Worship and Religion as can be; they likewise set Days apart to honour them, as God has his Day set apart; they command their Vigils to be kept, and have Prayers in their Honour, not questioning but that they can Pray for as many as they know upon Earth.

Nay,
Nay, they likewise pray for, and depend upon their Assistance, Help, and Protection, but especially of the Angels, as you may see in their Common-Prayer Books; where on the Day of Michael, they beg to be defended by the Angels; as if God, who is Almighty, were not able to defend them, that they should thus seek shelter under the Angels' Wings. Is not this to leave God and his Christ, and to make Gods of Creatures? Oh! such abomination as this is not to be endured; 'tis intolerable, Beloved. For these Churches in their honour, Days in their honour, Images in their honour, and Prayers in their honour, is paying to them Divine Honours, 'tis worshipping them as Gods: For, mark ye now, all Civil Honour is terminated on the visible things of this World, and we have no intercourse with the invisible Inhabitants of the other World, but what is Religious; now if all Worship of invisible Beings is Divine and Religious Worship; what abominable Idolatry are our blind Brethren fallen into, who by this Religious Worship make as many Gods, as there are Angels and Saints in Heaven!
5. They practice Idolatry again in receiving the Sacrament; for though they allow this to be only Bread and Wine, yet they pay it Religious Worship, and honour it as God, by falling down to it on their Knees. They may say, they do not this to the Bread and Wine: But what, must we not believe our Senses in so plain a Case? Do we not see them do it with our Eyes? And let them pretend what they please, their Practice is the best explication of their Belief.

6. They use a Book of Prayers, which is nothing but a slip of the Mass. 'Twas call'd a Mass-Book when it came first to light; and tho' it has since reform'd its Name, for the better imposing upon poor Souls; yet the Nature of it is still the same. The Epistles and Gospels and Collects and Litanies and Hymns are nothing but Terms of Babylon. And pray now, what are the Vigils, Ember-days, Rogation-days, Ashwednesday, Epiphany, Sexagesima, Quinquagesima, Septuagesima? is not all this the Language of the Beast? Yea, Beloved, from the abundance of the Heart the Mouth speaketh; as their Language is, such is their very Heart and Soul;
Soul; they delight in an unknown Tongue, and one may as well understand the Mass, as this Language of the Common-Prayer Book. Then look in the Calendar of the Common-Prayer, and there you'll find the Mass-Saints stand in their Order; March shews you Gregory the Pope, and Benedict the Monk; April has George that kill'd the Dragon; then follow Dunstan, that catch'd the Devil by the Nose, and stickl'd for the Celebacy of the Clergy; and Augustin, that brought Popery into this Nation; and thus their Saints are listed as in the Mass-Book, and as the Demy-Gods were in the Calendar of the Heathens. Then if you listen to them in this their Devotion, you will not think them to be an Assembly of Christians, but rather a Confusion of Misbelievers, of all sorts of Infidels met in a Club: There you'll hear them with the Persians crying out to the Sun, with the Egyptians to the Whale, to all the Fishes and Beasts; with the Chaldeans to the Fire; with the Syrians to the Birds; and with the Papists too to Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, Dead Men, Men that cannot hear them; and this in all their Churches, as if these their Saints were like God
God himself, present in all Places. And this Devotion is call'd the Canticle of Benedicite, taken out of the Apocrypha, which with them you may see pass for very good Scripture. So that the whole Common-Prayer Book, if not worse, is nothing but the Mass-Book in English. And all the difference is, that the Missal is of an Ancient standing, us'd even in Basil and Chrysostom's time: But our Common-Prayer Book never knew light, till 'twas devis'd under Edward VI. And how many Alterations has it had in this time? Some made by King Edward himself, some by Queen Elizabeth, and several others since. Nay, have we not seen Prayers added to this Book, in Thanksgiving for the Discovery of and Deliverance from a Plot, which now every considering Man has reason to believe to have been no more than a Chimera, and the Invention of Bad Men?

7. They make Gods of Men, attributing to them a Power of Forgiving Sins, the incommunicable Attribute of the Almighty; and this is plain in their Liturgy, in which their Priests are order'd to give Absolution to Sinners.

8. They
8. They encourage a Death-bed Repentance; permitting their Members to live as extravagantly as they please all the time of their Health; and not a word of Confess and Repent, but when Death is waiting for them at their Beds-Head. They have a Power to give Absolution; they say; and their never enjoying it, but in the last Agony, is Argument enough to conclude, there's no obligation of Repenting amongst them, till Death looks 'em in the Face.

9. They know not what their Belief is touching this Power of Absolution. Some of their Divines affirm, That the Sentence by which Absolution is given to the Penitent, is an Absolute and Definitive Sentence, judiciously absolving him from the Guilt of his Offences. Others of their Doctors say, That the Form of Absolution is Declarative rather than Absolute, and think it a rashness to pronounce a Definitive Sentence in Gods Name. And thus tho' their Faith be all pretended to be according to the Word of God, yet 'tis wonderful hard to know what it is; and whilst they thus disagree amongst themselves, how can any embrace their Creed, who know not what they believe themselves?

10. They.
10. They dispense with Vows, and dissolve the Obligation of such as are made even to God himself. Thus you see, when any Priest, Jesuit, or Fryar comes over to their Church, tho' they have solemnly vow'd their Virginity to God, and promised to the Almighty never to Marry, yet they are no sooner made a Member of this Reform'd Congregation, but their Obligation is forthwith dispensed with, they are allow'd to take a Wife, and wholly released from their Vow. And hearke ye now, my Chosen of the Lord, if they can thus dispense with a Vow made to God, what trust can be placed in them? how can we rely on them? since, after this, there's no difficulty in pretending to a Power of releasing the Obligation to Veracity amongst Men?

11. They are a Cruel, Bloody, and Persecuting Church, and think nothing unjust which is for the Interest of their Cause, for the Security and Propagation of their Doctrine. You know how they help'd on this score the Low Countries to Rebell against their Lawful Sovereign, and were the occasion of much Innocent Blood being Spilt:
Spilt: and how they profer'd to affift the French in their Rebellion against their Prince. What they did to that unfortunate Mary Queen of Scots, you know likewise full well: She took Sanctuary here, and being Heiress of the Crown, was made a Sacrifice upon the Scaffold for pretended Crimes, but in good truth for nothing else but the Security of the Church of England. Charles I. fell too upon the same account: They lay this, you know, at Difsenters doors; but how far that War was an Episcopal War, the Lord knows. For besides the engaging him to take up Arms on their account, you know one Archbishop changed his Rochet for a Coat of Mail, and the greatest number of the Convocation-House, of what Church were they?

12. They practice Cruelty again in per-secuting us for not obeying their Church, when they at the same time are as great Difsenters as we. For, look you now, Beloved, are not their Ministers commanded by their Church to enjoy but one Benefice: And yet how many of them possess two or three? They find no difficulty of being di-fpens'd in this Duty, if they can but make a Friend
Friend to speak for them, and Forty pound for the Fees. Are not their Prelates commanded by their Rubrick to wear a Scarlet Robe, a White Robet, and Corner’d Cap: their Ministers an Albe and Tunicle; and who is there complies with this Order? Do’s not their Church command all of their Communion to Fast all Lent, the Ember-days, Rogation-days, and all Fridays in the Year: and yet who of them satisfies this Precept? Do we not find the contrary everywhere practis’d? And not only in this, but in a thousand other Instances of the like nature. And yet while they themselves thus frankly trample the Commands of their Church under feet, is it not a most malicious Cruelty that we should be persecuted for not satisfying her Precepts? So that tho’ we are Members of their Church, we can, by their good will, enjoy no Peace amongst them. They spare us our Lives indeed, but without Liberty or Property, the only Comforts of Life.

13. They teach Absurdities and Contradictions. First, in requiring us to submit to the Authority of their Church, and punishing us for refusal: and then charging such as
as follow them from all such Submission, and giving them liberty of embracing nothing that is propos'd to them, but what they themselves shall judge consonant to the Word of God. And thus we must be oblig'd to go to Church, and yet when we come there, the Appeal is made from the Pulpit to the People; and we need not believe what we hear, unless we think fit our selves. Then the Authority of Councils we must likewise allow and submit to; and yet after all their Examinations and Determinations, we need not receive what they Decree, unless in our own private Judgments we think it conform to Reason and the Law. So that we must not be allow'd to do what we think best, and guide our selves; and yet when we follow them, we need believe or do no more than we think fitting: Which is to take them for Governors and Directors, and then afterwards go alone by our selves.

14. After all this Liberty left to their Followers, 'tis yet the Belief of their Church, That who soever will follow her, must shut his Eyes, stifle his Sense and Reason, and be led only by the Nose. And there-
therefore we poor Schismaticks must not reform any Abuse or Superstition, which our Reason assures us to be contrary to the Word of God, without the Thunder of Excommunication forthwith breaking upon our Heads; but if their Church in Parliament and Convocation makes any Reformation, there's no Appeal to be made to Sense or Reason, but 'tis immediately to be receiv'd as the Sense of the Word of God by all her Members. And therefore, says one of their Divines, let them in the Name of God Reform on, if they proceed according to due Course of Law, and Act with Authority. For as to What, and How, and How far, things are to be Reform'd, such as you and I are must leave it to the Wisdom and Pleasure of Governors. So that we must lay aside our Reason, if we intend to enter their Congregation; 'tis only going on blindly without fear or care, and relying confidently on their Infallible Governors, and we shall be forthwith True and Substantial Churchmen. And what think you, my Brethren, do's not this smell of the Infallible Chair? 'Tis e'en so. But such is the Church from which you are happily gone out.

Thus
Thus teach her Divines, and thus are her Members allow’d to believe; For you cannot doubt, but that all of them are allow’d to believe that, which any Man among them is allow’d to teach.

15. By this means they are a wavering and unsettled Church, subject to continual Variations, and turning as many ways as their Governors please to wind them; and yet still all is according to the Word of God. In the first Common-Prayer-Book of Edward the Sixth, ’twas requir’d that Water should be mingled with the Communion-Wine; and that in the Consecration of the Elements, the Minister should sign them twice with the Sign of the Cross: And that the Communion-Bread should be unleaven’d and round. Baptismal Water was likewise appointed to be bless’d with the Sign of the Cross; The Minister was commanded to Exorcise and Conjure out the unclean Spirit from the Infant, to dip him thrice in the Water, to Anoint him with Oyl upon the Head, and put on him the White Vesture call’d the Cry-some, and make the Cross on his Breast and Forehead. In Confirmation the Bishops were order’d
order'd to Cross the Children on the Forehead. In the Visitation of the Sick the Minister was to Anoint the Sick Person on his Forehead or Breast, making the Sign of the Cross. And there was no Command to receive the Sacrament Kneeling. This was their Church then, as Established by Law and the Pleasure of Governors, and conform to the Scripture: but now their Scripture and Governors say otherwise, and condemn what they then approv'd. 'Twas then according to Scripture to Pray for the Dead, as in the same Book of Edward VI. Now the Scripture forbids it. The Form of Ordination was then and many years after one thing, and now of late 'tis become another: and if right then, I wonder how it can be right now. Thus you see their Church alter and change according to the Complexion of the Times. And not only in these things, but in a thousand others; nay, in the very Articles of their Belief: The Apostles Creed had never more than Twelve Articles, and the assenting to these were enough to make a Christian; but to make a Church of England Christian, at first 'twas requir'd to Subscribe
scribe to *Forty two* Articles; and then a little after something was bated; and 'twas enough to subscribe to *Thirty nine*; and in these there was so much chopping and changing, both in Words, Expressions, and Sentences, that even the Bishop of *Meaux's Exposition* never had more before it came to perfection.

These are the Marks, my Dearest ones, of that Congregation to which you are so earnestly invited to joyn: but let those joyn with her that can, those that can find a way to dispense with all their Sense and Reason, and admit of Prophanation, and Superstition, and Idolatry, for the Word of God. But for us, *We have the Scripture and our Reason for our Guides*, and we need no better; and we have no surer way of avoiding the Teeth of the Dragon, than to keep out of the reach of his Tail.

If a Zealous Brother, I say, should in this manner paint out the *Church of England* to his Flock, and endeavour to imprint in their Minds an Idea thus Foul and Monstrous, of her teaching and maintaining abominable Superstitions and Idolatries; I would fain know of the *Answerer*, Whether this would be *Representing* or *Misrepresenting* the *Church of England*; whether 'twould be a shewing her as she is, or
or as she is not. I know, according to his Principles the Charges being not false as to matter of Fact, and none being urg'd without some Reason, this Character ought not to be Entitled, The Church of England Mis-represented. And yet methinks I cannot fancy 'twill be thought like her. But however it be, I am resolv'd to compound, and not quarrel upon this score. If he will not have this to be Misrepresenting in its strict and proper sense, I am ready to allow, that the word Misrepresented, as it stands in the Title of my Book, is not to be taken in its strict and proper sense, as it signifies Calumniating by Perjury only, and Lies; such as was the Story of the Pilgrims, Screw'd Guns, and Black Bills, for the hanging of the Jesuits; and that of Stifling Sir Edm. Godfrey with a Pillow in the upper Court of Somerset-House, and Strangling him in the lower Court, before the Stables, with a twisted Handkerchief, and laying it on the Papists: But in a less rigorous Signification, as it implies the Representing a thing otherwise than it is, and putting on false Colours, whether by Wry Interpretations, False Inferences, Malicious Applications, Weak Reasonings, or any such like Topick. For by whatsoever Method the thing is made to appear otherwise than it is, 'tis all the Misrepresenting I desire, and equally fit for my purpose. And now I have so far comply'd with the Answerer, I hope the Talk of Misrepresenting, as he says, will be over. And yet if he has a mind to prove once more, in other ten Sheets, That Misrepresenting is not to be taken in its strict and proper sense, let him do it; 'tis only Twelve-pence apiece more for the Curious: The Judicious will think it only worth a Smile, if so much.
But I am yet in Arrears, and must not part thus. For it seems the Answerer has a Complaint against me, and 'tis this, (pag. 3.) That in my last Reply, instead of defending my own Misrepresentations, which I so unjustly father'd upon them, I have pick'd up new Misrepresentations for him to Answer. And really I was much to blame, to look out for new Misrepresentations, when he had little to say against the former, except that they were not to be call'd Misrepresentations in a strict sense. But where did I father 'em upon any body? I laid them at no bodys door; and if some appear'd so solicitous in clearing themselves, that they were suspected to be Fathers, they may thank themselves; I pointed at none.

'Tis true, for the shewing they were none of my own Childish Conceits, I at length produc'd some eminent Protestants, describing Popery with the same ill Features, and worse than I had drawn it in my Character of a Papist Misrepresented: and first, the Archbishop of York. And here the Quarrel is, because I left out the Authorities mention'd by that Prelate. And now the Answerer has inserted those Authorities, what do they make to his purpose, or against me? Were they all exact and true, which yet no Man will be able to make good, is every thing to be set forth for the Faith of a Church, which can be found in one Author, as it is by him, when he prefixes to them a He (that is the Papist) must believe? Can the Church of England stand this Test? Would it not be Misrepresenting her, to Preface every extravagant Saying of her Members, with She believes, and She teaches? What signifies therefore the mentioning those Authors, when the Question is not, What some Private Authors say; but what the Church believes?

When
When the Archbishop therefore brings in the Papist professing his Faith, with this solemn Protestation, **We must believe**; and then supports the Paradox with a single Authority or two: as this was in him a piece of Artifice, not justifiable amongst Friends; so the omission of such Testimonies was beyond the possibility of being a Design, unless it were of Consulting the Credit of the Prelate.

And tho' the Books mention'd were publish'd by Authority of Superiors; yet from such Books cannot be fairly Represented the Faith of the Church, and whoever pretends to do it, is nothing less than a Misrepresenter: Nor will a Church of England-Man, I fancy, much question this Truth, who, I believe, upon consideration, will allow, that his Church may be easily Misrepresented, if every idle Opinion to be pick'd out of Books, which come forth with an *Imprimatur*, were to be inserted into the Character of her Faith. And I cannot but wonder the Answerer should urge this Dispute now at this time, when we have seen a Book Publish'd by Authority of Pope, Cardinals, and other Dignitaries, and in a particular manner approv'd by them, and yet question'd by some as not Representing the Faith of the *Church* aright. Methinks, when a Book of this Authority comes to be disputed, as not truly Representing, I cannot understand how every other Author with a petty Licence is a sufficient ground for a Representer. But it must be so to drive the Business on. When a Protestant shews forth the *Church of Rome*, every thing that can be rak'd out of Books, is authentick enough for him to put into the Character: but when a Catholic Prelate Expounds the Doctrine of his Church, all the Authority of *Pope* and *Cardinals* is not enough to set him up for a Representer. Besides
Besides the Archbishop, I produc'd Sutcliff's Survey of Popery, in which he had laid to the Papists charge such Tenets as are offensive to every Christian Ear, and as much detested by Papists, as any other Society whatsoever. But I did not, it seems, set down his Reasons and his Authorities. And this discovery puts the Answerer upon an outcry against the Representer's Honesty. And yet where the Scandal is I cannot find. For I undertook for no more, than to shew the Doctrines laid by Mr. Sutcliff at the Papists door, and this I did sincerely in his own words and sense, and for his Reasons; they were no Concern of mine, neither will the Answerer, after all his noise, put his approbation to them, as far as I see: for having summ'd them up, he concludes with this open hint, (p. 14.) If some Protestants have charg'd the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome with such Consequences as they cannot justify, Wiser Protestants disown it. He must be a very foolish Representer therefore, who should go about to confute such Reasons which nothing belong to Representing, and are such as Wiser Protestants are ashamed of.

But now we are come to the Point of Honesty, I cannot but admire a rare Knack the Answerer has, especially in Translating honestly: one Instance he gives us in his former Reply, and another in this (p. 76.) where reciting a Prayer out of the Pontifical, he has these words in the Latin, Ut orantes inclinantes, se propter Deum ante istam Crucem; but rendering it into English, he leaves out those two little words propter Deum, and puts it thus: That those who Pray and Bow themselves before this Cross, without mentioning for God's sake, or for the honor God, as not fit for his purpose. When I have learn'd this Artifice of him, he
may then with reason cry out of curtailing and dishonesty: But at present I think he has something to mend at home in this Point. And for my part, I'll endeavour not to follow so ill an Example.

And now at length we are arriv'd to the Question concerning the Bishop of Condom, and some Points Treated of by him. The Answerer has Debated the Matter in about One hundred Pages, and fairly invites the Representer to dispute it out, and two powerful Arguments he uses to provoke him to it. The first is, (p. 26) That there is no reason to dispute it at all: But the truth is, says he, I know no reason there is for all this dispute. So that the Representer, if he will be advis'd, must leave off Character-making, and dispute over an hundred Pages, because there is no reason to dispute. The second Reason (ib. ) is, because I was not satisfied with his bare telling me he did not like my Religion, now he will give me some Reasons for't. And this is a Reason like the former: For I never was concern'd with his not liking my Religion: I never told him, I was not satisfied with his bare telling me, he did not like it, that now he should pretend for this Reason, to give me some Reasons for it. All the busines is, dispute he's resolv'd, and in it must, tho' by head and shoulders; the Representing Humour do's not please him, and Character-making is an aggrievance, 'tis too fair a way of dealing for him, and lays too open the Mystery of Iniquity: and therefore he has no better way to quit himself of this trouble, than to draw me into an Ocean of Disputes, that so Representing may be at an end.

Thus he labours to change the Scene, and to tempt me out of the way; but his weighty Reasons do not work so powerfully, as to render me incapable of resisting
filing. And therefore till we have other two Reasons
given, I'll be no other than Representer still. My busi-
ness is matter of Fact, and not of Right, or de jure; and
since he has bulked out his Answer with Nine Sheets
of the Fifteen, fill'd up with an occasional Discourse, I'll
take the freedom gravely to turn over those his hun-
dred occasional Pages, tho' I fear he'll take it ill; but I
cannot help him. We Wise Converts do not love to go
out of our way, but upon very good grounds; and
therefore if the two Reasons he has given for this at
present, do not move us, 'tis because they are too sub-
lime, and not suited to our Capacity.

But however, he requires satisfaction as to the
Points he has there handled, and I shall remit him to
such Books in which these Controversies have been
discuss'd at large. And for myself I shall sit down contented with the Title he often allows me of a Repre-
senter. And as to the Bishop of Condom, to whom I ap-
peal'd for the justifying the Character of the Papist
Représenté, he has undertaken his own Vindication,
and needs not the assistance of another Hand.

All the Concern I have, is to declare, that to assent
to the Catholick Faith, as Expounded by this Prelate,
is sufficient for any to be receiv'd into the Communion
of our Church; we require no other Terms. And if the
Answerer finds different Explications given by Bell-
armine and others, tho' the Books are approv'd, yet
there's no obligation of being of their mind in things
that are disputed amongst Divines. 'Tis in vain there-
fore to clamour against the Opinions of Bellarmine, or
Suarez, Scotus, &c. as loose, extravagant, harsh or unfa-
voury, &c. since it suffices for Catholick Communion,
to subscribe to the Points treated by M. Condom, in the
sense he has expounded them; if they are more soft or
sweet than has hitherto been apprehended, or deliver'd
formerly by others, let them but be receiv'd in that
soft and sweet manner, and no more is requir'd.

'Tis therefore nothing more than a Cavil, to questi-
on whether Bellarmine and other eminent approv'd
Authors, are not as authentic a Rule for the Exposition
of the Council of Trent and the Catholick Faith, as the
Bishop of Condom. We have no concern in these Com-
parisons, our whole business is only this; Whether
the embracing the Catholick Faith, as expounded by
the Bishop of Condom, be sufficient for a Person to be
receiv'd into the Communion of our Church. And
since this is evidently so, and that all those that be-
lieve thus, are actually acknowledg'd Members of
this Church upon this Assent, what needs the Repre-
senter, who follows his Explication, any farther Apo-
logy? If any Person therefore may be thus receiv'd
a Member of our Church, upon the Terms I have
propos'd in the Matters there handled, I have Repre-
sented the Papist aright. And amongst all the Argu-
ments that have been publish'd, only those have be-
long'd to me, which endeavour to shew the falsity of
this. 'Tis no wonder therefore I have wav'd the Con-
sideration of many things that have been publish'd a-
gainst me under the Title of an Answer, since of the
Forty Sheets that have come upon this Errand into the
World, there has not been three, but what have for-
got their Business they were sent upon. If it be an
Omission therefore not to return an Answer to such
things as are not spoken to me, 'tis easily making a
List of Omissions. But let me see where it has been
prov'd, that 'tis not sufficient for a Catholick to believe
as I have propos'd, as to those Particulars. And if it
has had no Answer, it shall have one.

FINIS.
Imprimatur,

July 22, 1686.
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In Answer to the Reply to Papists protesting against Protestant Popery, our Author has amicably accommodated away the whole Book, excepting one word called Misrepresenting; and therefore whereas he expects Ten sheets from me in return, I must be forced to compound with him for a much less number.

We are likely at last to agree about the meaning of Misrepresenting, which is a very common word, and easily understood when men give their minds to it. Our Author Printed a double Character of a Papist Misrepresented and Represented; the first being an accusation on Protestants for misrepresenting Papists; I examined every part of his Character, and could not find why he called it Misrepresenting; for it did not appear by his Characters, that we had charged them with any Doctrines or Practices (excepting some few things) but what they themselves owned. We charge indeed their Doctrines and Practices with such guilt as they do not own; but this I told him
him did not properly belong to Representing but Disputing; for while we agree about matters of fact, there is no Misrepresenting on either side, and then we are no otherwise Misrepresenters, than as all men are who condemn such Opinions and Practices, as others judge very true and innocent; and thus Papists as much misrepresent Protestants, as Protestants misrepresent Papists; that is, they equally differ from each other in their Opinions and judgments of the same things: but who are truly the Misrepresenters, is not to be decided by character-making, but by Reason and Argument.

Well, our Accommodator is very willing out of civility and for the sake of peace, to yield this point, That the Title of a Papist Misrepresented, is not to be taken in its strict and proper sense, as Misrepresenting signifies downright Lying, or falsely charging of matter of fact; but in its larger or less-proper sense, as it comprehends both Lying, Calumniating, Mis-interpreting, Reproaching, Mis-construing, Mis-judging, &c. which I confess is a very great piece of civility, that he will not charge us now with downright lying, but only with Lying and Calumniating, and several other hard words into the bargain.

There needs not many words about this matter, for the short of the case is this: In order to reconcile our people to the Church of Rome, he thought it necessary to persuade them, that Popery is quite another thing, than what they had been taught it is, which would at once remove their prejudices against Popery, and beget in them a great jealousy and suspicion of their former Teachers; for men will not easily trust those who have once deceived them.

In order to this, he gives us a double Character of a Papist; one he calls the Character of a Papist Misrepresented, the other of a Papist Represented; which any man would guess,
guest, should be two very different and contrary things; the first what a Papist is not, the second what he is; and yet, when we come to examine them, every thing almost, which can properly be called a Character, or Representing, is the same in both; only the Character of a Papist Misrepresented tells you, what opinion Protestants have of Popery, and the Character of a Papist Represented, tells us, what good thoughts Papists have of themselves, and their own Religion; now whoever doubted, but that Papists and Protestants differ very much in their Opinions of Popery, as they do also in their Opinions of Protestantism. And this is the only pretence for his charge of Misrepresenting, not that we charge them with believing or practising, what they do not believe or practice, but that we think worse of their Faith and Practice than he thinks they deserve.

And if this be all that he means by Misrepresenting, we readily own the charge, that we have much worse thoughts of Popery than he has; that we believe those Doctrines to be erroneous, and those Practises to be sinful, which he thinks very well of; and because I am resolved, if possible, to be as civil as he is, in my Concessions, and not to dispute about words, I am contented he should call this misrepresenting, Lying, Calumniating, or what he pleases, if he can prove that we condemn their Faith or Worship unjustly; only he must remember, that this will engage him in a dispute, which he seems resolved not to engage in. For he must not think, that upon his bare word, we must be concluded guilty of that misrepresenting, which he calls Lying. He should have been very much afraid to accuse us of Lying, if he is resolved altogether to represent, and not to dispute: For certainly no wise man will give his Neighbour the lye, unless he be well prepared to prove it against him. Misrepresenting.
fentencing was a civil term, because honest men may through mistake misrepresent; but Lying is the fault of Knaves, which as it deserves great punishment, so it ought not to be charged upon men without great proof, much less with none at all: And therefore he should not have taken up an obstinate humour against Disputing, just before he thought fit to charge us with Lying, but have remembered what M. de Meaux says in his Pastoral Letter, p. 29. Those who bear false and scandalous witness against an innocent person, are condemned to the same punishment which the Crime of which they bear witness did deserve had it been found true.

But to clear my self as well as I can; besides this, that I am not conscious to my self of any misrepresenting, I must tell him once more, that in a strict and proper sense, to misrepresent relates only to matter of fact, when we charge men with saying and doing what they never said or did, as our Accommodater confesses; and in this sense I have already proved, that we are no Misrepresenters, and at last, if I understand him, he confesses that we are not; but then he tells us, that to misrepresent, in a larger and less-proper sense, signifies also to put a false construction on things: As for instance, to say that to Worship Saints and Angels, and the Virgin Mary, as practised by the Church of Rome, is to give the Worship of God to Creatures; and that their Image-Worship is what God has forbid in the second Commandment; that their denying the Cup to the Laity is contrary to the institution of our Saviour, and their Latine Service is a very unreasonable Worship, and destructive of the edification of the Church, &c. Now though we do not charge them falsely in these cases as to matter of fact, for they do Worship Saints and Images, and deny the Cup to the Laity, and keep the Service of the Church in a Language unknown
unknown to the people, yet if through prejudice and neglect of due consideration, we should condemn these Practices as contrary to the Laws of God, and injurious to mens Souls, though they were not so. I grant even this may be called Misrepresenting, for 'tis to call good evil, and evil good, light darkness, and darkness light; and whoever is guilty of this kind of Misrepresentation, is guilty of a very great Sin, and does great mischief in the World, not by falsifying matters of Fact, but as much as in him lies, by changing the nature of things.

And upon these terms the dispute of Misrepresenting may be easily accommodated: Let him plainly confess, that we are not Misrepresenters in the first sense; that we do not falsely charge any Doctrines or Practices on the Church of Rome, which she disowns; that we do not teach our People, that the Church of Rome believes or practices, otherwise than she does, and we will give him leave to call us Misrepresenters still, if he can shew that we charge their Doctrines or Practices with such guilt as they do not deserve.

But it is by no means a sufficient answer to this Charge to call us Lyars, which for ought I can see, is all we are like to get in Answer from this man. Of all the several projects for ending Controversie, the most effectual that I ever yet heard of, is that which our Author hath set on foot: For he would now insinuate, that he has vindicated the Church of Rome from our Misrepresenting, not one-ly matter of Fact, but the guilt we charge them with upon those matters that are confessed by themselves. Now I have shewn him as well as I could, that some of their confessed Doctrines are false, and some of their confessed Practices are unlawful, and that their best Apologies for them are insufficient. What says the Accomodator to all this? He answers, that all this is Misrepresenting, as that signifies Lying.
Lying. But how the dispute should be carried on upon these Terms, otherwise then by giving him the Lye back again, I do not comprehend. And therefore because neither true Religion, or good Breeding, will suffer me to carry on a Dispute at that rate, the Controversie should seem even upon this account to be at end; and I give him joy of the honour that he is like to get by it.

And yet I think an indifferent Reader may observe that his fastning the Lye upon us, for Misrepresenting them in the less-proper sense, as he pretends we do, is but an after-game to which he is reduced by the extremity of a bad Cause.

The design of our Author in his Twofold Character of a Papist, was to perswade our People, that we were Misrepresenters in the first and most proper Sense; that we had belyed the Church of Rome, with imputing such Doctrines to her, as she did not own; and this all men, that ever I met with, understood to be the design of it: But since he cannot make good his Charge against us, he will now make good his Title of Misrepresenting in a less-proper Sense, not that we misreport the Doctrines and Practices of their Church, but that we unjustly condemn them; and though we will rather allow him to call this Misrepresenting, than dispute about a word; yet if this be all he intended to acquaint the World, that Protestants think worse of Popery, than Papists do; it was a wonderful discovery; and he took as notable a way to rectifie such mis-apprehensions. He disclaims all disputing, and thinks to confute Protestant Misrepresentations, by giving onely a true Character of a Papist, with reference to his Faith and Practice, out of the most authentick Records of their Church: Now if the Misrepresentation does not concern matter of Fact, but only mens judgments and opinions about such matters, how can a
When we know, what the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome is, and yet think very ill of it; Can the meer relating what the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome is, cure our ill opinion of it? And yet this is all the business of a Character to tell us, what a Papist is, which might indeed reconcile us to Popery, had we disliked Popery onely, because we did not understand it, or took it to be something more formidable than it is, but cannot cure such dislikes as arise from a true understanding of Popery.

He appeals to the Definitions of the Councils of Trent, and the Bishop of Condom's Exposition, &c. to vindicate Popery from the Misrepresentations of Protestants; that is, to show us what the genuine Doctrines of Popery are.

And how can this confute our Misrepresentations, unless by Misrepresenting he understood Misrepresenting matter of Fact, charging such Doctrines on their Church as were never decreed by their Councils, nor owned by their most authentick Expositors? For the Authority of the Council of Trent is nothing to us, any other-wise than as we own it to be the Rule and Standard of the Romish Faith; and therefore he can prove nothing against us out of the Council of Trent, but onely that those are not the Doctrines of the Church of Rome, which we lay are, and this cannot confute Protestant Misrepresentations of Popery, unless our Misrepresentations consist in charging them with such Doctrines as their Church and Councils do not own.

And therefore, though he is now willing to grant, that we are not Misrepresenters, as that signifies, down-right Liyers, who charge the Church of Rome with Believing and Practising what she does not, yet it is apparent, that this was what he intended in his Title of a Papist Misrepre-
Presented, to accuse Protestants of charging Papists with such Doctrines and Practices as they do not own; and if this be not the intent and design of his Book, there is a great deal less Sense in it, than I thought there had been.

For if by Misrepresenting he only meant, that we reproach and calumniate the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome, and charge them with such guilt as they do not deserve, not that we charge them falsely with such Doctrines and Practices as they do not own, (as he now would have it;) though I grant this may be called Misrepresenting, if the charge be false, yet it is not such a Misrepresenting as is confuted only by a Character, or by true Representing; it is wholly matter of Dispute, as I have often told him; for he must not think that we Protestants shall believe ever the better of Popery, because he professes to believe very well of it, in his Character of a Papist Represented.

If he will vindicate the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome from that guilt, which Protestants charge on it; if he will justify the Worship of Saints and Angels and Images, Transubstantiation, the Adoration of the Host, half Communion, Prayers in an Unknown Tongue, &c. and prove us to be Misrepresenters, he must quit his retreat of Character-making, and fairly dispute the points in question, which is the way the generous Advocates of the Church of Rome have always taken, to defend her, by the Authority of Scriptures, Fathers, Councils, and here we are ready to joyn issue with them.

And thus, for ought I see, this Controversie is at an end, though he had not charged us with Lying; for whatever he at first pretended, he grants now, that we are not in a strict and proper sense Misrepresenters; and thus farewell to Character-making, since Papists and Protestants, who understand these matters are in the main
main agreed, what the Character of a Papist is, though they differ in their opinions about him, which can never be decided by Characters, but by Reason and Argument. And yet our Author, after all his pretences to an Amicable Accommodation, is unwilling the matter should end thus, at least unless we will acknowledge our selves very much beholden to his good nature for it: Why, what is the matter now? Have I not plainly proved, that we are not Misrepresenters in the strict and proper notion of Misrepresenting? That we do not charge the Church of Rome with any matter of Fact, with any Doctrines or Practices which she does not own? And can we Misrepresent them, when we charge them with nothing that is false? Yes, he says, my principle, p. 7. that there can be no Misrepresenting, where there is an agreement in matter of fact, has more of the counterfeit in it than true standard; is supposed to be certain, but without the support of Authority or Reason: That is, though we charge the Church of Rome with nothing but what she her self owns; though we represent a Papist just as a Papist represents himself, as to his Faith and Practice, yet we may be Misrepresents; and then we may indeed be Misrepresents for ought I know, if we may Misrepresent, when we say nothing but what is true.

If he can make good this, I must acknowledge him to be a man of Art; and therefore shall briefly examine how he proves it.

He says, Misrepresenting seems to stand in opposition to Representing, and proper Representing being nothing more, than the describing or shewing a thing, as it is in its self, as many ways, as a thing can be shewn otherwise than it is in its self, so many ways may it be properly Misrepresented.
This I agree to, and therefore let us proceed: Now (says he) it is certain, that for the description to bear an exact resemblance with the thing, it must not only agree with it in matter of fact, but likewise in every other respect, which it pretends to declare, as in motive, circumstance, intention, end, &c. The agreement in any one of these being enough to quite change the nature of the thing, notwithstanding the matter of fact being still the same. And this also I agree in, that motives, circumstances, intention, end, are all to be considered in representing; but I want a reason, why he distinguishes these from the matter of fact: for by matter of fact, I understand an action cloathed with all its circumstances, without which, it is impossible truly to represent any action: For circumstances alter the nature of actions; As suppose a man be killed, this may be done by accident, or with design, in heat of blood, or of premeditated malice, which makes it, either Chance-medley, Man-slaughter, or Murder; and therefore the consideration of these things falls under the matter of fact, and are the proper matters for a Jury to inquire into, who yet are judges only of Fact. And thus I understood matter of Fact, when I asserted, that we did not Misrepresent the Church of Rome in any matter of Fact; that we did not only charge them with nothing but what they did, but that we truly Represented all the circumstances of what they did, as far as the moral nature of the action is concerned in it, and indeed I know not, how we can either Represent or Misrepresent any action without its circumstances; we may tell what is done, but the matter of the action is the least thing considerable in Representing, because it may be either good or bad in most cases, according to its different circumstances:
flances: and we cannot say, which it is, without considering all circumstances. As for instance, We do not only charge the Church of Rome with Praying to Saints, and Worshipping Images, but we consider what is the Doctrine of their Church about these matters, in what manner they do it, and with what circumstances; we admit of all the excuses and apologies, and fair representations that they can make of it, and then consider what the nature of the action is, and what the Scriptures and Primitive Fathers declare it to be.

This, he knows, I did in the Book, which he now pretends to answer. To put an end to this Dispute about Misrepresenting, I told him, we did not like Popery, as he and the Bishop of Condum had Represented it, and shewed him our Reasons why we did not like it, as to the Object of Religious Worship, the Invocation of Saints, and the Worship of Images: And had he thought fit to have considered these, we might have obliged him so far, as to have confined the Dispute to his own Characters, and the Bishops Exposition, in the other points of Popery; but he says not one word about this, but advances a new Paradox, that men may be Misrepresenters, though they do not Misrepresent any matter of Fact, because they may Misrepresent the Motives, Circumstances, Intention and End, as if this were not to Misrepresent matter of Fact? Or as if we had Misrepresented them in this manner, when he has not, and cannot give any one instance wherein we have done so?

This short account shews, how impertinent all his examples of Misrepresenters are, who, as he says, did Misrepresent without belying men in matter of Fact;
for though this is nothing to us, unless he could prove us to be such Misrepresnters, which he has not once attempted to do; yet the Examples he produces do not prove what he brings them for, for all their Misrepresentations are in matters of fact.

Thus the ten Tribes suspected, that the Children of Reuben and Gad, and the half Tribe of Manassheb, had built an Altar for Sacrifice in the borders of Jordan, over-against the Land of Canaan, whereas the true matter of Fact was, that they had built an Altar not for Sacrifice, but as a witness and memorial of their right to Gods Altar, to offer their Sacrifices and burnt Offerings in the place which God should choose.

When Eli thought Hannah had been drunken, because she prayed in her heart, only her lips moving, this was Misrepresenting matter of fact, for she was not drunk. And surely he will grant, that the two wanton Elders did foully bely Susannah, though she was alone and naked in the Garden, and that they represented the fact, quite otherwise than it was.

And methinks our Author should grant, that the Jews did misrepresent matter of fact, when they charged our Saviour with being a Sabbath-breaker, a Glutton, a Friend of Publicans and Sinners, unless he will say that our Saviour was all this; for if he were not, then they did believe him in matter of fact; and so they did the Apostles and Primitive Christians, when they accused them as Troublers of the City, and Movers of Sedition, that they murdered Infants, and eat their Flesh; that they Worshipped the Sun, and adored an Asses head for God; for I suppose he will grant, that the matter of fact was false.

But still, says the Accommodater, they had some mat-
ter of fact, whereon their Accusations were grounded, and which gave some colour and pretence to them. Sometimes they had, and sometimes they had not: But is not this a pleasant inference, that because those who tell only a piece of a story may misrepresent, therefore those who faithfully relate the whole matter of fact, with all the particular circumstances of it, may be Misrepresen-
ters also? If he can give any one example of this nature, I will onely desire him to tell me the difference between Misrepresenting and true Representing: Men who have wit and malice enough, may put very spiteful constructions upon the most innocent and virtuous Actions, by altering or concealing some circumstances, or the end and intention of doing them; but this is to misrepre-
sent the fact, to represent a thing done otherwise, or for another end, than really it was; but if a man who tells the whole truth, not onely what was done, but the end why, and the manner how it was done, can be a Misrepresen
ter, the honestest man in the world may be a Misrepresen
ter.

When an action is truly and fairly Represented, men may still pass a false judgment upon that action; may think that evil and forbidden by God, which God has not forbid, or that allowed and approved by God, which God abhors; but this is not properly Misrepresenting, but judging falsely, which differ just as matter of Fact and matter of Law do in Civil Affairs. In all Causes Criminal and Civil, there are two distinct questions; what the Fact, and what the Law is, what is done, and what judgment the Law passes on such Actions: To falsifie in matters of fact, is to Misrepresent the person and the action; to give a wrong judgment, is to Misrepresent the Law: and thus it is in our case: We are first to en-
quire,
quire, what the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome are, and then of what nature they are, whether true or false, good or evil: If we affix such Doctrines or Practices on them, as they do not teach, or alter any material circumstance relating to them, then we are Misperrepresenters in a proper sense, as misreporting matter of fact; and this we utterly deny, and they can never prove that we do thus misrepresent them, that as our Author misrepresents us, we usher in, with they teach this, they believe that, they say this, they affirm that, and under these preambles charge the Papists for asserting and believing such Blasphemies, which they would sooner lose their lives than assent to: Which he has boldly affirmed without giving one instance of it; but as for judging of their Doctrines and Practices, we do indeed pass such a judgment on them, as I doubt not but they will call Misperrepresenting; but whether it be for or no, is matter of Dispute, and must be decided by appealing to Scripture and Reason; and we are not ashamed of being called Misperrepresenters by them, when that signifies no more than cenfuring and condemning their Faith and Practice.

But he has one example more of this Misperrepresenting, and that as he thinks a very nicking one, and that is the Fanatical Misperrepresentations of the Church of England: To this end he brings in a Dissenter charging the Church of England with Popery, and several other ill things, which is intended to serve more purposes than one.

Had he first proved us to be Misperrepresenters, it had been a very proper way to make us sensible of the evil of it, to appeal to our own resentments of such usage. But what if Dissenters Misperrepresent the Church of England, does this prove that the Church of England Misper-
represents the Church of Rome? If we indeed Misrepresent the Church of Rome, we have less reason to complain that the Difsenters Misrepresent us; but if we are no Misrepresenters, we have reason doubly to complain, both for being charged with Misrepresenting and for being Misrepresented.

And therefore the Answer to this long harangue, is very short and plain; however the Church of England be Misrepresented, whether by Papists or Fanaticks, we justify our selves either by denying matter of Fact when that is false, or by confuting the Charge: We are not afraid of Disputing with our Adversaries when that is needful, but justify the Doctrines and Practices of our Church by Scripture and Reason, which is a more generous way, than meerely to complain of being Misrepresented, without daring to right our selves; which is the case of our late Character-makers. If the World will be moved by their complaints, to believe that they are Misrepresented, all is well, and they have what they desired; but if you will be so perverse as not to believe that they are Misrepresented, though they tell you they are, and will needs be a disputing the point with them, they have done with you; for their business is not to Dispute, but to Represent. The difference between us in this matter, is no more but this: We are not afraid of Misrepresentations, because we know we can defend our selves; whereas they find they cannot defend themselves, and therefore have no other remedy, but to complain of being Misrepresented.

And yet I must confess, this is as artificial a way of saying nothing, as I have met with. Our Accommodator is very sick of this talk of Misrepresenting, and knew not how to get rid of it, but by diverting the
the Dispute; and therefore though it be nothing to
the purpose, instead of proving that we are Misrepre-
senters, he desires us to consider, how the Diffenters
Misrepresent us: but we have considered that enough
already, and when there is occasion for it, will do so
again; our business at present is not with Diffenters, but
Papists, and we are not for pursuing every new Game,
but will keep to our old scent.

It would be a plesant Scene, could he at this time of
day, engage the Church of England and Diffenters in a
new Quarrel; but thanks be to God many of our Diff-
enters are grown wiser now, and I hope more will e-
every day; whatever they have formerly suspected of our
inclinations to Popery, they find now that they were
mistaken in us; and whatever defects they may charge
our Worship with, I believe they will call it Popish
and Antichristian no longer; to be sure they will never
think us the more inclined to Popery, because a Papist
says so. While these Gentlemen lay behind the Curtain,
and acted the part of a Zealous Brother under several
disguises, there was much more danger of them than
now: They have laid aside their Vizards, and let them
now paint the Church of England how they please, and
the worse the better; for how mean an opinion foever he
seems to have of our Diffenters, they are too wise and
cautious to take Characters from open and professed Ene-
mies.
The truth is, he has horribly abused our Dissenters, unless by Dissenters, he means only his dearly beloved Quakers, with whose Cant he is as well acquainted, as if he had been either their Master, or Scholar. For he has drawn up such a charge against the Church of England, in the name of a Dissenter, as no Dissenter ever made. It is a Popish Character Fathered upon a Dissenter, for which they are much beholden to him, that when he has a mind to say things so spiteful and silly, that he himself (tho' none of the modestest men) is ashamed to own, he can think of no person so fit to say them as a Dissenter.

Did ever any Dissenter charge the Church of England with making gods of dead men, because we call our Churches still by the names of those Saints to whom they were dedicated in the times of Popery? For did not the Dissenters themselves do so in the late times of Reformation? And do they scruple to do so now? If there were any difference, it was only in not giving the Title of Saint to them, and I suppose that does not alter the case; for if it be Paul's, or Peters, or Mary's Church, it is much the same: But they were not so silly as to think, that names which were used only for distinction, without paying any worship to Saints, or erecting any Altars to them, in those Churches which were called by their names, made Gods of dead men. The Bills of Mortality were the same formerly in the Dissenters time, that they are now, and yet they did not suspect themselves guilty of placing Mary above Christ, or making a Goddess of her.
Did ever any Dissenter charge the Church of England with Image-Idolatry, for having Pictures in their Bibles, or Moses and Aaron painted with the Ten Commandments, without leaving out the Second against Image-worship? especially when these are things wherein the Church of England is no otherwise concerned, than in not correcting the extravagancy of Painters and Printers. And I confess, I have always suspected, that these men, who now charge us with the Image-Idolatry, of having Pictures in our Common-prayer Books (which is a very late invention) did secretly lay the design to reconcile our people by degrees to the use of Pictures and Images.

The Dissenters indeed were never any great Friends to Holy-days; but they never charged us with worshipping Saints on those days, which they saw we did not; nor do they now charge us with worshipping the Bread, when we kneel at receiving the Sacrament, (which is contrary to the publick Declarations of our Church) but reject it, because it was no Table-posture, and because it had been abused (as they scruple not to say) to an Idolatrous worship of the Host in the Church of Rome.

They have indeed objected against our Liturgy, That it was taken out of the Mass-book, and have been sufficiently answered as to that point; and we know who they were that first started that Objecti-
on, some Mass-Priests under the disguise of Puritans. But I never heard before, that they were scared with the very names of Epistles, and Gospels, and Collects, and Litanies, nor did they ever quarrel with retaining Popish Saints in our Calendar, when
when we give them no place in our Prayers, which is only an evidence what Reformation we have made. I never knew before, that our Dissenters thought the Mass-book as Ancient as St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, or that they liked our Common-Prayer-Book ever the worse, because it came in with the Reformation of Religion, and has been altered since several times for the better; whereas their complaint is, that it is not yet altered enough. Much less are they scandalized at the Thanksgiving for discovery of the Plot, how great a Chimera ever it be.

Nor is there any dispute, that I know of, between the Dissenters and us about the Power of Absolution, or the Ministerial power of forgiving Sin. They and we agree, that Christ has left such a Power in the Church, of remitting and retaining Sins, of receiving in, and putting out of the Church, which is the state of Pardon and Forgiveness; and we both deny, that this is absolute and judicial, or not only Ministerial. They know we oppose the pretence of a Judicial Power to forgive Sins in the Church of Rome, which we say is reserved for the great Judge of the World; and it is very strange, they should peremptorily charge us with giving the Power of God to forgive Sins, to men, and yet at the same time accuse us of not agreeing what this power of Absolution is. Tho our Accommodator may make bold sometimes to contradict himself, yet I doubt the Dissenters will think themselves misrepresented by such contradictions.

But did ever any Dissenter charge us with encouraging a Death-bed Repentance, for not obliging men...
men to Confession and Penance (which he calls to Confess and Repent) in the time of their Health? We teach men to confess their Sins to God, and to men too when there is occasion for it, either to reconcile themselves to their Brother, or to receive Ghostly comfort and advice; and we teach them to Repent of their Sins, and reform them in time of Health, and shew them what great danger there is in a Death-bed Repentance, and how very seldom it proves true; which is no great encouragement to such delays. But how the Dissenters, who reject Confession to a Priest, and the Popish Sacrament of Penance, themselves, should quarrel with us for doing so, is somewhat strange.

But we pretend to a power of giving Absolution, and never enjoyn it but in the last agony, which (he says) is argument enough to conclude, there's no obligation of Repenting amongst us, till death looks us in the face. But he has not improved this Argument so well as he might; for Absolution is never enjoined, not so much as in the hour of Death; (for we are only required to give Absolution, in case the Penitent earnestly desire it) and therefore, according to his reasoning, it follows, that we think Repentance never necessary, not so much as in the hour of Death. But other men, who have common understanding, would hence conclude, that we make a great difference between the Sinners Repentance, and the Priest's Absolution; that the first is always necessary, the other only in case of Church Censures, or to give relief to afflicted Consciences, or to dismiss penitent sinners in the peace of the Church.
Do not Difenters themselves allow converted Priests, who are under the vow of Continency, to Marry, if they cannot preserve their Chastity without it? And has not our Accomodator then, put a wife Objection into their Mouths against the Church of England; which, if it be any Objection, returns upon themselves? Neither they nor we pretend to dispence with Vows made to God; but we think no Vow can oblige men to Sin; and since all men have not the gift of Continency, as our Saviour says, if such Persons are ensnared in a rash Vow, (it may be, while they were Children, or before they understood their own Temper and Complexion) since we cannot think the Fornication of Priests a more holy State than Marriage, we think it more justifiable to repent of a rash Vow, than to live in a constant state of Temptation and Sin.

It is likely enough, as he says, that Difenters may complain of Persecution, tho' they themselves have been declared Enemies to an unlimited Tolerance; and it will be hard to find a medium between a general Liberty of Conscience, and those restraints which are laid on Difenters.

But it must be considered, whether the Church or the State be chargeable with this. The several Laws which have been made against Difenters, have been more for the security of the State, than of the Church; have been occasioned by a restless humour which has threatened the publick Peace; and have been rarely executed but at the instance of Civil Authority, to provide for the security of the State; and I suppose he will not parallel this with some other Persecutions. But to make the Difenters
Dissenters quarrel at the Assistance given to the Low-Countries, and proffered to the French in their Rebellion, and the hard usage of the Queen of Scots, and the late Murder of Charles I. argues, he matters not much what he says; and to charge these Intrigues of State upon the Church of England, is to forget that he is in England (and not at Rome) where Kings make Peace and War, not the Pope with his Council of Cardinals.

And yet our Accommodator has kept the sweetest bit for the last. For he brings in the Dissenter accusing the Church of England, for giving every man a liberty of Judging, and yet requiring Obedience to her own Constitutions, which the meanest Sectaries among them challenge and practice; and it is not very modestly done of them, to blame that in us, which they do themselves. They all judg for themselves, and therefore form Churches and Communions of their own; and they will not receive any into their Communion, without owning their Faith, and submitting to their Order and Discipline; and this is all that the Church of England challenges, only with this difference, that being established by Law, her Communion and Government is enforced by Laws. And what a mighty Absurdity and Contradiction is this, that men should be taught to use their own Reason and Judgment in Religion, and yet required to submit and conform to a Church, whose Faith and Worship is consonant both to Scripture and Reason.

Well, but after all this Liberty granted by the Church of England, Whosoever will follow her, must shut his Eyes, stifile his Reason, and be led only by the
the Nose. Why! What's the matter now? The charge is no more but this, That in matters of Order and Decency; and such things as are left to the Determination of Church Governours, as are neither forbid nor commanded by God, we must submit to the Determinations of Authority, whatever private Judgement or Opinion we may have of things. A great fault this, that tho every man must judge for himself in good and evil, yet every private mans Judgment must be over-ruled by the publick Judgment in matters of Order and external circumstances of Religion.

Much of the same nature, is his concluding Charge, That we are a wavering and unsettled Church, subject to continual Variations, because some Rites and Ceremonies formerly used, are now laid aside; And what then? Does the settlement of the Church consist in external Ceremonies? Is it any fault in a Church, which challenges to her self a Power to appoint, and constitute, and alter external Rites, to exercise this Power as She shall think most for the Edification of the Church, which is the only Rule of right and wrong in this Case, which may therefore change with the Change and Alteration of times and Persons, and other external circumstances of Affairs?

Now let every man judg, whether there were ever such a Speech made for a Dissenter before, which in every Point of it is directly contrary to his own Profession and Practice: It is time for our Author to have done with his Trade of Representing, for no man would know what it was he Represented, did he not take care with the unskilful Painter to write
write over his uncouth Figures, what they are; This is an Horse, and this an Afs. And thus this hopeful design of Representing and Misrepresenting, ends only in ridiculing the Church of England; a Liberty, which if we needed it, is not mannerly for us to use at this time; but we are contented they should ridicule our Church, if they will permit us truly to Represent their.

But to proceed, 'Our Accommodator grants that he is still in Arrears; and certainly, never any Bankrupt paid less in the Pound than he offers; and this is his Accommodating, which Merchants call Compounding.

In my Answer to his Reflections, I proved, that what he calls the Character of a Papist Misrepresented, has nothing of Misrepresentation in it properly so called; for there was no matter of Fact misrepresented; in his Answer, which he calls, Papists protesting against Protestant Popery, instead of justifying his Character, he seeks out for new Misrepresentations; this in my last Answer, I enquired the reason of, Why, instead of justifying his own Misrepresentations, which he had so unjustly fathered upon us, he should hunt about to pick up some new Misrepresentations for me to Answer. And the Reason he now assigns for it, is, Because I had little to say against the former, except that they were not to be called Misrepresentations in a strict Sense. Now, the less I had to say, it was the more easily answered, tho I know not what more need to be answered to the charge of Misrepresenting, than to prove that it is false. But he says, he fathered his Misrepresentations on no Body; and so much the worse for that, for a general charge includes every Body.
And yet he was as unfortunate in his new Misrepresentations, as in his old ones. He brings in the Arch-Bishop of Torr for a Misrepresenter, whereas the Misrepresentations he Transcribes out of the Arch-Bishop, the Arch-Bishop cites out of Popish Authors, and names the Authors where they are to be found; but the Protefter to make a Misrepresenter of him, conceals all these Authorities, and sets down the Words as the Bishops own; and this he did only to consult the Credit of the Prelate: In what Sir? That he might have the entire Glory of being a Misrepresenter, without being thought to steal out of Popish Authors.

But he says, The Bishop is still a Misrepresenter, in charging these sayings of private Doctors upon the Church; But where does he do that? Yes, He says, He (that is, the Papist) must believe; but does he say, The Church says thus, or only Stapleton? Stapleton might be a Misrepresenter, in delivering this as the Faith of the Church, That we must simply believe the Church of Rome, whether it teach true or false; but the Arch-Bishop does not Misrepresent the Church in saying, that Stapleton says so. What is the Authority of private Doctors, is not the Dispute; but, whether Protestants be Misrepresenters for saying, That such Doctrines are taught by such Doctors of the Church of Rome.

The Case of Mr. Sutcliff (another of his Misrepresenters) is somewhat different. For, besides what he cites from their own Authors, which is set down by the Protefter without taking notice that he quotes his Authors for it; he many times charges them with the Consequences of their Doctrines and
and Practices; not that he charges them with owning such Consequences, but proves such Doctrines on them, from what they do profess and own; and such sayings as these the Protefter sets down as charged on the Church of Rome in the first instance, as her avowed Doctrine: When Mr. Sutcliff only allidges them, as the just interpretations and Consequences of her Doctrine, which differ just as much as Misrepresenting and Disputing; as saying what a Church professes to believe, and what the consequence of such a Faith is. As to show this by an instance or two: The Protefter sets these Propositions down as Mr. Sutcliff’s Misrepresentations. That Papists speak what they can in disgrace of the Holy Scriptures; That they give the Office of Christ’s Mediation to the Virgin Mary, to Angels, and to Saints; That by the Doctrine of Papists, the Devils in Hell may be saved. Now indeed, had he said, That the Papists teach this in express Words, he had been a Misrepresenter in a proper Sense, for they teach no such thing; but Mr. Sutcliff never charges these Doctrines Directly upon them, but saies, That they say, the Scriptures are obscure and hard to be understood; and this is, to speak in disgrace of the Holy Scriptures. That they teach, that by the merits of Saints, Christians obtain their desires, and are delivered out of Purgatory. And this is to give the Office of Christ’s Mediation to the Virgin Mary, and to Saints. That they teach, that the Devils in Hell may have true Faith; and yet our Saviour faith, Whosoever believeth in him, shall not perish, but have everlasting life: So it follows by the Doctrines of Papists, That the Reprobates and Devils in Hell may be
be saved. So that he expressly distinguishes between what the Papists teach, and what himself concludes from such Doctrines, and therefore he does not Mis-represent the Papists; for he charges them with owning no Doctrines but what they do own; but if he be guilty of any fault, it is in reasoning and Disputing; and there is no way that I know of, to confute such Consequences, but by Reason and Dispute; the very Name of which is very uneasie to the Representer, and there is good reason why it should be so.

And this I suppose may satisfie the Accommodator, Why I charged him with setting down these sayings of Mr. Sutcliff, seperated from the Reasons of them; for how little soever he may think himself concerned in his Reasons, yet it is of great Consequence in the matter of Representing, to distinguish between the Doctrines of Papists, and what is charged on them, only, as the Consequence of their Doctrines. To charge them with teaching such Doctrines as they do not teach, is Misrepresenting; and therefore, had these sayings, which he transcribed out of Mr. Sutcliff, been charged upon the Papists as their sayings, it had been Misrepresenting; and this was the design of the Protefter in quoting these sayings, without giving an account upon what occasion they were said, to perswade his Readers, that Mr. Sutcliff had directly and immediately charged these Doctrines upon Papists as expressly taught by them, and then he had been a Misrepre- fenter indeed. But since it is otherwise, it is plain, Mr. Sutcliff was Misrepresented by the Protefter, but he did not Misrepresent Papists, as that signifies charging
charging them immediately with such Doctrines as they do not own.

In the next place he charges me with translating dishonestly, for not rendering propter Deum, or for God's sake, in English, in the form of consecrating the Cross. Now I confess, why this was not translated I cannot tell, and knew nothing of it, till I was informed by him; had it been in a dispute about the nature and reason of that worship which they pay to the Cross, these words had been very considerable; but it relating only to the manner of consecrating the Cross, they signified nothing, as any one will see, who consults the place. Especially considering, that the whole design of that discourse about the Worship of Images (against which he has not one word to object, but this Omission) was to show the evil of Image-worship, tho' they gave no Worship to the material Image, but only worshipped God or Christ, or the Saints by Images; and therefore I had no occasion at all to conceal the English of propter Deum.

In my Answer to Papists protesting against Protestant-Popery, I took occasion to examine the Bishop of Condom's Exposition in two very concerning Points, viz. The Invocation of Saints, and Worship of Images; our Accomodator, it seems, could see no reason why he should engage in this Dispute, and therefore thinks it sufficient to show, that my Reasons for this Dispute are not cogent, and he names two, such as they are; 1. That I know no reason for all this Dispute. But this saying related to the Dispute about the Bishop of Condom's Authority, not about his Exposition of the Catholick Faith. 2. His
2. His second Reason is like the first; Because I said, He was not satisfied with my bare telling him, That I was not satisfied with his Religion; and therefore now I would give him my Reasons for it; which he huffs at, and says, he was never concerned with my not liking his Religion. What pretty Reasons will serve to excuse a Man from Answering a Discourse which he knows he cannot answer!

The plain case is this, The Representer made his Appeals, and put great confidence in the Bishop of Condom's Authority, whose business is to put the softest sense he can upon the Doctrines of the Council of Trent; and such Interpretations of the Catholic Faith, as have been condemned by other very Catholic Doctors. In my Reply to the Reflections, I considered what this Bishop's Authority is; and in my last Answer I examined what the Protefter had returned in the defence of it, which our Accommodator now says not one word to: But yet I told him, I knew no reason for this dispute, Whether the Bishop of Condom's Exposition were to be the standard of the Roman Catholic Faith; for if we should allow this, yet Popery is a very corrupt Religion, tho' the Bishop of Condom were the Authentick Expositor of it. And to shew that it is so, I undertook to examine that Bishops Exposition in those two great Articles of the Roman Faith, the Invocation of Saints, and Worship of Images; and how this should be a Reason for our Accommodator to take no notice of it, I cannot imagine: Had he any zeal for his Religion, and could have answered that Discourse, I believe all that I could have said would not have hindered him.
To conclude this whole matter, He peremptorily adheres to his first Title of a Representer, and declines all manner of disputation, tho' in vindication of the Bishop of Condom's Exposition, to which he so often Appeals. The only point he sticks to is, That to assent to the Catholick Faith, as expounded in his Character, and by the Bishop of Condom, is sufficient for any Man to be received into the Communion of the Church of Rome. But both he and the Bishop of Condom do not meerly Represent, but Reason and Argue also; and I should have thought they had been a little concerned to justify their own Representations and Reasonings. But whether this Reasoning and Disputing were agreeable to his design or not, it was very necessary to ours. For when they endeavour to soften the Doctrines of their Church, and to abate a great deal of Bellarmin's Popery, to reconcile our people to them; it is necessary for us to warn them of the snare, and to show them what an ill thing Popery is in its best dress; and therefore I as little desire that he should answer what I have said to this purpose, as he cares for doing it: I never writ a Book with a desire to have it answered; but to inform those, who otherwise might be imposed on. And I suppose our people will think never the worse of any Book, because Papists decline the dispute, who were never known to avoid Disputing, when they thought they could get any thing by it.

And thus I take a fair leave of the Representer; for this matter, I think, is driven as far as it will go: We have by his own confession, cleared our selves from being Misrepresenters in the true and proper sense of the Word; for we have not falsly charged
charged them with any Doctrines and Practises dis-owned by their Church; and as for their Character of a Papist Represented, tho' it falls very short of what some great Divines among them, of equal Authority with the Bishop of Condom, have thought to be the Doctrine of the Council of Trent; yet we are willing to joyn issue with them upon their own terms, and to shew them our Reasons, why we cannot comply with this refined and new-modelled Popery. But this is to dispute, and that does not agree with a Representer, whose business is to make Characters without any concern to defend them: And I am not so fond of disputing, as to dispute with him whether he will or no.
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A Fourth Vindication of the Church of England.

In a

A Reply to the Answer of the Amicable Accommodation.

The Answerer in his last seems to take his leave of me; And thus (says he, p. 30.) I take a fair leave of the Representative. But me-thinks, if he be not gone too far, I would fain have a word or two with him before we part. And 'tis chiefly in civility to ask him, How he does? For throughout his last Reply, he seems sick of Answering, having said but very little throughout the whole; and yet assuring his Reader, he has driven the matter as far as it will go, (p. ib.) Well, and is there no more then to be said, to that manifold Charge summ'd up against the Church of England in my last Discourse? Is that matter driven as far as it will go? I there drew out...
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a Character of the Church of England, as lying under
the same Charge of Scandals, Innovation, and Idolatry
from a Dissenter, as the Church of Rome does generally
from Protestants: And almost every Point urg'd with the
same Proofs of Scripture and Reason, which Protestants
produce against the Papists. And all this he passes over
with a light touch, and the most artificial way of An-
swering with saying nothing, as can possibly be met
with.

And first, tho' amongst the many Divisions of Dis-
senters, there are several, from whom the whole Charge
might forcibly be urg'd, as the Rigid Anabaptists, the
Quakers, &c. yet because this would oblige him to answer
all the Arguments, and to shew, they are not of equal
force against the Church of England, as against the Papists;
he upon good consideration, takes it as spoken from such
a kind of Dissenter, which agreeing in many of the Points
with the Church of England, cannot reasonably be thought
to urge them against her. And so instead of giving them
any farther Answer, he comes off with, The Dissenters
did never charge the Church of England with this. The
Dissenters do the same themselves. There is no Dispute be-
tween the Dissenters and Us, about that. Did ever the Dis-
senters charge us with this? And so lets them drop without
any farther Reply, tho' still standing in their full force
against the Church of England, from most other Dissen-
ters, excepting those he has pick'd out for better Expedi-
tion.

Thus he gives the goe-by to the greatest part of the
Instances. And for such other Arguments, as are there
press'd against the Church of England, and that equally
from all sorts of Dissenters, those, he prudently says no-
thing to; In observance I suppose of a Rule he had laid
down before in a former Discourse, viz. The Greatest Wits
can do no more than the Cause will bear; tho' a little Pru-
dence
the Amicable Accommodation.

dence would teach ME to say NOTHING in such a Cause, as will admit of no better a Defence. And therefore he says not one Word in Vindication of his Popish Prelates, of their Mitres and Crofiers, not a Word of praying to be defended by the Angels: Nothing of their calling upon the Birds, the Beasts and Fishes; of their crying out to Dead Men, in their most Solemn Devotions; of inserting the Apocrypha into their Liturgy; of their not wearing the Rocket, the Albe and Tunicle; of their prescribing Faifs, and not keeping them; of their formerly Praying for the Dead, &c. Not one word to all his own Reasons, which in his Discourses against me he has formerly advanc'd to prove us Superstitious and Idolaters; and yet there pressing with the fame weight against himself and his own Church. And yet he's taking his leave on me, because the matter is driven as far as it will go.

And is it possible then, that the Disputing Humour is fo soon off? We have heard of nothing hitherto so much, as of Disputing, and Defending, and Justifying your Reasonings; of these repeated Challenges to the Reprefenter, We'll Dispute it when you will: And now, as far as I see, when the Answerer is put to defend his own Church, and justifie his own Reasonings, he's as cool, and as unwilling to dispute as the Reprefenter. No, We are not, says he, for pursuing every new Game, but will keep to our old Scent. Could any thing possibly be said, more coolly than this? Here's not a word now of Disputing or Justifying; if his Reasonings be shewn to fly in his own face, as much as against his Adverfary, he's well enough content to hear it, with scarce a word of Reply; because he's resolv'd to keep to his old Scent. And is not this something strange now, that He that should draw me out to dispute over the Bishop of Meaux's Exposition, and run over the whole body of Controversie, as to matter of Right, or de Jure, when I undertook for no more than to declare what our Church holds
holds as to Matter of Fact; and would not take my waving it without many a Flirt and a Jeer: Now when it comes to his own turn of Disputing and Defending his own Reasonings, in a Case directly appertaining to our main Point of Representing, lets the matter fall very cautiously, and will scarce touch at it forsooth, because he'll keep to his old Scent. So that tho' he's for beating up for me, as many new Games as he can possibly find, for my diversion; for his part, he'll not follow the old one, unless the scent be very agreeable, which truly 'tis not when it comes to press him to the standing his Ground, and justifying his own Cause. I must pardon him therefore, it seems, as to this.

But however, tho' he will not offer any defence against a Character, which seems to reflect upon his own Church, yet he'll endeavour to prevent all misunderstanding between Her and the Dissenters, that might possibly be occasion'd by such a Character. And because he finds it much easier to work upon their Affections by Fawning, than to convince their Judgments by Reasoning; He first tells them how Wise they are, and how Cautious; nay, how much Wiser they are grown now of late; and he hopes, they will grow wiser and wiser every day: Especially so as not to suspect Them or their Church of any Inclinations to Poverty. For whatever they have formerly suspected — I believe (says he) they will call it Popish and Antichristian no longer. And here he gives them a Reason or two, with which if they are not mov'd, they are much to blame. For he tells them, in how many things the Church of England agrees with the Dissenters. And first, as for their calling their Churches by Saints Names, that's much the same with what the Dissenters did themselves; and tho' they give them the Titles of Saints, yet he hopes the Dissenters are not so silly, as to think this to be any more than for Distinction. Then as to the Power of Absolution, there's no.
no dispute between Us and the Dissenters: They and We agree, says he; so that whatsoever the Common-Prayer-Book delivers, of the Priest absolving the Sinner, yet he assures them, there's nothing meant by this, but only what the Dissenters teach themselves, that is, to give Relief to afflicted Consciences, &c. So again as to a vow of Chastity; he and the Dissenters agree, that 'tis lawful to repent of it, and marry; 'tis presently a rash Vow, if the Temptation be but urging. But then as to the business of Pictures in Bibles, and Images of Moses and Aaron, &c. in Churches, there he carries with them closely, and assures them, that however these Pictures are in their Bibles, Printed by Authority, Printed at the University; tho' Moses and Aaron stand in most of the Churches, have Place next to the Commandments, are above the Communion-Table; yet that all this is nothing but the Extravagancy of Painters and Printers, a very late Invention, and a secret design of Papists, to reconcile the People by degrees to the use of Pictures and Images.

Now I defie any man to bid fairer for the good Opinion of the Dissenters, than my Adversary has here done; who, for fear they should receive any ill impression in relation to his Church, from my Character, which is little more than in jest, throws their scandals upon her in good earnest; being resolv'd, that if his Church be to be scandaliz'd, he'll have the doing it himself.

But for the winning of the Dissenters, he goes on, and tells them; Altho' they have been Persecuted, that still they are not to complain of his Church: For that 'tis not so much the Church has done this, as the State, to secure it self from their Restless Humour, which has threatened the Publick Peace. Now, how far this will agree with them I can't tell: But I am apt to believe, that if the Dissenters once reflect, how much more quiet they have enjoy'd, since his Church's Power have been something check'd, than before, they'll have
have some Reason to suspect, that in their former Sufferings, the Church has had the greatest share; especially since at this present the State is as secure without those Persecutions as ever, which is an Argument, it does not stand much in need of 'em. But I dispute not this matter, let them agree as well as they can; the business only is, to put the Saddle upon the right Horse.

Another Reason he lays down before, by way of Prevention: And 'tis that however the Church of England, as it is represented in my Character, may bear some resemblance with Antichrist; yet he's confident the Dissenters will hence receive no prejudice, nor entertain any worse opinion of Her upon this score; because They are too Wise and Cautious to take Characters from open and profess'd Enemies. Now if this be true, and sufficient reason for his presumption, that the Dissenters are so Wise; I would fain know, how Wise he thinks his own Congregations to be, that is, such as go to Church; who have been receiving Characters of Popery these hundred and Fifty years, from the Open and Profess'd Enemies of the Papists; 'tis a Mercy they are not so Wise and Cautious as his Dissenters, otherwise the Pulpits might e'en have been silent, as to any thing touching Popery; since holding forth against such as they have Professed against, and own'd themselves Profess'd Enemies to, they could have deserv'd no credit in their Characters. But 'tis well the Dissenters are so Wise; and from henceforward 'tis to be remembered, that whosoever undertakes to give a Character of his declared and open Enemies, and expects to be credited by his Flock, must needs think them not so Wise as they shou'd be.

But here a gen he comes over me with the Whip in hand, and having asur'd his Dissenters, that I have abus'd them, in Fathering upon them so foul a Character of the Church of England; he tells his Reader, that the Run of the Charac-
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racter is exactly to the tune of the Quakers, whose Cant the Author (as he says) is as well acquainted with, as if he had been either their Master or Scholar. And if this be so, I must confess it a very strange Providence, as having never heard twenty words from them in my Life; as I can remember.

All the Harangues and Pulpits, I have been ever acquainted with here in England, (excepting some few of the Catholicks of late) have been those of the Church of England; and if I have learn'd any Canting, it must have been, not from the Quakers, but from them. The truth of't is, in the drawing up that Character, I took no other model, but that of the Church of England against the Papists. There is scarce an Argument in the Character, but exactly Parallel to what the Church of England uses in her Defence against Popery; the grounds of the Arguments are the same; the manner of urging them the same, the Maxims, on which they stand, the same; and then the Reasons, which press them home, are they not the very same, which the Answerer himself in his former Discourses urges against me? I wonder then, how this comes to be a Quakers Cant? 'Tis strange men should know their own Picture no better; and that when they see a Copy of what they do, and say themselves, in the most serious concern, it should appear to them so unlike the Original: that what in themselves they deem Reasonable and Just, being shewn them in a Reflection or Emblem, should seem nothing but Spiteful and Silly; as the Answerer says this do's, (p. 17.) This is just as it happens with little Children, who when they are shewn what Wry Faces they make, and how Scowling looks, will not easily believe they make so Ugly.

Well, but now the Answerer has consider'd the whole Character, and begins to think at last, that in it I have ridicul'd the Church of England. And thus (says he) this
hopeful design of Representing and Misrepresenting, ends only in ridiculing the Church of England; a Liberty, which if we needed it, is not mannerly for us to use at THIS TIME. But wherein have I ridicul'd the Church of England? I have done no more in my Character against Her, than what they have been doing these Hundred and Fifty Years against the Church of Rome; only what I have done in a kind of Jest, and without endeavouring to delude any body with such kind of Sophistry, They have been doing in the greatest earnest, and by it making good their Cause. And as for the mannerly and at this time, were there any ridiculing in my Case; is it not still as little manners to ridicule at this time the Religion of the Prince, as the Religion of the Subject? But I leave to the Ingenious and Impartial Reader to examine this affair of the Mannerly and This Time; I'll not judge, neither for my self, nor him.

But however, notwithstanding this little displeasure of my Answerer, it clears up a'gen with him, he pardons all frankly, and we are contented (says he) they should ridicule our Church, if they will permit us truly to Represent theirs. Here now we have a liberty granted of Ridiculing, which I resolve never to make use of, unless it be to shew, how They ridicule the Church of Rome: But instead of returning my thanks for this favour, I am e'n resolved to beg another; and 'tis, that the Answerer will be pleased not to take that for Ridiculing in us, which in them he calls truly Representing: This would be a very Signal Favour indeed, if it could be obtain'd; but I almost despair. For by all that I can discover in their truly Representing, 'tis so unlike what he calls it, that nothing can be more undeserving that Name. For let but an exact Copy be taken of what they do to the Papists, when they truly Represent them, as they call it, with all its methods and circumstances; let the same measures they use to them, be applied to any other Body.
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Body or Society, even to their own Church of England, and if it do’s not appear to be down right Misrepresenting and Ridiculing, instead of truly Representing, I’ll e’en throw up the Cause, and grant the Papists to be as Black as they make them. This appears something already in the Character now examin’d, which he owns to be Ridiculing, tho’ it be nothing but what they do to the Church of Rome, and there call it Truly Representing. But this I shall more clearly evince afterwards, when I have examin’d some other Parts of the Answer, where I shall have occasion of playing him the same Tune over again, a little more distinctly, without any Ridiculing, but in very good earnest.

But first I must consider how he receives the Curtese I did him in my last Reply. I must confess, I could not but be concern’d, to see my Answerer turning and winding it, first through tedious Ten Sheets, and soon after through other Nine, and all to prove that the Word Misrepresented in the Title of my Book, was not to be taken in its Proper Sense. This to me was an Object of Compassion; and therefore to save him any farther Sweat, I thought fit to yield to his Pretensions, and give into his hands the full grasp of all that he had just before so earnestly contended for. And see now, how ill use he makes of this favour.

For having so far complied with him, that the Word Misrepresented in the Title of my Book, is not to be taken in its Strict and Proper Sense; he would now willingly impose upon his Reader and Me, and persuade the World, as if I own the Protestants not to charge falsely any Doctrines or Practices on the Church of Rome, which she disowns: and that they do not teach their Flock, that the Church of Rome believes or practices, otherwise than She does.

C

This,
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This, says he, at last, if I understand him, he confesses. Is not this stretching a Curtesy with a witness, and Misrepresenting the Representer.

I yielded to him indeed, for Peace sake, that the Title of a Papist Misrepresented is not to be taken in its strict and proper Sense, as Misrepresenting signifies ONLY downright Lying or falsely charging matter of Fact, the WHOLE Character being not of that nature. And this with our Answerer is the same as to confess, That Protestants do not charge the Church of Rome with any Doctrins or Practices, which She does not own. So that it seems, because the Character of a Papist Misrepresented is not wholly made up of matters of Doctrine and Practices falsely charg'd upon the Papists; Therefore, (as our Answerer will have it) it contains nothing at all, wrongfully charg'd upon them; and Protestants do not in any thing Misrepresent the Church of Rome. And this he would have me plainly confess.

But I must beg his pardon for this; I do not see he has made so good use of the last favour I did him, as to accommodate away my Senses and Reason, to do him another. No, Transubstantiation is not half so disagreeable to Protestant-Senses, as this is to mine. I could as easily confess, that Protestants do not at all Write or Preach against Papists, as that they do not Misrepresent them. And for the truth of this Cause, I dare stand to the Verdict even of a Protestant Jury. I'll give the Answerer choice-room enough; Let him pick out of all England, Twelve such Men who understand the Belief and Doctrine of Papists, all Good Men and True; and if they shall, upon examination, give in; That they know all to be true, which they have heard from Protestant Pulpits and Books concerning the Papists; I'll then yield up the Cause, and sit down contented with the brand of a Misrepresenter. Nay, I dare put it to a farther issue; If they do not own, they have heard and read several
several things charg’d upon the Papists, which they know to be false, I’ll submit to the Answerer; and be oblig’d never more to disturb him with the Talk of Misrepresenting.

But before we advance too far in this matter, let’s see first, how it stands with the Character of a Papist Misrepresented; and examine, whether there be nothing there falsely laid at the Papist’s door, enough for the Book to deserve such a Title: And whether the fathering on them such Doctrins as are there contain’d, and found in Protestant Authors, be not affirming more than is True, and charging on them Doctrins and Practices, such as they and the Church of Rome disown.

And first, what do’s he think of Praying to Images, aserted as a Practice of the Papists, in the first Chap. of the Papist Misrepresented? Is not this imputing more to the Papists, than they either teach, practice, or maintain? Do they believe their Sins to be infallibly remitted upon Absolution, whether they resolve upon amendment or no? And yet this is laid to them Chap. 7. Do they believe the Pope can give them leave for a Sum of Money, to commit what Sins they please? And yet this is reported as their Doctrin, Chap. 8. Is it absolutely true, that they are never permitted to know their Commandments but by halves? Is it their Doctrin, presumptuously to rely on a Death-bed Repentance? Are their Sermons in Latin; or do they teach in Unknown Tongues? Is it true, that they Fir’d the City? Is he sure they Kill’d Sir Edmondbury Godfrey? Or will he put in for an Evidence, to Swear the Truth of the Damnable, Hellish Popish-Plot? And yet all these things, and more stand charg’d upon the Papists, in the Character of a Papist Misrepresented. Why then should the Answerer thus quarrel with this Title, as if the Papists had no wrong done them in such a Description? I know it is the Interest of such ill men, as have run down the
the Papists with these Charges and Accusations, and pass'd them upon the People for Gospel, to have them still reputed as Truths; lest the falsity of them being once confess'd, they themselves should appear the Deceivers. But however they may be willing to pursue such Unchristian methods, to save their own Reputation; 'tis not for us to own the Belief of such Doctrins, which we acknowledge to be Injurious to Christ, nor to maintain such Practices, which would be a Scandal even amongst those, who know not God. And therefore because the Character of a Papist Misrepresented, contains such Doctrins and Practices, which Catholicks neither own, teach nor believe; nay such as they abominate and detest, and are ready to lay down their lives, rather than embrace or approve; such a Character of a Papist, is nothing les than a False Character, a Misrepresenting Character, and fit only for the use of those, who have a mind to dispose their Followers into a temper of giving a better welcome to Turks, Atheists and Jews, than to Papists.

I know 'tis thought necessary for the Establishment and Security of the Protestant Religion; that the People should be Preach'd into a dread of Popery: but let it be so; is it a Christian method to make use of Artifices to encrease the horror? Why should every thing the Papists do, be stretch'd and strain'd, and forc'd, to make it ugly? Why should the worst be made of all that belongs to them? 'Tis true, this is proper enough to win upon the Mobile, who make no distinction between Real and Artificial Monsters; 'tis well enough, where the interest is best maintain'd by the Madness of the People. But where's the Christianity all the while, where's Truth and Charity? Why should Praying to Images, Leave to Sin for Money, Forgiveness without Repentance, Trusting in a Death-bed Lord have mercy, &c. Why should feign'd Crimes, and Imaginary Contrivances, &c. be urg'd against them, to make them
them the Object of hatred, and the Subject of a Popular fury? Why should it be pretended, that where these things stand charg'd against the Papists, they are not Misrepresented? I am sure where Protestantism is either grounded or confirmed by thus bug-bearimg of Popery, 'tis not built upon the Gospel, nor is its strength from the power of Truth; and the using such unwarrantable methods, and taking so much pains for the dressing it into a Monster, is argument enough with Considering Men, to suspect something of the Undertakers.

The Answerer therefore is mightily out, when he supposes it confess'd by me, that there's no proper Misrepresenting, or false charge of Matter of Fact upon the Papists, in the Character of the Papist Misrepresented. I only yield to him, that the Character is not wholly made up indeed of these forg'd Accusations, but that 'tis a mixt Character, describing the Papists, as they lie under the false Charges, the Calumnies, Reproaches, Misconstructions, and Mistaken Judgments of their both Malicious, and Ignorant Adversaries. And therefore I inform'd him, that the Title of the Papist Misrepresented was not to be taken in its strict and proper sense, as Misrepresenting signifies only down-right lying, or falsely charging matter of Fact: But in its larger, or less proper sense, as it comprehends both Lying, Calumniating, Mis-interpreting, Reproaching, Misconstruing, Mis-judging, and whatever else of this kind. But this condescendence, which would have oblig'd an Ingenuous Adversary, has made my Answerer something peevish. And therefore now instead of his old Complementing Humour, he's grown very sour, he's full of grudges, and something seems to grate upon his Stomach. Well, and what's the matter now? What reason of this so sudden Change? Why, it seems the Representer said, that the Papists are strangely Misrepresented; that many matters of Fact are falsely charg'd upon them; that they
are calumniated, reproach'd, their Doctrin and Practices mis-interpreted, misconstrued, misunderstood, &c. as was shewn in his Character of the Papist Misrepresented: And all this the Answerer unhappily takes to himself, as if He were the Man accus'd for doing all this against the Papists, as if He and His were Arraign'd of Lying, Calumniating, &c. Whenas the Representer spoke only in general, without so much as hinting upon any Party or Person in particular; and if I may vouch any thing for him, never thought of reflecting upon the Answerer, much less of giving him the Lie. 'Tis true, the Representer says, for the running down the Papists, and Misrepresenting them, besides their being Calumniated, and their Doctrins mis-interpreted, many Falsties and Lies have been rais'd against them. But what does this concern the Answerer? Is this Complaint any Accusation against him? Suppose the Representer had gone a step farther, and had said, that the Papists have been injur'd by Perjury, Forgery, and Subornation too; would the Answerer have thought himself touch'd in this, and labour'd to clear himself? 'Tis true, for a Man to be over-eager in quitting himself, when the Accusation is only General, is not the best Argument of his Innocence: But for my part, I never design'd to accuse the Answerer, for I knew not the Man; neither have I any thing now to say against him, as to this Point; only that his over-solicitude to prove his Innocence, before he was accus'd, will be likely with some to breed a suspicion of Guilt.

The Answerer therefore must remember, that the Character of the Papist Misrepresented contains several unjust Charges of Doctrin and Practices, (tho' it be not wholly made up of these) such as the Papists neither own, nor believe. And that he is over-hasty in persuading his Reader, that this Point is gain'd, and confess'd by me. No, he must pardon me for this; I'll go as far as any Man
Man for an Accommodation, but never so, as to subscribe to a falsity in a Complement.

Hitherto as to what concerns the Character: Now we are to consider, how true that is, which he so often repeats, of the fair dealing of WE in relation to the Papists. For some it seems there are, if he says true, that are so just and kind to the Papists, as not to Misrepresant them. For throughout the Answer we meet with nothing oftner, than WE are not Misrepresenters in a strict and proper notion of Misrepresenting: WE do not charge the Church of Rome with any matter of Fact, with any Doctrins or Practices, which she does not own. WE charge them with nothing that is false. WE do not misreport the Doctrins of their Church. WE do not charge men with saying or doing, what they never said or did. WE are no Misrepresenters. And truly I should be glad to know, who these WE are, to return them my thanks for this so kind Office; for really, as the World goes, 'tis no small favour done to the Papists, to say no more of them, than they own and believe themselves. For my part, did I know the Men, I would never permit them to lie obscured, under the General name of WE; no, I would particularize them to the World, and have their Names blazon'd in every Street, upon Pillars errected to their Memory. For why? Are not such Men Prodigies of Vertue, of Truth, Honesty, and Justice? Men that never charg'd the Church of Rome with any matter of Fact, with any Doctrin or Practice, which she does not own: Men that never said the Church of Rome teaches, what she does not teach; that never condemn'd the Papists for believing, what they do not believe; nor accus'd them of saying or doing, what they never said or did; Men that never Misrepresented the Papists! Why, these are Admirable Men indeed, and not to be heard of every day. Were I assur'd of the being of such Men, I should begin to think Astrea was return'd again,
again, and that our Nation would in all likelyhood recover her Credit, lost in the unhappy times of our late Credulous Madness.

But I wish there be no mistake in this, it being so hard to imagine who these We should be. For now if he should mean by his We, We Protestants; We never accus’d the Papists of any Doctrin, or Practices, which they do not own; never charg’d them with anything that is false; who could believe it? Would not this look like a Paradox, which if the Answerer will affirm, I believe he’ll scarce find more than one to swear to? For is it possible that We Protestants never said any thing of the Papists, but what is exactly true; We never said they believe, what they do not believe; that they teach, what they do not teach; or that they did, what they never did? Is it possible this should be true? I would willingly give something for the sight of the Man that thinks so. For my part, I think it very hard to be believ’d: And if this be the meaning of the Answerer, and what he endeavours to persuade his Reader, I think of all the Mis-representations of the Papists, that ever I met with, this of affirming all to be true, that has been said of the Papists, is the greatest; and I wish the Answerer much Joy for the Improvement. For this is nothing else, than to vouch for the truth of all, that has been ever alledg’d against them; and in three lines to assert and approve all that has been invented against them these hundred and fifty Years.

But I think, upon consideration, I may take it for granted, that his WE that charge the Papists with nothing that is false, and are no Misrepresenters, are WE Protestants: for ’tis these he seems to vindicate, throughout his Books, and endeavours to wipe off from them the imputation of being Misrepresenters. And besides, if he speaks properly, the Answerer himself must come in, and make one of the WE; and for him, one may swear he’s a stanch True
True Protestant, as never scrupling at any thing that's for running down the Papists, tho' it be currying favour with, and colloquing the Phanaticks; as he seems plainly to do, in his last Answer (p. 16. 18.) And more particularly, because being to speak against Popery, he's as large, as loud, as long-winded as you please, and is ready to Dispute against it without end, could he but find any, that would think it worth their while to try him. But being to speak in defence of the Principles and Practices of his own Religion (as he had occasion sufficient from the Accommodating Sermon in my last Answer) he's as Flat, as Short, and as willing to wave the disputing for it, as any Adversary can desire, which is as plain an Argument to me of his Perswasion, as if 'twas writ in his Forehead; there being only one Perswasion as I know of amongst Christians, which has its Name, Being and Support, not from what it is in it self; but from what it is not, in defying and ProtestIng against their Neighbours.

We must suppose therefore now that his WE which are pretended to clear throughout his Answer, from being Mis-representers of the Papists, are WE Protestants: but because he disclaims all Title to Infallibility, there's no need of taking his word for the truth of what he afferts; nor danger of affronting him, tho' we call in question the verity of what he says, he has prov'd. And really, as my Case stands, I am oblig'd to question it: For if it be confess'd true, what he says, that the Protestants are no Mis-representers of the Papists, Then, I must needs own, I have highly injur'd the Protestants in complaining against them as Mis-reporters of the Doctrin and Practices of the Church of Rome, and holding out against them so long the charge of Misrepresenting. Why should I injure any body, especially so considerable a Number, as challenge that Name? No, I will do them no such wrong, and therefore, however Innocent our Answerer may pretend he has prov'd them;
I'll here shew the Papists have been always Misrepres-

ted; and that ever since they have had Protestant Adver-
saries, their greatest Suffering has been, not so much from
the force of Truth and Reason, as from Calumny and Sla-
der, and all sorts of Misrepresentations.

For the clearing of this, we must take along with us the
true Notion of Misrepresenting, as 'tis now agreed on by
our Adversary, who owns in his last Answer, That whofo-
ever undertakes to declare any Action, Doctrin, or Prac-
tice of Papists, and does not deliver it as cloath'd with
all its Circumstances, with the right Motives, due End
and Intention, is in a proper and strict sense a Misrepre-
senter. Again, in his former Answer he has this laid down
'As a Principle: If we (says he, speaking of We Prote-
stants) put our own Opinions of the Papists Faith and Prac-
tice into his Character, this is Misrepresenting; because a
Papist has not the same Opinion of these things, which we
have, and this makes it a False Character. So that here
'tis now to be suppos'd, that whatsoever Protestant in any
thing relating to the Papists, either leaves out, or alters
any material Circumstance, the Motive, Intention, End,
puts any false Construction, or thrusts in his own Opinion
into what he relates, is forthwith a Misrepresenter.

And now to discover, how much the Papists have been
always Sufferers from this Unchristian Artifice of Misre-
presenting, we can take no better way, than to make en-
quiry into the several Methods us'd in Misrepresenting; and
this not only in relation to Points of Doctrin and Belief;
but likewise in matters of Fact and History: and tho' it be
impossible to give an exact Catalogue of These, they being
as Numberless, as the Ways are of Ignorance to mistake,
of Envy to make false Constructions, of Malice to deceive;
yet to touch at some few, will be sufficient to evince, whe-
ther the WE of the Answerer are as clear from misrepres-
fenting and wronging the Papists, as he pretends. Or

Whether
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Whether the Papists are really, what they pretend to shew them.

And first, one way of Misrepresenting the Papists is by charging their Doctrin with Blasphemy and Prophanest, not otherwise due to it, but only through the Ignorance or Malice of him that draws the Consequence. This is the admirable Gift of Mr. Sutcliff in his Survey of Popery, where he lays upon the Papists the most Infamous Positions of the Heathens, and then gives his Reasons for it, such as are more for his own Confusion, with understanding Men, than to the prejudice of those he writes against. Thus he says the Papists Blasphemously make Christ not only a Desperate Man, without Hope, but also an Infidel without Faith. And Why all this Only, because Aquinas, (p. 3. q. 7. art. 4.) says, that Christ seeing and enjoying God from the first instant of his Conception, could not possibly have Faith or Hope in him, which always suppose the Absence of the Object; that is, respect the Divine Essence not seen and not enjoy’d. And this is reason enough for Sutcliff to cry out against the Papists, as Blasphemously making Christ, both a Desperate Man, and an Infidel. Certainly such a Piece of Divinity was never heard of before out of a Country Church. And yet such as it is, My Anfwener is not ashamed to Print it over again; making this profound Reason of Sutcliffs, a sufficient discharge of him from being a Misrepresenter; quarrelling with me, for curtailing the Author, in setting down this his charge against the Papists, without his Reason that back’d it.

Another way of Misrepresenting the Papists, is in pretending to deliver their Doctrin, and then to insert something, which is notoriously false, and absolutely detested by them; this is what is done by the Author of a Catechism lately Publish’d, who undertakes to give a Systeme of Popish Doctrins truly Represented, according to their own most receiv’d Authors, and Councils, and coming to speak of
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IMAGES, he says the Papists PRAY TO THEM; which Pag. 17. is so foul a Misrepresentation, that the Author of the Answer to the Papist Misrepresented plainly Condemns me, for making it a part of my Misrepresentations, as if ’twere never Charg’d against the Papists. This, says he, would insinuate, as tho’ WE did directly charge them with PRAYING TO their Images, without any farther respect: Which we are so far from charging them with, that I do not know of any People in the World liable to that Charge. Thus what one Protestant asserts positively, as the Doctrine and Practice of the Papists, another Protestant rejects as a Misrepresentation so foul, as not to be imputed to the worst of Infidels.

But however, foul as it is, ’tis not only found thus in a Grave Catechism, but something like it in a Sermon too, viz. of J. Thomas Rect. of St. Nicholas; Preach’d at Cardiffe, before the Bayliffs and Aldermen, 1679, where amongst other Gospel-truths, he gives his Auditory to understand, that the Papists do not only Worship Martin’s Boots, Georg’s Scabbard, Crispins Paring-knife, Thomases her Shoe, and Josephs Breeches, but do likewise CALL UPON THEM too. Which is to make them agen more stupid Idolaters, than the worst of Heathens; but ’tis by a Misrepresentation, however agreeing with that Year of Oats’s blessed Discovery, yet much better suiting with some other Place, than the Pulpit.

Another like this, is that of the Answer to Catholicks no Idolaters, who says, tis the common Answer of Catholicks, that their Adoration of the Eucharist cannot be Idolatry, because they Believe the Bread to be God, just as the Worshippers of the Sun believ’d the Sun to be God. Which is so absolutely false of the Catholicks, that on the contrary they believe, that whosoever believes the Bread to be God, as the Heathens did the Sun, and adores it upon that consideration, must of necessity be an Idolater in adoring it.

Ano-
Another way is in framing some heathenish Absurdity, and then laying it on the Papists, as their Doctrine and Belief, when tis only a Malicious Inference drawn from some abuse, or from an obscure expression in some petty Author; and this we find in the Archbishop of York so often quoted, who Represents the Papists as believing Christ to be Saviour of Men only, but no Women; that Whoredom is allow'd by them all the year long; and several other such abominable Positions, which are no better than the Doctrine of Devils:

Such Deductive Absurdities, are those which Dr. St. according to what the general Current of his Discourse Represents, endeavors to persuade his Credulous Reader, to be Doctrines of the Roman Church, viz. That it holds no necessity of Repentance, but only once in one's Life. That the Roman Repentance obliges none to the forsaking their sins, or a Reformation of Life. That the Sacraments confer Grace, on any Receiver of them, tho' never so unprepar'd. That Indulgences discharge Catholicks from doing the best part of their Religion. Which may be seen related and confuted in a Discourse entitled, The Roman Doctrine of Repentance and of Indulgences, vindicated from Dr. Sts. Misrepresentations. The like is to be seen in John Fox's Acts and Monuments, where (besides the infinite mistakes and abuses in relation to his Martyrs) in considering some chief Points of the Catholick Doctrine, in less than three leaves, he has falsified them in above one Hundred and twenty Instances; that is, as his Answerer words it in his plain Language, has uttered more than a Hundred and fifty Lies: as is made appear in the Examen of John Fox's Calendar, p. 3. p. 412.

Another way is in Falsifying Authors for the Proof of some Extravagant Doctrine upon the Church of Rome. And this is done several ways: As first by the Archbishop of York, who reports it a Tenet of the Papists, That the Pope
Pope can make that Righteous, which is unrighteous. And then quotes L.1. Decret. Greg. Titulus 7. Chapter the Fifth, which Titulus of the Decretals consists only of Four Chapters, and nothing mention’d in them all besides what concerns the Translation of Bishops. Other Tenets of the like stamp he imputes to the Belief of the Church of Rome, and then quotes St. Thomas and Bellarmine, &c. in such Places, where either the Matter or Place is not to be found, nor any thing like it.

This is done another way, by endeavoring to prove some Folly upon the Papists, out of their own Authors; and then bringing in the Authors quite contrary to their own Sense and Words: This is exemplified in a Sermon several times Printed, and now lately with Dr. Tillotson’s name to it, where p. 2. he says, Learned Persons of the Church of Rome do acknowledge that Purgatory cannot be concluded from the Text (1 Cor. 3. 15.) And then affirms, Nay ALL that Estius contends for from this Place is, that it cannot be concluded from hence, that there is no Purgatory. Which yet, tho’ Preach’d at Whitehall, and before His late Majesty, is not ALL that Estius contends for. For Estius in his Explication upon that Place of St. Paul, speaking of Purgatory concludes with these plain words, Itaque hac ratione pæna Purgatoria animarum, ex hoc Pauli loco bene & solide colligitur. Wherefore, says he, upon this consideration from this place of St. Paul the Punishment of Souls in Purgatory is well and solidly gathered. Which is little less than a Contradiction to what the Dr. affirms of him. Dr. Cumber is something good at this too, who in his Advice to Catholicks, endeavors to make appear that St. Gregory condemns the Doctrin of Catholicks concerning the not marrying of Priests, maintaining as he says, that it is lawful for such of the Clergy, as cannot contain, to Marry: And yet whosoever consults the place, will find St. Gregory, to speak only of such of the Clergy, as are
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Extra Sacros Ordines constituti, Not yet in Holy Orders; which is not at all contrary to the receiv'd Doctrin of the Church of Rome, as the Dr. is willing to represent it, but what at this day they teach and practice; so that in this he evidently falsifies the Father. Something after the same manner, he in another place treats Bellarmine; endeavouring to prove him a Blasphemer, for saying, that a Man may be his own Redeemer; whereas Bellarmine in the place cited, do's not say so of himself, as the Dr. represents him; but only sets down the words of Scripture, in which Man is so call'd; and by explicating in what Sense they may be understood, without any injury to Christ, defends the H. Scripture from the imputation of Blasphemy. Which, methinks, is not so ill an Office, as to deserve the Title of Blasphemer, for doing it.

The Old Dr. Willet amongst many others, has an excellent one of this kind, who in his Synop. Papism, will needs prove the Pope to be Antichrist out of St. Bernard, in these words, Their own Witnesses shall speak; Bernard says, Bestia de Apocalypsi, cui datum est os loquens Blasphemias Petri Cathedram occupat. The Beast in the Apocalypse, to which a Mouth was given speaking Blasphemies, possessesthe Chair of Peter. By which he will perswade his Reader, that the Bishop of Rome, according to the plain words of St. Bernard, is the Beast in the Apocalypse and Antichrist. Whereas 'tis contrary to St. Bernard, who in that Epistle, speaks very honorably of Pope Innocentius, animating him to the performance of his Duty with Courage; and in the words mention'd reflects only upon a certain Usurper, who by violence invaded the Chair of Peter, and banish'd Innocentius the true Bishop out of Rome. The late Discourse concerning the Devotions of the Church of Rome plays upon this String too, where p. 52. speaking of the Papist's, They tell us, says he, there is a vast number of Sins in their own nature Venial—— for the pardon
pardon of which there is no need, or occasion for the Mercy of God. Which is a Doctrin they neither own nor profess; but absolutely contrary to their Belief. And tho' he quotes here Escobar for this Absurdity, there is not one word of this to be found in him, in the place cited: But above all in this kind, I think Dr. Taylor bears away the Bell in his Difquasive from Popery, in which he shews an excellent Talent of forging strange Doctrins, and Fathering them on Catholick Authors: And then for his quotations which he pretends to lay down out of Fathers and Catholick Writers, the greatest part of them are either strangely wrested to a sinister sense, or not found at all in the Original, or else unpardonably corrupted: As his Answerer makes appear, who Examin'd them with his own Eyes, as he professes, in the Original Authors.

Another way mightily in fashion for the Mifrepresenting the Papists, is by putting them upon the same File with Infidels and Pagans, and by such comparisons to imprint in the Vulgar a Notion of the Papists being no better than Infidels. This is a great Topick with the Bishop of Kilmore, in his Sermon Preach'd at St. Warbroughs in Dublin a year ago, The Pagans (says he p. 12) had their several Titular Gods for several places; for Delphos Worship'd Apollo, Crete Jupiter, and Ephesus Diana: And so in Popery, England Worship'd St. George, Scotland St. Andrew, Ireland St. Patrick, &c. Again, In Paganism they had several Gods to pray to— and so in Popery. In Paganism several Professions had several Gods— So in Popery. Lastly, to these, says he, both Pagans and Papists build Churches, erect Altars, &c. This is the way this Prelate has of setting forth the Papists. And one reason why he deals so civilly with them, as to render the Papists no worse than Heathens, he gives in his Preface to the said Sermon, because we have the Word of the King (says he) to defend our Religion. An admirable return of this Royal Favor, to perswade his Majesties Sub-
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Subjects, that the Papists and Infidels are much of a Piece. And yet This Sermon, is deem'd by this Good Prelate a Defence of the truth, and a very seasonable Intimation of our (Protestant) Resolution of being True and Steady to our Laws, Oaths and Duties.—And let the Romanists take it as they please, they must expect a great many such. And really as to this, I think his Lordship is much in the right; for a great many such we have met with. But I must take the liberty to tell his Lordship, that if this be the method of defending his Religion, and an argument of his being True and Steady to his Duty; that (besides a great deal more that might be said to it) 'tis only done by Misrepresenting; and that tho' he's oblig'd to Preach against Popery, as he says, to the utmost of his Wit and Learning, that there's no more Wit or Learning in this, than what every petty Sophister might find without much ado, to make the Protestant, Turk, and Jew all one, because they all agree, in maligning and defaming the Papists.

However this way of calumniating, his Lordship has not the honor of inventing, 'twas first devis'd by those Divine the Compilers of the Book of Homilies, who besides this almost word for word, have variety of other Scurrilous ways, as comparing the Papists with the Horse and the Ass, and such like, exactly calculated for the Rabble. 'Twas afterwards taken up by the Psalm-makers, who finding David to have never a True-Protestant Hymn, added that of From Turk and Pope defend us Lord. And because this seem'd to some of too soft a strain, 'Tis since rais'd a Note or two higher, and I think even to Ela in a good hearty Family Prayer to be said Morning and Evening, added to the end of the singing Psalms in a Common-Prayer-Book, Printed at Oxford, in the year 1683, in Twelves, wherein 'tis said O Lord raise up faithful Distributers of thy Mysteries—contrarily confound Satan, Antichrist with all Hiredlings and Papists. Which seems the effort of a True-
Protestant Charity, not only to link Satan, Antichrist, and the Papists together, but to wish them all overtaken with the same Confusion.

Another way there is, in pretending to declare the Devotions of Catholicks, and then to insert something that is absolutely false as to the End or Intention, for which they perform them: This the Discourse of the Devotions of the Church of Rome, is admirable good at; as p. 56. where speaking of the frequent Repetition of the Names of Jesus and Mary, in the Jesus Psalter, &c. he thus gives the reasons: Now their saying the same thing so often over (says he) is not contrived to help and assist Devotion, or prevent Distraction, or as a Repetition of what is more than ordinarily important, or for any other good or prudent Reason; BUT OUT OF PURE VANITY AND OSTENTATION, OR AS IT WERE EVEN TO FLATTER OUR BLESSED SAVIOUR OR THE SAINT WHICH THEY PRAY TO. This is his reason he gives of our Devotion, and 'tis as Heroick a way of defending the Truth, by Calumniating with a Magisterial Confidence, and throwing dirt blindfold, as ever I met with. I am sure 'tis so unbecoming, that if he should with the like positiveness, interpret any thing belonging to the State or Civil Government, 't would not be call'd a bare Misrepresenting, without a—at the end of it.

But the Bishop of Kilmore will not give way to any in this kind of dawbling, and if the Papists be not black enough, it shall be none of his fault: What he does, is upon Oath and Duty, and therefore he's the more hearty: And his Talent being in Similitudes, as he before compar'd the Papists with the Heathens; so now he honors them with the Comparison of Esop's Dog; and then soon finds a staff to beat them. Some there are (says the Prelate in the same Sermon, p. 10.) Who with Esop's Dog, snatch at the shadow and lose the substance; that is, place the WHOLE Worship
of God in Bodily Exercise, and External Adoration; as bowing before a Crucifix, in creeping to a Cross, in running a bare-leg'd Pilgrimage,—in hanging down the head for a day like a Bulrush,—in Pixes and Paxes and such like fripperies. Thus he truly Represents the Devotions of the Papists, as he's bound by Oath, and yet without Truth, or Conscience. For is it true, that their WHOLE Worship of God consists in these bodily Exercises, as his Lordship calls them? Do they not teach their Followers to Worship God by internal Acts of Love, of Fear, of Reverence, of Honor, of Resignation, by an hearty Oblation of all they have, or are, and that no external Action is acceptable to God, without the Heart and Soul going along with it? How comes it then, that their WHOLE Worship of God is in these Bodily Exercises? But I must not urge too far; spreading of these Calumnies his Lordship takes for his Duty; and as long as he pretends to His Majesties Word, for his abusing us, I must be silent; tho' I have great reason to think, his Lordship's mistaken, and that he stretches His Majesties Word farther than 'twill go.

Another way there is, in laying on the Colours with so much craft on the Papists Tenets, that tho' they are the very same with what the most Learned Protestants hold themselves; yet they shall appear so Foul and Monstrous, as if nothing less than a certain Damnation attended their Abettors. This is done in several Instances: As when the Uncharitableness of the Papists is to be the Theam, and the Alarm to keep the drowsie Flock from nodding; how Unchristian are they render'd, for not allowing Salvation to any out of their Church, for giving the Protestants no better portion, but with those on the Left hand of the Judge! Dr. Tillotson, plays this Tune roundly in his before mention'd Sermon, p. 22. Where inveighing against the Uncharitableness of the Papists, he labours heartily to create a good Charitable Aversion in his Hear-
ers towards them. And after he has spent some pages in this; he at last in a Rapture of Charity concludes, p. 27. I have so much Charity (and I desire always to have it) as to hope, that a great many among them, who live Piously, and have been almost Enevitably detain'd in that Church by the prejudice of Education and an invincible Ignorance, will upon a general Repentance find mercy with God. One would have expected, by his earnest condemning the Papists, and the Preamble of this Conclusion, to have met with some extraordinary Piece of Charity, both for the Reformation and example of the Papists; and yet after all the outcry and bustle, he wont allow one more grain of mercy to the Papists, than the Papists do to them; that is, only to such; who having liv'd piously, and truly Repented of their sins, have an Invincible Ignorance to atone for all other errors of the Understanding; which is the very Doctrin of the Papists in respect of such, who die out of the Communion of their Church. But now whether Dr. Stillingfleet has even so much Charity as this for the Papists, 'tis not easie to tell. For he declares positively, that all those who embrace Popery, must, by the terms of Communion with that Church, be guilty either of Hypocrifie or Idolatry; either of which are sins inconsistent with Salvation. Now if the Doctor were Judge, what are become of the poor Papists? Are not they all damn'd in the Lump? And yet this is the Protestant Charity, which condemns the Papists for Un- charitableness. To say the Papists must be guilty of sins inconsistent with Salvation, is but to say they are Damn'd in another Phrafe. And if the Doctor can find any expedient to save them after this, he must make Heaven gate as wide as the Portico to the Turkish Paradise, where there's passage for the Dog, the Camel and the Whale. Thus when Protestants and Papists say the same thing of each other, 'tis strange how Antichristianly-black the Papists are made, when the Protestants have the laying on the Colors.
Another way yet there is, in undertaking to declare the
Tenets of Catholicks; and after having rak’d together
some odd and extravagant Opinions of some Authors, to
set them down for the receiv’d Doctrin of the Church;
and ’tis presently true Representing, if there be but an
Author’s Name to support the pretence; and most especi-
ally if the said Author be allow’d and not condemn’d after
the publishing. This is a most fashionable way, trodden
hard in Books and Pulpits. The Arch-Bishop of Tork ap-
proves it mightily. And so if he can but cite Bulgradus,
Veffel. Grovingens. or Dift. 96. that’s enough to make
any Extravagancy to pass for an Article of Faith: And
then if the thing happen to be disprov’d and shewn a Mis-
representation, ’tis at least a Popish Misrepresentation; and
this serves still to promote the Cause, to make the Papists
odious. This is a Method so unwarrantable, that if fol-
low’d by all Parties alike, in exposing their Adversaries,
’twould soon make all Christendom, only so many Di-
visions of Infidels. One little Example will clear this.
For suppose now any Popish Preacher in his Pulpit beyond
Sea, in a Country where his Auditory understands but
little what Protestants are, should let slip his Text, and
following our Modish way, should be so unjust to his Flock,
as not to spend his Glass in instructing them in their Duty,
or reforming their Lives; but making use of some little
Arts, should place his main endeavour in provoking them
to a good hearty aversion against Protestants; and should
thus expose them: My Dear Christians, stick fast to the
Truth of the Gospel, preach’d by Christ and his Apostles,
and deliver’d down to you by a continual Succession of Pa-
fitors and Teachers, and the Practice of the Faithful in all
Ages: But above all, beware of such, who make Divisions
and Schisms in the Church of God, such as cry out, Christ,
Christ, and Reformation, but are nothing but the Fore-run-
ners of Antichrist. These call themselves Protestants; the
Name
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Name you have scarce heard of, as being no where in Scripture, Fathers, nor Antiquity; but their wicked Principles and Practices have fill'd the whole Earth. They have out-done even the Heathens, and those that know not God, in all sorts of Wickedness and Impiety: And this the few Good Men that are amongst them own themselves: One Eminent for his Writings, and known by the Author of the Whole Duty of Man, confesses it to them and the World, that they have broken down not only the banks of RELIGION, but of CIVILITY too: And so universal a depravation is there, says he, amongst us, that we have scarce any thing left, to distinguish us from the most Barbarous People, but a better Name, and worse Vices.

Do you see how under the pretence of Reforming, they have brought Corruption into the World, that even they themselves own it, and yet go on, under an empty Title, of being the Chosen People of God? This same thing is confessed and own'd almost in the same words, by another Good Man now of late, who before his Prelate in a Visitation Sermon, delivers it for Gospel, that they are so wicked, that they cannot be thought the Servants of God:

We can never (says he) make them (our Enemies) believe that we are the Servants of the Living God, or have a just sense of Devotion, while they see that we have nothing to distinguish us from the Worshippers of a False God, but a Better Name and Worse Vices. But then, that you may neither doubt of the truth of this, nor yet wonder at it, he gives a sufficient Reason in the same Sermon, where he says, that their Guides and Ministers, who should lead and direct them to Good, do instead of this, encourage them to Vice and Faction. When the Clergy themselves (says he, p. 14.) have given EXAMPLE and ENCOURAGEMENT to Men, to break the Churches Laws, and contemn her Authority, no wonder that VICE and Faction appear insolent and daring. You see then
then, they have not the Fear of God in their Hearts nor Actions, and you see the Reason of it. This is all hitherto in respect chiefly of God; but now in respect of their Neighbour, they have no Charity for any, that are not of their mind; but for their own Brethren, they think themselves bound to help and assist them, tho' engag'd in the foulest of Villanies and Crimes.

Thus when the Scots, under pretext of Reforming Religion, had invaded their Prince's Authority, and by the Preaching of John Knox and other head-strong Ministers, says their own Author, had been persuaded, that it pertain'd to them to reduce by force their Prince to the prescript of Laws; and wanting some assistance to effect it, they sent to Queen Elizabeth for Aid. And here what says Sir Rich. Baker, a Protestant Historian? Amongst other Considerations, It seem'd no less, says he, than an IMPIETY not to give aid to the Protestants of the same Religion. So that tho' they are confess'd by him, to have pretended only a Reformation, not by chance; but rather plotted of purpose, according to the Suggestion of Head-strong Ministers, to incroach upon the Prerogative of the Crown; and to demand aid from abroad, by violence to reduce their Prince, (which is to be as great Traytours as can be) yet 'tis an Impiety (says he) not to help them in their Rebellion, since they are Brethren of the same Persuasion: Holy Brethren believe me, thus to deem it a Duty to joyn hands in Rebellion, and to be Traytours for Religion-fake!

You see what their Doctrin is in regard of Foreign Princes. And do you think they have any better respect for their own? Yes, if He be of their Religion, and thinks as they think. Otherwise they'll beg his Pardon: as now if he should be a Popish one, for Example; what deference would they have for him? You may learn it from one of their own Leaders in the Gospel, who with a
very Remarkable NOVERINT, or BE IT KNOWN, delivers a Doctrin of a most rare piece of Gallantry, with a most admirable Resolution of confronting such a Prince to his face, and making the contempt of him a Duty. And that none may question in the least this their Respectful Divinity, this Author delivers it yet plainer in another Place (p. 80.) Where making a Discourse with some prospect of a Popish Successor; He thus openly speaks their common sense: So far (says he) are all those, who are so tender of the Succession, from having any tenderness for a Popish Successor, that they dread him like the PLAGUE, and therefore would have had Provisional Laws made, to bind up such an One, and put him under very CLOSE LEGAL CONFINEMENT, in case he should be King. This is what the better and most Loyal Part of them, were willing to afford such a Prince; but for the others; Nothing would serve (says he) the other Protestants, but an Act of EXCLUSION, back’d with another for an ASSOCIATION. Do you see, my Dear Flock, what new sort of Christians these are, what their Charity, what their Loyalty; what they look upon their Duty; How far the Best of them can go, how far the Worst.

Well might that One Good Man confess, that they have broken down the Banks not only of RELIGION, but of CIVILITI too; and that their Vices are more heinous than those of the most Barbarous People. And what he confess’d, you your selves have now seen proved, to the scandal of the Christian Name, out of their own Authors; and those not obscure ones, or rak’d out of the Duft; but of the most Eminent amongst them, to be found in all hands, read every where, and never reprov’d or condemn’d by any; so that you have all the reason in the World to conclude, that ’tis the sense of their Church, whatsoever some of the more subtle of them may pretend to the contrary.
But I must not harangue too long, I know it will not please; and really it even nauseates me even in this manner to carry on a piece of Sophistry, which I have seen and heard so often practic’d in earnest, in the weightiest concern, by the Sobereft Men, and in the most Sacred Places. This will suffice, to let any considering Man see, what use may be made of Authors; how easy it is to make any Party Odious to the Multitude, and however Christian it may be, yet with how little difficulty it may be Painted as Black as Hell, if a Man will be so unjust, as to pass these kind of Misrepresenting Arguments upon the People for the Gospel.

These are some of the Methods, by which the Papists have been Misrepresented, in relation to their Tenets of Doctrine and Belief; now I must take another short turn, and examine, how many ways, the Papists have been Misrepresented, in relation to some matters of Fact and History; and by that time, I hope, the Reader will discover, whether it be without reason, that the Papists complain of being Misrepresented.

One way there is in letting Avarice, Envy, or Malice give ill Names to things, and then passing them upon the Crowd for no better, than they are thus stamp’d by these Passions. This was a method very serviceable in the time of the Reformation; when there was no need of more, than nick-naming the most Sacred things, and presently they became Unhallow’d. Thus we find related by Dr. Heylyn; The Grandees of the Court, casting many an envious Eye upon the Rich Hangings, the Maffy Plate, and other things, which adorn’d the Altars in those times, did no more than call them Corruptions, and presently they were no longer fit for Churches, but only for Private use, and seis’d them. The Candlesticks, Crucifixes and Shrines had Superstition stamp’d on them, and forthwith were made a spoil. The Protector Somerset did no more than pitch
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upon Three Episcopal Houses, Four or Five Churches, a Chappel and Charnel house of St. Paul's, and calls them Superfluous; and they are immediately blown up, and make proper Materials for his New Palace Somerset-house. St. Margarets-Westminster too was condemn'd to the same fate, upon the sentence of Unnecessary: But the Workmen that were sent to demolish it, being disturb'd by the Clubs and Staves of the Parishioners, 'twas again judge'd Convenient for their use. This was the Method in those Reforming times, when, as we may read in Heylyn, Covetousness, Ambition, and Envy set up for removing Corruptions out of the Church; when Profit and Interest was to give Orders, and Violence to Execute; when Sacrilege and Rape were the best means for the bringing in the Purity of the Gospel. But because this may be all seen at large in some Historical Collections gather'd out of Protestant Authors, lately Publish'd, Ile remit the Reader to them, where he'll easily discover how considerably the Art of Misrepresenting contributed to the outing of Popery.

This same method it was that King Henry the Eighth, Luther, &c. made use of, when by Luxury and Rape they began to reform the Extravagancies of their times, and make way apace for Protestantism to enter into the World. If the Pope will not consent to the Irregular Passions of that Prince, and permit him to take a second Wife, while his first is alive; the Power, that is the Curb to his Lust, is forthwith Antichristian, tis a Usurpation and Foreign Power; and with such hard names, tis rendred as odious to the People, as 'twas to him; who by this means throwing it off, passeth for a Good Christian amidst his Vile Extravagancies. If Luther has a mind to Marry, and his Vow of Chastity stands in his way, he do's no more than nick-name it a little, calling it a Rash and Inconsiderate Vow, and he's as free to Marry as the best of them; his Vow is no farther a Let to him, and he now
now contracts according to the Prescript of the Gospel. And if he thinks a Nun will make the best Wife; he do's no more than make her Vow as Foolish as his, and the business is effect'd without any more ado, no farther Scruple; they forthwith become a most Evangelical couple. This same way we have seen trod over of late by Honest Sir William, who by the Name of Popish Trinkets and Trumpery, made a spoil of Chalices, Crosses, the Images of Christ and his Saints; and by a rare knack of turning Guineas into Medals; Pearl-Necklaces into Beads; and Watches into Relick-Cases, made them fit for Seifure according to Law, to the great benefit of the Practitioner, and much edifying of his Brethren, who could not but have a holy envy for his Zeal.

Another way there is in telling a Story to the advantage of the Cause, in putting that side outwards as will serve turn best, and keeping under-board whatsoever is not for the purpose; and sometime tis only the turn of the hand, the winding of the breath, a pat Phrase, and presently a Devil's made of any thing. Thus when Sir Rich. Baker has a mind to Paint Queen Mary deep in Blood, he thus Tragically begins: Hitherto Queen Maries Reign had been without Blood: but now the Cataractis of Severity will be opened, that will make it rain Blood. Thus he draws the lines of Antichrist in her Face: And see upon what score; For now, says he, on the Eighth of August the Duke of Northumberland, Marquefs of Northampton, and Earl of Warwick, were Arraigned at Westminster-Hall, Condemned and Executed for High Treason, for Proclaiming the Lady Jane Gray Queen of England, in opposition to the true Heirefs. And this, which in a Protestant Prince, on the like occasion, is termed the executing of Justice, giving deserv'd punishment to Traytors, &c. in Queen Mary is nothing les than the opening Cataractis of Severity, and the raining of Blood. This same Mistrepre-
senting Artifice is made use of on all occasions, in every thing relating to Queen Mary. Nothing can be heard of, when her Reign is made the proof of the Text, but Cruel-
ty, Blood, Fire, Faggots, Stakes, Smithfield; nothing can serve to parallel those times, but the Persecutions of Decius and Dioclesian, and she is so in all things set out, as if little better than a Heathen, and swimming in the Blood of of the Martyrs. This is her Picture. But if we should view it a little, and consider, whether she has no wrong done her; might not we ask; What, and how much this Blood was, what the occasion of its being spilt, and what the Provocation given? And here we shall have an account of some Protestant behavior: of Praying for the death of their Queen in Meetings, that God would shorten her days; of a Gun shot at her Preacher in the Pulpit, of Cats hung on Gallows, with their Heads shorn, and something like Vestments, in derision of her Priests; of a Dog held up in the Church by the Legs, in derision of the Elevation of the Host; a gallantry of one of Fox's Martyrs; of several other provocations by Tumults, Seditious, and Rebel-
ions: And that after this, for the security of her Crown, She put in execution Laws not made by Her, but enacted long before by her Ancestors Rich. 2. Hen. 4, & 5. Now one would think to be just to Crown'd Heads, the Blood should not be expos'd alone to the People; but likewise the occasions and provocations given, even according to Law, and then let things go as far as they will: but to Misrepre-
sent the Papists, Stories must be Told and Preached by halves; otherwise they will turn to no account with the People, and serve nothing to the Interest of the Cause.

But to see now how much there go's in the telling a Story: Queen Elizabeth put to death Two hundred persons upon the score of Conscience, without any actual Crime or Misdemeanor against the Ancient Statutes of the Land, but only against the Law of her own contriving; a Law fo
so cruel, that the like is scarce to be found even among the Mahometans, who tho' they have conquer'd many Christian Nations, yet never, as I have heard of, made it Treason for the Natives, to profess their own Religion, or maintain their Pastors. And tho' this and much more was done by this Princess, yet she is set forth with that advantage, that she is a Meek, Merciful, Tender-hearted, Saintlike, true-Protestant Queen: While her Sister, who put to death not Three hundred, of which number, those of the greatest Note were Traytors in the highest Degree, others Guilty of the most intolerable abuses both to Church and State, and liable to death by the Ancient, and known Laws of the Nation; such as Dr. Heylyn and Dr. Pocklington both Protestants, in their Book Licensed and set forth by Authority ftile Schismatical Hereticks, Faidious Fellows, Traytors and Rebels, and She is no better than a Cruel, Bloody, Hard-hearted, Popish Tyrant. Thus according to this Reform'd Method, there needs no more for the making a Protestant Saint or a Popish Fiend, than a little turn of the breath, and the meer knack of making the Narrative: And if there be not Misreprefenting in this, I never heard of any.

Another way there is in spreading the guilt of some few Papists upon the whole of that Communion; so that if any of them are catch'd in a Villany, 'tis immediately suggested, that what These did, was according to the Principles of their Religion, and not so much to be charg'd on them in particular, as on their Church, which encourages them to such wicked undertakings. After this manner the Powder-Plot is manag'd, which tho' it was in all likelihood a contrivance of the good Lord Cecil (as Ofborne a Protestant Historian plainly confessest, yet because a few Papists were prov'd Actors in it, the guilt is forthwith thrown upon the whole body of them, their Religion Calumniated, and they Condemn'd as Destructive to Mo-
narchy, and unfit to live under a Protestant Prince. Now however it may be nothing but truth, that Digby, Faux and their complices were as black with this Treason, as they are commonly Painted; yet hence to spread the Scandal upon the Papists without distinction, to cry out against the Bloody Papists, the Barbarous Papists, and by such innuendos to incense the Multitude, and lead them into false conceits, that this was a design of the Catholicks in general, according to their profess'd Principles and Doctrine, is an unwarrantable proceeding, unbecoming the Desk, and nothing better than a Misrepresentation: Yes as unjust a Misrepresentation, as it would be in any one at this day, who to drive on a Faction, should get up into the Pulpit, with the Bible in hand; and after having given a large display of the Trayterous, Bloody, and Inhumane doings of the late Rebels in the West, should at last throw it upon the Church of England; crying out against the Bloody Church of England-men, the Cruel Church of England-men, their Rebellious Principles, abominable Doctrins, and Practices of Men not to be tolerated in a Monarchical Government; and this because he proves the Duke that Headed that Rebellion, to have been a Member of that Church, with some others that joyn'd hands with him. For be it never so true, that some were thus really chargeable with this Rebellion, nay, that at their deaths they never own'd it as a Crime; (which yet the Powder Plotters did) yet still to charge the guilt upon the whole of that Communion, can be done no otherwise, than by the fashionable Artifice of Misrepresenting.

Another way there is in putting malicious Constructions upon indifferent things, and running down a Party upon false surmises. This was the Case of the Papists some years since; When they enjoying a little rest by the merciful Indulgence of the late King of Blessed Memory; behold on a Sudden they are rendred obnoxious to the Government,
vernment, as abusing the Royal Favor, and Plotting against his Majesties Subjects. A great quantity of long devilish Knives are discover'd, made on purpose by the Papists, for the cutting all the Protestants Throats; this was the Protestant cry, and thus was the matter fairly Represented by them. Upon this the Papists, the Cruel Bloody Papists are to be no longer suffer'd, their Priests are order'd into Banishment, and so the point was gain'd. When the whole truth of the Story, was only some parcels of Knives made publickly, to be transported for the use of the Plantations. But this serv'd the Protestant Interest; and the Peoples heads by this are full of the Bloody-minded Papists.

Another way is by making a Plot of every thing. Thus in the year 1666. was that dreadful Judgment of the Fire improv'd into a Plot of the Papists. How many Papists were taken with Fire-balls in their Pockets? How many apprehended in the very Act of throwing Fire-balls into Windows? How many Thousand Papists were in Arms at Temple-bar, and the Country allarm'd to suppress them? And at the latter end, not one word of all this true; but only a true Protestant Representation of a thing that never was: And yet very much to the purpose of enraging the multitude against the Cruel, Bloody Papists. For by the frequent buzzing of these kind of Gospel-truths, the Vulgar within a while became so throughly convinc'd of the damnable industry of the Papists in throwing Fire-balls, that they began to think, that Heaven it self could not now confume a Protestant Sodom, without making use of a Jesuits hand to throw the Fire and Brimstone.

No Fire therefore happens after this, but the Papists have a hand in't: If Southwark be Fired, 'tis the damnable Papists do it; if the Temple be Burnt, 'tis the Devilish Papists are blowing the Coals. And thus these repeated Misrepresentations are made use of, to create an aversion in
in the Peoples hearts against Popery; and are the Evangelical proofs to convince the Multitude, that its Doctrin and Practices come all out of the School of Antichrist.

Another Text out of the same Gospel, was that Anniversary Misrepresentation, of the Papists contriving the Death of King Charles the First. This was an unparallel'd Barbarity Acted in the face of the Sun: the Actors and Contrivers are as publick as the noon-light, and yet those who at other times are Scrupulous of distrusting their Senses in a Case where God himself speaks; here in defiance to all their Senses, in contradiction to all that was seen and heard, give credit to a Monsieur's Invention, who comes out of France with a Tale, and lays this Royal Blood at the Papists doors. But this still serves the purpose, the deeper the Papists are Painted in Blood, the more the People are convain'd of the truth of the Reformation.

Another way is by making a Plot of nothing: Thus it happened in the year 1679, When the People having been by these and a Thousand other such like Gospel-policies, most Apostolically satisfied of the Principles of the Seditive, Trayterous, Barberous, Cruel, Bloody-minded Papists: And being now so moulded and dispos'd, that nothing could seem incredible concerning Those, that were thus detestable and odious, outcomes the Garagantua Misrepresentation of them all, that is the Divine Oates, with his Papist Plot. And here the Papists are overwhelm'd with that fury, that never were poor People in greater distress. The Plot was as dark and confus'd as the Chaos, its monstrosities were beyond all the Fables of the Talmud or Alcoran; that 'tis impossible even to be related, without a touch of that madness, that then possess'd the Nation. And yet the whole was receiv'd with that welcome and credit, that what would have been question'd in the very Scripture, was entertain'd without any Scruple: The Dr. having a grant of that Power, which is denied even
even to Heaven itself, that is, of verifying contradictions. 'Tis strange to consider, how easy it was then to swallow Screw'd Guns, Handkerchiefs and Pillowers; with how little difficulty Troops of Pilgrims, and whole Armies with their Black-bills went down. And why all this welcome to Fictions and Nonsense? Only to defeat Antichrist, and to root out Popery. A rare new way, I confess, of fighting against the Devil (as 'twas pretended) with his own Weapons. But Misrepresenting do's always the best Execution against the Papists; and therefore the Plot is carried on with all possible Vigor and Zeal. But hitherto only of the least part of these Plots and Misrepresentations, the chief is yet to come, and that is the carrying up of these Inventions of Wicked men into the Pulpit, and thence with the Finger in the Bible, and a Preamble of Hearken to the Word of the Lord, dispensing them to the People for Truths. These are the Misrepresentations above all justly to be complain'd of, that into That Place, which ought to be set apart as Sacred, for instructing the People to Salvation, and sowing the Seed of God's Holy Word, such things should be prefer'd, as had nothing of truth in them: Nay, that what Ungodly men reported, vouch'd and swore to, to the evident Peril of their Souls Damnation, should take place with the holy Text, should be infinuated into the People for Truths, nay be confirm'd by proofs of the Gospel, and be deliver'd out, as something relating to the way to Heaven: So that what was Damnation at the Bar, became Salvation from the Pulpit. And all this not in any indifferent matter, but in a concern of Credit, Reputation, Honesty, and Life; and this not of one Man (which yet would have been a great impiety thus to have defam'd from the Pulpit) but of many Families of many Thousands.

I will not enlarge upon a matter so Odious, so Unchristian as this. I hope this hint will be enough for the Answerer.
swerer to consider, that 'twas none of the greatest Modesty in him to brag, how clear WE were from charging the Papists with saying or doing, what they never say'd or did. When these Innocent WE have done all this against the Papists, and Fifty times more into the bargain. For this is only a Taste of what may be done at large, if it be requir'd, for our Justification; it being no great Task instead of so many Sheets upon this Subject, to furnish out so many Volumes.

But I forbear at present, and will only call upon the Reader to consider; That if Misrepresenting be, what 'tis agreed upon above, viz. to set false Constructions, to alter or change the Motives, Ends, Intention or Circumstances of Things; Whether the Papists have not some Reason to cry out against this Unchristian Dealing; when (as it has been made appear) there is scarce any thing belonging to them, either as to their Faith or Practice, wherein they have not been wrong'd by Adversaries, and which has not been injuriously set forth to the People, under some of these Disguises.

For my part, the whole matter is so clear to me, that I do not at all wonder at the Temper of our People at this day in respect of Popery, who have a notion of it in their heads so Foul and Monstrous; that to be a Papist with them, is the same thing as to be Cruel, and Bloody, to be without Soul or Conscience, and to be given o're to all sorts of vice and Extravagancy. And that Papist, who is thought by them only a Fool or an Hypocrite, is highly in their Favor. Some indeed have not yet concluded, which is worse, the Turk or the Papist; and are not resolv'd which side shall have their Good Wishes; whilst others at first sight prefer the Mahometans, and think Them of the Two, the nearer allied to Christendom. Then for the Jews, they are still more agreeable than the Papists; and for a Man to turn Atheist, is tolerable enough; A Green-
Ribband-Man is much more suitable: Yes any thing, Good Lord, but a Papist.

Thus it stands with the People; and amongst them may take place as to this, many a Grave and Sober Face. But that they are of this Temper, I do not (I say) at all wonder. For when I consider the manner how the Papists have been treated; that Ten thousand Pulpits have been for many years declaiming against them; where every Man has had a liberty of exposing them as he pleas’d, as was most taking with his Auditory, and best suiting with the Times: Where every Man has represented Their Doctrine, as he pleas’d; has charg’d it with what Consequences and Interpretations, he pleas’d; has expos’d their Practices, as he pleas’d; has put on them what Constructions he pleas’d; has expounded their Authors, as he pleas’d; has made Narratives of them, as he pleas’d; has made them as Guilty, as he pleas’d; has made Truth, and Gospel of any thing against them, as he pleas’d. That besides this, infinite numbers of Pamphlets and other Books have been constantly and carefully Publish’d, for the promoting the same Cause, for encreasing Fears and Jealousies, advancing Suspitions, and obliging the People to a Conscientious Hatred of Popery: When I consider, I say, this, and reflect upon the many other ways, by which the Papists have been handled, left to the Mercy of every Pretender, and made to be that, which every Weak, Idle, Passionate or Malicious Brain thought fit to make them; ’tis no strange thing at all to find the People to have a less aversion against the Turks and Jews, than against the Papists; and that all the most horrid Sins against the Twelve Commandments together, are not half so Foul and Damning with them, as that one of Popery (as they conceive it) is by it self. For these Means that have been taken to effect this, are so well proportion’d to this end, and do so naturally work People into this Aversion and Hatred; that were Chris...
Anity it self treated and expos'd to the People for some years, in the same manner and method only, as Popery already has been, I am confident, 'twould be the same crime within a while with them, to become a Christian, as now 'tis to turn Papist.

But in the mean time this Method is so Unjust and so unbecoming all true Christian Candor, under which, the Papists have been suffering these so many years, that I cannot in Charity with it to befall the Worst of Enemies. And did Charity allow me to seek any expedient for the ruin of any ones Credit and Reputation, and rendring him the Object of a Popular Hatred, I would consult no farther, but only desire he might take his portion with the Papists, and be treated no worse than they have been all along, by their adversaries. After what manner this has been, I hope the Considering Reader, who has perus'd what has been already said in this Discourse, do's by this time comprehend. I gave some hint of it before in a former Answer, call'd the Amicable Accommodation, in which under the Person of a Dissenter arguing against and Defaming the Church of England, I discover'd in what manner the Papists are handled, by the Protestants.

But this is taken by some by the wrong handle, and therefore can afford it no better a Title than of Light, Scurrilous, and Jesting, and are willing to persuade their Readers, that the Character of the Church of England, as 'tis there drawn, is nothing better than a Controversial Lampoon; and that since every Idle word is to be given account of, what apprehensions ought the Author of it to be seiz'd with, who instead of having any True Zeal for Truth, has made a Droll of Religion, widens the Divisions of the Church, and finds a harmony in her groans! This is a very severe Charge; but the Comfort is, I am in good Company; for 'tis not only the Amicable Accommodation stands thus endited, but the Vindication of the Bishop of Meaux
Meaux, and the Defence of the Late Kings Papers, which (if any one will be so Civil, as to take this Authors word for’t) do’s not Vindicate, but Ridicule; and is both void of Charity to his Adversaries, and of respect to the Persons and Church He defends.

Besides this, he has urg’d the charge against them all, in the bitterest expressions imaginable: Nothing is heard of in Two whole pages, but of their art of Palliating, want of Fairness and Civility, laying aside Moderation, falling into a vein of Lightness and Scurrility, forgetting that Religion is the Subject, and Christians and Scholars their Antagonists. Their Mean Reflections and Trivial jestings, their Ridiculing, their want of Charity and Respect, their Writings Accommodated to the Genius of Sceptics, who divert themselves at the expense of all Religion; and being not design’d to satisfy the Sober and Conscientious of either Side, &c.

Now what This Author seems hereat first sight to require, being nothing but Moderation, Candidness, and Civility in Answerers of all sides, I cannot but highly commend; but then again, when I look further into him, and see him wishing for Moderation in the deepest Satyr, condemning the want of Civility in Others, with the most Exasperating Reflections of his One, writing against the Passion of his Adversaries, with his own Pen fecept in Gall; when I hear him desirous of laying down his Dearest Blood for the redressing the Evils of the Divided Church, and at the same time most Uncharitably exposing Antagonists, even such as nothing belong’d to his Province, under the most Odious Characters imaginable, I cannot tell how to take him in earnest; he seems but to make a serious Droll, and brings into my mind, what I have heard of one, who Preaching on Ship-board to correct the extravagant Swearing of the Mariners, after many arguments to convince them of their Prophanefs, at length to press the matter home to them, Swore Bloodily, They would be all Damn’d if they did not leave off Swearing.

But however it be, Ile Answer for my self, and do here aflure this Zealous Author, notwithstanding all his hard words, that there’s no more of jesting in my last Papers, than he may find in any Parable or Emblem, in which tho’ the Persons may be feign’d, as in that of the Trees chooing a King; yet the thing signified or intended, is real and serious. So that tho’ it may be, never any Dissenter press’d all those things against the Church of England in the manner I have there urg’d them; yet that there is shewn the Exact Method how the Church of Rome is struck at by Protestants, is what is intended most Seriously and without any drolling in the leaft. And therefore if he finds any Ridiculing in the Arguments, Mean Reflections or Trivial Jesting in the urging them,
them, I can only tell him, that the Copy must be like the Original; and that he that undertakes to shew, how Protestants Ridicule the Church of Rome, doe not jest, when he does it in something that looks Ridiculous. And if he is sensible that this way of handling Controversies, doe rather exasperate, than heal our Divisions, I am sincerely of his mind. But then think, that for the preventing it, he ought rather spend his Zeal upon such of his Brethren, who by thus Ridiculing play the Controversists in good earnest, with their Bibles in hand; than upon Adversaries, who only detect the Sophistry, and by Emblem shew how 'tis done.

If he has therefore so much Esteem for the Salvation of Mens Souls, and the Truth of Religion, as he pretends, let him shew himself so in a most Christian Action. Let him but turn to such of his own Communion, who have given this bad Example, and win so far upon them, as Publickly to make Restitution to such Innocent Persons, of the Credit and Good Name, which They have Publickly helpt to take away: To remove that Uncharitable Opinion, they have Imprinted in the very Souls of their Hearers, against their Neighbours, by vain Rumors, and groundless Surmises; let him prevail upon them never more to Preach to Peoples Passion, instead of their Reason: never more to enflame the multitude by Preaching to them Dreams and Visions; nor to advance every un-soul'd Informer to the Authority of an Evangelist. Let him see, that they play not with their Neighbours Reputation, and Religion, and run them both down with idle Stories, such as are Authentick enough for a Plot-Catechism, but not for a Pulpit. Let him endeavor that their Arguments and Methods for the defeating of Popery, be not such as any Jew may take up to strike at Christianity, and every Atheist to make a sham of all Religion. Let him advise them with a late Preacher, That their Zeal against Popery betray them not into some of the worst Principles, that are charg'd upon that Church. That while they are Zealous for their Church, they continue Loyal to their King. That whilst they Preach up the Principles and Loyalty of their Church, they have a care of proving themselves no Members of it, by their instilling Suspicions and Jealousies; by their telling their Flock of a Cloud hanging over their Heads, and at the same time Prognosticating its Dissipation. Let him employ his best endeavors on this side a while, to redress these evils; and I dare engage, (notwithstanding all the complaints he has against his Adversaries) The Nation will enjoy more Peace, His Church will have less Divisions, and the King better Subjects.
Imprimatur,

Jan. 7, 1686.  JO. BATTELY.
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A VIEW
Of the Whole
CONTROVERSY
BETWEEN THE
Representer and the Answerer.

The Representer was loth to part with his Answerer without asking him in civility how he did: Now from so civil a person, I may, for ought I know, have the courtesy of a turn or two, for asking; which if he will allow me, I shall at last desire a word or two with him before we part, and that chiefly, in civility to ask him How He does? I would intreat him to go back with me as far as to a Papist Misrepresented and Represented, that we may see how matters have been carried all along, since that Book gave occasion to this Controversy. How I shall speed in this Request, is hard to say, for 'tis a favour that his Second Adversary did not obtain, who fairly led the way, when the Walk was not quite so long as it is grown since. But with, or without his Company, this is the way I must needs go; and because I will not do it, without giving the Representer a Reason, 'tis this: I hope to satisfy thole
those who will go along with me, That he has but jested all this while; and (to make his words speak truth for once) has passed over all his Adversaries Answers with a light touch (most of them with none at all) and the most Artificial way of replying, with saying nothing to 'em, as can possibly be met with.

It was well done of him to tell the Reader in the Title Page of his last Reply, That it was a Fourth Vindication of a Papist Misrepresented, &c. for if he had not said so, really men could not have believed it. There were Thirty seven double Characters of a Papist laid down with solemn order in the first Book, to tell the World what he is by us falsely said to be, and what he is truly in himself: And this later Character was fortified with such Arguments to justify his Faith and Practice, as could be had. What now is become of all this? What says the Fourth Vindication in defence of any one particular Complaint, Representation, or Argument? Why not a word that I can find, unless it be where he barely asks, What we think of Praying to Images, and of some few other things, and of more than he would speak of, which stand charged upon the Character of a Papist Misrepresented. He puts these Questions shortly and confidently, as if nothing had been yet said to any of them. And his behaviour would almost persuade a man, that his double Characters were yet to be considered, and his Reasons yet to be Answered. So one would think indeed by comparing his first and last Books together, without observing what has come between them; or, at least, that the Cause is dropt by one Side, or the other: And let him that thinks so, think so still; for that is the plain Truth of the Case, which I shall make out by an Argument that will do the business to the satisfaction of
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of all men but the Representer; and that is, That He hath dropt it.

This I shall do in the First place, if it be but to try whether he will take notice of it in the beginning of this Answer, tho' he would not bestow a word upon it, when he found it at the end of another.

And perhaps, now that the length of this Controversy, together with the windings and turnings of the Representer, has made it something uneasy to be comprehended; it may not be ungrateful to those that have concerned themselves in it, to have some general prospect of it, all at once before them; which I shall make as short and as easy as I can, in going through the several Books that have been written in this Cause, since the first.

The First Answer to the Representer.

The first Book that called him to account, was truly Represented; in which, the Learned Author, having first made some Exceptions against the Representer's way of proceeding in his double Characters, went on to examine his Characters Point by Point. Every Question was particularly and exactly stated, and the sense of the Church of Rome about it was shewn, by the Decrees of the Trent-Council, or their Roman Catechism, or their Publick Offices, and their most approved Divines and Casuists, as the matter required. This was done very distinctly throughout the whole Answer, where he saw cause to correct the state of the Question; that the Reader might see the grounds of every particular charge, that we and our
A View of the whole Controversy.

Fathers have laid against the Church of Rome. And thus, by the way, all the false colours of the Representer were taken off, where he thought it for his purpose to lay them on too Foul on his Misrepresenting, or too Fair on his Representing side.

But this was not all; for whereas the Representer, not altogether trusting to his Arts of Representation, thought fit sometimes to urge, never fail'd to insinuate, Arguments in favour of his side of the Question; The Answerer, without omitting any shadow of Reason offered by the Representer, took all his Argumentations, and every pretence from Scripture, into particular examination: I say, he took them one by one in their place and order, and made it appear, that they were very faulty; as we at least thought, and as we may think still, for any thing that we have heard to the contrary.

Nay, to give occasion to a more perfect understanding of these matters, He took Popery as Represented by the Representer himself in one Column, and gave him Our Reasons against it, in another.

And because, to gain the greater opinion of sincerity, the Representer had with Anathema's disclaimed several points, which, as he said, are imputed to Papists by Protestants; the Answerer considered him here too, very particularly, and seemed to discover insincerity in the Representer, even where one would be most apt to believe him to be in good earnest.

To all which I must add, That this was done throughout with that Calmness and Moderation, that his Adversary did not think fit to dissemble it. So that this Book wanted nothing to make it deserve a fair and full Reply, or at least some honorable sort of Concession, That the Subject would not bear it.
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For surely no Method of Answering the Representer could be more Compleat, Honest, and Manly, than this was; nor serve better to put all those, for whose fake Books are written, into a way of judging what Popery indeed is, and whether we have rightly condemned it or no, if they were not already satisfied in these things; especially because all was done with that plainness and perspicuity, that if the Discourse was in any particular greatly defective, it could not but be obvious to an Adversary, that was, it seems, thought a fit Person by his Superiors, to Represent Popery to this Kingdom, and to defend it against this Church.

The First Reply of the Representer.

To this Answer the Representer published a Reply under the Title of Reflections upon it. Now did he in these Reflections undertake to shew from Point to Point, That the Answerer had without cause corrected either the Misrepresenting or the Representing Side, where he undertook to correct them? Did he, as the Answerer has done before him, take the Questions in their Order, to examine how they were stated, and where need was, did he pretend to state them better? Nay, Did he bear up fairly to any one point of Representation that his Adversary thought fit to alter, and try by the force of his Learning to reduce it to what it was when he left it? No truly, his mind did not serve him, for stating of Questions.

But did he not stand up in defence of his Anathema's which his Answerer charged, not without giving Reasons for it, with Art and Sophistry? No, he did not so much as offer at it.

What
What then was the business of his Reflections? Did they turn upon our Reasons against Popery as Represented by the Representer? No sure; Nor was it likely that he should be forward to answer our Arguments, that had no Fancy to defend his own.

What? Did he not betake himself to make good his own particular Arguments in behalf of Popery, against his Adversaries Answers? Nothing less, I assure you; he did not take care so much as of one Argument belonging to any one point, but fairly left them all to take their Fortune: Is it not enough for a man to bring Arguments, but he must be troubled to defend them? Well; From this time forward, the Representers business was not to Dispute, but to Represent. But was it so from the beginning? The Representer indeed has ever since so vehemently disclaimed Disputing, that perhaps he only Represented at first. Let us therefore try that a little.

Were there not three Arguments for Veneration of Images, and for Praying to Saints? Were not Moses, Job, Stephen, the Romans, the Corinthians, the Ephesians, and almost every sick Person that desires the Prayers of the Congregation, engaged one way or other? Did he not argue for Transubstantiation from our Saviours Words, from the Power of God, from the incompetency of Sense and Reason to judge in this, no less than in some other cases? I think this is Disputing. There were three Texts of Scripture to justify the Restraining of Christian people from reading the Scripture. And if they are not vanished out of the Book, there are about seven Reasons for Communion in one Kind: The 12th Chapter of the 2d Book of Maccab. was once thought one good Authority for the Doctrine of Purgatory; and St. Matth. 12. 32, another; And a little pretence
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pretence of Antiquity there was beside, and three or four more Reasons for it; and in this strain the Book went all along: Now this I say, Those Arguments were not made by the Answerer, but they were answered by him, and so were all the rest, and now they may go shift for themselves.

And yet this is the Gentleman, who with no small opinion of himself, takes his Adversary to task for letting his Arguments drop, nay, for not saying one word to all his own Reasons pressed against himself; but letting the matter fall very cautiously, when it comes to his own turn of Disputing and Defending his own Reasonings, and that too in a Case directly appertaining to our main point of Representing, &c. Now this is a biting Accusation, if it be a True one; and before we part, I hope we shall have a word or two about that. But if it were as true, as I am well assured 'tis false, the Representer, of all men living, should have made no words on't; and that not only because himself is a most notorious example of forsaking his own Arguments in their distress, but because his Adversary was so generous to wink at him when he stole off from his Disputing post, upon the very first attack that was made upon him. For I do not remember that he charges him with this, in shewing the progress of the Controversie; and indeed, considering all his other Advantages, there was no need of it. So that if the Representer had been content, this might have been forgotten still; but if a man owns himself a shame, he does well to pay it.

Well, but what went the Reflections upon, all this while? By this time I think a stranger may guess the Truth, and that is, that the Reflections were to flutter up and down between the Answer to the Introduction, and the Answer to the Book; and to settle
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no where. And now I shall give as short and faithful an abstract of them, as I can. In the Answer to the Introduction, the Answerer declared himself unsatisfied with the Representers method to clear his Party from Misrepresentations; and particularly, that he should make his own ignorant, childish, or wilful mistakes, the Protestant Representations of Popery, as that the Papists are never permitted to hear Sermons which they are able to understand, and the like. Now from hence the Representer desires leave to assure his Friends, that the Protestant Representations of Popery are ignorant, childish, or wilful mistakes. One would not have expected so mean a Cavil, so soon after he had promised most material Points; But because I find in his Protestant Reply, that he is ashamed to own it, I shall take no further notice of this, than to tell him, He ought to have been more ashamed to deny it; it being so manifest, that what the Answerer said of some of his Misrepresentations, he applied to all that himself calls Misrepresentations, that his utmost Art will never be able to disguise it to any man that will take so much fruitless pains, as to compare the places. But to proceed,

1. Whereas the Answerer justly exposed him for pretending to draw his Misrepresentations exactly according to his own Apprehensions, when himself was a Protestant; he now affirms, that he can justify his Protestant Characters of Papists, by Protestant Books, which he names, and out of one of them [Sutcliff's Survey] he produces some sharp sayings concerning Popery. Nay, he thinks to defend his Complaints of Misrepresentation, by those very words of the Answerer concerning that Popery which the Representer allows.
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we can never yield to it without betraying the Truth, renouncing our Senses and our Reason, wounding our Consciences, &c.

2. Whereas the Answerer excepted against his Representing Part, wherein he pretends to keep to a Rule, That the Representer shewed no Authority that he, a private Man, had to interpret the Rule in his own Sense, against the Judgment of Great Divines, as in the Question of the Popes Personal Infallibility; and against the Determinations of Popes and Councils, as in the Question concerning the Deposing Power. The Representer replies, That he followed the Council of Trent, which he does not interpret, but takes in the Sense of the Catechism: That he also kept to Veron's Rule of Faith, and to the Bishop of Condom's Exposition, so highly approved by Pope and Cardinals, &c. As to the Instances, having first ran to the Book for two more, he comes back with them to the two that were mentioned, and replies, 1. That whereas he limited the power of the Saints to help us to their prayers, he followed the Council, and the Catechism, and the Bishop of Condom. 2. That he did not qualify the Doctrine of Merit, without Authority, since it is so qualified by Trid. Sess. 6. Can. 26. 3. That the Popes Personal Infallibility is not determined by a General Council. 4. That the Deposing Power was never established under an Anathema, as a Doctrinal Point; and those two are therefore no Articles of Faith.

3. He makes these Reflections upon the Answerers proceeding in the Book, That he either 1. owns part of the Representers Doctrine to be the established Belief of the Church of England: Or, 2. Does without good
good Reason deny part of it to be the Doctrine of the Roman Church, appealing from the Definitions of their Councils, and Sense of their Church, either to some Expressions found in old Mass-Books and Rituals, &c. Or to some external Actions, in case of Respect shown to Images and Saints, as Bowing, Kneeling, &c. Or finally, to Private Authors. Upon which follows a grievous Complaint of Misrepresenting upon the last account.

4. From hence he goes back to the Answer to the Introduction, where he was charged for saying, That the Pope's Orders are to be obeyed, whether he be infallible or not: From whence it follows, That Papists are bound to Act, when the Pope shall require it, according to the Deposing Power. He replies, That he gives no more to the Pope, than to Civil Sovereigns, whose Authority is not so absolute and unconfined, but to some of their Decrees, there may be just exception.

5. From hence he flings again into the middle of the Book, and blames the Answerer for scouting amongst the School-men; till the Question about Dispenations to Lye or Forswear, was lost; and that he offered no proof, That the Dispensing Power was to be kept up as a Mystery, and not used, but upon weighty Causes. Then he leaps into the Chapter of Purgatory, and affirms, That St. Perpetua's Vision is not the Foundation of Purgatory, but only used by him as a Marginal Citation amongst many others. Then a Complaint of Misrepresentation again; and because Complaints are not likely to convince us, Let us, says he, depend upon an Experience; Do but give your Assent to those Articles of Faith in the very Form and Manner, as I have stated them in the Character of a Papist Represented, and if you are
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are not admitted into our Communion, I'll confess that I have abused the World.

Thus far the Reflections: It is now time to compare Things, and to see how much of the Cause is left standing.

I pass it by, that the Answer to the Introduction, upon which the Representer spent his main Strength, is in many most material Points untouched by the Reflections: But this is a small Matter: For,

1. He has dropped the defence of his Double Characters, his Representations and Misrepresentations. For instead of going on with his Adversary in those Thirty Seven Points, with which himself led the way, he does nothing but nibble about Three or Four of them, and that without taking notice of the tenth part of what was said by his Adversary to fix the true state of the Controversie even about them: He has indeed thrown about four Loose, General Exceptions amongst the Thirty Seven Chapters in which the Answerer Represented the several Doctrines and Practises of the Church of Rome; but he has not with any one of these Exceptions come up fairly to what the Answerer has said upon any one particular Point; And therefore I add,

2. That for any thing our Representer has done to shew the contrary, the Answerer has truly Represented the Doctrines and Practises of the Church of Rome. And then we have great Encouragement to turn Papists, since the Representer tells us, That if the Answerer has truly Represented the Doctrines of the Church of Rome; He, the Representer, would as soon be a Turk as a Papist.

C 2
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3. He has absolutely dropped the defence of all his own Arguments, not so much as pretending to shew where the Answers went upon a wrong State of the Question; no, nor trying to reinforce his Arguments, where the State of the Controversie was agreed upon on both sides: So that for ought I can see, the Representer fell sick of his Thirty Seven Chapters all at once, both as to matter of Representation and Dispute: And this I think was pretty well for the First Reply.

The Second Answer to the Representer, being a Reply to His Reflections.

But we are to thank the Reflections for one good Thing, and that is for the Answer which they drew from another Learned Hand, under the Title of a Papist not Misrepresented by Protestants: In which I shall make bold to leave out several Material Points, which the Answerer offered to Consideration; and take notice of no more, than what I think may serve to shew with what Sincerity on the One Side, and Injincerity on the Other, this Controversie has been managed. Wherefore,

1. Whereas the Representer chose to justify his complaints of Misrepresentation, not by taking the first Answerers Representations into examination, but by referring us to other Books, and to Sutcliff's sharp censures of Popery; The second Answerer consider'd that the Representer called the Censures which Protestants
testants puts upon the Avowed Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome, Misrepresentations: which was in the first Book discernible enough, and spoken of in the Answer to it; but was so grossly owned in his second Book, that no man could now doubt of it: For he made his Answerer guilty of Misrepresentation for saying, That we cannot yield to that Popery which the Representer himself allows, without betraying the Truth, &c. This Answer therefore blames him for putting into the Protestant Representations of Popery, those faults which we find, and those ill consequences which we charge upon Popery, as if we would make the World believe, that Papists think as ill of what themselves profess and practice, as we do: And much more for putting these consequences, as owned by Papists, in the front of the Protestant Characters of them, as if we pretended, they were the First Principles of Popery. As for the Doctrines and Practices of the Roman Church, which we charge them with, the Representer generally owned them; but he disowned, as he easily might, the belief of those Consequences and Interpretations which we charge upon them. And therefore his putting them into the Protestant Characters of a Papist, was his own Artifice of laying the fouler colours upon Popery on the one side, that it might look the fairer, when he took them off, on the other. Now to prevent these Deceits for the future, this Answer goes through the Thirty seven Articles again, to shew under each Head, what we charge upon them as their Doctrines and Practices, which is properly matter of Representation: And likewise, what we charge upon such Doctrines and
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Practises, which is properly matter of Dispute: By the confounding of which two things, the Repre-
senter had made a colour for his unjust complaints of Mifrepresentation.

2. Whereas he pretended that he never delivered
his own private tenie and opinion in Representing
a Papift; the Answerer replies, that he certainly
does so, when he determines concerning Questions
which are disputed among themselves, whether they
be Articles of Faith, or not; and that the Catechism
may be interpreted by a private spirit as well as
the Council. That Vero's Rule, had no more Au-
thority than the Representer's Characters. That Bel-
larmines Controversies had attestation from the Pope,
as well as the Bishop of Condom's Exposition; And
that Canus himself, who is referred to by the Re-
presenter, acknowledges that the Popes approbation
is not always to be accounted the judgment of the
Apostolick See. As to the Instances, The Answerer
shews, 1. Of his limiting the Power of the Saints to
their Prayers; That no such limitation of their Aid
and Assistance, is to be found in the Council; That
the Representer would take no notice of what his
first Answerer had said, to shew that no such limit-
tation was intended in the Council or the Catechism;
And that he did not find this limitation in the Bis-
shop of Condom. 2. Of Merit; That the Twenty
sixth Canon of the sixth Session, mentions nothing
of it; and that it is clear from Chap. 16. of that
Session, That they make Good works truly and
properly meritorious of Eternal Life, tho' they grant
the Grace of God, and the Merits of Christ, to be
the cause of their own Merits. Finally, That the
An-
**Answerer** did not Appeal to the Thirty second Canon to oppose the **Representer's** Qualification of the Doctrine of Merit, and was therefore unconcern'd in his defence of it. 3. As to the Pope's Personal Infallibility; That he denies it to be of Faith, and makes it but a School point; whilst there are as many who deny it to be a School point, and make it a matter of their Faith. That the want of *positive Determination* by a General Council, does not prove it to be no matter of Faith, because neither the Infallibility of a General Council, nor of the Church, is positively determined by a General Council. That if Infallibility must be somewhere amongst them, they have the best Reason that place it in the Pope. 4. As to the *deposing Doctrine*, the **Answerer** shewed largely and clearly, That Articles of Faith may be, and have been decreed without Anathema's; That the deposing Decree includes a Doctrinal point; That if it were meerly a point of Discipline and Government, they must either acknowledge it Lawful for the Church to depose Heretical Princes, or consent that the Church is not secured from making wicked Decrees, in things that concern the whole Christian World. That when the **Representer** says, That some Decrees of Trent are not universally received, he does not tell us that the Council had no Authority to make them, and to oblige Princes to receive them. And lastly, That the Pope's letting so many asserters of the *No-deposing Power* to pass without any censure of Heresy, does not argue a change of their Doctrine, but only of the Times.

3. To the **Representer's** Reflections upon the **Answerer's** way of proceeding, as that *He owns in some*
some part the Representer's Doctrine to be the established Doctrine of the Church of England; The second Answerer charges him with foul Misrepresentation upon this account, in as much as the first Answerer owned nothing which is peculiar to the Faith of a Papist, as distinguished from the common Faith of Christians; and that the Representer might as well have said, That because Protestants own that Christ is to be worshipped, therefore they in part own the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, That Christ is to be worshipped by Images. And this he shewed to be the very case in every one of those six or seven Points, which the Representer only named, but did not think fit to insist upon, to shew how his Reflection was applicable to them. 2. And that the first Answerer appealed from the definitions of their Church, &c. 1. To some Expositions found in old Mass-Books and Rituals. This Answerer says, that he could find but one Instance of this, relating to the Worship of the Virgin Mary; viz. that scandalous Hymn, O Felix Puerpera, &c. But that their Church is accountable for her old Missals, which were the allowed and established Offices of Worship; That even this has never been condemned; but that Monsieur Widenfelts Book was condemned at Rome, which was writ to bring the people to a bare Ora pro Nobis, to the Blessed Virgin. 2. To some external Action as in case of respect shewn to Images and Saints. To this the Answerer says, That the Representer brings in this Exception, without taking the least notice of what his first Adversary said concerning external Adoration, That it is a part of Divine Worship; and that the Council of Trent requires it should be given.
given to Images. He shews further, That since there is such a thing as external and visible Idolatry; an Idolatrous action is nevertheless such, for the intention of him that is guilty of it, not to commit Idolatry; That the worship of the Invisible Inhabitants of the other World, tho' with such external acts as may be paid to creatures, has always been accounted Religious Worship; That as the Degrees of Civil honour are distinguished by the sight of the Object; So one certain distinction between Civil and Religious is, that the worship of an Invisible Object is always Religious; and that to Worship the Image of an Invisible Being, must therefore be Religious Worship also; because it is referred to the Prototype. 3. To the sentiments of private Authors. And here the present Answerer challenges him to give one instance wherein the Judgment of private Authors was, as he pretended, set up against the declared sense of their Councils and Church: And moreover shews what use was made of private Authors, by particular Instances; and that sometimes recourse is necessary to be had to them, and to the general practice of their Church, to know the sense of their Church.

4. Whereas the Representor avoided the charge of their being obliged by his Doctrine to obey the Pope, when he commands them to act in pursuance of the Deposing Power; by pretending that the Decrees of Popes may be excepted against no less than the commands of Civil Soveraigns, as the case may be. The Answerer does acknowledge this Reply to be good, if the Representor be sincere in the Application, and will grant the Deposing Decree
cree to command a Sin; and that Bellarmin and Canus were mistaken in asserting, That Popes and General Councils can make no sinful Decrees relating to the whole Church.

5. To the complaint of discoursing upon Dispen-
sations out of the Schoolmen, and bearing the Reader into a belief, that the Dispensing Power was kept as a Mystery, to be used upon weighty occasions, &c. the present Answer saies, That there was reason for the former, this being one of the Instances wherein the whole sense of their Church is not to be had, but from the Practices of Popes, and the Opinions of their Great men. To the latter, That their own Doctors had declared it, as the Answerer had shewn, before he said it himself. Then as to St. Perpetua's Vision, That if he did not think it gave some cre-
dit to the Doctrine of Purgatory, it was mentioned by him to no purpose. Finally, to the Represent-
er's Invitation of us to come over to their Church upon his Terms, with promise of Acceptance; the Answerer returns, That he must like their Faith bet-
ter first. And certainly the Invitation was some-
thing unseasonable, before the Representer had an-
swer'd our Reasons against that Popery, which himself allows. And this for the second Answer.
The Second Reply of the Representer, being an Answer, to a Papist not Misrepresented by Protestants.

The second Reply comes forth under the Title of PapistsProtesting against Protestant Popery. In which the Representer beginning with a defence of himself as to his construction of the wilful mistakes, (see before, p. 8.) which if he pleases shall be forgotten from this time forward: falls a wondering that there should be such a noise about exposing of their Doctrines to open view; declares, that tho he discovered what he thought, and sometimes said briefly, why; yet he made not disputing his business; and knows not how this should be taken as a piece of controversy against the Church of England, which he had not charged with Misrepresentation, nor any body else, but those only in general that are guilty. He complains that his second Answerer makes that which they call Misrepresentation, to be in all the material points, a Representation of the avowed Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome; and protests, That if Popery be guilty of what he saies; it cannot enter into his thoughts there’s any room for it in Heaven. For the very Title of his Book is a condemnation of the Religion to all those horrid shapes it has been at any time exposed in by the Members of the Reformation: And so is his pretence, that We charge
charge Papists with nothing but what they expressly profess to believe, and what they practice. But since they must not learn what Papists believe from the Council and the Catechism, but from the Writings and Sermons of Protestants; he is resolved to give us a taste of their way of Representing Popery; and therefore,

1. He recites several passages wherein Popery is misrepresented, as he will have it, out of a Book of John, sometime Lord Archbishop of York, and a Book of Dr. Beard, and Sutcliffs Survey, and the Book of Homilies. And in conclusion he tells us, That this is the Protestant Popery, which since he protests against no less than the Answerer, Protestants and Papists may now go shake hands, and What possibility is there of farther divisions? But if this be intended for a true Representation of Popery, Roman Catholicks suffer under the greatest injustice imaginable. And then follows a vehement expostulation against the iniquity of such Misrepresentation. And whereas the Answerer blamed him for putting into the Protestant Character of a Papist, those ill consequences we charge upon their Doctrines and Practices, as if we pretended that they think of their own profession and practice just as we do: He Replies, That this is a pretty speculative quarrel, and a quaint conceit, but lost, for coming in a wrong place. For the Representer's business was to draw the Character of a Papist, as it lies in the People's Heads, who when they hear one declaiming against Popery, do not distinguish between Antecedents and Consequents, between the Doctrine of the Papists, and the fault we
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we find with it, but swallow down all in the lump; and whoever supposes otherwise, must conclude them to be better at separating, than the Chymists, and that in subtle Distinctions they are able to out-do Aristotle himself. This is in short, what he says with much circumstance, and no little contentment, for four Pages together; and 'tis all that he thinks fit to return to his Answerers careful distinction between matters of Representation and of Dispute, through all the Particulars: For though he confesses 'tis Learnedly done, yet the almost Forty Pages about it, might have been spared, because this Distinction is not to be found in the Notion P. 25.

the people have of Popery.

For the rest, about his denying the Belief of our Interpretations, and the two other Particulars, p. 24. They are so little to the Purpose, that I can afford them no room in this Abstract; and he that will not take my Word for it, may go to the Answer to Pap. Prot. p. 20, 21. and there satisfy himself.

2. To his Adversaries Question, Whether the Catechism may not be expounded by a private Spirit, as well as the Council? He says, Thus a Question or two is a full Confutation of the Reflefter. To the Testimony of Canus, That that is not to be accounted the Judgment of the Apostolick See, which is given only by the Bishop of Rome, privately, maliciously, and inconsiderately, &c. He replies, That so Reverend an Authority, as that of the Bishop of Condom, is not to be thus overthrown, since his Exposition was examined with all due Deliberation, approved with all Solemnity, &c. and recommended by his Holiness to be read by all the Faithful: Upon which occasion he puts himself into some Heat, That we who protest
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rest against their Religion should pretend to understand it better than a Catholic Prelate eminent in the Church, &c. and than those who depend upon it for their Salvation. As to the Instances; and 1. Of the Invocation of Saints, he says, Their Aid and Assistance is limited to their Prayers, by the Bishop of Condom, and cites the place; but to what his Adversary said concerning the Intention of the Council, and of the Catechism in this Matter, he says nothing. The Instance of Merit he passes by: But 2dly, and 3dly, As to the Popes Personal Infallibility, and the Deposing Power, he pleads the Authority of the Bishop of Condom, that they are no more than matters of School-Debate: and, as if he had been in good earnest at first, he does again promise we shall be admitted into his Church, without the belief of these Articles: So that he has every way Represented the Faith of a Papist aright; and now has found out something in his Adversary to be answered with a smile, That a Protestant should understand the Faith of a Papist better than the Papist himself does. And thus all being guarded by the Bishop of Condom’s Authority, and his own Proposal, it was his mere Civility to take any notice of his Adversaries answers to his Argument about the Deposing Power, from the want of an Anathema to the Decree. And so he replies, 1. That every thing is not an Article of Faith, which is declared in a General Council, without an Anathema. 2. That to decree what shall be done, does not include a Virtual Definition of Doctrine, as he thinks his Adversary himself shewed under the next Particular, from the Council of the Apostles at Hierusalem. 3. That
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the Deposing Decree does not relate to things necessary to Salvation, nor concerns the whole Church. And whereas his Adversary imputes the Escape of those that oppose this Decree, to a Change of Times, and the Popes want of Power, he tells us, That Oracles are ceased now a days.

3. As to Veneration of Images, he says, That although Acts of Honour expressed to any Image that has Relation to some Invisible Being, be supposed a Religious Honour; yet all religious Respect and Honour is not so a Divine Honour, as to make a God constructively of the thing to which it is paid: Otherwise Bowing to the Altar, and to the Name of Jesus, cannot be excused, since these things relate to the Invisible Inhabitants of the other World; nay, All religious Respect, besides to God, must then be constructive Idolatry. Therefore as the different Kinds and Degrees of Civil Honour are distinguished by the sight of the Objects, tho the External Acts are the same, so the different Kinds and Degrees of Religious Honour are distinguished by the Intention of the Givers, and by Circumstances. He says further, as to the unalterableness of the Nature of Actions determined by a Law, That if this makes the Intention of doing no evil in Bowing or Kneeling to an Image, unable to excuse those from sin, who do this forbidden thing; this strikes as severely at Bowing to the Altar, and Kneeling to the Sacrament, as at them, since the Actions forbidden, are the same part of Divine Worship in both Cases. Finally, That a Quaker may justify his Yes's and Nays, by his Adversaries Rule, That no Intention can alter the Nature of Actions determined by a Divine Law, since it is said, Matth. 5. 34.
Swear not at all, but let your Communication, &c. And now to give him his due, setting aside the frivolous Instance of the Quaker, he has in this Particular come up fairly to his Adversary, and said what deserves to be considered. Then he concludes with two or three Requests, which he hopes are not unreasonable; to which his Adversary gave such reasonable Answers, that we have heard of them no more since that time, [See Anf. to Pap. Prot. p. 124, 125.] and therefore we have no reason to be troubled with them here. And so let us now come to a Reckoning.

1. He grants his Adversaries Distinction throughout, between matters of Representation, and matters of Dispute; which Distinction, since himself did not observe, he either wanted the Skill or the Honesty of a Representer.

2. The Defence of his Argument, That the Popes Personal Infallibility is not of Faith, from no General Council's having determined it, is dropt.

3. He will not be brought to say, Whether the Council of Trent had, or had not Authority to oblige Princes to receive those Decrees which are not universally received; and so the Defence of his Argument, from some Decrees not being received, is dropt.

4. His solemn Cavil, That the First Answerer owned some part of his (the Representer's) Doctrine, to be the Established Doctrine of the Church of England; and his Objection against him for appealing to old Mass-Books and Rituals, and that other for appealing to private Authors, are all three dropt.

5. He
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5. He will not say that the Deposing Decree commands a Sin; and to his Defence of himself against his first Answerer's Charge, That by his Principles he is bound upon the Pope's command, to act according to the Deposing Power, is dropt.

6. His complaints against his first Answerer's Representing the matter of Dispensations; and his note upon St. Perpetua's Vision, are dropt: But his Invitation of us to come over to the Church of Rome upon his Terms, is not dropt; for we thank him, he has invited us again.

The Third Answer to the Representer, being An Answer to a Papist Protesting against Protestant Popery.

To the Representer's wonder, That such ado should be made about his First Book, the Answerer saies, That a Misrepresenter is so foul a P. i. Character, that no man can wonder if we think our selves concerned to wipe it off; which surely may be done without offence to any, but those that meant us, in the general Accusation. To his complaint that the Answerer makes, All that which they call Misrepresentation, to be in all the material points a Representation of the avowed Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome; he saies, That he has done him all the service he can in distinguishing between matters of Fact, wherein
if we charge them wrong, we do indeed Misrepresents them; and matters of Dispute, in which, if we should charge them wrong, it is not Misrepresentation, but merely a wrong Judgment upon what they profess and practice. And he had already shewn, That all matters of Fact (excepting some few points) in the Character of a Papist Misrepresented, are confessed and defended in the Character of a Papist Represented. Now Representation or Misrepresentation is properly about matters of Fact. But as for the Consequences we charge upon their Doctrines and Practices, and which were put into the Misrepresenting Side, to be taken off again in the Representing Side; they are not matters of Representation, but of Dispute. To this purpose the Answerer argues, leaving the Representer to apply these plain things to his Protestation against Protestant Popery; which amounts to thus much, That it could never enter into him, that there should be any room for Popery in Heaven; and that he would as soon be a Turk as a Papist, if he thought as ill of the confessed Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome, as we do. Which would be a wise Speech, no doubt, tho we hope a true one. For the rest, he saies, That his Title related only to his own Book; and the Book, to the Character of a Papist Misrepresented; and therefore 'tis hard that he must be drawn in to answer for more than he knows, even for all that any Protestant may have said concerning Popery since the Reformation; and he thinks it strange, that the Representer, instead of defending his own Characters, should hunt about for new Misrepresentations for him to Answer.
between the Representer and the Answerer.

For since he has allowed the Distinction between matters of Representation and Dispute, and can find no fault with his Adversaries performance about it; it should seem we are agreed upon the Representation of Popery now at last, and therefore unless he were ashamed of his own Popery, now we had clearly found it, why should he divert from that, to new complaints of their being Misrepresented by others?

The Answerer however was resolved to see what occasion there was for this fresh complaint.

1. And he shews, That if what was transcribed out of the foresaid Archbishop of York's Book, be Misrepresentation, it is not a Protestant, but a Popish Misrepresentation: For the Archbishop cites his Authors for what he saies, tho' the Representer left them out; And this the Answerer thought good to shew from point to point: And concludes, That tho' every Doctrine found in Popish Authors, ought not presently to be accounted an Article of the Romish Faith; yet a Church so watchful to purge, expunge, and censure in all Cases where her Interest is concern'd, is Responsible for those Doctrines, which have her Toleration and License, and which any man among them is allowed to Teach, and to Believe. As for Dr. Beard, and Mr. Sutcliff, he saies, Tho'se Sayings do not concern Representing, but Disputing; and that the Representer had unfaithfully concealed, either their Authorities or their Reasons, which had made the thing plain; or curtail'd their sayings, as he shews by several Instances out of Mr. Sutcliff; but that when such Consequences are charged upon Popery,
P. 14.
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Popery, it is more to the purpose to Confute them, than to complain of Misrepresentation. Finally, As to the Book of Homilies, those things which he hath taken out of it, as the Answerer tells him, do no more than shew the Judgment of our Church about the Worship of Saints and Images in the Church of Rome; in which he cannot prove us to be Misrepresenters, otherwise than by Confuting our Arguments; which yet would but shew that we make a wrong Judgment in a matter of Dispute, not that we Misrepresent a matter of Fact. Upon this, the Answerer shews, That Papists profess and practice the same things that ever they did; and that all this grievous cry of Misrepresenting, is grounded upon nothing else, but a Protestation, That they do not believe those ill things of their own Doctrine and Practice, which we do; which altho' it be a new business, yet there was no Reason for it, since we never said they did. In the mean time, the Cause is the same that ever it was, which is a sufficient Answer to all that he saies of Protestants and Papists taking hands, &c. And whereas he makes the distinction between Representation and Dispute, to be a speculation above the Vulgar, and so was not to be regarded by him who drew the Character of a Papist as it lay in the peoples heads; The Answerer thinks, That he who undertakes to make Characters, is bound to consider what belongs to it; and withal, That our people are not so silly as to think (for instance) that Papists believe the Worship of Images to be Idolatry; or that Idolatry is lawful, because they Worship Images; but that if he
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he wrote his Characters for the Information of such Vulgar Heads, as he fancies, he wrote to inform those that can *neither write nor read.*

2. As to his Representing, That he did it not by a private Spirit, since he followed the Catechism; the Answerer had reason to ask, Whether the Catechism may not be interpreted by a private Spirit, as well as the Council, since their Divines differ in Interpretation of both; and as for the Popes Approbation, he said that Bellarmine’s Controversies had it, as well as the Bishop of Condons Exposition; to which the Representer would say nothing; and he now says, That by Canus his Rule, the said Bishops Exposition has not the Authority of the Apostolick See, unless the Pope had given Judgment for it *ex Cathedra,* which the Representer also would take no notice of:

But what he says further concerning the Nature and Design of the Approbations given to the Bishop of Condom, I shall wholly pass over, since it is by this time somewhat plain, that this Bishops Authority has enough to do to shift for itself, and is not in a Condition to spare any help to his Friends. As to the limitation of the Aid of the Saints to their Prayers, he acknowledges that it is to be found in the Bishop of Condom, though he missed it, because it came not in the right place. But whereas the Representer justifies his renouncing the Popes Personal Infallibility, and the Deposying Doctrine, by the Authority of the said Bishop; the Answerer plainly shews the Bishops great Judgment, in having ordered Matters so, as to have himself both with Protestants, and with the Pope. To the Represenders Second Invitation, he answers, by making this Proposal,
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P. 15.

posal, Whether their Church would refuse him admission, if he should come in upon Bellarmine's terms in these Points, which contradict the Representers; though there be no reason for this Dispute, since as he said before, he likes not the Roman Faith as the Representers has described it? Now to his Replies in behalf of the Deposing Doctrine being no Article of Faith, the Answerer says, 1. That whereas the Representers would prove it was not so, because no Anathema was fixed to the Decree; it is something strange, that he should now be content to say, Everything is not an Article of Faith, which is declared without an Anathema; for this is next to a downright Concession that his Adversary had baffled his Argument; and shews manifestly that he would seem to say something, when he knew he had nothing to say to the purpose. 2. He shews that the Decree of the Council at Hierusalem did include a Virtual Definition of Doctrine. And 3. That the Deposing Decree concerns the whole Church; and if it be a wicked Decree, that it relates to a thing necessary to Salvation, by commanding to do that which it is necessary to Salvation not to do; and therefore he expects the Representers further Consideration of his three Answers.

P. 16.

3. Concerning the Worship of Images, the Representers bids so fair for a Dispute, that the Answerer took the occasion, and examined not only what the Bishop of Condom hath delivered upon it, but the several ways of fating it by their Divines; shewing that their Images are Representatives to receive Worship in the Name and Stead of the Prototype; that in this Notion Image-Worship is condemned in the Scripture,
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Scripture, and in what the evil of it consisted; a more particular Abridgment of that just Discourse upon this Subject I cannot make, without either wronging the Answerer, or detaining the Reader here too long; and therefore I refer him also to the Book itself for an Answer to the Charge upon Bowing towards the Altar, &c. And to the Apology for Image-Worship, from the Degree of the Honour that is given to Images: And to the Representer's Objections against that way of distinguishing Religious from Civil Worship, by making that to be Religious, which is given to the Invisible Inhabitants of the other World; and likewise to the pretended Parity of Reason in the Quakers Case. And thus much may serve for the Answer to Papists Protesting against Protestant-Papery.

The Third Reply of the Representer, in Return to the Foregoing Answer.

THE Representer finds as little Comfort in Protesting, as Disputing, and so falls to Accommodate the Difference between the Representer and the Answerer; and calls his Work an Amicable Accommodation. For now he grants the Protestants are not guilty of Misrepresentation in a strict and proper Sense, and is very sorry that he and his Answerer understood one another no better before: He thinks indeed it was his Answerer's Fault, not to conceive him
him right at first; and that if his Book had never been Answered, the Peace had never been broke; but he is persuaded the Difference may be yet compounded; for the Case at first was no more than this, That he perceiving the Unchristian Hatred which grew in the Vulgar, upon that false Notion of Popery, which our Misconstructions, &c. had drawn in their Imaginations; He, I say, Good Man! No less in Charity to Protestants, than in Justice to Papists, drew his Double Characters, to shew how Popery is Misrepresented. But then comes an Adversary and says, He has proved that the Character of a Papist Misrepresented contains nothing in it, which in a strict and proper Sense can be called a Misrepresentation. Now really he never meant to Fight for a Word; and had he but imagined, that his Adversary had contended for no more, he would have spared him the Charges and Sweat of laying down his Proofs the second time.

Wherefore to end the strife, he solemnly declares, that the Title of the Papist Misrepresented, is not to be taken in its strict and proper Sense, as Misrepresenting signifies only downright Lying, or falsely charging matter of Fact, the whole Character being not indeed of this Nature; but in its larger or less proper Sense, as it comprehends both Lying, Calumniating, Misinterpreting, Reproaching, Misconstruing, Misjudging, and whatever else of this kind.

But that we may know what a Lover of Peace he is, he must assure the Answerer, That this Condescension is purely out of good Nature; for betwixt Friends, he does not think the Answerer has advanced any thing that has the Face of a proof, That there can be
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be no Misrepresenting where there is an Agreement about matter of Fact.

Representing, he says, being nothing more than shewing a thing as it is in itself; as many ways as a thing can be shewn, otherwise than 'tis in itself, so many ways may it be properly Misrepresented; so that the Description must agree with the Thing, not only in Matter of Fact, but likewise in Respect of Motive, Circumstance, Intention, End, &c. But according to the Answerers Rule, had the two Tribes and an Half, been declared Guilty of setting up Altar against Altar; and Hannah been set out amongst her Neighbours for a Drunken Gossip; here had been no Misrepresentation, because of some Matter of Fact in the Case. The Elders too, that offered Proof against Susanna, since they saw her in the Garden, &c. were no Misrepresenter: Nor the Jews against our Saviour; nor Infidels against the Apostles and Christians; nor shall any be excluded from a share in this Favour, but they that have Malice enough to Calumniate, but want Wit to give a Reason for what they do, &c. So much was the Representer overcome with pure good Nature, that for Peace sake he would yield to a Principle that can do such things as these, if his Word may be taken for the Reason; but we have another Reason in the Wind presently; For if this same Principle which he has ordered to protect the lowest Defamations and Perjuries, will but do its Office upon the Church of England, he has had his Reward: And so he shews what execution he can do in the Mouth of some Zealous Brother, whose Honour and Interest engages him to set out the Church of England, as we Represent the Church of Rome: To which
which Purpose he puts a Sermon into his Mouth, which whether it be a Copy or an Original, the Dissenters may say when they please. But the Heads of it are such as these,

After a solemn Preface of Exhortation to keep out of the Swing and the Sweep of the Dragons Tail, he lays down his Doctrine, That the Church of England Mens Marks are the Marks of the Beast, which he proves by the large Revenues and State of their Prelates, who wear the Miter and the Crofier upon their Coaches while they Live, and upon their Tombs when they are Dead: By the Weekly Bill of London, which shews that Mary has Nineteen Churches, and Christ but Three; by the Pictures in their Bibles and Common-Prayer-Books; and by many other Marks as good as these; which because they stick fast to us, as he thinks, for any thing the Answerer has said, must come over again in another place, and therefore the less Repetition shall serve now.

Sermon being done, he asks whether this be Misrepresenting in a strict and proper Sense; and if not, he is contented that the Word Misrepresenting in his Book should not be taken so, i.e. for downright Lying; but, as we heard before, for vry Interpretations, weak Reasons, &c. And here ends the Amicable Accommodation.

For his picking up New Misrepresentations, he says he did it to shew that the former were not his own childish errors: For leaving out the Authorities of the Arch-Bishop of Tyrk; that this makes nothing against him, because the Question is not, What some private Authors say; but, What the Church believes; whole Faith cannot be fairly Represented from their Books.
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Books, though published by the Authority of Superiours: For producing what Sutcliff laid to their Charge, without producing his Reasons; that his Reasons were none of the Representer's concern, because they nothing belong to Representing, nor has the Answerer put his Approbation to them.

He charges the Answerer with leaving out propter Deum in a Citation out of the Pontifical, and this because the Words were not for his purpose.

In Conclusion, he is resolved not Dispute, since the Answerer knows no Reason for all this Dispute, p. 26. and he cares not whether the Answerer likes his Religion or not; He will be no other than a Representer still; for We wise Converts do not love to go out of our way, but upon very good Grounds: The Bishop of Condom has undertaken his own Vindication; and if he does but come off as well as the Representer, and 'tis strange if he should not, let Bellarmine and other Eminent Approved Authors say what they can, he has no Concern in it, but his Representation; and the Bishops Exposition, are the Authentick Rule for the Exposition of the Council of Trent; for the embracing the Catholick Faith, as Expounded by one, and Proposed by the other, is sufficient for a Person to be received into the Communion of their Church.

We are now coming to the Foot of the Account; for besides other Particulars of less moment that are dropt,

1. Whereas his only Reply to the clear and particular Distinctions of his Answerer between Matters
Matters of Representation, and Matters of Dispute, was this, that these Matters did not, and could not lye in Vulgar Heads, with that Distinction; his Defence of that Reply, and consequentely of his confused and deceitful way of Representing, is wholly Dropt.

2. The Defence of his Arguments, that the Deposing Power is no Article of Faith; is now at last wholly Dropt.

3. His Defence of the Worship of Images, against his Adversary's Discourse, is Dropt; or to use his own Words, he took the Freedom gravely to turn over his Answerers Occasional Pages about it.

And now if the Reader will please to put all together, he will find by an easie Computation, that this was the poor Remainder of a Controversie begun by the Representer upon no less than Thirty Seven Articles: So that these Points having had the hard Fate to be served by the Representer as their Fellows were before, I reckon that he has Dropt and Dropt, till the whole Cause is Dropt at last; but this is one of those Things in which he is not concerned; for though the Papist Misrepresented and Represented, be in a very forsaken Condition, yet himself, the Representer, was never more diverting, nor in better Humour all his Life: And who can blame a Man for not being sorry for what can ne're be helpt? And therefore since he sped no better with his Grave Undertaking, it was not amiss to
The Fourth Answer to the Representer, being An Answer to the Amicable Accommodation.

The Answerer has no Reason to be displeased; that the Representer now grants we do not Misrepresent the Papists in a strict and proper sense, viz. by Imputing such Doctrines to them as they do not own. But he saies that the Design of the Representer in his First Book, was to perswade our people that we were such Misrepresenters; but that failing in the performance, he would now make good his Title of Misrepresenting in a less proper sense, inasmuch as he thinks we do unjustly condemn the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome. But why he should tax us for this at all, the Answerer wonders, and that very justly, one would think, because the Representer has sometime since disclaim-ed Disputing, without which it cannot be seen whether we be Misrepresenters or not in this less proper sense: And therefore he tells him, That if he will vindicate the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome, he must quit his retreat of Character-making, and fall to Disputing as their Fathers did; in which, he is ready to joyn issue with them: But that
it was by no means civil to charge us with *lying*, how prudent soever it might be upon another account, since if he proceeds in this way, he may be secure, that no civil person will care to dispure with him. Now whereas the *representer* did in effect recall his grant, by attempting to prove largely, That there may be a *misrepresentation* where there is an *agreement* about the matter of *fact*; because there may be *misrepresentation* upon other accounts, *viz.* in respect of *motive*, *circumstance*, *intention*, *end*, &c. Here the *answerer* shews that these things do indeed belong to true *representing*; but that they were too nicely distinguished by the *representer* from matter of *fact*; for he had given him no occasion for the distinction, since he had considered these things in those matters which he charged upon the Church of *Rome*; For Instance, That not only Worshipping of Images, but the Worshippers *intentions*, and all other circumstances, without which the Nature of the *fact* cannot be throughly understood, were taken into consideration. Then he shews through all the *representer's instances*, That the *misrepresentations* were in *matters of fact*; but wonders why he did not produce one instance of the like nature out of his *answers*, if he thought there were any. For what could he gain by shewing, That in such and such cases others have been *misrepresenters*, unless he proved withal, that we were *misrepresenters* in like cases? His instances shew, that they who tell a piece of a Story, may *misrepresent*; but not that they do so, who faithfully relate the whole matter of *fact*, with
between the Representer and the Answerer.

with all its circumstances; which is our case; and he has not produced one example to the contrary; tho' so to have done, had been more to his purpose, than all his other instances. In short, this matter was so fully Answered, that when we hear next of the Representer, we do not find one word more about it.

To the Zealous Brothers Harangue, he saies, tho' it be granted that the Dissenters Misrepresent our Church, yet this does not prove that we Misrepresent the Church of Rome; and therefore this is nothing but a device to get rid of us, by throwing us upon the Dissenters. But we are not for pursuing every New Game, but will keep to our old scent. And yet he has made the Dissenter say such silly things of us, as no Dissenter will own, unless he has heard them among the Quakers. This the Answerer plainly shewed through almost all his Fifteen particulars of the Charge against the Church of England, and by the way, where it was any thing needful, he taxed the unreasonableness and folly of the Charge, which yet was more than he was bound to, since if it came to the Trial, we have some reason to think that there is not a zealous Brother in England, no nor Friend neither, but would be ashamed to own it. So that this design of Representing and Misrepresenting, to which I may add the Representer's yielding in pure good Nature, that henceforth Misrepresenting shall be understood in its less proper sense, ends only in Ridiculing the Church of England, with which we are content, if they will permit us truly to Represent theirs.
To what the Representer offered, for seeking out new Misrepresentations, the sum of what is Answered, is this, That it is in the main agreed what the matters of Fact are with which the Papists may be charged; and since these only are the proper Subject of Representation, the ill consequences which Protestants have urged against their Doctrines and Practices, ought not to have been put into the Character of a Papist Misrepresented, unless he could shew, that we say that Papists do believe those Consequences: And therefore the Representer vainly endeavours to excuse himself for putting them into that Character, by hunting about for new pretended Misrepresentations, to imploy his Answerer withal. This I gather to be the Answerer's sense, from his reference to what he had proved before.

As to the Archbishop of York; the Answerer saies, he did not Misrepresent the Church of Rome in saying that Stapleton said, We must simply believe the Church of Rome whether it Teach True or False. The most that can be made of it, is, That according to one of their allowed Doctors, Thus a Papist must believe. And therefore if it be a Misrepresentation of the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, Stapleton is to be thanked for it in the first place, for saying so; and in the next, the Church of Rome for allowing him to say so; and then the Arch-Bishop for reporting what he said, tho he does not say that one Doctor may make Doctrines for the Church of Rome.
between the Representer and the Answener.

The Case of Mr. Sutcliff, he says, is different; and he shews that he expressly distinguishes between what P. 26, 27: the Papists teach, and what himself concludes from such Doctrines; and therefore that he does not Misrepresent the Papists. So that how little soever the Representer thought himself concerned in Sutcliff's Reasonings; because Reasoning belonged not to a Representer; yet surely it belonged to a Representer to distinguish between the Doctrines we charge upon the Papists on the one side, and the Arguments we bring against these Doctrines on the other.

To the Charge of omitting to render propter Deum into English; He says, It was omitted he knows not how or why; but very justly blames the Representer for insinuating that it was dishonestly omitted, since it was the whole Design of that Discourse about P. 28. the Worship of Images, to shew that Image Worship is Evil, tho God was worshipped by it. I will upon this occasion add, that the Answener could not but know his own foul Dealing in this Charge, which is so very manifest; that this Injustice, if there were nothing else, does assure me, that he must make another Change, before we can expect much sincerity from him.

With like honesty, he disengages himself from all Obligation to dispute concerning the Worship of Images, &c. 1. Because the Answener knows no Reason for all this Dispute; which words did not at all relate to that Dispute, but to the Question about the Bishop of Condom's Authority. 2. He was never concerned whether the Answener liked his Religion or not. But if he could have answered that Discourse, all that the Answener could have said would not have P. 29. hindered him.
For the Rest; the Answerer says, that the Representor and the Bishop of Condom, reason'd and argued at first, as well as Represented; and since their Representation is offer'd as a Rule by which we may be taken into the Roman Church, they were the more concern'd to justify their own Reasonings; which since it is declined, our People will be apt to think why Papists decline the Dispute, who are never known to avoid Disputing, when they think they can get any thing by it. And thus the Answerer takes leave of the Representor, believing that this Matter is driven as far as it will go.

The Fourth Reply of the Representor, in behalf of his Amicable Accommodation.

This last Reply is made up;

1. Of insulting over the Answerer, for offering no more than he did in Answer to the Zealous Brother's Sermon against the Church of England.

2. Of more and more out-cries upon the Protestants for Misrepresenting the Papists.

But the Particulars that come under these Heads, together with his Reflections by the bye, will be best produced in the following Answer, where I shall consider what Reason he has for this kind of proceeding.
The Fifth Answer to the Representer in Return to his last Reply.

If the Seven and Thirty lost Points had been recovered, the Representer could not have entered the Lifts with more seeming satisfaction, in himself, than he shews in his last Reply. But he has made a shift to forget them, and that's as good. What the Answerer said, that the Matter was driven as far as it would go (whatever the Representer imagines) I find still to be true. For with reference to the chief matter of Dispute betwixt us, we are parted; and, I think, never like to meet any more about it. Indeed as to the manifold Charge summed up against the Church of England, that matter, as he truly observes, is not driven as far as it will go: And it seems he intends to drive it farther and farther. But why that should ever come to be a matter of Debate betwixt us, any one who considers the Controversy from first to last, must needs wonder.

The Design of what has been said on behalf of the Church of England has been to make evident these three Things.

1. That we do not charge the Papists with some things which the Representer will have us to charge them with.

2. That some things which he faith we falsely charge them with, are maintained and practised by them.

3. That allowing them to maintain and practise only, what themselves acknowledge that they do maintain and practise, yet there are sufficient Reasons why
why we cannot comply with Popery, altho refined after the newest Fashion.

This is the sum of what has been argued on our side. Now how comes his Zealous Brother's Cant to be an Answer to all this? I know not I must confess how to imagine any Diffenter to be so ridiculous as to object against us, what the Representer makes him to Object: And without Flattery or Fawning, I may safely affirm that there are not many who do it. But suppose there should; will such their Objections prove against the First particular above mentioned, that we charge Papists with what we deny we charge them with? Or against the Third, That allowing them to maintain and practice, what themselves acknowledge that they maintain and practice, we ought to comply with Popery. I think that no Man in his Wits will assert this. And therefore we may justly ask what is to be done with all that has been said upon these particulars? and whether there not having been any thing that is material urged against them, does not imply that there is nothing material to be urged; and consequently, if the Answerer had not some Reason to say, that the matter was driven as far as it will go?

As to the second particular, viz. that several things which we are said falsely to charge them with, are maintained and defended by them; This indeed the Character which he made, little more than in Jest; for his Zealous Brother, doth seem more directly to oppose. And yet it might be easily answered, that this Brother, in his Zeal might urge what was False against Us, tho we urged nothing but what was True against the Papists. Which with a great deal more the Answerer offered to the consideration of the Representer; and he is now told that he passed over this same charge
An Answer to the Representer's last Reply.

charge upon the Church of England, with a Light Touch, &c. And much ado there is, because he was not for pursuing every new Game, but for keeping to the old Scent. For what could possibly come more cross to the Representer, than that after all his Doubling and Shifting, he should start new Game for us, and yet we should be for keeping to the old Scent? And therefore I do not wonder to hear him complaining in this manner. And is it possible then that the Disputing humour is so soon off? We have heard of nothing hitherto so much as of Disputes——and yet the Answerer is as unwilling to Dispute as the Representer———Here's not a word now of Disputing——And is it not strange that he should draw me out to Dispute——and when his own Turn comes of Disputing he should let the matter Fall, because, forsooth, he'll keep to his old Scent?

Now really this would almost persuade a Man to let him go for good and all; as he might have done if he had observed but a little moderation. But he gives it out, that in his Brother’s Character of the Church of England, Almost every Point is urged with the same Proofs of Scripture and Reason, which Protestants produce against the Papists: That there is scarce an Argument in the Character, but is exactly parallel to what the Church of England uses in her Defence against Popery; that the Grounds of the Arguments are the same, the manner of urging them the same, the Maxims on which they stand the same, and then the Reasons which press them home, are they not the very same which the Answerer himself in his former Discourse urges against him? And he turns it upon his Answerer, That a little prudence would serve him to say nothing in such a Cause as will admit no better a Defence. This I must needs say, is a little too tyranni-
cal in a Representer under his Circumstances; and would tempt a Man against his own Inclinations to follow him a little farther now, under his new Shape.

I tell him therefore, in the first place, that a close Disputant would have pressed him to shew, that the Reasons upon which we proceed in our manifold Charge against the Papists are false and unsatisfactory; and not have suffered him to run out into an Inquiry, whether the Reasons upon which his Zealous Brother proceeds against us, be the same with them, or no.—Or, if this were to be allowed him, we might be well excused from answering him in this matter; since the particular Controversies which the Church of England hath with the Dissenters, have been managed on her behalf, not so long since that it should be forgotten; and the difference of the Case between the Separation of Protestants from the Church of Rome, and of Dissenters from the Church of England, was shewn after all, and that in very good earnest. For this being not taken notice of by the Representer, it might very well set off our Debt to him for a Charge upon the Church of England, which himself meant little more than in jest. Besides, altho he glories in this Charge more than in all his other Performances, yet since he frequently intimates, that he intended no more by it, than to Ridicule our Charge against the Church of Rome, 'tis all one, as if he had given it under his hand, that his Cause is more safe by ridiculing what we say, than by replying to it like a Disputant. Now on the other hand, we think our Charge must needs have been carefully laid, and well defended, if at last it will admit of none but Ridiculing Replies: And so we might without
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without much danger, leave things as they are, and put it to the venture, whether the World will not think so too. But because he boasts so very much, that this Discourse which he has composed for the Brother, is not yet sufficiently answered, and as some think, he may grow a little popular by it; I care not if I go on with him in some part of his own way; and, in compliance with the Opinion of others, inquire into the difference of those Objections upon which we proceed against the Church of Rome, from those upon which his zealous Brother proceeds against the Church of England.

1. I grant that our Prelates have Revenues, and I believe Coaches, Miters, Crosiers and Copes. Now if there be any reason why his Brother calls these Papish, 'tis this, that these things were not in use in our Saviour's, and in the Apostles times. But when did we ever object against any thing that is merely circumstantial amongst them (as these things are) that it was not used in our Saviour's, or in his Apostles Times? Have we not said it a thousand times, that we like nothing the worse because the Papists approve it, provided it be useful; nay, if it be innocent, and harmless? As for their Ornaments and Ceremonies, where does any one find that in the Controversies now on foot betwixt us, we do at all insist upon them? Tho we cannot but think many of them to be neither grave nor decent, their Number too great, and too much Religion placed in them by some People. So that, tho there is scarce an Argument in the Character, but exactly parallel to what we use, and tho ALMOST EVERY Point is urged with the same Proofs, &c. yet surely the first Point is none of them. And therefore let's try the next.

2. It
2. It is objected against us, that we make Gods of dead Men, and this is proved by the weekly Bills of Mortality, where our Churches are called by the same Titles that they had in times of Popery. Now if by making Gods of dead Men, be meant making the Saints so many Independent Deities, there is then a great deal of difference between what the Zealous Brother objects against us, and what We object against the Papists, as well as between the Reasons of our Objections: For we never object this against them. But if by this Expression be meant, giving that Worship to the Saints, which belongs only to God and our Saviour; we then allow our Objection to be the same, but do think that we have much better Reasons to object this against the Papists, than that of a weekly Bill of Mortality. For we appeal to the Publick Addresses which are made to the Virgin Mary, and other Saints, with all the Circumstances of External Adoration, to their Litanies and to the Hymns of their establish'd Offices, wherein they are often in voked after the same manner, as God himself is; to their appropriating to particular Saints, distinct Powers of doing good to their Worshippers; to their Acknowledgment, that the Saints are Mediators of Intercession; to the Prayers that are made to them in all places, as if they were omnipresent; to the Sense also of their Council of Trent, that they are to be prayed unto with mental as well as vocal Prayer, as if they knew our Hearts. All which I hope is something more than that in the weekly Bill of Mortality, and in common Conversation, we call our Temples by the same Names they formerly had. And yet the Representer asks, Wherein have I Ridiculed the Church of England? I have done no more in my
Character against her, then what they have been doing these hundred and fifty years against the Church of Rome? So that it seems we have for these hundred and fifty years charged them with Worshipping the Saints upon no better grounds than their weekly Bills of Mortality. Only, faith he, what I have done in a kind of jest, and without endeavouring to delude any body with such kind of Sophistry, they have been doing in the greatest earnest, and by it making good their Cause. So that he confesses his Charge upon our Church to be carried on with a kind of Sophistry: only what he has done in a kind of jest, we have been doing against them in the greatest earnest; i.e. we have in good earnest charged the Church of Rome with giving that Worship to Saints which belongs to God only, upon nothing else but the Titles of Churches, such as ours have in the Bills of Mortality. But surely his greatest Sophistry of all lies in this, that he endeavours to delude People into this Opinion, which yet if he could, he must delude them into another Opinion too, that Bellarmin and all the famous Champions of old Popery, were a company of Fools, to be at so much Sweat and Charges to maintain the Worship of Saints, and to defend it, as they have done, when they could so easily have denied it. For that nothing is easier than to make good our disowning it against the ground upon which he charges us with it, I shall presently make appear.

To let pass his Suggestion, that the London Churches were first built by the Papists; his adding that we rebuilt them, with the same Titles, Invocations and Dedications which they use, shews how little he is to be trusted in a Question of Antiquity, who talks so carelessly of things that are notorious in our own Days,
Days. Our Fathers indeed found the Titles convenient enough, and the Churches themselves reasonable good Churches, and retain’d them both. But when we raised them out of their Ashes, we dedicated them to no Saint, whatever has been done in this kind formerly; nor have we since invoked any Saint in any one of them, but we keep the Titles still. And does our new Representer expect that we should Answer such Objections as these? At least I desire him not to think that we will make a practice of it. Must our retaining these Titles, necessarily infer a virtual Dedication of our Temples to those Saints, by whose Names they are distinguished from one another? But what if we had called them by the Names of those Streets only where they stand, had they then been dedicated to the Honour of the Streets? We say that the Hundred Thirty and Two Churches here, which are known by the Names of dead Men and Women, are with us God’s Houses, and dedicated to his only Service, no less than the Five that are distinguished by the Names of Christ and the Trinity. And methinks so acute a Disputant as he is grown, might have seen that the Title of one Church distinguishing it from the rest, does not shew who is served and worshipped there, when the same Service and Worship is used in all of them. That which we blame them for is, that they continue to worship Dead Men and Women in those Churches which bear their Names, and in those which do not. For if in Christ’s Church they call upon the Blessed Virgin; tho the Church has its Title from Christ, yet ’tis a House of Prayer to Her as well as to Him. And if in the Churches which are known by her Name, we call upon God only, and worship him alone,
alone, they are his Houses intirely, and none of Hers. But after all, where does the Answerer press him with the Titles of their Churches? And yet the Reasons which press home the Arguments, are they not the very same which the Answerer himself urges against him the Representer?

3. I confess that I have seen Pictures in some English Bibles and Common-prayer Books, and Moses and Aaron painted on each side of the Commandments upon some of our Altar-pieces; which things how they have crept in amongst us I cannot tell, for they have no publick Authority from our Church. The Answerer made his guess, and perhaps it will not be easy to mend it. But upon this great Occasion, the Representer has brought in his Rigid Brother making us worse than the Papists themselves, forgetting that he undertook to represent us not altogether so Bad, and therefore he should at least have corrected himself in this manner; “Indeed, Beloved, I told ye at first, that these Church-of-England-Men are within the Swing of the Dragon’s Tail; but I had not lied to say that they are under the Feet and the Belly, more than the Papists themselves are. For the Papists do no more towards the placing of Image-Worship in the Word of God, than by a cleanly conveyance of that Commandment which forbids it, out of the way. But these Church-of-England-Men, as they are called, have given that Abomination of Images themselves, a place in every Leaf of their Bible, in the very Word of God; which is the greatest Argument of Soveraign Honour. Nay, in some of their Bibles you shall find Moses and Aaron stand in the very next Leaf to the Ten Commandments; which
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"which what is it, Beloved, but a Defiance to the Second? Whereas the Papists being more modest than to affront it, have put it away far from them. But this is not all, my Brethren, for they pray to their Pictures; for if you but look over their Shoulders, you'll see their Pictures in the very heat of their Devotion, under their very Eyes, in the Leaves of their Common-Prayer Books; And therefore, mark me now Beloved, if we must believe our own Senses, they pray to the Pictures, and to the Leaves, and to the Idol Common-Prayer Books and all.

This indeed had been something like, and would have pieced well with what follows, that our Altars have their Images too, and that in a more profane way than the Papists, &c.

Well; but let us suppose our Church bound to answer for these Pictures, and for Moses and Aaron, &c. Are we enjoyned to pay them any Worship, as they of the Romish Communion are obliged to pay to their Images? The Council of Trent has determined, That due Honour and Veneration must be given to Images, and that the Honour which is given to them is referred to the Things which they represent. Has the Church of England done any thing like this? We read of several Prayers used at the Consecration of Images amongst them: But whoever heard of any such thing practised at the setting up of Moses and Aaron? We know that they walk many Miles in Pilgrimage to particular Images, and that they think much more good is to be expected from some, than from others: But who ever thought so among us, or imagined that the Pictures of Moses and Aaron in Cornhill, were more to be honoured than those in Woodstreet,
Woodstreet, or in any other place? So that how silly foever the Zealous Brother may appear to be in imputing to us, upon such frivolous grounds, the worship of Images; I am sure that he who made the Harangue for him, is either much more so, or something that is worse, in pretending that when we urge the same against the Papists, the Reasons we go upon are no better than his.

But we do at least make Images and Pictures, which the second Commandment expressly forbids, as he makes his Brother say. And now a Reason of the Answerer is produced, that no Intention can alter the nature of Actions which are determined by a Divine Law. I would therefore know of him, whether there be, or be not good reason to make us certain, that the second Commandment does not absolutely forbid the making of Images and Pictures, but only with reference to worshipping them. If there be no good Reason for it, let him then tell me, whether any Intention can justify the making of Images against an absolute Law to the contrary. If there be, let him then but confess what he thinks of this Objection that he has put into his Brother’s Mouth, and there’s one labour saved.

I confess, it were not ill for him if some Intention might justify the breaking of the ninth Commandment; for he pretends that the New Common-Prayer-Books do not profess that hatred to Image-Worship, which the Old ones did: When in the Commination to which he refers, the very first instance runs thus, Cursed is the Man that maketh any carved or molten Image to worship it. Does he think that his Dissenting Brother must answer for these things.

4. Neither
4. Neither is he more just to us in making his Zealous Brother to object against us that we worship Saints and Angels. For, to pass by the Argument about erecting Temples to them, to which we have already spoken; Is our giving Thanks to God upon set Days for such eminent Examples of Faith and Vertue, as the first Propagators of the Gospel were? Is our commemorating their Patience, and all their other Divine Graces, to excite one another to the Imitation of them? Is our Praying to God that we may be Followers of them, who through Faith and Patience inherit the Promises? Is this, I say, any thing like to what the Council of Trent declares, That they think wickedly who deny that Saints are to be Invoked? Is it of the same nature with owning them to be Mediators of Intercession, the same with putting up to them that sort of Petitions which are fit to be offered to God only? Or does our Praying upon St. Michael's Day, that by God's appointment his holy Angels may succour and defend us, come near even so much as to one single Holy Michael Pray for us? which Form of Words, tho' much inferior to what is sometimes used in the Church of Rome, we never dare to venture upon, because we cannot make Addresses either to him, or to any other Angel or Saint, but by interpretation we must ascribe the Divine Attribute of Omnipresence to them, and for many other Reasons, which yet we have not been able to get an Answer to from these Men. But he says that we Pray on St. Michael's Day, as if God were not able to defend us, and therefore we seek shelter under the Angel's Wings: And this surely is to worship Angels. By like reason if we pray for
for our Daily Bread, we pray as if God were not able to preserve us without it: And this would be to worship Bread. The Representer makes too bold with his Zealous Brother, and with us too, if he would have it thought that we reason against them at this rate. But by this time I hope he sees to how little purpose he applies that of the Answerer to this matter, viz. that All worship of Invisible Beings is Religious Worship, &c. For as yet he has not proved that we worship Saints or Angels; and if he has done his best towards it here, I will be bold to say, that he knows he cannot prove it against us; as we can against them, if there were any need of it: But there is no need of it, because they confess it.

5. As for what is objected about our Idolatry in Receiving the Sacrament; if I did not know the Prompter, I should be ashamed to find it amongst such Instances as are said to be built upon the same Maxims, that our Objections against the Papists are. For how far soever We and the Zealous Brother might in other cases be said to agree in the Reasons of what we Object; I am sure it is most unreasonable to say we agree in this. For do we, as the Papists, hold that the Bread and Wine are changed into the natural Body and Blood of Christ? Do we require any worship to be paid to the Elements after Consecration? Do we elevate or carry them about, on purpose to have them adored by the People? Nay, with reference to our receiving the same in the posture of Kneeling, is it not as fully as can be declared, That that posture is meant for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ to all worthy Receivers; That no Adoration is hereby intended,
tended, for that the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural Substances, and the Natural Body and Blood of our Saviour are in Heaven and not here? Which Declaration is the more significant; one would think, as being made by our Church in Opposition to those who do Adore the Sacrament: Especially since it was not the posture of Kneeling when the Sacrament is received, which of it self could make such a Declaration needful, but the Scandal which they give to the World who Adore it. Had this been considered by the Representer, his Brothers Zeal might well have been spared in saying, They may say, they do not pay Religious Worship to the Bread and Wine, and Honour the Sacrament as God: But what, must we not believe our senses in so plain a Case? Or else his Zeal should not have stopp'd here, but carried him a little farther, to appeal to his own Eyes that we honour the Patin and Chalice as Gods too, by falling down to them on our Knees, for this is as plain a Case as the other; and our Church has made no Declaration against it in solemn and particular Terms neither, as it has against the Adoration of the Bread and the Wine. But I guess that the Zealous Brother when he is once at liberty to speak for himself, will confess that he sees neither the one nor the other; and that it is no affront to his Eyes to acquit us of Adoring the Sacrament, and to yield that when we receive it, we Adore God and him only, in a posture which as we think, well becomes the thankful Receivers of such Holy Mysteries.

However, tho we, it seems, must not be believed when we say that we do not adore the Sacrament at all; yet we will not be so hard to the Church of Rome,
Rome, but believe her telling us that she does adore
the Sacrament, and that with Divine Honour too.
And when the Zealous Brother gets our Church at
any Advantage like this, or can find out any practices
amongst us like those above mentioned, we shall hear
him, I doubt not, speaking to better purpose for
himself, than as his Brother here has taught him.

And now, I think, I have omitted nothing in the
first Five of the Fifteen Parallels, that required the
least notice, but have rather ventured being laugh'd
at by the Representer for giving any serious Answers,
where he meant only to Ridicule. But by this he
may see what little reason there was to Crow over
his Adversary as he does upon this occasion; which
was all that I intended. And therefore since it is
needless to drive the Parallel any farther with that
circumstance which I have hitherto used; I must not
do a needless thing, which according to one of his
weighty Observations, would be Six-pence a piece more
for the Curious: Especially since the Answerer has
done Reason enough to the remaining Particulars.
For tho the Representer, to save himself from any
further Reply, comes off with telling him that he
answered the whole charge with, The Dissenters ne-
ver charged us with this or that, &c. and nothing else;
yet the Reader will find more said than this comes to,
if he will consult the Answer it self, instead of taking
the Representer's word. But I hope Five of his Par-
ticulars have been handled his own way: And now
I offer him this, either in full Satisfaction, or in part
of Payment; let him chuse, as he likes, 'tis all one
to his Humble Servant. And therefore if he will
please to call upon me for Arrears, I promise him

I that
that our calling upon the Birds, the Beasts, and the Fishes, shall not be forgotten, nor our crying out to Dead Men, in our most solemn Devotion, nor the Apocrypha in the Liturgy, nor the Rochet, the Alb, and the Tunicle, nor any thing else which yet wants a Vindication, as he says: But, to return him one of his familiar Phrases, I shall take occasion of playing him the same Tune over again as distinctly upon the remaining Ten, as he has had it already upon his first Five Particulars.

And now let us go on with his Reply; in which the next thing I observe, is, that he will needs have the Answerer to bid fair for the good opinion of Dissenters, and to curry closely with the Dissenters, and to throw those scandals upon his own Church in good earnest, which the Representer did little more than in jest. If the Representer could have turned his Adversaries Pen against the Dissenters, there are some would have had a better opportunity of currying closely with the Dissenters; and I shall tell him who they are, before I have done with him. But, it seems, we are not for doing every good thing, in the very nick when he would have it done. And so to be revenged on us, we must be represented as currying with the Dissenters; which yet we are as far from, when we own our Agreement with them in those many things, which they no less than we, object against the Papists; as from currying with the Papists, when we confess that we agree with them in those fewer things that are to be objected against the Dissenters. And yet currying with the Dissenters is not so great a Fault, but he could tell them upon the Spot, how their Sufferings are at an end, now our Churches power has been
something check'd, which he thinks they may Reflect upon. But if the Representer would win their good opinion, he should of all things beware of putting them in mind to Reflect; lest when they begin to Reflect upon those things of which he speaks, they should chance to Reflect upon other things of which he speaks not.

Methinks too, I may reasonably suspect a little currying of the Representer in what comes next. For, whereas the Answerer thought the Dissenters too wise and cautious to take Characters [of us] from [Their own] open and professed Enemies; (for that was his plain meaning) the Representer understands him, as if he had meant our, i.e. the Church of England's professed Enemies: and then hopes that our People will henceforth be so wise, as not to take Characters of Popery from us, who are, as he says, Enemies to Papists. But whether he was resolved to make this mistake for the sake of the neat Turn, or to save himself from saying whether he was Friend or Enemy to the Dissenters, I leave him to resolve. But I hope he does not expect that I should take notice of every such little Reflection, as he knows this to be.

And yet I must needs vindicate the Answerer from that Charge, that whereas the Representer granted, that his Protestant Character of a Papist was not made up wholly of down-right Lies, the Answerer stretches this Courtesy with a witness, and concludes that we have the Representer's word for it now that we are guilty of no Misrepresentation at all of matters of Fact, which he, the Representer, never did, nor will allow. But in this the Answerer is wronged, who very well remembred, that his Ad-
versary did a little dispute his Churches owning the Deposing Power, and two or three Points more, which he thought fit to drop at last. Now therefore, as the Answerer had frequently said before, that the matters of Fact were the same in both Characters, very few things excepted; so in his last Answer, he was to be understood in course with the same Exception, viz. that we now had our Adversaries Confession, that in the Character of a Misrepresented Papist, there were no Protestant Misrepresentations of Popery properly so called; and so, that a very few Points excepted, we are agreed on both sides upon the matters of Fact. And this one would think was plain enough in the last Answer, where the Answerer thus interprets the Concession of his Adversary. Whatever he at first pretended, he grants now, that we are not in a strict and proper sense Misrepresenters; and thus farewell to Character-making, since Papists and Protestants that understand these matters, are in the main (not absolutely in every point, but in the main) agreed what is the Character of a Papist, tho they differ in their Opinions about him, &c.

I know indeed the Representer would extend the down-right Lies, from which he does not absolutely acquit us, to more Instances than those excepted by the Answerer. For which he appeals to his own Character of a Papist misrepresented, where he has represented the Protestants as Liars, in charging the Papists with other things disowned by the Church of Rome: Which is one of the finest Fetches that is possible. For tho in that Character, he has made the Protestant to charge the Papist with all that we indeed charge him with; yet he has made him do more,
more, and therefore might safely appeal to his own Character, to prove that we are Liars in some things; always supposing that he is the honestest Man in the World, in representing the Protestant Representations of Popery. But how often must he be told, that he has been a false Representer of us as to this matter? That he sometimes brings in Protestants charging Papists, (1.) In ambiguous Terms, which admit of different Interpretations; for instance, under the Head of Praying to Images, which is the first Point he mentions. (2.) With owning the dangerous Consequences of their Doctrines and Practices, as that Papists do believe their Sins to be infallibly remitted upon Absolution, whether they resolve upon Amendment or no: which is his second Instance, and there are two or three more, to the same Tune. (3.) With some things that we do not impute to 'em at all, either as Principles or Consequences; witness that Instance which he has the fore-head still to insist upon. For, says he, Are their Sermons in Latin? Do they teach in unknown Tongues? as if we charged them with this. I know not what every Protestant in the World may have said in his heat against Papists: But I am apt to think that it will be as hard to find a Protestant that hath said this against them, as to find a Zealous Brother that will own the Canting Sermon he hath made against us. Upon one or other of these three accounts he might well appeal to his own Characters to convict us of Lying, and ask the Answerer what he thinks of this, or that which Protestants charge upon Papists; supposing, as I said before, that he delivers Oracles always, when he is setting us out to the World.
And now, I say, 'tis too late for the Representer to ask us, what we think of these things; because, not to mention the second Answer, his first Answerer has told him very particularly what we think of them, what we do charge them with, and what not. And since he has said nothing to it, it is unreasonable to expect that we should do the same thing over and over again, as often as he is pleased to put the Question to us. As for firing the City, and killing Sir Edmund-Bury Godfrey, &c. what have these things to do in the Character of Popery? I suppose 'tis no Article of the Representer's Faith, that Papists did not these things; I am sure 'tis none of mine, that they did.

Having upon no better grounds than these accused the Answerer of Misrepresenting him, he runs out into general and passionate Expostulations concerning the injustice of those who for their own Interest support the false Notions which the People have of Popery, lest themselves should appear the Deceivers. At length he asks, whether altho' the People must be preached into a Dread of Popery, it be a Christian Method to make use of Artifices to encrease the Horror? Why should every thing the Papists do be stretch'd and strain'd, and forc'd to make it ugly?—

'Tis true, this is proper enough to win upon the Mobile, who make no distinction between Real and Artificial Monsters; 'tis well enough, where the Interest is best maintain'd by the madness of the People. But where's the Christianity all the while, where's Truth and Charity? Why truly not so much as there should be, where either these things are done on the one side, or falsely said to be done on the other. Now it must not be quite forgotten that the Representer wrote
wrote his Protestant Characters of Popery, as they lay in his own and the Peoples Heads; and made all his Answerers work in distinguishing between Representation and Dispute; between Principles that are owned, and Consequences that are denied by the Papists, utterly useless; because things did not and could not lie thus distinctly in the Peoples Heads. For Instance, Because if a Preacher should say, that though the Papists think it lawful to worship Images, yet it is plainly forbidden in God's Word so to do, and that too as an Idolatrous Action; the poor People presently conclude, that the Papists believing it to be Idolatry, differ from us in no other thing, but that we think Idolatry, and forbidden Worship, to be unlawful, and the Papists do not think so. But if the Representer believed this of the People; Where was Christianity, where was Truth and Charity, when he wrote his Representation of Popery, under colour of disabusing the People; and made one part of a Papist's Character to be this, that he abhors Idolatry? for thus the People would be betrayed into a belief, that he does not so much as worship Images; for Consequents and Antecedents are so jumbled in the Peoples Heads, that nothing can lie distinctly there. We indeed do not think so meanly of them, and therefore might honestly urge Arguments and Consequences against that and other Practices of the Roman Church. But he, it seems, believed they could not distinguish between the one and the other; and then I am sure if they acquitted Papists of the Consequence, it would go hard if they did not acquit them of the Fact too; and therefore whether he put the Denying of the Consequence...
sequence into the Papist's Character with an honest Design, at least, whether he had any reason to object against the distinct proceeding of the Answerer, I dare almost now appeal to himself. But, as I observed before, the Answerer made him ashamed of imputing this kind of madness to the People, and so we heard no more of it in his next Reply. But yet the Interest we are said to have in the People, must still be imputed to their madness. And what madness is it now? Why they cannot distinguish between Real and Artificial Monsters: Which is as much as to say, that we have made the Papists Monsters, by telling notorious Lies of them; and the People are so mad that they cannot find it out. But may not I take my turn now to ask, Where's Christianity all this while; where's Truth and Charity? Why must we be branded with the Imputation of Falseness and Calumny, and our Christian Brethren treated in that manner, as if they were mere stupid Creatures, and more fit to herd with Beasts, than to live amongst Men?

As for ourselves being thus urged, we beg leave to appeal to All that know us, whether this odious Character be any way suitable to our Conversation; and then, whether we have deserved it for the management of this Controversy in particular, we appeal to the World. We appeal to all Men of Sincerity and Understanding, what colour of Reason the Representanter had here to ask, Why praying to Images, leave to Sin for Money, Forgiveness without Repentance, &c. should be urged against them to make them the Object of Hatred, and the Subject of popular Fury? Have not his Answerers more than once published clearly and distinctly
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ftinctly what we do, and what we do not charge them with in every one of these Respects? Has he convinced them of any Insincerity, nay, of any mistake in the stating of these things? Has he taken notice of any thing they have said about them? Why would he not be brought to confess the Justice of our charging them so far as we have done, and our Justice to them in charging them no farther, or at least to confute us by shewing wherein we had done unjustly? What other Construction now can Truth and Charity make of these Proceedings, but that he would not confess that we do them no wrong, and yet could not prove that we do? But then certainly he should at least have been silent, and not go on as he does to declaim against us; as if he really believed we were those odious Misrepresenters and Falsifiers, which he would have the World believe that we are.

He says indeed, that the Answerer unhappily takes it to himself, as if He and His were arraigned of Lying and Calumny, &c. whereas the Representer spoke only in general, without so much as hinting upon any party or person in particular. But surely when after the first Answer that was made in behalf of the Church of England, the Representer without telling us the particulars why, could yet declare that he would be a Turk as soon as a Papist, if the Answerer had rightly represented Popery; we must have as little understanding, as he allows to the Mobile, not to find that we are principally intended in these general Declarations. He thinks the Answerers over solicitous to prove his Innocence, may in some breed a suspicion of his Guilt. But whether it be Innocence or Guilt that makes us solicitous to clear our selves, we may now leave
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leaves the World to judge. One thing, I take it, is easy to be discerned, that tho our Adversary Rowls in Figures to heighten the injustice under which He and His have suffered by Misrepresentations, yet he throws the Guilt so faintly upon the Church of England, as if he were conscious of being unjust to us all the while.

As for the People of our Communion, whom he complements under the Title of the Mobile, we may say without vanity, that how scornfully forever the Representer treats them, we shall never be ashamed to compare them with their Neighbours; and that it would be a better World for the Representer, if they were as ignorant and stupid as he would have them thought to be.

But no more of what he has said in this fit of Anger; for here's a sudden change, and now behold him the gayest and merriest Man alive. He fancies the Answerer left him to wonder who those We are that are not Misrepresenters in a strict and proper notion of Misrepresenting, i.e. who do not belye the Papists. For indeed he would gladly know who those We are, that he might return them his thanks for this so kind Office—Did he but know the Men, he would never permit them to lye obscured under the general name of We. No, he would particularize them to the World——For why? are not such Men Prodigies of Truth, Honesty, and Justice?——Men that never misrepresented the Papists! Why these are admirable Men indeed, and not to be heard of every day! Now really this, with all that belongs to it, is allowed to be very well for the kind, and so much the better, because it more and more appears, that tho he can be angry without a cause, yet a small matter
matter will please him again. For he is delighted beyond measure with wondering who these We are, and wishes there be no mistake in it, and makes it hard to imagine who they should be: But I'll warrant him, he has 'em presently, as hard as it is. For in the very next place he tries whether the Answerer by his We, should mean We Protestants. And that is a pretty near guess for the First. But then alas! who can believe it, that We Protestants should be no Misperpresenters? He, for his part, would willingly give something for the light of the Man that thinks so, who would be the greatest Misperpresenter of All, in vouching for the Truth of All that has been invented against the Papists these hundred and forty years. Why then, surely, they are not We Protestants. But for all that, upon consideration, he thinks he may take it for granted that they are We Protestants. For the Answerer vindicates Protestants, and for himself, one may swear he's a stanch True Protestant, as never scrupling at any thing that's for running down the Papists, tho' it be carrying favour with and colloguing the Fanaticks. And thus the Answerer coming cross in his way, his Fit takes him again; for he cannot abide the Answerer, and so there's an end of his Mirth: And now in sober sadness we must suppose that the Answerers We, are We Protestants. For which reason the Representer begins the World again, and is resolved to prove out of the Sermons and Books of Protestants, that We Protestants are Misperpresenters: And so he falls to work about it in good earnest through the remaining part of his Book. Now I am so far from being angry with him for this, that I rather wish some merry Youth were to take him up here, to re-
quite his Railery, and keep up the good humour a little longer. And if it should come into any Bodies Head hereafter, who is given that way, to lay the Pleasant and the Angry Representer together, as it might be done: The Jift would go rarely forward, and that to some Bodies cost too, that may be thinks little on't.

For, was it not the Representer that would be glad to know who these Men are that do not misrepresent Papists, these Admiraile Men that are not to be heard of every day; these Men, that were he but assured of the Being of such Men, he should begin to think Aftrea was returned again! Did he not wish to know them, that he might particularize them to the World, may and have their Names Blazoned in every Sheet upon Pillars erected to their Memory? Yes surely, this was the Representer himself. Why then, Dear Sir, be happy and joyful, for many such Admiraile Men, as these, are in being I assure you, and to be heard of every day; But because it will be too great a charge to erect Pillars for 'em All, I shall at prent recommend but two of 'em to your Acquaintance, who are already particularized to the World, by the Names of the First and Second Answereers to A Papist Misrepresented and Represented. What pity is it that such Friends should be obscured so long under the general Name of We, and be no better known to one another? These, Sir, are the Men whom you desire to honour, as if they were made on purpose for it. For why? Tho very honest Gentlemen they are, and their Words may go for as great a matter, yet they have a notable Quality besides, never to think of Representing the Church of Rome, without proving what they say. Why, Sir, they
they have been lately tryed upon no less than Thirty
and Seven Points of Popery; and have born the Test
of a severe, watchful, double-dealing Adversary;
and one as vehemently desirous to find false Repre-
senters among Protestants, as you can be to know the
true ones. Now, Sir, judg if these two are not
likely to prove Right and True Men: For the Ad-
versary is to this day roaming up and down amongst
other Mens Books to get Protestant Misrepresentati-
ons for them to Answer; a plain sign, you will say,
that he has found none of their own to call them to
an Account for. And so having found out your Ad-
mirable Men for you, I wish you much joy of one
another.

Now this is too Blunt, I confess, to go for Railery;
but 'tis True tho, and that's almost as good: And the
Representer may see by it how another would have
handled him upon this matter, if he had not by good
fortune fal'n in my way. It is to me a most unac-
countable thing, why the Representer should search
for more and more Misrepresentations, Misquotati-
ons, and such like faults in Protestant Authors, and
forfake the Defence of his own double Characters, if
indeed he thinks they may be defended: But if he
does not think so, it were but an honest Mans part
to confess it, and then I think the Controverfy were
at an end. Certainly the design of his first Book,
which he still pretends to vindicate, was to give us
an account of the Doctrines and Practices of the
Church of Rome, upon which score he took upon him-
self the Title of a Representer. 'Tis true he pre-
tended to dispute for them too; but that design fell
to the ground upon the first Attempt that was made
upon:
upon him, and I believe he will hardly stoop to take it up again. But then to illustrate the Representing part, he shewed on the other side how Protestants, as he says, have Misrepresented Papists. So that here was a solemn Controversy begun upon so many several points, about Representing and Misrepresenting; and it was, one would think, very fairly carried on by the First Answerer, who we know went on with the Representer from point to point, discovering, where need was, his Ambiguities and Fallacies on both sides, mending his Characters, and giving a correct and plain account of the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome, in opposition to that lame and deceitful account thereof which the Representer had published. The sum of the performance was to shew how much and no more we absolutely charge upon the Church of Rome, and in matters of charge not so clear as the rest, how far and no farther we accuse them; every Particular being guarded with reasonable Proofs and Testimonies. The second Answerer perceiving into what mistakes the Representer was wandering, by confounding the proper Subject of Representation, with Subjects of Dispute, went as particularly through all the points, and plainly distinguished those things under every one. Now would not any Man of common sense imagine, that, if the Dispute were pertinently carried on, the Question must be this, Who gave the truest account of the Faith and Worship of the Church of Rome, the Representer, or the Answerer? And if it were pertinently managed, that this Question must be driven through all the Thirty Seven Points, as it has been done once and again on our behalf. And therefore to
to what end the Representer should trouble himself to find out new Representations in the Books of other Protestants, a Man may well wonder for a while, tho' at last he will settle upon the true Reason, that the Representer was Sick of defending his own.

If it be said, that one part of his business at least, goes forwards still, which was to shew, that some Protestants have been Misrepresenters; I desire it may be considered too, whether this was not in order to the settling of a clear and indisputable account between us, what are, and what are not the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome, as to the Thirty Seven Points. For granting now, (and 'tis a good large Grant to be made at once) that the Representer did sincerely give in his own former Protestant thoughts of Popery, and (as far as he could understand them) those apprehensions what Popery is, which lay in the Heads of the Vulgar; then so far as the Answerers confessed this was not a true Representation, if Protestants did thus charge the Church of Rome, so far I say they complied with the Represen ters design, which was to correct such, if there were any such mistakes going amongst Protestants. But so far as they owned the charge in the Protestant Character to be good against the Church of Rome, if the Representer disowned it, he had in this case nothing to do, but to confute their Testimonies, and to shew that in those particulars as well as in others, his Church was Misrepresented. And therefore if, he had been sincere, the Controversy had proceeded thus on his side; and nothing could have diverted him from proceeding in this manner, if he had been able to make any thing of it. But instead of this, he has for some time
time forsaken his *Thirty and Seven Chapters*, and employed himself in turning over some Books of Protestants, to find out such Sayings as he thinks there is any colour to call *Misrepresentations*; nay, he is fal'n so low as to pick out what *Misquotations* of Authors he can find amongst them, and to tax them here and there for Historical Passages.

But did ever either of his Adversaries undertake to justify all that any Protestant Divine, or Historian has at any time said in opposition to Popery? Or, was it not possible to give a more honest account of Popery than he did, to discover his fallacious way of representing his own Church, and the true state of the Questions that have been hitherto disputed, without such an undertaking? Nay have not his Answerers effectually done it, without any such undertaking? So effectually that he has forsaken the defence of his double Characters under the *Thirty Seven Points*? Why then must they be bound to Answer for all that every Protestant has said against the Church of Rome? Will he answer for all the Popish Misrepresentations of Protestants, that I can bring before him? I shall try him a little as to this before I have done: And I think with some better Grace, than this Task has been put upon us withal. For if it be but a mean way of carrying on the Controversy, as I confess it is, yet he has forced us to it by insisting upon it so obstinately, that we have now no other way to let him see the inconveniency of it, but by turning it upon himself. And, which is something too, we have cleared our Hands of him as to the Original Controversy, for he has dropt that quite away, and so having no Arrears to be reproached with, we may handsomely enough talk with
with him upon this new Score; and I will venture before-hand to say thus much, that he is likely to be as deep in our Debt for this, as he is for his first dealings with us. Nor am I afraid thus to speak my belief in this matter, tho he seems to have taken up a way of writing now, that will not fail him in haste; for as long as he can but find out any new severe Sayings of Protestants against Popery, 'tis but furnishing out a new Book with 'em, and he may as well call it by the Title of a Fifth or a Sixth Vindication of himself, as by any other Title whatsoever. Nay the Vindication will go forward, if he can but find out a Vulgar Head without a Name, to say that he believes the Popish Sermons are in an Unknown Tongue, or any other thing as extravagant as that.

But tho it be no part of our business to bring off every thing that has been said or done by Protestants, yet I shall a little examine what our Representer has charged those with, whom he has singled out to expose them to the World. For I am much mistaken if even here, he has not exposed himself a great deal more than any Body else: Since he does often take the liberty to fill up his Tragical Declamations against Protestants, by spiteful Constructions, weak Inferences, and now and then by false Accusations, which is never more intolerable, than when a Man is in the same Breath exclaiming against the Misrepresentations of others. For my own part, where his Accusations in whole or in part fall justly, there shall they lye for me, nor will I make another Man's Fault my own by going about to defend it. And if he had taken the same care not to make himself Guilty, by accusing the Innocent, he had come off better upon this
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this Theme of Arraigning particular Men, as wild as it is.

He begins first with Sutcliffs Inference from Aquinas, which I confess is a very silly one; tho I think it had been not only for Sutcliff's credit that this matter had been let alone, but for Aquinas's too, whose Principle is no very wise one. But I see no reason why the Answerer should have been ashamed to print it over again, since he did it only to shew that Sutcliff inferred his Accusation by Consequence from what an Author of their own had said, but not to justify the Inference. And for any thing the Answerer has said, the Represente rer is at liberty to go on with his charge of Ignorance or Malice against him that drew the Consequence, to call him a Fool in this business, if he believed the Consequence to be Good, or a Knave if he did not.

But I would gladly know how the Represente rer can clear himself from gross Misrepresentation in the next Instance, where falling upon the Author of the Representing Catechism for charging them with praying to Images, he makes it to bea Crime, which his first Answerer had cleared them from, in saying, that we do not charge them with praying to Images without any further Respect. For may not a Man pray to Images, and yet not pray to them without any farther Respect? This would make one believe that he writes only for the Mobile, in whose Heads things cannot lie distinctly. But 'tis not so honest tho, especially in a Man that complains of Misrepresentations. But by this time, I hope, he is made sensible of his miscarriage here, by what the Author of that Catechism has done to justify his Charge. And so I pass over this complaint, and come to the next.

Which.
Which is of a Sermon that charges them with praying to Reliques too. Now whether the Preacher had any particular Testimonies that there are some amongst them who do not only Worship, but likewise call upon Martin's Boots, &c. I know not, and therefore cannot at present pass Sentence against him; especially since I am well assured that the Council of Trent condemns those in general, who affirm that the Memories of the Saints are in vain frequented, for the obtaining of help from their Reliques, and other their sacred Monuments, or Remains. Now if Martin's Boots and Joseph's Breeches, &c. are the Reliques of Saints, then they are not only to be venerated, as the Council affirms, but the Memories where they are, must be frequented also, for obtaining help from them. This, I think, is no Misrepresentation, no wry Interpretation, no Imputation upon them from Ignorance or Malice in drawing the Consequence.

In the next place the Answerer of Catholicks no Idolaters, is made a Misrepresenter for saying, that the common Answere of Catholicks, that their Adoration of the Eucharist cannot be Idolatry, is, because they believe the Bread to be God, just as the Worshippers of the Sun, believed the Sun to be God: whereas the Catholicks do not believe the Bread to be God, &c. To which I say, 'tis so notoriously known that Papists believe (as they tell us) the Bread to be Transubstantiated, that if the Answereer's Words be as they are here set down, 'tis yet a mere Cavil to pretend that he would insinuate as if the Papists believed that which they Adore to be Bread, as we believe it is no more. And the Argument is good thus, if their mistake, who believed the Sun to be God, did not excuse...
their worshipping the Sun from being Idolatry; neither will their mistake, who believe what they worship to be Bread no longer, but God, excuse them, if it be Bread still. But I suspect the Words are more clear and full in the Answerer, at least, I make no doubt that they are sufficiently secured from the Representer's Interpretation of them, by other Passages in Connexion. For the Representer has not referred us to the Page, where he has picked up this Exception, which omission I believe was designed, because he has neglected such reference in four or five Instances more. But tho' I have upon this disadvantage given him a particular Answer here, yet I do not intend to use him to it. For the employment he has found out for us at present, is not of that weight, that I should be obliged to turn over whole Books, and some of 'em no small ones neither, to find out a single Passage that he thinks fit to carp at. And therefore, at present, I will not be concerned with the Vindication of those Deductive Absurdities, which Dr. St. would persuade to be Doctrines of the Roman Church: For the Representer here refers to the general current of his Discourse; and which is yet more unreasonable, has given me a whole Book written in confutation of the Doctor to answer. For the like reason as he has referred the proof of a hundred and fifty Lyes (without giving one Instance) against John Fox's Acts and Monuments, to the Examen of John Fox's Calendar, p. 3. p. 412. so do I too. Thus also the Arch-Bishop of York mis-quoting St. Thomas and Bellarmine; and old Dr. Willet's proof out of St. Bernard, that the Pope is Antichrist; and Bp. Taylor's misquotations and corruptions of Authors, which some Answerer of his has made to appear, shall
shall with all the rest of this kind, pass off together without any further notice. For still I say 'tis too hard an imposition, for the Representer in a few Lines to oblige us to read over so many Books; and which is by no means to be submitted to, unless the Fate of the cause depended upon it, which I am not yet convinced it does. And therefore once again, I must desire him to give in his particular Exceptions against our Authors in their own Words; if he thinks fit to go on in this way, and to tell us the particular Page or Section where such Passages are to be found; and then he shall have my Judgment in the case: But if he leaves all upon his own and his Friends credit, I shall be so civil as to do so too.

I come now to his charge upon Dr. Tillotson, for abusing Estius; but whether Estius be not more obliged to Dr. Tillotson than to the Representer, I leave it to others to judg, when I have given a particular account of this matter. I do acknowledg that those Words cited by the Representer are in Estius; but tho I cannot say whether the Dr. minded them or not, yet I believe it will either way appear, that the Representer had but little reason to make this an Instance of our endeavouring to prove some Folly upon the Papists, out of their own Authors, and then bringing in the Authors quite contrary to their own sense and words. Estius concludes that the Fire which the Apostle speaks of, 1 Cor. 3. 15. is the Fire of the Day of Judgment, which shall prove every Mans work, and purge that which is not already purged. And at length he comes to speak of the Purgatory of Souls after this Life, which seems not only not to be supported, but to be overthrown also by this place of the Apostle, since the whole purgation is reserved.
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ved to the last Judgment. To this he answers, that thus much is manifest against the Sectaries, from his Interpretation of the place, that in the World to come some Sins are to be forgiven, viz. theirs who shall be purged and saved by Fire. Nor, says he, does it follow from the Purgatory Fire of the last day, that no Purgatory of Souls is left before that day, any more than it follows from the Purgatory of Souls, that there is no purging in this Life; which, allowing for the principles of his Church, is with the rest that follows to this purpose, a good and solid Answer to the foresaid Objection. And this was the Doctor's Ground for saying, that Estius contends that it cannot be concluded from hence that there is no Purgatory. But then he goes on, Besides, we must know that as the Scripture often leaves a particular Judgment to be understood, under a general Judgment, and from the last day in which all shall be judged, will have the day of every one's Death to be understood in which each Man is judged by himself; so from the Fire that is to go before the Face of Christ at the general Judgment, and to purge whatsoever at that time remains to be purged, it leaves a certain Fire to be understood, in which a particular Judgment is exercised for the purging of Souls presently after this Life. Then come in the words cited by the Representer. Wherefore by this way the Punishment of Souls in Purgatory is well and solidly gathered. But how is it well and solidly gathered this way? Does Estius say that the punishment of Souls in Purgatory is implied in, or that it does any way follow from that general Purging which is to be at the Day of Judgment? No, he says not a word that looks this way; but only that one leaves the other to be understood, that is to say, if a Man has a mind
mind so to understand it, but not else. For 'tis a
shame to repeat that, because where the Scripture
speaks of a general Judgment, it supposes that we
must dye first; therefore when it speaks of a general
Purgatory of Men, it leaves a Purgatory of Souls be-
forehand to be understood, or well and solidly gathered.
But the Representer will say, the Question is not whe-
ther Estius's way of gathering Purgatory from this
Text, be good and solid; but whether Estius does
contend for no more than that Purgatory cannot be o-
verthrown by it, as the Dean pretended. I grant
this to be the Question; and it shall have an An-
swer, if it has not had it already. Whether the Dean made
the same observation that I have made upon this my-
sterious business; I cannot certainly say, having never
spoken with him about it: But I presume he did,
because it will clear him from any great matter of
blame, in taking no notice of the Passage cited by the
Reprenter. The Case in short is this, Estius was very
clear in this Point, that St. Paul does not here speak of
a Purgatory of Souls, but of that Fire which is to prove
the works of All at the day of Judgment. But then he
must guard himself as well as he could from the charge
of interpreting this place, otherwise than the Latins
had interpreted it at Florence; which made it necessa-
ry for him to bring in his third Question, An & quo-
modo probetur, whether and how it can be proved from
this place, that there is a Purgatory for Souls after this
Life, in pursuance of which Question he says what
we have already cited. Now, although in his Inter-
pretation of this Text, he could own, as he did, with
great modesty and good reason, that he did not fol-
low Bellarmine, Lenfane, Vicus, Bonaventure in all
things;
things; yet when the Name of a Council lay cross to him, no other kind of modesty would serve but some appearance at least of submission to it. And therefore observing that the Latin Fathers thought that Purgatory was to be established upon this place, tho' the Greek Fathers dissent; he also thought it needful to gather it as well and solidly as he could, from this place too. For by that time he had done his best, proving was dwindled to gathering; and to such a way of gathering too, that, the premises being considered, I leave it to all impartial Men to consider, whether so Judicious a Man as Estius was, contended for the point; or rather if the modest Estius, in the strait he was in, did not choose to talk beneath himself, in compliance with the Latin Fathers at Florence. So that at last we have here an Example of the Servitude of Ingenuous Minds in the Church of Rome; but not of charging Folly upon the Papists out of their own Authors. For this was that which the Dean declined the doing of; whereas if he had said, Nay, All that Estius contends for from this place is, that it cannot be concluded from hence that there is no Purgatory, altho' he makes a hard shift to avoid falling foul with the Florentine Council; here had then been no colour for accusing him of Misquotation, it had also done his business as well; only this had been to charge Folly upon Estius, and upon the Latin Fathers too, which it seems the Dean had no mind to do.

I proceed next to his Charge upon the Author of The Devotions of the Church of Rome. And first he accuses him of quoting Escobar for that which he does not say in the place cited; nay, there is not one word of it to be found in him there. Now to know whether this be so or not, it is but fair to take the whole Passage
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sage of that Author, for which he refers us to Escobar, and not as it is flily gelt by the Representer. The Passage is this: They tell us there is a vast number of Sins in their own Nature Venial, which are so very inconsiderable that an infinite Number of them altogether, will not deprive a Man of the Grace and Favour of God, or make up one Mortal Sin; and for the pardon of which there is no need or occasion for the Mercy of God. Now Escobar in the place cited, Trae. 2. Exam. 1. Chap. 4. in answer to that Question, N. 15. Whether many Venial Sins of themselves, and formally speaking, can make up one Mortal Sin? says thus, No, because innumerable Venial Sins do not deprive a Man of the Grace of God. But the Representer will not allow, that there is one word of that Passage, at least, to be found there, that for the pardon of such Sins there is no need, or occasion, for the Mercy of God. But I am sure the thing is to be found there; For he says N. 1. that a Venial Sin is that which does not render a Man worthy of Eternal Punishment: And now if innumerable Sins of this sort do not of themselves make up one Mortal Sin, I think it is plain that take them altogether, and there is no occasion for God's Mercy in the pardon of them, unless it be Mercy to pardon where there is no desert of Punishment.'Tis true, Escobar says that they are worthy of Temporal Punishment: but our Author was not obliged to take any notice of that, because that which he complained of was not, that these Doctrines brought Mens Fortunes, in this World, into danger; but that by reason of 'em, Men are in wonderful danger of being cheated in a matter of so great moment as their Eternal Salvation. So that altho the Representer professes that this Doctrine is contrary to their Belief, yet, at
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least, he must confess that it was not contrary to Escobar's; and therefore that he hath wronged our Author in charging him here with Misquotation.

The same Book says in another place, p. 56. That their saying the same thing so often over, in their Jesus Psalter, is not contrived to help and assist attention, &c. but out of pure Vanity and Ostentation, or as it were to flatter our B. Saviour, or the Saint they pray to. And this the Representer calls throwing Dirt blindfold, &c. and such Misrepresenting, that if the State or Civil Government were served so, there would be a ——— at the end of it. By which, I guess, he would be content that the Author were hanged. But one would be willing to know first what he has done to deserve it. Why, says the Representer, This is the Reason he gives of our Devotion. What? that all who use those Forms of Devotion which the Author censures, have no other End or Intention, but pure Vanity and Ostention or Flattery? To indeed the Representer would insinuate: But, as I shall make appear, the Author's meaning was that the Repetitions themselves, which he spake of, were purely vain, and do not serve to any good and prudent End: For which he chiefly blames the Contrivers of 'em, as the words plainly enough shew. But what reason he had to say this, was laid down just before in these words. Their Manuals of Devotion are so full of Tautologies, and vain Repetitions, that they must needs come under the censure of our B. Saviour, Matt. 6. tho they use his holy Name. For so in the Jesus Psalter, at the end of the Manual of Prayers and Litanies, printed at Paris, in English, An. 1682. in a Litany of Fifteen Petitions, the Name Jesus
Jesu is repeated over above 130 times: And in the same Book, in the Litany of the B. Virgin, they pray to her by 40 several Names, being only so many distinct Praises of her. Now this the Representer thought fit to suppress, which would have shewn that he did not make Vanity, &c. to be the Reason of the Peoples Devotion, but that he charged their Forms of Prayer with vain Repetitions. And here the Representer should have shewn, if he were able, that the Repetitions mentioned do not fall under our Saviour's prohibition of vain Repetitions; that they could be contrived for some good and prudent End; that they serve to any thing better than Oftentation or Flattery: Here, I say, he should have employed his Skill, and told us what are vain Repetitions, if these are not. But this was something a harder Task, than to take a Passage by it self, without that Connexion which would have explained it, and to represent the Author by it as odiously as he could. For, I say it again, he does not make Vanity, &c. the Reason of their Peoples Devotion, even in using these vain Repetitions. But indeed he says plainly enough, that they are so contrived for Vanity, and Oftentation or Flattery, that they are not Helps, but Hinderances to Devotion. But however, does not this Author make Vanity to be the End and Reason of their Contrivance, who composed those Forms? No, not that neither; for tho that Expression out of pure Vanity, &c. be, I confess, something obscure, and seems to look that way, yet it was not his meaning, as any Body will say is plain beyond all Exception, that consults the whole place. For thus begins that particular to which this Passage belongs.

M 2

Seventh-
Seventhly, Their Manuals and Books of Devotion, which they give their People to read instead of the Scripture, which they forbid to be used, tho they may DESIGN THEM AS HELPS; yet I must range them amongst the Hindrances of Devotion. By which it is evident, that he meant not to charge even the Contrivers of these Tautologies, with any design to lead the People to Vanity, because he supposes that they might design them as Helps, and not Hindrances. The Book which he carps at, is written with great Judgment, and no less Modesty; as one may discern by this, that the Representer could not find a more convenient Passage for his Anger to work upon, than that which we have seen. But we must not forget that he is all this while making good his Title of a Representer.

And now the Bishop of Kilmore is called to account for misrepresenting the Papists, by putting them upon the same File with Infidels and Pagans. For, as Delphos worshipped Apollo, &c. So, in Popery, England worshipped St. George, &c. And as the Pagans had their Gods for the several Elements, for Cattle and Fruit, for several Professions, and several Diseases, to pray to: So, in Popery, they have one Saint for the Fire, &c. Now if this be misrepresenting at all, 'tis misrepresenting with a witness, i.e. in the Answerer's Phrase 'tis misrepresenting in a strict and proper sense, and in the Representer's Phrase, downright Lying. For I do not find that the Bishop affirms any thing in all this, but matter of Fact. But will the Representer say that Papists have not Tutelar Saints for several Countries, and several Saints to pray to, for their Cattle, and
and the Fruits of the Earth? Is it true or false that St. Roch is prayed to in case of the Plague, St. Petronella under Agues, St. Apollonia against the Tooth-ach? I shall expect his Answer to this; and if he dares not deny it, as I am persuaded his Modesty will not suffer him: I shall then ask him where the misrepresenting lies? If it be said to lye in this, that the Bishop puts them upon the same File with Pagans, let us see how far he does so. He had laid down that Rule of God’s Word a little before, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. And then he proceeds to the Comparison, in which indeed he must be supposed to tax the Papists with contradicting that Rule, by their practice of worshipping their diversity of Saints, no less than the Pagans by serving their several petty Gods. But he is so far from saying, that in all respects they are as bad as Pagans, which one would understand by putting them all upon the same File, that he does not enter upon a Comparison of Aggravations, in respect to this very matter of Worship; but only shews that Rule is violated this way, no less than that. Now if this be a true Charge, I conceive it is no ill manners to speak the Truth in a Case of such vast Concern. If it be False, the Representer had done more Service to his Cause, and won more deserved Thanks from his own Communion, as well as ours, by shewing the difference between the one and the other, with respect to that Commandment, than by declining, as he has done, not only the Justification, but very craftily the Confession too of the Fact upon which the Charge is ground-
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grounded: Infomuch as they in whose Heads nothing lies distinctly, would be almost persuaded, that the Representer accused the Bishop of downright Lying, and that perhaps the Papists have not their Tutelar Saints, and Saints proper for several Occasions to pray to, as the Bishop pretended. But any thing in the World shall serve to swell the Charge, when Protestants are to be set out for Misrepresenter.

As little reason do I find for his severe charge upon the same Bishop, for observing that some place their whole Worship of God in Bodily Exercise; meaning, as I have good reason to offer for it, not All, but Some Papists. For the Bishop proceeded to lay the same charge upon the Differencers (without any currying I assure you), nay, to those of our Communion also, as any one may see, pag. 11. And what was said particularly of the Externals, in which those Papists truft, whose Religion runs out into nothing but External Show, seems to me to note no more, than the greater danger they of the Roman Communion are in of falling into this kind of Hypocrisy, by reason of the vast number of Ceremonies and Observations which they, above all other Christians in the World, have brought into Religion. These are the Passages which Anger and Ill-will have pick'd out of the whole Sermon, to expose the Bishop to His Majesty's Displeasure; by which one may see what little cause the Representer had to say, that he pretends to His Majesties Word for abusing them. If the Reader desires to know the motives he had for Preaching and Publishing this Sermon, he will not
not take them, I suppose, as they are Ridicul'd by the Representer, but go for 'em to the Preface it self, which declares what they were; and then he will find that the Representer has abused the Bishop.

Now whereas he found some Passages in the Book of Homilies of the same Strain with what he had noted in the foresaid Sermon; the same Answer will therefore serve for both: And what he adds besides, in contempt of those Divines that compiled the Homilies, is as easily answered with Contempt: And so I come to that hearty Family-Prayer, which, as he says, has raised up from Turk and Pope, defend us Lord, a Note or two higher; in as much as it runs thus. O Lord confound Satan, Antichrist, with all Hirelings and Papists. This Prayer, he tells us, is added to the end of the Singing Psalms, in a Common Prayer Book, Printed at Oxford, in the Year 1683, in Twelves; by which I guess he would bring that University too, as well as the foresaid Bishop, under His Majesties Displeasure. And therefore this Accusation is not to be passed lightly over. Now Henry Hills could have given him abundant Satisfaction in this matter, if he had been consulted. For, upon the best Inquiry I can make, I find that no Psalms, in Twelves, were Printed in Oxford before the the Year 1684, and therefore no such Impression, as the Representer means, could be there in 1683. But this is not all: for neither had those Printed in 1684, that hearty Family-Prayer, which he talks of. But the Truth of the Case is this, Henry Hills, or he and his Partners, had Printed these very Psalms, in Twelvess
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Twelves, which the Representer mentions, and that to a vast number, as I am informed by those who will make it out, if it be required. Now if Henry Hills bound up his Psalms with the Oxford Common-Prayer Books, the University is no more to answer for that, than if he had bound up his own Life with one of them. It is such another Suggestion the Representer offers at in a Marginal Note elsewhere, where he makes the Fire of London to be imputed to the Papists, in the Plates of the Common-Prayer Books Printed at Oxford, An. 1680. For no such Plates were Printed there, however they came to be bound up with some Common-Prayer Books Printed that Year at the University. I am apt to think Henry Hills is able to give as good an account of this too, as another. And I believe he can guess very nearly, who did not only Print since 1678, but has also very lately Sold, a certain Confession of Faith, as hearty as the foresaid Family-Prayer; for there Idolaters and Hereticks, Papists and Ana-baptists, are all put together, as Limbs of Antichrist. But some Men take themselves to be priviledged to do these bold things themselves, and to accuse others of the like when they have done. I am sure that either the Representer, or he, is not a little to blame for these unhandsome Insinuations; my own suspicions in this case I do not care to tell, and therefore I leave it betwixt them Two, to set the Saddle on the right Horse, as the Representer speaks upon another occasion.

Ano-
Another way of Mis-representing them which he complains of, is in laying on the colours with so much craft on the Papists Tenets, that though they are the very same, with what the most learned Protestants hold themselves, yet they shall appear so foul and monstrous, as if nothing less than a certain Damnation attended their Abetters. This, he says, is done in several instances; which makes me wonder that he chose so unlucky an instance, as that of our rendring them so Unchristian, for not allowing Salvation to any out of their own Church; in a word, for damn- ing Protestants. But do we Misrepresent them in this? mark how the Representer makes it out, Dr. Tillotson in the fore-mentioned Sermon, inveighing against the Uncharitableness of Papists — at last in a rapture of Charity concludes, 'I have so much Charity (and I desire always to have it) as to hope that a great many among them who live piously, and have been almost inevitably detained in that Church by the prejudice of Education, and an invincible Ignorance, will upon a general Repentance find mercy with God. Now instead of this, the Representer expected from the Doctor some extraordinary piece of Charity both for the Reformation and example of the Papists; and yet, says he, after all the outcry and bustle, he wont allow one more grain of Mercy to the Papists, then the Papists do to them, that is only to such who having lived piously and truly repented of their Sins, have an invincible Ignorance to atone for all other errors of the understanding, which is the very Doctrine of the Papists, in respect of such who die out of the Communion of their Church. So that we have Mis-represented Papists in pretending that they do not allow as great hopes of Salvation to us continuing and dying Protestants, as we allow to them continuing and dying Papists.

N  Now
Now I confess I am under some temptation to shew who is the Mis-representer in the Case; but this is so good a hearing, that I will not go about to clear our selves from being Mis-representers upon this occasion, but take him at his word, that here we are Mis-representers: nay, more than that, I will thank him for taking all opportunities to report us for such Mis-representers, to the people of both Communions; for thus it may be hoped that we shall never more be troubled with that Argument to perswade Ours, and to confirm His, in the Communion of the Roman Church, that since we grant the Papists a possibility of Salvation, and they utterly deny a possibility of it to us, the Communion of the Roman Church must needs be the more safe, inasmuch as both parties agree in a possibility of Salvation in that Church, but they do not both agree upon such a possibility in ours. And since we are proclaimed Mis-representers upon this account, I desire also that from this time forward, the Trade of going up and down with peremptory denouncing Damnation to all of our Communion, may be at an end, and never heard of more: And that no advantages may be made of our charitable hopes and concessions in behalf of some that dye in the Communion of the Church of Rome, since it seems the Doctrine of the Papists is the very same in respect of such who dye out of that Communion: Or at least, that no regard be given to those of the Roman Church who shall hereafter positively denounce Damnation against us, since the Representer will have it that we are as positive against them, inasmuch as to say that Papists are guilty of sins inconsistent with Salvation, is but to say, they are damned in another phrase. The Representer I say, who takes upon him to correct all false notions of Popery, and is therefore much to blame, if
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if he be ignorant of the Doctrines of Popery, has declared to the World, that whether in the way of Hoping, or of Censuring, Protestants and Papists say the same thing of each other: And therefore I think the foresaid Requests are very reasonable ones; so that this one matter is in a way of being fairly compounded, and if the Representer likes it, I am sure both parties are well pleased.

For want of other complaints, he takes up one at length, which he had dropt some time since, viz. That we take together some odd and extravagant Opinions of some Authors, to set them down for the received Doctrine of the Church. Which complaint he supports by nothing else but supposing that the so often-mentioned Archbishop of York is guilty of this in citing Bulgradus, &c. and that this is enough to make any extravagancy pass for an Article of Faith. Now he does not so much as make it appear that this Archbishop pretends the Extravagancies for which he brings those Authorities, to be Articles of Faith in the Church of Rome. But how far their Church is chargeable with the several Extravagancies of their Authors, and what use we may and ought to make of their Divines and Casuists, &c. in the Controversies now on foot, the Representer has been already told very distinctly; and when he thinks fit to Reply, he shall not want an Answer. In the meantime, to convince us of the unwarrantableness of this method, and what a wretched thing it is to charge private Doctrines upon a Church as Articles of her Faith, he brings in a Popish Preacher inveighing against the ill Manners, and especially the disloyalty of Protestants, upon one passage in the Decay of Christian Piety, another in Sir R. Baker, and a third in Jovian. Now I say, let them who do thus argue against the Church of Rome, as he makes his Popish Preacher to inveigh a-
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against us, let them I say take the shame of it. But for any thing that he has done hitherto, the men are yet to be found out: though I do not know but upon very diligent search some one such or other may be taken amongst us; and when that happens, he shall go for me, and keep company with that once Protestant who believed the Sermons of the Papists were made in a language unknown to the People. Now he confesses all this Harangue to be a piece of Sophistry, which he has put into the mouth of a Popish Preacher: Which is enough for me, and I am not at all moved by his pretending this was done to make us ashamed of practicing it in good earnest, as he has seen and heard that we do. For this is a reason I am now pretty well used to, it being the very same wherewith he defends that ridiculous Sermon which he composed for the Zealous Brother. And therefore I shall even pin this Harangue to the remainder of that Brother's Sermon, that when one is called for, the other may not be forgotten.

And so at last we come to Mis-representing, in relation to some matters of Fact and History, and here he hopes the Reader will discover notable things. The first Mis-representation of this Kind, in which he instances, was the Mis-representing of the Rich Hangings, the Maffy Plate, and other things which adorned the Altars in the times, before the Reformation, the Candlesticks, Crucifixes, and Shrines; Three Episcopal Houses, with Four or Five Churches, &c. For these were Represented as Superflitious, or Superfluous, and forthwith were immediately blown up. Now a man shall not presently find how this comes to be Mis-representing, the Papists in relation to some matters of Fact and History. He names but one Protestant, speaking of these things, viz. Dr. Heylin, and he too, is brought in.
in agreeing with the Representer in charging those doings upon Covetousness, Ambition and Envy; nor is any other Cited as contradicting him. Was not the Representer full of choler and bitterness, that he must needs ease himself whether it be in fit place or not? I see the bottom of this business plainly enough: If that Reformation of Doctrine and Worship which our Church made, be not blackened enough already, he is resolved to charge upon it all the faults of the great Men that made advantages by the Change. But must the Vices of the States-men in those days necessarily affect the Reformation? Why then must not the Vices of Popes affect Popery? If he has a mind to it, let him represent the former ten times worse than they were, and when he has done, I will shew him as many Popes Represented by their own Historians as really bad, as he has made those by Fiction, and this too by Historians of no less Credit amongst them, then Dr. Heylin is with us. The Representer owes us a good Turn, and if he can but bring in the word Mis-representing, 'tis all the pertinence he cares for, though it be Mis-representing Plate and Hangings.

Again, because he fancies that King Henry the Eighth made way for Protestantism to enter into the World (in which however, he is mistaken) he taxes him boldly of Vile Extravagancies, the respect that is due to Crown'd Heads, no nor the consideration of that Line in which this Prince stood amongst them, being not able to restrain him. But where is the Mis-representation complain'd of? Certainly the Popes Power here might be an Usurpation, though the motive upon which Henry the Eighth threw it quite off, (as it had been curbed by his Predecessors before) should not prove the best in the World: But let the Represen-
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Anwser to the Representer's last Reply. For 'tis certain, that in all other points he was a Papist, excepting that only of the Supremacy; unless the Representer will say that the whole of their Religion is in effect this, that the Pope should be all in all, in the Dominions of every Christian Prince in the World.

Luther comes next upon the File for Marrying a Nun contrary to his Vow of Chastity. By which he means a Vow of Celibacy, as if the Marriage Vow, were not a vow of Chastity too. But do not their own Divines say, that the vow of Continency may be dispensed with? And has not the Pope dispensed in greater matters? Had Luther married with his Dispensation, he had it seems committed no fault at all. And we are apt to think that if notwithstanding his Vow, he had good reason to marry, he might do it safely enough without the Popes Dispensation. But where's the Mis-representation now? Why, here's a Vow of Continency Represented as a rash and inconsiderate Vow, and this is Mis-representing Papists in relation to matters of Fact and History. And thus also honest Sir William Mis-represented Chalices, Crosses, Images, nay, Guineas, &c. Into Popish Trinkets and Trumpery, and made them fit for seizure. But I say neither was Sir William honest in doing it, nor the Representer over wise in mentioning it here.

His next Fling is at Sir Richard Baker, who upon the Executions of several great Men in Queen Mary's Reign, chanced to say according to his wonted Eloquence: Now the Cataracts of severity will be open-
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ed, that will make it rain Blood. Well, but to bring off honest Sir Richard for once, he does not say that this severity was Tyrannical or Unjust, for if he had, certainly the Representer had brought us all under the lash for it: But the ends of these great People being Tragical, he thought good to set the matter off with a Tragical, or, as the Representer calls it, a *pat phraze*, without any further design. And then as for the other Blood spilt in Queen Mary's Reign, which he seems to charge altogether upon Provocations, Tumults, Seditions, and Rebellions; he is guilty of the same fault, which he accuses Protestants of, *viz.* Of Representing things by halves. Were none put to death in those days but for such causes? Were Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Taylor, and almost all the 300 spoken of, burnt for Herefy or not? Was not the Question concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, the burning Question? For those that were guilty of the Abuses he mentions, they might thank themselves, we defend them not. But what colour is there for Representing all as such? And why will the Representer put us upon talking of these things, who had said nothing of them, if he had not forced us to it in our own defence.

But to see now how much there goes in the telling a story: *Queen Elizabeth put to death,* as he says, *Two* hundred Persons upon the score of Conscience, without any actual Crime or Misdemeanour against the Ancient Statutes of the Land. Two hundred Persons! Truly I do not know but in her long Reign of about 40 Years, so many might be put to death. But I wish the Representer, since he pronounces in general with so much confidence, had named One or Two that were put to death upon the score of Conscience, and likewise what point of Conscience it:
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it was. However something is necessary to be said in general Answer to that Charge which he plainly intends, though he would not plainly speak it out. In short therefore, about ten Years after the Queen came to the Crown, Pope 

Pi
tus Quintus sends over his Bull for the Excommunicating and Depositing her, upon which followed the Statute against the Execution of it: Which yet did not hinder several Priests and Jesuits from trying to have it Executed, in pursuance whereof the Queens Life was more than once in danger. And therefore when no other Remedy would serve the turn, all Popish Priests of the Queens Subjects, were banished under the Penalty of Treason, and had forty days given them to prepare for departing. This Law was made at least twelve years (I believe more) after the Popes Breves were sent hither: And upon this Law some Priests that were afterwards found here, were Executed, and some were not, who though coming into England contrary to the Law, yet withal, giving security for their dutiful Behaviour to the Queen, were, without changing their Religion, set at liberty: For, if we may believe one that knew these things better then the Represente
er seems to do, though our Princes judged it necessary for their own safety, that this Law should continue in force, yet to avoid the doing of any thing that looked like putting men to death upon the score of Conscience, they qualified the rigour of it by their own Mercy, where a Trea
sable design did not otherwise appear. For when Goodman a Jesuit, was Reprieved by King Charles the rst, and the King was Expostulated with by the Parliament about it, he signified the cause to be this, that Goodman had been found guilty, merely as being a Priest, which was the reason of the King's
King’s mercy, and that in this clemency he did but follow the examples of his Father, King James, and of Queen Elizabeth. Now whether we should believe King Charles the Martyr, or our Representer, I leave others to judge. This general account may serve for his general charge; and I do not think fit to run out into more particulars, unless the Representer gives occasion; but I leave him to consider better of these things: And when he has done it, he may perhaps feel a little shame for having said just before in the Case of Queen Mary, Now one would think to be just to Crowned Heads, the Blood should not be exposed alone to the People, but likewise the Occasions and Provocations given: And in Queen Elizabeth’s case I will adde, And the mercy also that was shewn, notwithstanding those Occasions and Provocations that were given her.

But whereas he calls the Law we speak of a Law of her own contriving, a Law so cruel that the like is scarce to be found among the Mahometans, who though they have conquered many Christian Nations, yet never, as he has heard of, made it Treason for their Natives to profess their own Religion, or maintain their Pastors. To let pass the Misrepresentation he insinuates, of making it Treason to profess their own Religion, it would almost tempt a man to search the Records of old Time, to see if something has not passed in the World as cruel as this Law, if it had been executed to the utmost rigour. For why should Queen Elizabeth, under whose Reign our Nation purchased some Glory abroad, suffer now at home the imputation of being the most Tyrannical Prince that ever was in the World; beyond the examples of Mahometans? and of Mahometans too in their severity towards the Christian Nations which they have Conquered; why, this is strange indeed,
An Answer to the Representer's last Reply.

and not to be taken upon the Representers word: For there are Annals that speak of a certain Law, not indeed for the Banishing of people upon the score of Conscience, but the keeping of them at home to be tormented for their Conscience. Had they been suffered to use the Liberty that our Saviour once gave, of Flying into another Country, when they were Persecuted in their own; it had been a favour in comparison to the restraint; and Death had been a mercy to the Vexations they endured. The like to this indeed is scarce to be found even amongst those whom the Representer speaks of: And which made the case yet harder, this People had not deserved ill of the State, they neither sided with Forreign Powers, nor with Domestic Rebels; nay, they had behaved themselves so well, that there was nothing but their Vertue to make them feared. But Histories say that those of them who escaped by miracles of Providence, were well received everywhere, and especially by a Prince who was not of their Religion, but yet to his immortal Glory gave them Refuge and Relief in his own Countries.

As to the Powder Plot which he next mentions: His insinuation concerning my Lord Cecil, has been so often expos'd, and if it were true, is so unable to lessen the guilt of those that were concerned in it, that I see no reason why I must needs enter into that History: We do not charge all of that Communion with it, but we have reason vehemently to suspect all that went about to excuse, and positively to condemn all that thought fit to praise the Traytors. But if we should have charged, as he pretends we do, the Church of Rome with this Treason, yet I am confident the Rebellion of the West stands not altogether so fair to be imputed to the Church of England: For surely there was no
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no Act of this Church for the Excommunicating and Deposing of the King; but it was the sight of the Pope's Brief to such a purpose as that, inspired one of the Traytors, as himself confess'd, with those thoughts that at last settled upon the Powder Plot. And I think it was a Church of England Parliament, and a Church of England Army that so loyally served his Majesty upon that occasion in the West: But let the Representer shew, if he can, that the Papists were as serviceable in the prevention of the Powder Plot.

We are now drawing to an end of a tedious Complaint, which surely cannot last much longer, when he is fain to spin it out with a story of the long divilish Knives which Papists were said to procure for cutting of the Protestants Throats. For I am so perfect a stranger to the least report of this matter, till I met with it here, that I can say nothing to it. As for the Fire of London, that I confess I have heard of, and likewise that many charged it upon the Papists; now for those that did so, I hope I may without offence offer that excuse for their credulity, which I take a hint of from the Representer himself: It could not be expected but that the grief of undoing a Calamity in vast numbers of suffering People, should discharge it self in accusing those as the Authors of it, who, as they believed, were well pleased with it: As for the Representer, what his thoughts are towards London, he has given us plainly to understand; in calling it a Protestant Sodom, which Heaven consumed. Now I dare say this was not meant for a lamentation over the sins and sufferings of the City: But if men will go on to insult at this rate, they should however, be less clamorous against those mistakes of which the greatest occasions are given by themselves.

Then
Then as to that which he calls a *Monsieur’s Invention*: They that gave credit to it, have this to say for themselves, That *Du Moulin’s* public offer to make full proof of his story, when Authority should require it, stood many years, even to the day of his death; which was no improbable argument that he was provided with reasonable good testimony, though it was not thought fit to call upon him for it. This may be said to shew, that if there were never so many that swallowed the story, yet this was no reason for the Representers furious exclamations: For I am by no means satisfied that they who believed it, did so in defiance to all their Senses; for though there were Actors and Contrivers of the Murder of King Charles the First, as public as the noon-light, yet I do not feel any such contradiction in supposing that some Contrivers there might be who were not as public as the noon-light: And when the Representer thinks of it better he will say so too, unless he will say, that because the Contrivers of that dark Treason of the Powder Plot, were at last as public as the noon-light, therefore that it was in all likelihood a Contrivance too, of the good Lord Cecil, cannot be credited, but in defiance to all our Senses. And yet after all, how does it appear that we have laid any such stress upon *Du Moulin’s* Relation, as the Representer intimates: For my own part in all the conversation I have had amongst Protestants, I can remember nothing concerning it, but that it has been sometimes a little wondered at, that he was never required to prove his story. And therefore I doubt the Representer has here plaid the part of an unwise man, in reviving a story to the disadvantage of the Papists, which died with the first report of it, as we thought at least, for unless the Representer thought we had some reason to believe it, why should he
he go about to complain that we do believe it? I think we have been more Jut to his Party, than he has. For our sense as to this matter is, that since now the story is not capable either of being proved, or disproved, it is to be let fall, and the World is no more to be troubled about it; though whilst Du Moulin was alive, it was not to be expected but that one or other would be harping upon it.

At last he comes to the Garagantua Mis-representation of them all, that is, the Divine Oates with his Popish Plot. And here, as from a Castle where he is safe from all possibility of Assault, he bids defiance to us with all the Rhetoric, that Anger and Scorn can inspire a man with al. But because he lets fly at the Pulpits for this, and so makes the Clergy to have given what Authority they could to Oates his lies from their Pulpits, I must needs change a word or two with him about that in our own Defence, and tell him that neither is himself of that Credit, nor the thing it self so likely, but that it stood in great need of particular proofs. I know not but that amongst Ten thousand Men, here and there one might deliver the news of the Pilgrims, and the Black Bills from the Pulpit. But I never heard of any that did, and I almost think that if the Representer had known a few instances of this Kind, out they had come, if it had been for nothing but to support the Credibility of his general Accusation. And to go further with him, whereas he confidently says, that the WHOLE Plot was received with that welcome and Credit, that what would have been questioned in the very Scripture, was entertained without any scruple. I will make bold to ask him, by whom it was entertain’d, did himself believe the whole Plot, while he was a Protestant? If he did, undoubtedly
doubtedly we have not loft one of the wisest of our Party, If he did not, neither did any body else that ever I could hear of, though perhaps many might believe more then was true. But for a more particular account who believed much, who little, who nothing at all of Oates his Discoveries, and the reasons of the several Opinions, he must excuse me for that; I am resolved not to be drawn in. Nor have I lately spoken with every Man in the Nation. And 'tis onely for a Representor to talk of these matters, and to pronounce generally without exception, though he does it also without examination of the particulars before hand.

Thus far I have waited upon the Representor in examining the Reasons, upon which he pretends that we use. I know not how many Methods to Mis-represent Papists, though it has been every step out of the way: For if all had been true that he pretends, what is all this to the Defence of his Thirty-Seven Chapters? What is it to his Answerers, who had no more to do then to rid their hands of those Thirty-Seven Chapters? And they have done it so effectually, that the Representor has thought good to rid his hands of them too.

But I think by this time, it may appear that he has all this while given us just cause to complain, that we are many ways Mis-represented by Papists, though the Representor without just cause, was resolved to be before hand, in the same Complaint against us.

For not to repeat those Mis-representations, False Constructions, and Wry Interpretations of Protestant Authors, &c. which I have shewn him to be guilty of, in examining some of his Complaints; it were a very easie matter to convict him of no less untrue then spite
spiteful insinuations against all Protestants without exception in this, and in his other pieces. I shall at present give but one Instance, and that in this his last Reply, where he says, that the Protestant Persuasion has its Name, Being, and support not from what it is in its self, but from what it is not, in defying and protesting against their Neighbours. 'Tis easy to see what notion of Protestants such Passages as these are intended to imprint upon the minds of Men. But does the Representer in good earnest, believe that our Religion is a mere Negative Religion, and that we should have none at all, if we had no Neighbours to defile, and to protest against? Or does he believe that our Religion so far as it is Negative, is supported by defying and protesting against other Men; does he not know that we at least pretend to support it by Reason, Scripture, and Antiquity? Nay, does he believe that there are no Affirmative points of Religion which we maintain against them, and in respect of which they do in reality protest against us, though it seems we have got the Name of Protestants. If he does believe thus of us, much more if knowing the contrary, he says so however, Where's Truth, Charity, or Justice? If we take the Religion of Protestants, as it stands in opposition to the Errors of the Church of Rome, it is in many Points Affirmative, and the Negative is on that Churches side. For instance, that God onely is to be Worshipped, is as Affirmative a Conclusion, as that God is but One, and that Christian people are bound to read the Scriptures is as Affirmative, as that they are bound to lay their Prayers, and that the Laity have a Right to the Communion under both Kinds; is surely as Affirmative, as that they have a Right to One only. Why then does the Representer say, that the
the Protestant Profession has its Name, Being, and Support; not from what it is in its self, but from what it is not? But to let this pass, what although the Points held by us in opposition to the Church of Rome, were only Negatives; yet, why must we be so bitterly represented, as if our Persuasion were supported by nothing but pietishness and a Spirit of Contradiction to our Neighbours? Why must we be brought in as defying and protesting against our Neighbours? As if we opposed their Doctrines and Practices, in despight to the Jews, and not rather blamed them for saying and doing things which we at least think are not to be justified? There are divers things surely, which neither Christians nor Men ought to do; And so far as our Religion stands in not doing such things, one would think it is not the worse for being Negative, nor our Practice to be blemished for having its Name from what it is not. And therefore when Men come in with their Negatives in Religion, and their protestations against false persuasions and evil practices, they are not without more ado to be represented as Defying and protesting against their Neighbours. But least of all, should it be insinuated, as if our whole Religion in effect, stood in this Defying and protesting: For we do in the first place Glory in this, that we are Christians, though we are not ashamed to be called Protestants. In our Religious Assemblies, where we confess our Faith before God and the World; we profess no other Articles of Faith, than those in which the Church of Rome agrees with us. By this it is that we are Christians, and it is this that makes them so. This Faith which we profess, and into which we were baptized, is the Foundation of our assurance, that if we live accordingly, we shall be saved, and of our hopes that
that those among them, who are disposed to receive the Truth, and repent heartily of all known sins, shall find Mercy with God, notwithstanding their Captivity to those Errors, which if we should profess, we could not have the least hope for our selves. In the mean time for our Negatives against that Church, we offer in our own defence, that the Religion which the Scriptures teach, is such a Negative Religion as ours, they not injoyning, and in some points forbidding what we do not do; and that the truly Primitive Fathers neither professed those Doctrines, nor did those things, which the Church of Rome would have us to profess and to do; so that their Religion was not more positive, nor less Negative then ours. But if it grieves good Men in the Roman Communion, that there should be amongst Christians, any Protestation of one Party against what is done by another, it is a grief also to us; only with this difference, that we cannot help it, but they can. For if they will Reform the Terms of their Communion by the Scriptures, and Primitive Antiquity, they shall soon see an end of our protesting, and that our Perswasion is not supported, as this Representor faith, by defying and protesting against our Neighbours; then which he could not have laid a viler thing against us, no not if he had put us upon the same File with Infidels and Pagans; since this is in effect to say, That we have no Religion but in crofness to other People.

But at this rate we have been used all along, though we have made no complaints of it, onely they force us to it now, whether we will or no: Thus even in their Catechisms, where one would expect plainness and sincerity, we find ourselves Mis-represented in that manner, as if there was no such way of making Novices
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fast to their Church, but by giving them false notions of ours: For at present, to name no more then their famous Doway Catechism, there you shall find the Teacher giving this wise reason, Why Protestants are so divided, and damn one another for Mis-believers? Because, forsooth, it is the very ground-work of Protestant that all men, even the whole Church of God, are fallible and subject to error. We say indeed that all men are subject to error; but the very ground-work of Protestant is not as this Catechist pretends that the Church of Rome and every other Church is subject to error, but that she hath actually erred, and that grievously too. And his Inference from hence is no less a Mis-representation then his principle: So that, says he, they cannot pretend to Certainty or Infallibility in any one point of their Belief. So that because he is pleased to put Certainty and Infallibility together, he must needs teach his Scholar that we have not so much as Certainty of our Faith, nay, not of one Point of it; and which is still more false, that we cannot pretend to it. No wonder that we find it so hard a matter to get a little Discourse about Religion with those whom they have had the breeding of, when we see what an absurd pretence to Religion they represent ours to be all at once; especially since they take care to let them know, that 'tis not well possible for any two Protestants or Sectaries to be of one Religion, every man expounding the Scriptures as he lifts, and no one having power to control the others Exposition of it. Which if their Schollars believe, they must needs conclude that Protestants must profess as many Religions almost, as they are men and Women; since it is not well possible for any two of them to be of one and the same Religion: And, I think, any body may see that this is taught to discourage all who are educated in this per-
persuasion of us, from hearing what we have to say for ourselves, since by hearkning to one or two of us they are never the nearer, but must talk perhaps with a million before they can understand the Religion of Protestants, nay, and shall then be as much to seek for it as they were at first. For what he says of every man's expounding the Scripture as he lists, no one having power to control the others' Exposition of it: It is also an untrue suggestion, if by expounding the Scripture as we list, he means arbitrary and groundless Expositions of Scripture. Which when the Representer pleases, I can prove the Church of Rome to be more guilty of then any Church that we know in the World besides: If any are guilty of it amongst us, there is a power in our Church to control them, which has also been used upon occasion, unless by power he means a Cudgel, and this we do not take to be Church power. Again, he says that all Heretics pretend equally to the Scripture for their Novelties and Heresies, (which is not true neither) no one of them ever yielding to another: Which is notoriously false; for many of those whom he calls Heretics, have yielded to the reasonings of others out of the Scriptures, who are also Heretics with him: And this plainly shews that some of these men care not what they say to disgrace us, when they will so positively affirm a thing which 'tis impossible for them to know but it may be false; nay, which 'tis not well possible for them not to know that it is false.

'Tis after the same way that our Doctrines and Practices are represented by retail; of which I shall give you but one instance which I well remember, and that is where the Catechist assuring his Scholar that their Laiety receive whole Christ under one kind: Tells him also that this is incomparably more than the pretended Reformers
formers have under both, who receive only a bit of Bakers Bread, with a poor sup of common Vintners Wine. By which scandalous way of representing our Communion to a Novice, he would be apt to believe that when we celebrate the Eucharist, our great business is to send to the Baking-house for Bread, and to the Tavern for Wine; and so we fall to eating and drinking without any more ado. If he would be Steeling his Novice against us, he should at least have been so just to us, as to let him know that we do not give the people common Bread and Wine, though we do not pretend to give them the natural substance of Christ's Body and Blood.

For that way of Misrepresenting us by charging the particular opinions of some Protestants upon all: They have the confidence to do it, even in those points wherein neither Protestants nor Papists are of the same mind among themselves: And though the Doway Catechism represents us so divided that 'tis not well possible for any two of us to be of the same Religion, yet when again 'tis for their turn to Represent us otherwise, there is not an odd opinion of any Protestant, but forthwith it belongs to the Religion of all the rest. Thus we have been charged for making God the Author of Sin; and that for nothing but for the sake of those Opinions held by some Protestants, which are no less vehemently defended by some Papists: In which kind of Representations no man, I think, has out done the Reconciler of Religions (whoever he was) printed in the year 1663. They teach, saies he, profane, false, and ungodly Doctrines, as for example: That God is the Author of Sin; that Christ despairs upon the Cross. Which latter Opinions, this man and Fovardentius, and divers others, as I well remember, fasten upon Calvin; and then talk as if it was the received Doctrine of all Protestants
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testants. So says he, They say that Christ suffered the P. 14. pains of Hell upon the Cross, and that this was his Descent into Hell. See Calvin here, Psal. 15. Now I think Calvin does say so: But 'tis so small a matter in Comparison, to charge what one says upon All, that I shall lay no great stress upon it. But that which follows is admirable: Neither, says he, are they miserably mad only, but also diabolically malicious; for its of meer purpose they say and do thus, lest that by clear places of Tradition and Scripture they should be constrained to confess that there is a Purgatory. Are not these rare Men, thus at once to charge us with what we do not say or do, and withal to pronounce concerning our Intentions in so doing, and that in this Vile manner, that no honest Heathen ever used his Neighbour so? Nay, if you will believe this Representer, They that hear Sectarian Ministers are not Believers, for they do not truly believe in God the Father Almighty, nor in Jesus Christ his only Son. For he knows their Hearts better then they do themselves: and let them be never so confident that they do, he will prove that they do not believe in the Holy Ghost. And he peremptorily says that they do not believe the Communion of Saints: And lastly, That neither do they believe forgiveness of sins. For which he brings an excellent Reason, Because they say, The Priests cannot forgive Sins: Though we do not say that neither, but only that they cannot forgive Sins Absolutely; which now they would persuade us too, to be their own Doctrine. Thus he has made us Infidels almost throughout the Creed, only at last he grants, that we believe the Resurrection of the Flesh, and the Life Everlasting; which I wonder at, because it was as easy to invent a reason why we believe not this neither, as for all the rest.
rest. But then even in this matter, we are no better Believers then the Devil. For, says he, this they believe, and so do the Devils.

No wonder therefore that he comes afterward, and puts us upon the same File with Turks and Heathens. As the Turks are divided and subdivided among themselves, so are the Protestants. The Turks wheresoever they come, demolish Churches, destroy Crosses, and beat down and break Altars, and Images; so do the Protestants. The Turks cannot abide Praying to Saints; no more can the Protestants. The Turks love not Beads nor Holy Water; no more do the Protestants. The Turks above all things, hate the most Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and so do the Protestants; which alone is enough to shew that in their Religion or Belief, they are like Turks and Heathens. This I think may serve at least, to set against the Bishop of Kilmor's Parallel: Though I ought to ask the Bishops Pardon for making the Comparison. For as to that Parallel between Protestants and Turks, it is not in every particular true, for Protestants do not demolish Churches wheresoever they come, nor break down Altars, nor destroy Crosses, nor always Images. And as to the particulars that agree to both, how much malice soever there may be, I am sure there is little Wit in putting them and us together upon these Accounts. For certainly, we are no more obliged to do any ill things, because the Turks themselves forbear them, then we are obliged to forbear any useful or innocent Customs, merely because the Papists use them. Had this Reconciler shewn our Agreement with the Turks in some Practices that we could not but confess they are to blame for; this indeed, had been a shrewd Instruction to us, to amend that in our selves, which we cannot but con-
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demn in People so grossly deceived as they are. Now this it was; that the Bishop of Kilmore did in that Comparison of the Papists Worshipping their Tutelar Saints, with the Heathens Worshipping their Petty Gods. The Papists do with us, justly condemn these Practices of the Heathens. The Bishop only desires them, being thus prepared, to look at home. But to infer that in our Religion, we are like Turks and Heathens, because we forbear those things, which the Turks are to be justified in not doing; is a Mis-representation of us, upon so wry an Inference, that if there be not want of Wit, to excuse it, it will be found equivalent to a down-right Mis-representation, which the Genius of this Author, as it appears, by the particulars of this Book, makes me fear it is.

And of a great many particulars which I might note, there is one not to be let pass, and that is, that he does in very good earnest, affirm that we adore the Sacrament, though the Representer would be thought to charge us with it, little more then in jest. For says the Reconciler, Though they say thus of us, for Worshipping of Images, yet they can dispense with themselves in Worshipping their Sacrament. And if this be not jesting, 'tis something a great deal worse; for it is as notorious, that we do not Worship the Sacrament, as it is that the Papists do.

But to go on with him a little farther. Their Preachers saith he, what are they forsooth? Intruders, Thieves and Robbers, Hypocrites, Ravenous Wolves, and Murderers; Sons of Belial, False Prophets, and Priests of Baal; which is their Heresy, Rebellion and Stubbornness against the Church. —— And if the Preachers be so, What must the Hearers be? Why sure enough, they shall both fall into the Ditch of Everlasting burning Brimstone and...
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and Fire, &c. Unless they be Converted, do Penance, and live in the Church. Now this way of Mis-representation by railing at, and damning us, is as crafty a method, as any they have to imprint upon weak minds an incurable prejudice against our Communion. For when we are confidently represented as damnable Wretches, that shall certainly be Damned, if we continue Protestants; especially by Men, that at other times talk demurely, and always look gravely when they give us these good words, it cannot be expected, but that some or other should believe there is more then ordinary Reason for it, though they are not able to find it out. We may say what we will in our own Defence, let but these Men go on to say still that we are Damned, and the very noise and din of these words, and the like, shall make them deaf to all the Reasons we can bring. And therefore every degree of this dealing, is to be condemned in any party, wherever it is found, because it is a way to work upon the Passions and Imaginations of People; and instead of directing, it does but confound their Judgment. But I must needs say, we have suffered under this injustice by those of the Church of Rome, beyond any examples that I have yet seen.

Of which, I will give the Representer one instance so remarkable, that it may serve instead of a great many. Mr. Harding, who had to do with no lefs a Man than Bishop Jewel, thought fit to use us in this Fashion, as follows: *Te are moved by the Instinct of Satan; the Devil hath you fast bound, and ye are the Children of the Devil: Te are the limbs of Antichrist. Our Church, he calls the Synagogue of Antichrist and Lucifer; and we are no better with him, then Profane Hell-bounds, Wicked Cains brood, Turkish Huguenots*.
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An answer to the Representers last Reply. nay, he says that the Fiends of Hell begat Lutherans and Calvinists; and that we would say if we durst, that Christ is the Abomination of Desolation, and that Antichrist is the true God. And then I think he had reason to say, That the Devil coming from Hell, hath carried us away. Thus in his Rejoyniser he bids the Hell-hounds of Zuinglius and Luther's litter, bark until their bellies break; and calls the Defender one that is like a mad Dog; and for all this, he that has a mind to see more of this, may find two Pages in Folio full of it, just before the Preface to the Bishops Defence of his Apology. Now it is easie to Judge what effects this kind of Eloquence will work upon weak minds, especially when he that uses it, has the Face to say as Harding did in the Preface to his Confutation. The manner of writing, which I have here used, in Comparison of the Adversaries is sober, soft, and gentle, and in respect of their heat, bitterness, and railing, as many tell me, over-cold sweet, and mild.

I do not say, that they never speak of us, but in this strain; for I do well remember that the Apology for the Papists which came out about Six or Seven Years after the Restoration, treats us after another manner, I mean us of the Church of England; for then it could call us Men, Brethren, and Fathers, and would fain unite them and us together against the Fanatics: For why? then we were some-body, and it was not amiss to curry with us: But there was a time when we indeed were as no-body; and then the Dissenters were worth being curried with; insomuch that Dr. Holden, who was always esteemed by us as a person of the best temper and truest moderation among them, could
could not forbear shewing the difference he put between them and us, even where there was no necessity at all so to do, but the mere necessity of currying: For to a Discourse concerning Infallibility in Religion, Printed at Amsterdam 1652. Dr. Holden gave his approbation in these words amongst others, That the Book demonstrated the false Foundations of the Presbyterian Consistory; of the Socinian Ratiocination; of the Independent's Private Spirit; and of the ERRONEOUS, OR RATHER NO GROUNDS OR PRINCIPLES OF THE LATE PARTICULAR ENGLISH PROTESTANT SCHISMATICAL SYNAGOGUE. But why are the several Dissenters so softly and gently touched? Presbyterian Consistory, what harm in a Consistory? or in Ratiocination? Nor is much anger expressed in giving the Private Spirit to the Independents. Why, surely these are all complemented in comparison to the Church of England, which is the Particular English Protestant Schismatical Synagogue of Erroneous, or rather of no Grounds or Principles at all. But why this difference I say? Why, nothing is plainer, it was then THE LATE Church of England: But when the Apology came forth, it was then the Present Church of England again. Then was Then, and Now was Now. Thus we are used by some of the very best of them.

But to return to our Reconciler, He wisely considered that we might take sanctuary in the Bible against the hard words and reproaches they persecute us with; and therefore to spoil that retreat, he will not allow that we have the Word of God amongst us; for thus he faith, The Protestants, or Sectarian Bible is defective, therefore evil, and consequently not the Word of God; for besides, what we have above said, almost every year they
they correct it and mend it, chop it and change it, as they do their Almanacks, adding thereunto what they will, and subtracting what they please. This is such mis-representing, that I had rather the Representer should give the proper name to it, then do so myself: Nay, if this man were to be believed, we make such material alterations in the Version or Edition of our Bible every year, as infers a necessity of altering our Religion upon it, the Bible being the ground of our Religion; for says he, Neither do they change their Bible onely, but also their Religion and Fashion thereof grounded on it. If then every following years Bible be better then the former, why may not the next years Bible be better then this year, and so to the end of the World? and in the mean time the Sectarian Bible never be perfect, or better then a yearly Almanack; not so good as an Almanack for Ever; as is Erra Pater, or the Shepherd's Prognostication, or Seaman's Calendar. Why then should it be more the Word of God then Aesop's Fables, or the Turkish Alcoran? One would think now that he had done his worst against our Bible; but he understood his trade better then so, & therefore because this calumny needed it very much, he was resolved to help it with a good share of that confidence, which I observed before, was peculiar to these men. For as if he had been yet over cold, sweet, and mild, he mends the matter by saying, that our Bible is worse then Aesop's Fables; it is Diabolical Inventions, and Heretical labors, and a Sacrilegious Instrument to deceive and damn all such poor Souls as believe it, and therefore worthy to be burnt with Fire in the middle of the Market at noon, and let all the people say Amen, so be it. This was a good hearty man I warrant him, and would not willingly lose his business by doing it by halves.
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I should now have done with him, but that I find him afterwards imposing upon his Reader with as shameful a Down-right Mis-representation of us, as ever was invented: For says he of our Clergy, All their Mission was either the inspiration of a Spirit they know not what, or the Commission of a Child, or the Letters Patents of a Woman, or the illicit and invalid ordination or mission of or by one Scory an Apostate Monk, who ordained the first Bishops at the Nagg's-head in Cheapside, in Queen Elizabeth’s time. Now I would desire the Representer to consider with himself how he would have set us forth to the World, if we had invented the story of Pope Joan, as they have done this of the Naggs-head Ordination: Why, surely he would have muttered up all his Figures to represent us as the lewdest Varlets upon the face of the Earth? But though we have received that story from their own Authors, and know what advantages to make of it, if we needed them; yet we are very willing to hear what any learned man can say to disprove it, and to allow all reasonable presumptions against it. Of our Adversaries we beg none of this candor, and desire no more of them then not to tell tales of us of their own invention. As to this Naggs-head business, I ask the Representer two things, one is, Whether himself believes it? the other, Whether they have not commonly and boldly reported it up and down amongst us? Let him then remember how he declaimed against us for creating in the people such an aversion to Popery, which he did not wonder at, because he considered that ten thousand Pulpits have been for many years declaiming against them, where every man has had a liberty of exposing them as he pleased, &c. Well, but what must we have expected by this time, if the Ten thousand Pulpits had been all this while at their
their Service, when they have not been afraid to publish such scandalous untruths against us, even whilst they had not all the liberty of doing as they please; which he imagines we have taken: If they take this freedom of telling of Tales, even here amongst us, without any colour of proof, and against the Testimony of unquestionable Records; we may, I think, without Uncharitableness guess that where they are under no restraint, they represent our Doctrines, as they please, and charge them with what Consequence and Interpretations they please, and expose our Practices as they please, &c. And make Narratives of us as they please, and make us as guilty as they please, and have made Truth and Gospel of any thing against us as they please. And when I consider these things, I cannot wonder that in some parts of Spain (where the Mif-representing Trade has gone rarely forward,) they are made to believe that we English, since we turn'd Heretics, are grown Satyrs, and have gotten Horns and Tails.

I am now something weary of this unprofitable Labour, and shall therefore add but one thing more, which is, That some of them are wont to Reproach their Adversaries only by their Faults, when they pretend to give them their whole Character, and to add what they have any Colour for, out of their own Heads, and sometimes without any Colour at all; but especially when the manner and circumstances of their dying are to be related, for here the Attention and Passions of the Reader are commonly raised very high. Of all which Bolfec's Life of Calvin, is a memorable Instance: Thus when he brings him to his declining Age, he tells us the several Diseases which afflicted him for many years to the last Gasp, were a certain and express Token and Testimony of God's anger against him; and answers that Ob-

\[\text{Calv. c. 22.}\]
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...jection against it, from the Calamities that befel Job, by the deliverance God sent him at last: Which kind of reasoning gives every man to the Devil that dyes of painful and tormenting Diseases. But not content to argue from those Diseases by which Beza said that he ended his Life, viz. Consumption, Cholic, Stone, &c. incident all of them to Old Age, and especially to Men of a Sedentary Life: Bolsec adds one out of his own Brain, With which, as he says, God's open Enemies by his just Judgment have been punished, viz. That he had a most filthy and poisonous Ulcer about his lower parts, which were corroded by Vermin. Thus, says he, Honorius the Second King of the Vandals, Dyed, after he had persecuted the Orthodox Church eight years; thus Maximianus, the most cruel Enemy of the Christians; and thus Antiochus; and thus Herod, who Usurped the Honour of God; thus many more Hypocrites and Enemies of God perished, who under pretence and colour of Sanctity and Zeal, had fought against the Truth, and after a miserable death in this World, have been thrown headlong into the Everlasting Torments of Hell. And in this manner, as he says, was Calvin marked out; nay, he affirms it to be most true, that the Wretch not being able to bear his horrible Tortures, called upon the Devil, and expir'd with Oaths, Curses, and Blasphemies. Well, but one would expect now a very notable proof of so wonderful a matter as this was, and of all the rest that he says upon this occasion: Why, says Bolsec, they have given Testimony to this, who were about him in his Sickness to the last: And therefore let Beza and others deny it as they please, the thing is sufficiently plain. Was ever malicious Story supported by more feeble Testimony then this? It seems we must take Bolsec's word, that Calvin's Friends and Servants reported these things:
things: But can any man be so silly as to think that if Bolsec had come to the knowledge of this by any certain or probable means of Intelligence, that he, I say, would have suffered us to go without it? But then if he had pretended particular Proofs, he had laid himself open to be particularly baffled: for which reason the safest way, was to say in general, 'The Servants said so, and the thing is plain, and there's an end."

Thus also Cochles represents Luther's Death, viz. That he went to Bed merry and drunk, and was next morning found dead in his Bed; his Body being black, and his Tongue lolling out, as if he had been strangled, which some think was done by the Devil, some by his Wife; and as they carried him to the Church to bury him, his Body stank so that they were constrained to throw it into a Ditch, and so they departed. Which is a very pleasant story, but that another tells it so croffly, that 'tis impossible but one of them must be guilty of Leesing. The truth is, they were so impatient, that these kind of Tales were told and sent up and down before the Man himself was dead, as I shall further acquaint the Representer when he desires it.

In the mean time I forbear, as he says, and wish there may be no occasion given, to carry on the Controversy in this manner. This very little that I have said of a great deal more that remains, being designed only to shew them what may be done, if they think fit to leave the Question, and to fall upon us for Misrepresenting them, instead of maintaining their Doctrines like Scholars and Disputants.

There remains now but one thing more to be considered, and that is, What Reason the Representer had to tax the Author of the Exposition of our Doctrine,
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Strive, with wishing for Moderation in the deepest Satyr, condemning the want of Civility in others, with the most exasperating Reflections of his own, and a great deal more to this purpose; which according to the most impartial Judgment that I can make, is all said without Cause given. And the declamation of the Representer hereupon, shews only that if he had lighted upon a fit Subject, the man does not want words to set it out to the Life. But what has that Author done? He charges them with their Art of Palliating, with want of Fairness and Civility, with laying aside Moderation, and falling into a vein of Lightness and Scurrility, forgetting that Religion is the Subject, and Christians and Scholars their Antagonists, &c. These things I confess he lays to their charge: But where's the Satyr? Where are the Exasperating Expressions? The Pen steep'd in Gall, and the Uncharitable Exposing, for which he seems, to the Representer, but to make a serious Droll? 'Tis true enough, that to accuse men of Palliating their Religion, of want of Fairness, of falling into Lightness, of trivial Jestings, and accommodating their writings to the Genius of Scepticks, who divert themselves at the expense of all Religion. This I do acknowledge to be Satyrical, and as the Persons may be upon whom it falls, Exasperating. But then the Satyr and the Sharpness lyes not here in the Manner of saying, but in the Truth of what is said: And I hope that Author does not deserve ill of these men, for speaking the plain Truth of them in Expressions so soft and inoffensive, as if he had taken time to choose the gentlest: If they do not now represent their Religion with that Sincerity which one would expect from Christians, I know a great many sharper words, whereby one might justly express that Fault, but scarce
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scarce one that has less keenness, then that they Palliate. If they bring in a Zealous Brother Ridiculing our Church, instead of Defending their own; could any thing be more cool, then to complain of want of Fairness and Civility, then to resent their Falling into a Vein of Lightness and Scurrility; and to put them in mind that Religion is the Subject, and Christians and Scholars their Antagonists. If this be turned into matter of Accusation too, we have an ill time of it, who must have to do with men that can well enough endure to do all these things, but cannot endure to hear of it again, though in the mildest way of Representing it: Had that Author, whose Books the Representer may be ashamed to acknowledge that he has read; had he, I say, written in the Representer's strain, had he said any thing like making the King's Capital City a Protestant Sodom, and the Fires of Southwark and the Temple, our Evangelical Proofs against the Papists; and the Preachers Theme the alarum to keep the drowsie Flock from nodding; had he set the Representer any example of such unhandsome levities as these are; and which, to say no more, are hardly tolerable upon the flag, then indeed the justice of his charge would not have born him out in his management of it: But when that excellent man had charged them with no more then what he has terribly proved, and that is Palliating, or with no more then what is flagrant in their last pieces, viz. Want of Fairness and Civility, &c. in a word, with no more then what is true; and this without virulence or so much as levity of expression, (for which I leave the World to judge by those very phrases which the Representer has picked out of his last Book) and yet for this, his Pen must be said to be steeped in Gall, and his Antagonists exposed under the most odious character.
imaginable. I might well make more, but I cannot make less of it, then that some men are very much exasperated by being shewn to themselves.

And now, if I had a mind to take every occasion, he has given no small one by bringing in that Parable in the Scripture, Of the Trees choosing a King; to illustrate his own seriousness in the Drolling Sermon he composed for the zealous Brother: But I forbear at present, because he pretends to forbearance too.

For the advice that he has given the forementioned Author, I do acknowledge that it were very good, but that it wants pertinence and occasion; and for that reason looks more like an unjust Accusation, then a charitable Admonition. But if he thinks good counsel is always to be received with thanks; I lay to him what he says to our Expositor, Let him turn to such of his own Communion who have given bad examples in the business of Mis-representing. And let him too that gives good advice take it also; which though it be not so easie, it will yet be better for him: But above all things, Let him endeavour that their Arguments and Methods for the defeating of Protestants, be not such as any Jew may take to strike at Christianity, and every Atheist to make a shamb of all Religion. Which advice is so good, that 'tis pity it should be loft upon those that need it not; and therefore I desire him to recommend it to the Author of the Parallel between the Doctrine of the Trinity and the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. Let the Representer do his duty well upon this occasion; and I can hereafter tell him of others wherein his interest will prevail more then mine.

But because the Representer is sincerely of our Expositor's mind, That this way of handling Controversies, doth rather exasperate then heal our Divisions. I will tell him
an effectual way to prevent it. Let them Represent their Religion like men that are not afraid to let the people know the bottom of it; and when they offer to defend their Doctrines, let them not pretend to go on with their first undertaking, when they leave it, and fall into Invectives against their Adversaries: for if they would honestly confess that their business is to make us look as odiously as they can, they should, for me, go on in this way till they are weary, without any recrimination. If the Representer desires also that these Controversies may have an end, let him persuade his Friends not to produce testimonies out of the Fathers for Popery, without taking notice of the Answers that have been so often made to them: Which advice, if it had been given and taken, we had not seen the Consensus Veterum, and the Nubes Testium. Let them not furnish out Books with Arguments that have been often offered, and as often answered; but take the Controversie where it was left by their Predecessors and ours, and then go on with it if they can; which had been very good advice to Mr. Clenche. Let them not begin all over again, to spin out the time, and to make our Disputes endless: Let them write and do like men that hope to gain upon the World by Reason and Argument. As for our parts we shall be careful to follow his last Advice, and to prove our selves true Members of the Church of England, not onely by maintaining the Truth which She hath taught us, but by practising those Principles and that Loyalty which we Preach; that as we are sensible to whom we owe the Liberty we enjoy, so we may approve our selves not altogether unworthy of it, but be always able to give some good account of our selves, with respect to these Controversies, both to God and the King.

THE END.
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ACTS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE FRANCH CLERGY IN THE YEAR MDCLXXXV. CONCERNING RELIGION. TOGETHER WITH THE COMPLAINT OF THE SAID GENERAL ASSEMBLY AGAINST THE CALUMNIES, INJURIES AND FALSETIES, WHICH THE PRETENDED REFORM'D HAVE, AND DO, EVERY DAY PUBLISH IN THEIR BOOKS AND SERMONS AGAINST THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH. PRESENTED TO THE KING BY THE CLERGY IN BODY, JULY THE 14TH. 1685. TO WHICH IS ADDED, AN ADVICE HOW TO READ BOOKS OF CONTROVERSY, AND SOME QUERIES ABOUT RELIGION.
TO THE

KING.

SIR,

THE Clergy of your Kingdom have frequently made Complaints to your Majesty, against those of the Pretended Reformed Religion; and always took an exact care not to mention any thing in the Papers they presented to you, but what was both necessary and very clearly proved.

But they thought this ought to be separated from all the rest; because this, of all others, most sensibly touches them; appears to them the most important; and may be proved by the most authentick Testimonies.

This Complaint, Sir, regards the Faith of the Catholick Church, whose Purity the Ministers and Writers of the Pretended Reformed Religion seek to blacken, by unsufferable Injuries, and Calumnies of the deepest Dye.

They know it cannot be attacked with solid Reasons; they have by Experience found, that the Arguments they bring to prove their new-invented Doctrine, make slight Impressions in the Peoples Minds. They daily see, that when they faithfully represent the Sentiments of the Catholick Church, they can neither justify their separation, nor excuse the Extravagancies of their first Reformers. Finding it therefore impossible, by this means, to maintain their Ground, they have recourse to an unjust, and pernicious Artifice: they impute to the Catholick Church an infinite number of gross and palpable Errors: they suppose that she either disguises or condemns the most essential verities of Religion; and representing her under the hideous Idea of a Society, professing an impious Doctrine, and denying the chiefest Articles of Faith, no wonder the Peoples Minds under their Conduct, should be so far alienated as to feel a horror, and detestation of her.

The Clergy has long time, with grief, perceived the sad Effects
of this their Malice, and studied to find out some means to damm the Current.

The last Assembly, in Eighty two, upon this account issued out a Pastoral Advertisement, directed to those of the pretended Reformation. They thought by exhorting and pressing them to explicate the reasons why they separated from us, they might induce them to make a more serious Reflection; and that they would be ashamed to see their Breach with us, to have been grounded only upon Calumnies, and Suppositions.

And God be praised, their endeavours were not wholly frustrate; for of the almost infinite number of Heretics, who have since that time been converted, there are but very few who did not return to the Bosom of their Mother Church, upon the force of this invincible Argument; that seeing there cannot be any lawful cause of Separation, all those which the pretended Reform’d alleged in their behalf, can bear no weight.

But there is one obstacle which did, and does at present, hinder the chief Effects which were hoped from it. That voice of the Bishops and Pastors of the Catholic Church, could not reach the Ears of the common sort of People of that persuasion; the Ministers either dissuaded them from reading this Pastoral Advertisement, or gave false Explications of it, as they do of the Holy Scripture, and Writings of the Fathers. By this means, Sir, the greatest part of your Subjects, of the Pretended Reform’d Religion, still live in Error, and the Evil will be without a Remedy, unless your Majesty support by your Protection, and by your Authority uphold, what the Clergy has so happily begun.

Although our Kings, your Majesties Predecessors, permitted the Exercise of the Pretended Reform’d Religion, upon Conditions only, in times of Disturbance, and for reasons which no longer now subsist; and though, considering the flourishing State in which your Majesties Wisdom and Valour has established this your Kingdom, the Clergy has just reason to beg a revocation of those Edicts, which granted this permission; yet this is not at present what they insist upon.

It is not for the revocation of any Edict, they make this humble Supplication to your Majesty.

There is none, neither can their be any, that permits the pretended Reform’d to Calumniate the Catholic Church, or to charge her with false Doctrines, which she neither did, nor does, at present, teach.
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That would be a strange and wicked Privilege, which the Ministers themselves would blush to own.

Imputations and Calumnies are Crimes which both divine and human Laws condemn. They are severely punished, when they only touch the reputation of Particulars; but much more criminal, when they strike at the whole Body of the State.

The Pretended Reform'd, how great soever their Blindness be, are not arrived to that height of Folly, as to maintain it to be lawful for them to Practice those Crimes, or to complain of your Majesty, for your Prohibition of them.

Yet this however (Sir) is the sole Grace your Clergy here demands; that so long as it shall please your Majesty to permit the Pretended Reform'd to excercise their Religion, they may be forbid to continue to make use of those Injuries and Calumnies, which they have formerly, and do daily, publish in their Books and Sermons.

Your Majesty will see clearly, it is not without Grounds, your Clergy offers you this Complaint.

Tho' we have abstained from relating many of their Terms, which thwart the rules of Modesty, and which St. Paul would not have to be named amongst the Faithful; yet your Majesty will be amaz'd to see to what almost incredible excesses Passion has carried our Reformers.

There's not one Article of our Faith, which they do not abuse by gross Injuries, and Calumnies not to be endured.

This Collection which the Clergy has made, and takes the liberty to present to your Majesty, is a full Conviction of it.

They accuse the Catholic Church of professing Errors. They accuse her of not believing the Fundamental Verities of Christianity; and to lay the charge home, they affect the most outragi-and injurious Language.

The Clergy (Sir) complains of so unreasonable a manner of Proceeding, and to evidence so great Injustice, beseeches your Majesty to compare the Doctrine, which is attributed by the Calvinists, to the Church of Rome, with that which is contained in her Profession of Faith, and the Decisions of the Council of Trent.

This comparison is the most natural, and the surest way to judge of the Justice, or Injustice of the Pretended Reformers accusation: And this, Sir, is the only thing your Clergy, with due Submission, begs of your Majesty.
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We have, to avoid Confusion, and to shew the truth more clearly, noted each Article of Faith in Particular, and formed thereon two Columns.

In the first we have transcribed the proper terms of the Profession of our Faith, and of the Decisions of the Council of Trent: and your Majesty will see therein the true Doctrine of the Catholick Church.

We have in the second, related the very words which the Pretended Reform'd make use of, when in their Books they propose the Faith of the Roman Church: and your Majesty will there see what kind of Doctrines they impugn to us.

And by the Parallel alone, than which nothing can be more simple and sincere, your Majesty will clearly see there's no resemblance, but on the contrary, the difference to be so sensible, and so palpable betwixt what the Roman Church professes, and what is attributed to her by the pretended Reformers, they are plainly convinced of Calumnies and Impostures.

If the Question concerned only our own Persons in particular, we would not, Sir, appear before your Majesty with these complaints, that we might by your Justice, and your Authority obtain the Reparation of those injuries, which these Ministers daily utter against us in their Libells; on the contrary, the Clergy would be overjoy'd to testify the sincere Charity they have for them, by Patience, and a voluntary oblivion of all such injuries: but we cannot neglect the Honour of the Church our Mother, which these Ministers assaule with Calumnies; nor the Conversion, and Salvation of so great a number of her Children, as they keep in error by their false pretensions.

We doubt not, Sir, but these very Considerations will sensibly touch your Majesty, and that having (as you testify upon all occasions) so much Zeal for the Salvation of your Subjects, and so great respect and veneration for the Church, you will by your Authority suppress an evil, and an injustice which is so contrary, not only to the Principles of Christianity; but also to the most common Rules of Natural Equity.

Upon which account (Sir) we humbly beseech your Majesty, First: To renew (by what way you please, or by what methods you think most convenient) the Edicts and Declarations by which it is ordained, the Pretended Reformed should use respect in speaking of the Mysteries of our Religion, and to forbid them hereafter in proposing, or refuting the Articles of our Faith, to make use of those injurious terms which they have hitherto affect-
ed, and which the Clergy has here collected, and to abstain for the future, from the like expressions. Secondly, Seeing the Doctrine of the Catholick Church is clearly propos’d in her profession of Faith, and in the Decisions of the Council of Trent, to forbid them in like manner also, to impute to the Catholick Church any other Doctrine, or any of those Errors which they have hitherto had the boldness to charge her with, though she always detested and condemned them, in what Authors forever they were found.

By this means (Sir) you will imprint in the minds of all your Subjects, that inviolable respect which they ought to have for our Faith and Religion; and whilst those of the pretended Reformation, who shall be converted, do voluntarily submit themselves to the Orders of the Church, and with comfort embrace her Doctrine, the Enemies of her Truth, as well as of her Glory, will not at least have any longer the liberty to abuse her by their scandalous proceedings.
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The King's EDICT,

Forbidding all Ministers, and other Persons whatever of the Pretended Reformed Religion, to Preach, or compose any Books against the Faith, and Doctrine of the Church; or to use injurious terms, or such as tend to Calumny, by imputing to Catholicks those Tenets which they Condemn; or to speak directly, or indirectly against the Catholic Religion.

Registered in Parliament the 23d. of August, 1685.

L E W I S by the Grace of God, King of France, and Navarre; to all that are present, and to come, Health. The Deputies of the Clergy of our Kingdom assembled by our Permission in our City of St. Germain en Laye, having represented to us, that amongst all the means which are made use of by the Ministers of the pretended Reformed Religion, to hinder the Conversion of some of our Subjects, who make Profession of that Religion, they find not any more efficacious, or in which they have greater success, than that of giving a false Idea of the Catholic Religion, by Impositions; and at the same time having besought us to hinder the Continuation of so great an Evil, by what means we should think most convenient; we have caused those Errors, which the Ministers of the pretended Reformed Religion, and some other Persons who make Profession of it, do impute to the Catholic Religion in their Sermons, and in the Books they compose, to be examined, and seeing nothing is more opposite to that respect with which our Edicts oblige them to speak of the Catholic Religion, than to accuse it of a Doctrine, which it condemns, and that it is not just to permit their Calumnies to imprint in the Minds of our Subjects, a horror of that Truth, which they would necessarily love and embrace, if they were not deprived of the knowledge of it by these Artifices; and having on the other side considered how the Ministers of a Religion tolerated in our Kingdom, by our Edicts, and those of the Kings our Predecessors, should be content to teach their own Doctrines, without raising disputes against that true Religion, which we profess, and from which their Predecessors in this
this last Age so unfortunately separated themselves: We have thought it necessary to stop the course of a Liberty, which produces such sad effects. Be it known, that for these Causes, and others hereunto moving us, and of our certain Knowledge, full Power, and Regal Authority, we have by this present Edit forbidden, and do forbid all Ministers, and all other Persons, of what quality and condition soever they be, making Profession of the pretended Reformed Religion, to Preach, or to compose any Books against the Faith and Doctrine of the Catholic, Apostolick, and Roman Religion, and to use any injurious terms, or tending to Calumnies, by imputing to Catholics those Doctrines which they condemn, and moreover to speak directly or indirectly, after what manner soever, of the Catholic Religion. We command the Ministers to teach in their Sermons only the Tenets of the pretended Reformed Religion, and the rules of Morality, without mixing therewith any other matters. Furthermore we forbid the said Ministers, and all our other Subjects, who profess the said pretended Reformed Religion, to cause to be Printed, any Books touching Religion, excepting those which shall contain their Profession of Faith, the Prayers, and the ordinary Rules of their Discipline, and all Printers and Booksellers to Print, or vend them: We will that all the Books which have been made till this present time, against the Catholic Religion, by those of the pretended Reformation be suppressed: We forbid all Printers to print them hereafter, and all Booksellers to vend them. We ordain, the Ministers, and our other Subjects of the pretended Reformed Religion, who shall transgress the Ordinances of this our present Edit, to be condemned to an honourable amends, and banished for ever out of our Kingdom, and their Goods which are subject to confiscation, confiscated, and that the exercise of their Religion to be for ever interdicted in those places where the Ministers shall have preached against the contents of our present Edit. We will in like manner, the Printers and Booksellers, who shall Print or vend the said Books contrary to our Prohibition, to be fined fifteen Hundred Livers, and for ever deprived of the liberty of keeping open Shop, &c. Given at Versailles, in the Month of August, 1685. and in the 43d Year of our Reign. Signed, Lewis, &c.
THE
DOCTRINE
OF THE
CHURCH,
CONTAINED
In our PROFESSION of FAITH,
and in the Decrees of the Council of TRENT.
OPPOSED
To the CALUMNIES, INJURIES, and FALSITIES,
dispersèd in the Works of the Pretended Reform'd.

Fidei Professio quæ habetur in fine Concilii Tridentini.

The Profession of Faith inserted at the End of the Council of Trent.

EGO firma fide-Credo & proficior omnia & singula, que continetur in Symbolo Fidei,
quo S.R. Ecclesia utitur, vide-tur. CREDO in unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, factorem
Caeli & Terræ, visibilium omnium, & invisibilium: & in unum Dominum JESUM CHRISTUM Filium Dei unigenitum;

I With a stedfast Faith, believe and profess all and every Article contained in the Symbol of Faith, which the Holy Catholic and Roman Church doth use. To wit: I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven
and Earth, and of all things Visible and Invisible: And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, and born of his Father before all Ages: God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, Consistential to the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us Men, and for our Salvation, came down from Heaven, and was Incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, AND WAS MADE MAN; was Crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered, and was Buried; and rose again the Third Day, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into Heaven, sitteth at the Right Hand of the Father; and shall come again with Glory, to judge both the Quick and the Dead; of whose Kingdom there shall be no End: And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life; who proceedeth from the Father, and the Son; who, together with the Father, and the Son, is ador'd and glorify'd; who hath spoken by the Prophets: And one Holy Catholic and Apostolick Church. I confess one Baptism for the Remission of Sins; and I expect the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Life of the World to come. Amen.
ARTICLE I.

Of the Canonical Books of Scripture, and of Tradition.

PROFESSION FIDEI.

Apostolicas, & Ecclesiasticas Traditiones, reliquas ejusdem Ecclesiae Observationes & Constitutiones firmissime admitto & amplector, Item Sacram Scripturam juxta eum sensum, quem tenuis & tenes Sancta Mater Ecclesiae, cujus est judicare de vero sensu & Interpretatione Scripturarum admitto.

CONTINUATION

Of the Doctrine of the Church, contained in our Profession of Faith, and in the Decrees of the Council of Trent.

Firmly admit and embrace Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and the other Observances and Constitutions of the same Church. I also admit the Holy Scriptures.

CALUMNIES, Injuries, and Fallacies dispers'd in the Works of the Pretended Reform'd, against the Doctrine of the Church.

THAT with (a) the Heretics mentioned by St. Irenæus, we reject the Holy Scriptures: (b) That with the Marcionists, we accuse it of Imperfection: (c) That we contemn it:


(c) Theilaurus disputatum Theologicarum in Academia Sedanensi variis temporibus habitatur a Pastoribus & Theologiae Professoribus; Petro Molinæo, Jacobo Capello, Abrahamo Ramburtio, Samuele Mareño, Alexandro Colvino, Ludovico le Blanc, Josia le Vafeur, Jacobo Alpavo de S. Maurice, Theof de meritis operum part. 2. Edit. Genevensis anni 1661. tom. 1. pag. 699. Scripturam quidem contemnere Pontificis solenne est.
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ART. I.

That (d) we commonly teach, The Scripture is not necessary, and that the Church can be without it: That (e) we prefer Traditions before the Holy Scripture; that we attribute more Authority to them, than to the Scripture; which, we say, has no Authority but by them: That (f) according to us, Tradition corrects the Holy Scriptures; that it changes the Commandments of God, and dispenses with them contrary to the Apostle: (g) That


(e) † In eodem Thesauri disputatur. Sedanensi thef. 12. tom. 1. pag. 6. In Ecclesia Romana Traditiones non scrivetur multo pluris sunt Scriptura, earumque est longe majus Autoritas, quam Scriptura, usque adeo, ut adversarii quidquid Scriptura habeat in dubio velint pendere ex autoritate Traditionis Ecclesiae. Andreas Rivetus ubi supra; * Georgius Dounamus ubi supra.

(f) † In eodem Thesauri disputatur. Sedan thef. 14. cit. de perfectione Scripturarum. tom. 1. pag. 61. Tradicio Ecclesiae (juxta Pontificios) emendas Scripturam mandata Dei imo utat & dispersa ab Apostolo.

2 I will never understand nor interpret the same, otherwise than according to the unanimous Consent of the Fathers.

1 The Holy Council also, with the like Affection of Piety and Reverence, embraces and venerates Traditions, whether they regard Faith or Manners; as being dictated either by JESUS CHRIST, or by the Holy Ghost, and conserved in the Catholic Church by a continual Succession.

we call the Scriptures a dumb Rule, a stumbling Stone, a Nose of Wax, a Two-edged Sword:

That (h) we place the Roman Church one Degree above the Holy Scriptures, and the Pope Two: That (i) our Doctrine concerning this Point leads to Atheism, and the overthrow of all Religion: And that (k) it has no other Authors for it but the Pharisees, the Disciples of Simon Magus, and the Montanists.
ARTICLE II.

Of the Efficacy, Number, and Ceremonies of the Sacraments; of Penance and Auricular Confession.

I

DOCTRINE of the CHURCH.

I

Do (1) also profess, there are truly and properly Seven Sacraments of the New Law, instituted by our Lord JESUS CHRIST, and necessary for the Salvation of Mankind, though all be not necessary for e-

CALUMNIES of PROTESTANTS.

That (2) the Sacraments are corrupted, bastardized, and falsified in the Church: That (b) they are polluted by unworthy means: That (c) they are fouled and spattered with many prophane Opinions:

That (d) we teach, That

(a) La Confession de Foy des Pretendus Reformez de France art. 23. Nos condamnons les Assemblees de la Papaute, ven que la pure verite de Dieu en est bannie, esquelles les Sacraments, sont corrompus, abatardis, et falsifiez du tout.

(b) Theodorus Beza Vezelius in Antithesi Papatus & Christianismi tractationum Theologicarum Edit. 2. Genev. an. 1576. tom. i. pag. 71. Satis appareat Sacramenta indignissimis modis pollui ac perdi, in Papistica Synagoga, qua Catholicæ Ecclesiæ nomen fui falso vendicat.

(c) Joannes Calvinus in respons ad Cardinalem Sadoletum opusculorum ultimæ Edit. Amstelodamenfis anni 1667. pag. 111. Sacramenta ostendimus, multis profanis opinionibus inquinata.

(d) Martinus Lutherus in Libro de Captivitate Babylonica, tom. 2. Edit. Wittembergenfis anni 1558. fol. 75. Impulsi sunt tandem tribuere Sacramentis novæ Legis, ut prodesse ex statuerunt, etiamvis, qui in peccatis mortalius sunt, nec requiri fidem aut gratiam; sed sufficere non possuissse obisem, hoc est actuale propositione nemo pectori. Philippus Melancthon in Apologia Confessionis Augustanae titulo
Of the Efficacy of the Sacraments.

very Man: That is to say, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony.

1. If any one say, These Sacraments of the New Law do not confer Grace by themselves; but that Faith alone, in the Promises of God, is sufficient to obtain Grace; Let him be Anathema.

1 Persons of riper Years are in a Disposition to receive the Sacraments conferre Grace to those of riper Years, though they have no good disposition in their Hearts, and are in a state of Mortal Sin, supposing only they have no actual formed Design of committing a new Sin: That this impious and Pharisaical Opinion is taught with full Authority in the Church: That we permit those who receive them, not to be attentive to what they do; and that, according to us,


(e) † Thesaurus disputat. Sedanens. th. 6. de Baptismo part. 3. tom. 1. pag. 779. Id volunfari, ex opere operato, id est, vi nude actionis, nullam enim attentionem aut devotionem requirit in eo qui baptisatur, etiam si satis adultus. Nam si adultus dormiens aut incogniti & alius agens baptisetur, statuunt eum Baptismo regenerari, eique sidem insinudif, satis esse ad efficaciam Baptismi, si baptisatus non post obicem, id est, Baptismum data opera non aversetur: Et ante pag. 753. th. 6. de Baptismo part. 3. tom. 1. pag. 779.
A R T. II.

it suffices, they do not designedly put an hindrance, and oppose what is there Administered to them: That (f) we give Occasion to believe, the Indevotion we bring to the Sacraments, arguments their value: That (g) we make the Efficacy of the Sacraments to consist in a certain Incantament, like that of Magick: That (h) we will have the Holy Ghost so to act in the Hearts, when he disposes the Persons to the Sacraments, that he does not

squando nuda actis & celebratio est efficax, etiam si nulla dispositio, aut devotio accedat in administrante, aut recipiente & nulla sit recipientis attentio, modo ne data opera ponat obicem & contranitatur.

(f) † Ibidem th. 20. pag. 755. In Sacramentis susciendiis, evagatione mentis & supinitati parte est securitas, quasi ex ipsa induvovione Sacramentis, pretium accessorius.

(g) † Ibidem de Sacramentis in genere part. 1. th. 27. pag. 750. Cum deo sic agere, quasi vinciretur syllabis & formulis astringeretur, quae labes a magica Disciplina in Religionem transit. Guilielmus Bucanus Theologiae Professore in Academia Lausaniensi, loco 46. de Sacramentis, paragr. 75. pag. 650. Edit. 3. Bernæ Helvetiorum anno 1605. vi verborum, quasi magica incantatio, &c.

That passing from the fear of Divine Justice, (which was at first necessary to stir them up) unto the Consideration of God's Mercy, they are raised up in Hope, trusting that God will be Propitious to them for the Love of JESUS CHRIST; and begin to love Him, as the Fountain of all Justice: and are therefore animated with an Hatred and Detestation against move them interiourly: That (i) it is a constant Tenet amongst us, That it is not necessary to be sorry for Venial Sins: That (k) Confession is the Butchery of Souls, a Tyranny over Consciences; the Snare of Desperation, the Bait of Priests and the Church, to enrich themselves, and gain a formidable Authority: That (l) the Power of Absolving is a Declaration of War against God; that

(i) † Idem Thesaurus disputat. Sedanens. th.26. de Sacramento Pœnit. part.1. tom. i. pag.685. Constans est Pontificiorum sententia non esse necessi conteri, de pecatis venialibus, sed tantum de mortalibus.


The Doctrine of the Church. Sin; that is to say, By that Repentance which ought to precede Baptism. Lastly, When they resolve to receive Baptism, to begin a New Life, and to keep the Commandments of God.

I Professio Fidei. Et ex his (Sacramentis)

I believe, that Three of these Sacraments,


Of the Efficacy of the Sacraments.

that is to say, Baptism, Confirmation, and Order, cannot be reiterated without Sacrilege.


ART. II.

1. If any one shall deny Sacramental Confession either to have been Instituted, or to be necessary to Salvation, by Divine Right, or shall say, That the manner of Confessing secretly to the Priest alone, which is practiced in the Catholic Church, is not conformable to the Institution and Command of JESUS CHRIST, but that it is an Human Invention; Let him be Anathema.

2. If any one shall say, That in the Sacrament of Penance, it is not necessary by Divine Right, in order to the Remission of Sins, to confess all and every the Mortal Sins, that the Ceremonies used in the Church are Magical Incantments; like those which the Devil taught his Disciple Apollonius Thyaneus; that they are Superstitious, Prophane, Impious, Ridiculous, &c. taken from the Pagans, Jews, and Ethnophriarian Heretics, &c. That Holy Water is a renewing of the Heresie of the Hemerobaptists; and the Ceremonies of Mafs, a Farce; that we attribute to Ceremonies a Power to give Grace, and to chase away the Devil by a kind of Charm, in imitation of the Pagans; that the Church has by these Ceremonies changed Christianity, not only into Judaism, but also into Paganism: That (o) we make Idols

Opinio operis operati uti voce, ita magis sensu barbaro, cum externis signis sacrilegii potestatem attribuat, precum ipso Christo externorum rituum Idola Ecclesia tractanda, & colenda offerat.
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quorum memoria, cum debita & diligent præmeditazione habeatur, etiam occulta, & que sunt contra duo ultima Decalogi Precepta, & circumstantias, que speciem peccati mutant, &c. Anathema sit.

which, after a due and diligent Examen, shall be remembred; yea, even secret Sins, and those which are committed against the two last Commandments, with the Circumstances which change the Species of the Sin, &c. Let him be Anathema.

I do also receive and admit the acknowledged and approved Rites and Ceremonies of the Catholic Church, in the Solemn Administration of the aforesaid Sacraments.
ARTICLE III.

Of Justification and Merits.

PROFESSIO FIDEI.

Embrace (1) and receive all and every one of the things, which have been defined and declared in the Holy Council of Trent, concerning Original Sin and Justification.

2 Conc. Trid. s. 5, in Decreto de Peccato Originali, §. 3. Si quis Ade peccatum, quod origine unum est, & propagat, non imitasse transmittit, DA FINIS. That (a) it is Blasphemy against God, to say, We are not Justified by Faith only; and that it is not sufficient to be Justified, to have Faith in JESUS CHRIST: That (b) to Explicate the Word FAITH, as we do in this Point of Justification, is to destroy Faith, and Christian Religion: That

(a) In Confessione Fidei Ecclesiarum Belgicarum oblata Synodo Dordrechtana, inter Aeta hujus Synodi pag. 308. primar partis Edit. Elsevir. anno 1600. approbata est, hac Confessio in Synodo Protestantantium Galliae Vitriaci habitate 25. Maii anno 1583. Necessarium est, aut omnia, quae ad salvum nostrum requiruntur in Jesu Christo non esse, aut si in eo sunt omnia, tum omnium qui sive Jesum Christum possident, totam salvum habere: afferere itaque Jesum Christum minime sufficeret; sed alii quoque prater ipsum opus esse, horrenda omnino in Deum blasphemia est. Nam inde sequeretur, ipsum Christum ex parte tantum Servatorem esse. Merito igitur dicimus cum Paulo nos sola fide justificari.

(b) Thesaurus disputat: Sedan. th. 22. de Justificatione part. r. tom. r. pag. 625. Hominibus quibus propo sit, Christianam Fidem cuniculis subjacere & machinis evertere, Saebam suggerit compendiosam viam, qua omnes vocis (Fidei) corruptione, totam Fidem Christianam perfunderent; & Fidem Christianorum a Christi gratia, ad suas ipsorum virtutes & opera convertent.
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(c) in Justification and Penance, we content our selves with meer Human Endeavours, rejecting the Assistance of the Holy Ghost: That (d) out of diffidence in the Merits of JESUS CHRIST, we have recourse to our own Good Works, and to the Intercession of Saints: That (e) we adopt the Error of the Pelagians, concerning the Impecca-

bility of the Just: That (f) we teach, Baptism gives us the same

ration, and not by I-

mitation, becomes pro-

per to every one, can be taken away either

by the Power of Hu-

man Nature, or by

other Remedies, than

the Merits of JESUS

CHRIST our Lord,

and only Mediator,

who has Reconciled

us by his Blood; or
deny, the same Merits

do not become pro-

per to every one, can

be taken away ei-

ther by the Power of

Human Nature, or by

other Remedies, than

the Merits of JESUS

CHRIST our Lord,

and only Mediator,

who has Reconciled

us by his Blood; or
deny, the same Merits

do not become pro-

per to every one, can be taken away either by the Power of Human Nature, or by other Remedies, than the Merits of JESUS CHRIST our Lord, and only Mediator, who has Reconciled us by his Blood; or deny, the same Merits of JESUS CHRIST are applied, as well to those of riper Years, as to Infants, by the Sa-

(f) Joannes Calvinus l. 4. Instruct. c. 15. paragr. 10. pag. 351. Perspicuum

est quam falsum sit, quod docuerunt pridem nonnulli, in quo alii persistunt, per Baptismum solvi nos ex omni peccato, & a corruptione, quae ab Adam in univer
sam posteritatem propagata est, atque in eandem iustitiam nature quam puritatem restitut, quam obtinuisset Adam, sive in quoad primum creati fuerat, natura in-

sum omnibus, inest uniuene proprum, vel per humanae naturae vires, vel per aliud remedium afferit tolli, quam per meri- tum unius mediatoris Jesu Christi, Domino nostri, qui nos Deus reconciliavit, in Sanguine suo, aut negat ipsum Christi per Baptismi Sacramentum in forma Ecclesiae rite collatum, quam adultis, quam parvulis applicati, Anastem sit.


1 Sect. 5. Si quis per Jesu Christi Domini nostri gratiam, qui in Baptismate confertur, rectum Originalis Peccati remittit negat, aut etiam afferit, non tolli totum id quod veram & propriam peccati rationem habet; sed illud tantum dicit radi, aut non impurari, Anathema sit, &c. Manere autem in baptisatis concupiscentiam, &c. hanc quam aliquando Apostolus peccatum appellat, declarat.

If any one deny the Guilt of Original Sin to be remitted by the Grace of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, conferred in Baptism, or affirm, all that has truly and properly the Nature of Sin, not to be taken away; but only, as it were, blotted out, or not imputed; Let him be Anathema. Nevertheless, the Holy Council confesses and

Degree of Sanctity Adam would have had, if he had persevered in the State of Innocence: That (g) our Doctrine which teaches Original Sin to be taken away by Baptism, is Diabolical; that the Glory of JESUS CHRIST, and the Salvation of Souls require it be not tollerated; and that it was forged upon the Anvil of the Avarice and Ambition of the Clergy, to extol the Efficacy of the Sacraments, and to augment the Honour and the Revenues of their Function: That we fall into a Contradiction, by saying,

(g) Theodorus Beza in Antithesi Papatus & Christianismi extinct. Theologicar. c. 7. tom 1. pag. 63. Romani originis peccatum, levi aequaque asperrime, voluet statim ac penitus in nobis elui, & ejus reliquias docent peccati rationem non habere, nisi consenses accedat, quam Doctrinam prorsus diabolisam esse affirmamus. Hieronymus Zanchius operum Theologicorum Vol. 1. tom. 4. Edit. Gamonetian 1605. pag. 71. l. 1. de peccato Originali cap. 5. thesi 3. de Concupiscencia in renatis: Non potest negligi hoc Controversia, quin neglegatur gloria Christi, &c. Ergo si nobis cordi ess gloria Christi & salus nostrae, non debemus permittere, ut Pontificia fententia obtineat in Ecclesia; sed pro viribus expugnanda ess. † Johannes Heydeggerus in Anatome Conc. Trid. ad 5. de Peccato Originali. tom. 1. pag. 131. Totum dogma de expun- tione Peccati Originalis per Baptismum, ad avaritiae & superbia incendem formationem ess. Id enimdam operam Clerici, ut Sacramentorum, que ab ipsis conferuntur, extollatur efficaciam, & inde ministerio suo lucruram ac bonos acceperat.
acknowledges that 

Concupiscence, or the Inclination to Sin, remains in Persons Baptized; but also it declares, this Concupiscence, which the Apostle sometimes calls Sin, was never understood by the Catholic Church to be called Sin, as being truly and properly Sin in the Regenerate; but because

(h) Concupiscence is not properly speaking a Sin in the Regenerate; and that it is to accuse the Apostle of not having thought of what he writ, to pronounce Anathema to the Holy Scripture; and to commit a kind of Deicide: That (i) according to our Doctrine, we prepare our selves for Grace, and merit it by our Works, which precede


Philippus Melancthon in Epitome renovato Doctrina Ecclesiasticae tom. 2. pag. 4. Aristotelici Theologi docent meritus nos nostris viribus & nostro conatus gratiam † Le Ministre Noguier, reponse a l'exposition de la Doctrine de l'Eglise par M. l'Eveque de Meaux pour lours Eveque de Condom. 1. partie c. 12. pag. 103. Monsieur de Condom ne donne t-il pas a connoître, qu'il approuve ce que toute l'Ecole de Rome soutient, que si l'homme par son libre arbitre ne peut pas faire des œuvres, qui méritent la vie Eternelle, il peut avoir des mouvements, qui le disposent a recevoir la grace, ce qui s'appelle dans leur langage merite de con- gruité. † La seconde Reponse de l'Anonyme au mesme ouvrage de M. de Meaux pag. 85. Le Concile de Trente enseigne que de nous-memes, nous nous preparam, et nous disposons a la grace, qui nous regenera. Franciscus Burmanus in Synopsi Theologiae l. 6. c. 8. Sect. 25. tom. 2. pag. 241. In eo erant Pontificiis, quod meritem operibus ante gratiam factis tribuant. † Jurieu dans fon Livre intitule Preservative. pag. 150. article 7. Le Concile de Trente par ses ambiguius, & ses expressions vagues, a laisse le Semipelagianisme, & mesmo le Pelagianisme en son entier.
it is an Effect of Sin, and inclines to it.

If any one say, That a Man may be justified before God, by his own Works, which are performed only by the force of Nature, or the Light of the Law, without the Grace of GOD thro' JESUS CHRIST; Let him be Anathema.

If any one say, That without the preventing Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, a Man may perform such Acts of Faith, Hope, Charity, and Repentance, as he ought to do, whereby to obtain the Grace of Justi-

(k) Philippus Melanthon, in Commentar. ad cap. 3. Epift. ad Romanos tom. 3. operum pag. 953. Tantum tribuant Christo, quod principium & occasionem merendi nobis promoveret, ipsi sic loquentur Christum meruisse primam gratiam, postea sepeulium eum & singum otiosum esse, & imaginantur homines mereret remissionem peccatorum & justos esse propter proprie imploctionem Legis.

(l) Thesaurus Disputat. Sedanenc. th. 5. de Fide justificante & operibus parte 3. tom. 1. pag. 637. An quidquam est Evangelio magis adversum, aut Religionis Christianae magis Fundamenta convellens, quam hanc Doctrina, quae docet hominem praeditum Fide justificante posse damnari.

(m) * Gulielmus Bucanus loco 31. de Justificatione Sect. 48. pag. 356. Error Pontificiorum 9 Marie Virginis autoritatem justificandi tribuant; Pape potestatem vendendi remissionem peccatorum.
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Let him be Anathema.

1 We are therefore said to be Justified gratis; because none of those Acts which precede Justification, whether they be Faith or Works, merit that Justifying Grace.

2 If any one shall say, The Free Will of Man moved and excited by God, by assenting to God exciting & calling us, does not at all co-operate towards the preparing or disposing our selves for obtaining Justifying Grace;

mission of Sin: That (n) our Opinion concerning Merit, is full of Pomp and Pride, essentially contrary to true Piety; and that we are like the Pharisees, puffed up with the Persuasion of our own Justice; because, according to the (o) Divinity of the Pretended Reform'd, all the Best Works of the Just, merit only Hell and Damnation.

---

(n) † Joannes Heydegerus in Anatome Concilii Tridentini, tom. 1. pag. 261. Quid statuendum de hac fastuosa Doctrina, nostram Doctrinam de meritis operum intelligit. † L'Auteur des Considerations sur les Lettres Circulaires & sur l'Avertissement Pastoral du Clerge de France a ceux de la Religion Pretendue Reformee, quatrieme Consideration pag. 111. La pensee du merite est d'elle-mesme une pensee d'orgueil, essentiellement contraire, a la vraie piote. † Jureiu dans le Preservatif. pag. 149. Pourquoy a-t-on tant de jalouse pour ce terme de merite, qui est superbe & oppose a l'humilite Chrestienne. † Joannes Heydeg-gerus ad fell. 6. Conc. Trident. tom. 1. pag. 131. Ipsos Phariseos Romanen-sos, suffarcinatos persfnasone proprie justitie.

and that Man cannot refuse his Consent, if he would; but that he is like an Inanimate Thing, without acting any thing, being meerly Passive; Let him be Anathema.

1 If any one shall say, That Man is Justified by Faith alone, in such manner as they understand thereby, that to obtain Justifying Grace, there needs nothing else to cooperate; Let him be Anathema.

2 If any one shall say, That Men are Justified, either by the sole Imputation of the Justice of JESUS CHRIST; or by the sole Remission of Sins; Grace and Charity, which are diffused in their Hearts by the Holy Ghost, being excluded; Let him be Anathema.
1 If any one shall say, That in any Good Work whatsoever, the Just Man sins, at least Venially; or, which is more intolerable, Mortally; Let him be Anathema.

2 If any one shall say, The Just ought not, for their Good Works done in GOD, to expect nor hope from Him an Eternal Recompence, through his Mercy, and the Merits of JESUS CHRIST, so they persevere to the End in doing Good, and keeping his Commandments; Let him be Anathema.
ARTICLE IV.
Of the Adoration of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist; and of the Mass.

DOCTRINE of the CHURCH.

Likewise profess,

That in the Mass there is offered up to GOD a true, proper, and Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living, and the Dead.

A Sacrifice, by which is represented unto us the Bloody Sacrifice of JESUS CHRIST, once offered up upon the Cross; by which the Memory of it is

PROFESSIO FIDEI.

That (a) we have forged a New Priesthood, of which Jesus Christ is not the Author; and another Sacrifice besides that of his Death, in which we prefer the Priest before Jesus Christ: That (b) in the Sacrifice of the Mass, we place the Saints; in whose Remembrance we Celebrate it, above


(b) † Ibidem th. 34. pag. 828. Eu procedit superstitio, ut Sacerdos dicat se Christum offerre Deo in honorem Sanctorum, quæ oratio Sanctorum supra Christum evertit.
preserved to the End of the World, and by which the Virtue there of, so Beneficial for the Remission of our daily Sins, is applied unto us.

1. I believe, That in the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, and really, & substantially, the Body and the Blood, together with the Soul, and the Divinity of our Lord JESUS CHRIST; and that there is made a Conversion of the Jesus Christ: That (c) the Sacrifice of the Mass, is a renouncing of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and the Fruits of the Death and Passion of Jesus Christ; that it overthrows and destroys it, by a Sacrilegous Attempt:

That (d) we have borrowed the Name of Mass, from the Sacrifices of the Goddess Isis; and that we do once more murder Jesus Christ in this Sacrifice: That our Consecration does not at all


(d) Gulielmus-Bucanus loco 48. §. 145. pag. 798. Pontificiorum errores, qui Missa nomen a sacris Isidis sunt mutuati, &c. Verba coeae Dominica, in Ephesias Letteras transformant, seu in consecrationem talem, quam nihil differt ab incantationibus magicis, &c. pag. 799. ibidem, Qua ratione Sacrificium Crucis Christi prorsus evacuatur, unicum & perpetuum ejus Sacerdotium negatur, mortis ejus meritum obruitur, Christus rursus occiditur. Synopsis purioris Theologiae Professorum Lugdunensium apud Batavos difp. 46. th. 1. pag. 698. Pontificii, loco Coae a Christo instituted, nobis Missam obtrudant; hac Sacramentum impiecatatis, signum Apostas ia; ac vinculum diffusionis appellari potest.
The Doctrine of the Church.

whole Substance of Bread into the Body, and of the whole Substance of Wine into the Blood; which Conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation. I confess also, that under each Species whole and entire CHRIST, and a true Sacrament is received.

If any one say, that JESUS CHRIST, the only Begotten Son of G-O D, is not to be Adored in the Blessed Sacrament of the Ex-

( e ) Gulielmus Bucan is loco mox laudato pag. 800. Scenico & histrionico ornato, gesta, buatu, minuamu, fibilis, gemitibus, cantu & aliis modis, tanquam Orgia Sancta & Baccanalia celebrant, &c.

* (f) Georgius Donanum in libro cui ti usus est, Papa Antichristus, L. 3. c. 7. pag. 203. Missa etiam celebrant, hoc est, Christum ipsum Deo offerunt, in honorem Sanctorum, priliorum intercessione apud Deum obtinenda.
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differ from Magical Incantations; and that the Mass may be called the Sacrament of Impiety, the Sign of Apostacy, and the Bonds of Dissonition: That (e) Mass is Celebrated amongst us, as formerly the Orgia’s and Baccanalia’s of the Pags: That (f) in the Mass we offer up Jesus Christ to God, in honour of his Saints, that through his Merits we may obtain their Intercession to God for us: That (g) we Adore a
Of Satisfactions, of Purgatory, &c.

& ejus Adoratores esse Idolaters, Anathema sit.

Breaden God: That (h) we renew the Error of the Nestorians, adoring instead of Jesus Christ, what is not Jesus Christ, but a Morsel of Bread.

* (b) Georgius Dounamus in L. cui titulus est; Papa Antichristus: l. 3. c. 6. pag. 180: Sicut Nestoriani Christum hominem adorant, non quod Deus sit; sed quia Deo conjunctus; atque ict areaturam pro Creatore adorant; sic Pontificis laetice cultum, qui soli Deo debetur Sacramento Eucharistiae exhibent, non quod Deus sit; sed quod Deum in eo addesse credant. Ioannes Calvinus in Epift. ad D. N. S. D. pag. 95. Secundae partis Voluminis Institutionum ult. Edit. Amstelodam: Quam belle Missa conveniat cum Cena Domini, &c. cumulus autem abominationis, ipsa quae ibi primas tenet Elementi adoratio est.

ARTICLE V.

Of Satisfactions, of Purgatory, and of Indulgences.

As to (1) Satisfaction, the Holy Council of Trent declares, That it is al-

**DOCTRINE of the CHURCH.**

**CALUMNIES of PROTESTANTS.**

That (a) our Doctrine touching Satisfactions & Purgatory is full of Pomp

tiones pro peccato prater satisfactionem Christi, dogma absurdum & blasphemum est.
The Votume oj the Church.

and Pride, and injurious to JESUS CHRIST:
That (b) it makes GOD to be unjust; and is an Invention proceeding from the Shop of Satan: That (c) all Fasts and Mortifications affront JESUS CHRIST; and that it is so far from being Lawful for us to make use of them, whereby to render Satisfaction to GOD, they heap new Crimes upon us:


(c) Joannes Calvinus ubi mox supra. † Thesaurus disputat. Sedan. th. 5. de Satisfac. tom. 1. pag. 595. Jeinnia, peregrinationes, multas pecuniarias sub obtena Pemitentia, & flagellationis laconica diamantat. Imitamentus vacant operas satis executed, his tricis putant Deo satisfieri pro pecini temporali. Et Theil 16. pag. 597. Præter is perfeclissima Coristi satisfactio, qui adjungere subest a quaedam opera, gerrasque siculas, flagellationem & ciborum distinctionem, tum incubare solo & cranium habere pro cervicale, & sub interna nodo succingi, qui lambos exul erit cedid in Coristi contumeliam. Moi: Sane hic ad Lydiam verbi dei lapidem explorata, tantum abest ut satisfaciant Deo, ut eriam penam mereantur, & ad lanceam judicii divini ponderata, immensum quantum peccata novo ponere praga-vent.
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If selves, can do nothing, can do all things by the Assistance of Him who strengthens us: So that Man has nothing wherein to glory; but all our Glory is in JESUS CHRIST; in Whom we Live, in Whom we Merit, and in Whom we make Satisfaction; bringing forth Fruits worthy of Repentance, which have their Force and Merit from Him; which are offer'd up to the Father by Him, and

That (d) our Doctrine touching Satisfactions, is grounded upon JESUS CHRIST's having satisfied only for Sins committed before Baptism; and denies the All-sufficiency of the Blood of the Saviour of the World:

That (e) the Origine of our Satisfactions, is derived from Pagan Observances; and is sustained by many Blasphemies: That (f) we hold, We do by our Satisfactions discharge our

(d) Ibidem th. 24. pag. 598. Nitetur hoc dogma illo axiomatico, quo vivulla est capitalior Doctrina, Christum morte sua nos liberasse a poena & culpa peccatorum, que antecedunt Baptismum; at pro poenis peccatorum, que sunt post Baptismum, Christum aut non satisfacisse, aut satisfactionem ejus nobis, non imputari. Joannes Calvinus L. 3. Institut. c. 5. Sect. 2. pag. 574. Qui poterat feius profanari Christi Sanguis, quam dum negatur sufficere ad peccatorum remissionem, ad reconciliacionem ad satisfactionem, nisi velut aerecentis & exhausti defectus aliumque supplicatur & sufficiatur.


(f) Thesaurus difputat. Sedan. th. 9. de Satisfactionibus, tom. 1. pag. 600. Han compendiationem Poniificii dicunt fieri ex condigno, id est prae equipollentiano. Theodorus Beza in Antithelli Papatus & Christianiimi tract. theologici. tom. 1. pag. 61. Putatur Papisae se posse quaedam compensatione satisfaciere divina justitia, qua in se plane ac perspicue, se potius stupidos simul ac intolerabiles arrogantium disputationem
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ART. V.

Debts to GOD by Equivalence: That (g) Purgatory is a Trick to get Money: That, according to our Doctrine,

Death it self is Tributary to the Pope: That (h) we allow to Indulgences the Power of drawing Souls out of Purgatory, which we refuse to Jesus Christ: That, (i) by this Doctrine the Pope deposes God from his

by Him are accepted of by the Father.

1 I constantly hold, There is a Purgatory, and that Souls therein detained, are aided by the Suffrages of the Faithful.

1 The Holy Council of Trent commands all Bishops to have a particular care, the


(h) † Thesaurus disputat. Sedan. tom. 22. de Satisfact. humanis tom. 1. pag. 598. Pap libus Indulgentiis vis tribuitur (eruendi a flammis Purgatorii) qu.e Christo negatur.

(i) † Idem Thesaurus disputat. Sedan. tom. 38. de satisfact. parte 2. tom. 1. pag. 62. Gravissimum est quod per impium hoc dogma Deus devinitur solio, & Papa supra Deum extollitur: oporret major sit Deo, qui liberat hominum necessi-
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found Doctrine concerning PURGATORY, which has been delivered by the Holy Fathers and Councils, be held, taught, and also everywhere Preached to the Faithful.

Throne, and places himself above Him: That (k) the Pope sells Indulgences, and makes a Shameful Traffick of them: That (l) we believe the Pope remits Sins contrary to the Will of God; and the Indulgences which he grants are Efficacious, though God do not approve of them: That (m) the Pope by Indulgences ties the Grace of God to a piece of Lead

tate parenti Dei mandatis. † Pierre du Moulin Ministre de Charenton dans fon Bouclier de la Foy, Sect. 89. Edit de Geneve de l'an 1660. pag. 344. Le Pape veut qu'on croye qu'il tire du Purgatoire; en quoy il se met manifestement par desfuis Dieu.


(m) Joannes Calvinus Institut. L. 3. c. 5. Sect. 5. pag. 175. Porro ut tales abominationes pratereamus, quis docuit Papam plumb & membrana, gratiam Jesu Christi includere.
2. That she has made use of this Power even in the Primitive Times.

3. The Use of them to be very beneficial to Christians.

4. And that (as the Holy Council desires) they ought to be granted with Moderation, according to the Antient and approved Customs of the Church.

2 Conc. Trid. sess. 25. in Decreto de Indulg. gentis. Atque hujusmodi potestate Divinitus ibi tradita, antiquissimas etiam temporibus Ecclesi. sia sua fuerit.

3 Profitio Fidei: Illarumque usum Christiano populo maxime salutarem affirmo.

4 Conc. Trid. in eodem Decreto de Indulg. In his tamen concedendis, moderationem juxta veterem & probatam in Ecclesia consuetudinem adhiberi cupit.

ARTICLE VI.

Invocation of Saints, Relics, and Images.

THE (1) Holy Council teaches, That the Saints Reigning together with JESUS CHRIST, do offer their Prayers to God for Men; that it is good and profitable humbly to Invoke

Doctrine of the Church.

That (a) Invocation of Saints, as we now use it, is Superflitious and Idolatrous: That (b) all we believe concerning it, is nothing but the abuse and deceit of the Devil: That (c) we have no cause to

Calumnies of Protestants.


(c) Thesaurus disputat. Sedanensi. th. 1. de superstitioso Sanctorum cultu tom. 2. pag. 614. Transimus ad alium Idololatria Pontificiorum caput de adoratione Sanctorum, qua Ethnicoram heroas & Deo acceptos homines inferiorie ac relativi.
complain, that Protestants accuse us of worshipping Idols, and renewing Paganism; because it is very true, That (d) we renew the Heresy of the Anglicks, and far surpass them: That (e) we renew that of the Collyridians, who Adored the Virgin Mary: That (f) we make her equal to God, and prefer her before Jesus Christ: That in our Prayers to


Dei adversari-
que honorii unius
mediatoris Dei
& hominum Je-
su Christi, vel
stultum esse in
Coelo regnantu-
bus, ut vel men-
ta supplicare, im-
pie sentire: San-
ctorum quoque
Martymrum &
aliorum etiam
cum Christo vi-
terum sancta
Corpora, que vi-
for Men, or the Invo-
cating them to Pray
for us in particular
also, to be Idolatry;
or that it is repugnant
to the Word of GOD,
and contrary to the
One Mediator between
GOD and Man, JES-
SUS CHRIST; or that
it is a foolish thing to
her we treat her as we
do JESUS CHRIST;
and that we do not Ad-
dress our selves to her in
these Words, Holy Vir-
gin, Pray for us; no
more than we do to JES-
SUS CHRIST: That
in all the Profes and Li-
tanies, in which we Pray
to Saints, we make no
1. c. 12. pag. 544. de l'Edition de Sedan de. 1627. Les charges diverses qu'on
donne aux Saints en font soy, &c. es Litanes, on dit Saint Pierre prie pour nous;
mais a la Vierge Marie, on ne dit point, sainte Vierge prie pour nous, non plus qu'a
Jesu Christ: Joannes Calvinus Institut. I. 3. c. 20. §. 21. pag. 233. In suis om-
nibus Litanis Hymnis & Profis, ubi Sanctis mortuis, nibil non honoris desiderat,
nulla sit Christi mentio ubicunque Papismus viget. Idem Calvinus ibid. paulo ante:
Nimis stuporis fuit, ne dicam insaniam nobis per ipsos (Sanctos) accessum
(ad Deum) sic velle moliri, ut ab illo (Christo) abduceremur, sine quo nececead-
tus ulius patet. Id autem aliquos faculis factitatum, quis negat, hodieque ubicum-
que Papismus viget factitari? &c. concilis &dam Des benevolentiam eorum merit
subinde obtundunt, atque ut plurimum Christo præterito, per eorum nominam Deus
obscenatur, &c. Qua primum perplexitate Christum in honos & solius mediatio-
ris titulo solum. Idem Joannes Calvinus fermo 14. in 1. Epist. ad Timoteo-
um de l'Edition de Geneve de l'an 1561. pag. 72. Les Papi\xes n'ont point force
des Patrons & Avocats suivant la Doctrine de l'Ecriture; mais c'est comme si
Jesu Christ n'estoit rien, &c. Naus voyons comme Jesu Christ est fortelo par eux,
& qu'ils ne luy attribuent rien qui soit, s'ils disoient: Et bien nous prions les Saints
de Paradis, pourqo'ils sont membres de l'Eglise, comme je prieray cettu-cy &
cettu-la; anfi en faiz-je de Saints de Paradis. Si les Papi\xes paroissoient anfi en-
core y auraoit-il quelque modestie en eux; mais nous voyons quand ils imaginent des
Patrons la haut au ciel, que c'est en destituant Jesu Christ de son Office. Or c'est
un blaspheme execrable. Idem Calvinus comment. in Epist. 1. Joan. cap. 2. v. 1.
operator ult. Edit. Amfterdamin. pag. 54. Christum esse Advocatum, hodie fa-
tentur unum quidem esse ex multis; sed non solum. Qui inter Papi\xes paulo plus
habent veretundiae non negant Christum eminere; sed posse haingent comitum tur-
bam illi asseiant, &c. Dubium itaque non est, quin totidem Christo Idolae opponant
Papi\xes, quod sibi patronos comminiscitur.
Supplicate with Words or Mind the Saints in Heaven, are perverted contrary to Piety. Also that the Holy Bodies of Saints and Martyrs, which were the Living Members of JESUS CHRIST, the Temples of the Holy Ghost, and are one Day to be Raised again to Eternal Life, and Glorified by Him, are to be Venerated by the Faithful.

ART. VI.

mention of JESUS CHRIST: That when we have recourse to Saints, as to our Patrons, we discard JESUS CHRIST of his Office of Mediator, and set up so many Idols against Him: That (g) we believe, we ought to honour Saints, Relics and Images with a Religious worship of the same Species with that which we pay to GOD, but in a lower Degree: That (h) we rob

(g) † Thesaurus disputat. Sedenansf. Thefi 6. de cultu unius Dei tom. 1. pag. 256. Uni Deo cultus Religiosus tribuendus est, hujusque honoris portio vel minimum ad creaturam transferri, aut cum ea communicare, sine nefario scelere non potest, sine altius pro vero Deo colatur; sive cultus inferior aut subordinatus creature tribuatur, sive Deus colatur in imagine, aut cum imagine & per imaginem; hae enim omnia legi Dei cæntur & communi Idololatria nomine cenfuntur, &c. Ibid. pag. 280. th. 27. de Imaginibus: Adoratio Imaginum, que frequentatur in Ecclesia Romana, plane Religiosa est, &c. Nisi id d indsit Pontificis, qui qui volunt per Imagines Deum coli meditate, & in Imaginibus coli Santos, & in Sanctis Deum. pag. 283. Profecto non minori scelere sancti adorantur, quam aliæ creature. Et Thesi 1. de superstitio Sanctorum cultu tom. 2. pag. 614. Transmissus ad aliud Idololatriam Pontificiorum caput, qua Ethniorum heroas & Deo acceptos homines inferiori & relativo cultu adorantium superstitionem renovant, &c. Daniel Chamierus Delphinas in Epil. ad Petrum Cotonum Epist. Jeuiticarum parte 1. Edit. Genevensis anni 1599. pag. 150. Demonstrandum est ibi, vel non admissi Idololatriam, cum creaturis tribuuntur honos Religiosus, vel Santos & Imagines non esse creaturas; vel denique vos Sanctis & Imaginibus non tribuere cultum Religiosum. Et max: Multa dixistis distinguens ea trina honorum (latrinx, duliae & hyperdulix) capita non eis eorum inter se aliqua differentia; sed tantiun de vario gradu eorum rerum, quibus suis honos defertur.

(h) † Thesaurus disputat. Sedenanf. Thefi 1. de cultu Religioso. tom. 2. pag. 587. Pontificios honores soli Christo debitum Sanctis, quos mediatores constituisse differre.
That the Images of JESUS CHRIST, of the Blessed Virgin-Mother of GOD, and of other Saints, are to be had and retained, especially in Churches; and that due Honour and Reverence is to be given to them, not that we believe any Divinity or Virtue to be in them, for which they ought to be worshipped, or that we ought to ask any thing of them, or put our Confidence in Images, as

\(\text{Idem Conc. Trident. Ibid. Imagines porro Christi, Disparae Virginis, & aliorum Sanctorum in Templis praeferunt, habendas & retainingas, eisque debitum honorem & reverentiam impositiendam, non quod credatur in eis divinitas vel virtus proper quam singulatem, vel quod ab eis sit aliquid pedestium, vel quod fiducia in imaginibus sit figenda, velut enim sibibat a gentibus, que in Idolis fper.}\)

\(\text{(i) Joannes Calvinus in admonitione de reliquis opuscul. pag. 203. Fieri nullomodo potest, quin inde ad Idololatriam homines paulatim declinet, neque enim reliquias intueri, aut asserire possint, sine veneratione, in qua nullus tenetur modus, quin pertinens honor Christo debitus illis tribuantur. Itaque ut pance dicam reliquiarium desiderium nuncupat superstitione caret, imo quod desperius est mater est Idololatriae.}\)

\(\text{(k) Thesaurus disputat. Sedanen. in Thesi. de Reliquiis Sanctorum parte 1. th. 2. tom. 1. pag. 394. Adorandus esse reliquias Sanctorum summo consenso creditur in Ecclesia Romana.}\)

\(\text{(l) Ibidem pag. 267. th. 24. de Imaginibus & Idolis: Prima controversia est de imaginibus Dei, circa quas Ecclesia Romana supra fidem insaniit.}\)

\(\text{(m) Ibidem pag. 275. th. 2. Circa Imagines Sanctorum Ecclesia Romana supra fidem insaniit, quorum in Templis tanta est multitudine, ut possit alter populus lapa- dens appellari, qui populus inanimis colitur a populo animato}\)

\(\text{(n) Ibidem th. 27. pag. 280. Adoratio imaginum, que frequentatur in Ecclesia Romana plane Religiosa est, scc. nec id differentur Pontificii.}\)
the Pagans did, who put their trust in Idols; but because the Honour which is paid to them, is referred to the Originals which they represent.

That, (o) we believe a Divine Ver-
tue to be in them, as in a Nest: That (p) we re-vive all the Herefies of the Carpocratians, Bas-


(0) † Ibid. th. 5. pag. 276. Quibus Imaginibus credi imesse vivam aliquam & san-


(p) Andreas Rivetus in Catholic. Orthodoxo quaest. 1. Procemiali de Hæ-


pag. 285. Si bis (Nicene fecondæ Synodi Patribus) creditis gravius est crimine non colere Imagines, quam negare, Chriftum esse pronomis mortuum.

(r) Daniel Chamierus in Epift. ad Gautierum Jesuitam Epiftolar. Jesuiti-
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ring Images with a Rel-
igious Worship: That (o)
we believe a Divine Ver-
tue to be in them, as in
a Nest: That (p) we re-
vive all the Herefies of
the Carpocratians, Ba-
silidians, Staurolatri-
ans, and others, who re-
served and adored Im-
ages: That, (q) according
to the Second Council of
Nice, it is a greater
Crime not to adore Im-
ages, than to deny J E-
SUS CHRIST died
for us: That (r) through
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an Idolatry perfectly Pagan, we propose to the People Jupiters, Mercuries, Minerva's, Mars's, Perseus's, Atlas's, Venus's, Neptunes, The-tis's, Esculapius's, Vulcans, and the other Gods of the Pagans; yea, even Minos and Rhadamanthus under other Names and Titles.

ARTICLE VII.

Of the Superiority of the Roman Church, and of Obedience to the Pope.

DOCTRINE of the CHURCH.

That (a) we raise the Church of Rome above the Holy Scriptures: That (b) the Authority of the Church, according to our Doctrine, is founded upon the Authority of the Pope: That (c) we give to the Pope a Power of changing the

(1) Acknowledge the Holy Catholic, Apostolick, and Roman Church, the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; and I promise and swear true Obedience to the Bishop of Rome, Successor of St. Peter Apostolorum Principis Successoris, Jesus Christi Vicar, and obedienti fpondeo ac juro. Conc. Trident. sess. 25. de Re-

THAT (a) we raise the Church of Rome above the Holy Scriptures: That (b) the Authority of the Church, according to our Doctrine, is founded upon the Authority of the Pope: That (c) we give to the Pope a Power of changing the


(b) Pierre du Moulin in Hyperaspite l. 2. c. 12. pag. 384. Si ut volente adversarii; sacra Scripturae autoritas, nisitur & fundatur in auctoritate Ecclesiae; hujus autem Ecclesiae autortas, fundatur in successione Papae in Petri Primatum, quod non est juris Divini; sed humani, nonne inde sequitur Scripturam sacram non esse juris Divini, & fundari in humana auctoritate, & ad humanas conjecturas & opiniones redigi, que via compendiosejima est ad Atheismum.

Commandments of GOD, of dispensing with the Gospel, and contradicting the Apostle: That (d) he is an Idol, and that we commit Idolatry in the Obedience we render him:

That (e) we adore him with the Worship of Laetria, which is only due to GOD; calling him God and Divine Majesty:

That (f) the Pope has framed a new Gospel, in place of the Old one: That (g) he is Antichrist, and Mahomet and he are Gog and Magog, the Capital Ene-


(f) Pierre du Moulin in Hyperaspître l. 1. c. 34. pag. 267. Pontifex Romanus, profus sapientia procudit novum Evangelium longe præstantius & rem faciendam accommodatius, veteri illo Apostolorum Evangelio, quod in Ecclesia Romana pri dem exclevit.

(g) Joannes Calvinus institut. l. 4. c. 2. Sect. 12. pag. 283. Antichristum in
The Doctrine of the Church.

ART. VII.


* (h) Georgius Dounamus in fine prædicti Libri de Papa Antichristo, pag. 651, 652. Deducitur necessaria consequentia, omnem cum Papa tanquam cum Capite, Romanamque sede Communionem illicitam esse; que enim Communio Christi cum Belial, hoc est Antichristo, &c. 4. in Christiana Republica bene constituta, non esse tolerandos Antichristi Emissarios, Sacerdotes, Jesuitas, &c. 5. non esse fieri quam Papisni, hoc est Antichristianismi professionem.

* (i) Francois Bourgoing, Ministre de Geneve l. 2. de son Historie Ecclesiastique chap. 5. tom. 1. pag. 229. de l'Edition de 1560. Le Pape infichet & ordonne des Sacramens a son plaisir. Il corrompt ceux que Jesus Christ a instituez,
Of the Superiority of the Roman Church.

pleasure: That (k) to take away all doubt of his being Antichrist, he has invaded and usurped all the Rights of Jesus Christ; that of Prophet, by substituting a new unwritten Word in place of the Gospel; that of Priest, by introducing a new Sacrifice, and new Intercessors to God for us, besides Jesus Christ; that of King, in attributing to himself a Dominium over Consciences, and a Power to command the Living, and the Dead: That (l) not only the Lives of Popes, but their Doctrine, and the Titles of Honour which they at

voire les abolis du tout, & en leur place il substitue des sacrileges qu'il a forgez lui-même.

(k) Franciscus Burmannus in Synopsi Theologica l. 8. c. 18. Sect. 10. tom. 2. pag. 576. Ut autem verum & indubitatum Antichristum se proderet, omnia Christi munera invasit; Propheticum puta per substitutionem novi verbi aegrot. Sacerdotale per introductionem novi sacrificii & intercessorum prater Christum; Reginum per Dominium in conscientias, & imperium in vivos, non solum; sed & mortuos.

ART. VI.

tribute to themselves, shew clearly they are the Enemies of Jesus Christ, and do no more believe in him, than Epicurus did in God, whose Providence he denied: That (m) the Popish Religion is composed of Paganism and Judaism mixed together by an adulterate Alliance: That (n) Popery is very well compar'd to a great Sea, because it contains almost all Heresies that ever were, as the Sea contains all Rivers: That (o) Popery is as different from Christianity, as White from Black: That


(n) Andreas Rivetus in Catholico orthodoxo seu summa Controvers. q. 1. Procemiai de Harrefibus tom. 1. pag. 42. Liquit appositissime quoqdam Papismum comparasse mari magno, in quod quemadmodum sumina omnia & rivi dicitur pleno alveo; sic etiam pluris & pene omnes variarum temporum locorum & personarum heresies in hunc errorum abissum flunt, & impuris ejus undis miscentur.

(o) Theodorus Beza in Antithesi Papatus & Christianismi tractat. Theologic. tom. 1. pag. 56. Hoc affirm, atque utinam non possem tam justis de causis affirmare, album nigro non magis repugnare, quam Papismum Christianismo.
Of the Superiority of the Roman Church.

(p) In the Church of Rome all things are sold, even GOD Himself, and the Remission of Sins: Lastly, That (q) it is impossible to invent a Doctrine more impure and corrupted, than that of the Church.

(p) Pierre du Moulin dans sa Lettre pour repondre a celle de Balzac. De la vient qu'en l'Eglise Romaine tout se vent, Dieu meme, & la remission des pechez.

(q) Idem Theodorus Beza loco mox laudato: Jugulum causa peto, doctrinam illorum nimium, quia nihil impurius & corruptius ne fings quidem posse affirmo.

Read and Approved in the General Assembly of the Clergy of France, held by the King's Permission at St. Germain in Laye, Wednesday the 11th. of July; and Signed Saturday Morning the 14th. of the said Month, 1685. By the Persons whose Names are mentioned at the end of the foregoing Petition.

Note, At a* denotes English Authors, and a † Modern Authors or Impressions. The rest are either First Reformers Professions of Faith, or Ancient Authors.
A Necessary Advice

For Profitably Reading

BOOKS

OF

CONTROVERSIE.


Whoever you are, who intend to employ your self in Reading Books of Controvery, in order to your Satisfaction in Religion,

1. You must apprehend this matter as a Point of singular moment and Importance, and not read lightly, either for curiosity as many do, or negligently for recreation, or to pass the time; nor with the Spirit of Contradiction to find out Faults, whereon to quarrel, without just occasion: but sincerely, and in Conscience; making God himself the Judge; and proposing for that end, the only knowledge and finding out of this Truth for your direction and instruction, and his glory and service; for by this way, you will, as it were, oblige him to give you Light and Assistance to discern the same. And you must make account, that if the true comprehension or error, in any one principal Article in Controversy between us, doth draw with it the peril of Eternal Damnation, if we miss therein; how much more in them altogether, whereof you intend to make Judgment by this your reading; for which cause you have great need to stand attentive, be humble, devout, indifferent, pray much, and be earnest with God to enlighten you in this behalf.
2. When you begin to read about any Controversy, you must en-
deavour first, to apprehend well and briefly the true State of the Que-
ston, not believing one side only, but searching out what each side
faith and holdeth therein; for in this Point above others, you shall
find fraud oftentimes used by Writers of divers Sorts and Sects, every
one proposing the State of the Question advantageously, as himself
would have the Reader to understand it, and not as his Adversary
doth hold it indeed.

3. When you have the true State of the Question, be very careful
to hold the same continually in your Mind, making often reflection and
recourse thereto, about the Discourses you shall read in your Author,
considering well and attentively, whether they be to the purpose in
hand, and do level right at the mark proposed or no, or run aside to im-
pertinent matters, as often they do, and fill up Leaves with things, that
are far from the principal substance of the Question. So as this must serve
you, as the Plummet or Square doth the Mason or Architect, to tell you
whether the Building goth right or no. And whatsoever you find that
inferreth not, or concludes not the principal Point in question, that
you must lay aside for the time, tho' it be otherwise never so witty,
plesant or profitable, until you have considered that which toucheth
the purpose directly; for you shall find many Authors in these our
Days, who pretending to prove directly some Conclusion in Contro-
versy, will afterwards slip aside, and draw you into so many by-mat-
ters, as will either confound your Judgment and Memory, or weary
your Patience, and thereby make all your Reading unprofitable, and
to no purpose.

4. Ponder well the weight of all such Arguments as are alleged.
For albeit they be to the purpose and not wholly impertinent; yet they
may be weak and feeble, and not able to infer so much as is required.
And these may be of Two Sorts. Either out of Scripture, or ancient
Fathers. As to the Scriptures, forasmuch as not the found of Words,
but the true Sense and Meaning thereof is that which most importeth;
the securest way, and most reasonable to assure our selves of the true
meaning of it, is to look and consider, how the same was understood
and interpreted by Antient Fathers before these our Controversies did
arise. As for Example, Catholics alleged for Purgatory Fire, 1 Cor. 3.
Ipse salus erit sic tamen quasi per ignem. The Antient Fathers understood
it so. Protestants alleged on their side these Words of Solomon,
Where the Tree falleth, there it lyeth. But cannot bring any one Father
for it in that Sense.
As for the Fathers themselves, when they are alledg'd by any Party, it is to be considered in what Age they wrote, and whether that which they say was ever found to have been contradicted, or reprehended by others of that Age or after them. For when this is not found, tho any Fathers Sentence doth not make a Matter fully de fide, yet it is a weighty Proof, the thing which he affirmeth was so believed by the whole Church of his Days, and consequently it would be great temerity to discredit the same; for so much as that Church being acknowledged by all to have been the true Catholic Church, it must needs be presumed to have held nothing generally, that the Catholic known Church of the precedent Age did not also believe and teach; and so from one Age to another, both upwards and downwards, may this Demonstration be made, which ought to be a great Motive to a discreet man to think seriously hereof.

5. It is much to be considered, when the Testimony of any antient approved Father is brought forth, whether it be conform to the rest of his Doctrine or no, containing a Conclusion purposely treated by him, and not some particular Saying, wrested from him by violence; as oftentimes Protestants use to do. And therefore when the Matter is of importance, his whole Discourse is to be seen and perused, with what goeth before and what cometh after, to see how they hang together. And this I advertise you of in particular, that whenever you see any clear or pregnant Authority of any one Antient Father, alleged by Protestants for their own side, there do you stand attent and examin the place exactly, and I do assure you, you shall find either fraud used in malleging or misconstruing, or that the Place itself, well considered, will answer it itself; for Truth cannot be contrary to Truth. With the observance of this only Note you will be sure to have all the Current of ancient Holy Fathers with you.

6. This is also worthy your weighing, that Protestant Writers upon all occasions seek, as it were by anticipation or prevention, to diminish the credit of the Antient Fathers, when they are brought against them; making comparison between them and Scripture (where notwithstanding there is no comparison at all) and telling their Readers, they are not to be believed as Judges in Controversy, except they bring Scripture, and that you must think, understood and expounded in such sort as they themselves may like the Exposition; which is an Argument they have no confidence indeed in Fathers, tho for a shew they make fair weather with them for a time. And this is one notorious difference between them and us, that when they alledg any place out of ancient Fathers, founding to the Favour of any Doctrine of theirs
that is in Controversy with us; if you demand them, whether they will stand absolutely to the Fathers determination in that, and all other Controversies he handleth, they will refuse it, but we not, if it be a Matter not contradicted or censured by any other Father, or by the Church of that time.

7. And lastly, I must advertise you, that when you have read all the Protestant Writers, which you will always find of the same Spirit in slippery dealing; yea, and when you have read all the Books of our side also, if it were possible for you to read and ponder them all, you will hardly find any certain Rule to resolve upon by your much Reading: for the one saying, and the other unsaying; and the one accusing the other of Falshood, and protesting Truth themselves, will always hold your Mind in suspense. And the Controversies are so many, and the Discourses so large upon every Controversy, and the shifts of them who mean not simply are so innumerable, that it will be impossible for you to quiet and settle your Judgment, without some more certain Rule than Reading at random. And albeit it were possible for a Learned Person, studious and patient of so much Labour, and had the Commodity of Books, to run through every Controversy; yet is it not possible for thousands that have not these helps. And yet we must think, God has left some way for them also, both to inform and resolve themselves securely in matters of Religion, which concern their Salvation. And this way is no other than the Universal, Visible Catholic Church.

He who leaving his own Judgment relyeth upon the Authority and Determination of the Universal, Visible Christian Church, as commended and proposed by Christ Himself to be obeyed, descending down from age to age for a publick Direction of all until the end of the World; this man, besides the merit of obedience, deserveth also the praise of the highest wisdom; for to prefer the Judgment of so great a number of learned, holy and virtuous men as have been, and are, in the Church from time to time, before his own private Judgment, is most evident and apparent wisdom, even considered according to the Principles of Human Wisdom; but more if we respect divine Reasons: as namely, That our Saviour himself hath promised to be with the Church, and assist the same with his Holy Spirit unto the Worlds end; insomuch that the gates of hell shall never prevail against it, to bring it into Error. And the Apostle St. Paul doth assure us, that it is and shall be such a pillar and foundation of truth, that we may build and rely upon the same without fear of falling. Which thing the Holy Father
A Necessary Advice for

St. Augustine considering, gave this general Direction in his Book against Crescensius the Heretick: *Quisquis salit metuit hujus obscuritatem questionis, Ecclesiam de ea consultat.* If any one fear lest he should be deceived by the Obscurity of this Question, let him consult the Church about it: Which must needs be meant of the Governours and Chief Pastors of the Church. This way then I advise you to, as a more compendious, easie, and certain way, than to weary your self by reading many Books, whereof one doth impugn and contradict another.

This was the Method used by the Primitive Church. St. Paul said to the Corinthians, *Si quis videtur contentiosus esse, non talem consensus inem non habemus nec Ecclesia Dei;* But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such Custom, nor the Church of God. See Tertullian's whole Book *de Prescript. adversus Heret.* Also Irenæus his Five Books against Heretics.

**QUERIES**
QUERIES
OF
Religion or Liberty.

I. Whether the Flock and Church of CHRIST (to whom was promised Grace and Eternal Happiness) be that Company and Society of People Christened in his Name, who by Order of Government, Rules, and Decrees from him and his Apostles, were united in Faith, Worship, Discipline, and manner of Life called Religion?

II. Whether by Separation, or Excommunication from that Society and Unity, are lost those Promises?

III. Doth Christian Religion consist in Matters of Morality, or Ceremony of Indifference to be accepted, or rejected, and altered, at the choice, judgment, and well-liking of Private Persons, Corporations, or States?

IV. Or doth it consist in the Laws and Rules of Faith, and Life of Christians, so important and binding, as that by the contempt thereof one must lose Eternal Happiness?

V. Whether those Laws and Rules taught by Christ and his Apostles, bind as well the Christians of succeeding Ages (who could not be present to see and hear them) as they bound those who were present, heard them taught, and saw their Original Writings?

VI. Whether after the Death of Christ and his Apostles and Disciples, by his Institution other Persons successively in all Ages, were in order chosen and authorised, as Pastors and Church-Magistrates, to preserve, teach, and promulgate those binding Rules to all Nations?

VII. Were they Clergy-men or Lay-men, by whom immediately they were chosen, and authorised in those high Functions?

VIII. Were all Christians in succeeding Ages bound to believe what those succeeding Pastors or Supreme Church-Magistrates taught them, as binding Laws of Christ and his Apostles; and that the Writings by them collected, preserved, and delivered in a different
Language from the Original, were the true Copies of Original Apostolic Writings; and that the Sentence, Interpretations, and Use thereof delivered by them in Supreme Councils, for Unity and Peace, and to prevent Schisms and Errors, were Rules which all Christians were bound to follow?

IX. If not, then, What other Order was there left by Christ and his Apostles, for the Christians of succeeding Ages, to be truly and undoubtedly informed what Christ and his Apostles taught, or wrote so many Ages before, as binding Laws to them that should come after, who never heard them speak, nor saw any of their Original Writings?

X. Whether to the Testimonies and Decrees of those succeeding Pastors and Supreme Church-Magistrates, and to their Sentence given upon the Controversies of Religion, riven in divers Ages, is due at least as much Credit and Obedience (altho' perhaps some of them might be vicious in Life) as in Temporal Matters is due to the Laws, Interpretations, and Sentences of Supreme Civil Magistrates?

XI. Or hath CHRIST left such Liberty to all succeeding Christians, that they need not believe, credit, or obey any the Testimonies, Laws, Interpretations, or Sentences given by any Supreme Legal Governours, Civil or Ecclesiastical, in their respective Councils, farther than every particular Person, in his private Judgment, shall like, chuse, and accept of?

XII. Whether a few particular Persons, or some few of the Magistrates, Civil or Ecclesiastical, for Discontent, or differing in Judgment from the united Body of the rest, may, under pretence of Conscience, or Reformation, separate themselves from that united Body and Society, and make new Translations and Interpretations of Written Laws different from the former, and by Force and Persuasion draw People from their-old Society, Unity, and Obedience, to New Congregations, Institutions, and Rules of their framing, opposite and destructive to the former?

XIII. Whether Persons so acting, are better than Rebels and Usurpers, or such as Simon Magus, and those that deserted the Apostles to follow him; and therefore to be avoided, as Persons separated from the Flock and Religion of CHRIST?

If any give Answer, it is desired to be Categorical and short, without Discourses of things not demanded.

An
An Explanation of the Roman Catholics Belief, concerning these Four Points: Their CHURCH, WORSHIP, JUSTIFICATION, and CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

As it was presented to some Persons of Quality, for their particular Satisfaction.

I. W e believe the Holy Scriptures to be of Divine Inspiration, and Infallible Authority; and whatsoever is therein contained we firmly assent unto, as to the Word of God, the Author of all Truth.

But since in the Holy Scripture there are some things hard to be understood, which the ignorant and unstable wrest to their own destruction, 2 Pet. 3. 16. we therefore profess (for the ending of Controversies in our Religion, and settling of Peace in our Consciences) to submit our private Judgments to the Judgment of the Church in a free General Council.

II. We humbly believe the Sacred Mystery of the Blessed Trinity, one Eternal, Almighty, and Incomprehensible God, whom only we adore and worship, as alone having Soveraign Dominion over all things, to whom alone we acknowledge as due from Men and Angels, all Glory, Service and Obedience, 1 Tim. 1. 17. abhorring from our Hearts, as a most detestable Sacrilege, to give our Creators Honour to any Creature whatsoever.

And therefore we solemnly protest, That by the Prayers we address to Angels and Saints, we intend no other than humbly to solicit their assistance before the Throne of God, as we desire the Prayers of one another here upon Earth; not that we hope any thing from them, as Original Authors thereof, but from God the fountain of all Goodness, throu' Jesus Christ our only Mediator and Redeemer.

Neither do we believe any Divinity or Vertue to be in Images, for which they ought to be worshipped, as the Gentiles did their Idols, but we retain them with due and decent respect in our Churches, as Instruments, which we find by experience, do often assist our Memories, and excite our Affections.

III. We firmly believe, that no force of Nature, or dignity of our best Work, can merit our Justification; but we are justified freely by Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ, Rom. 3. 24.

And tho' we should by the Grace of God persevere unto the end in a Godly life, and Holy Obedience to the Commandments; yet are our hopes of Eternal Glory still built upon the Mercy of God, and the Merits of Christ Jesus.

*All the Misspellings and text imperfections have been removed.*
more than Actions done by the assistance of God's Grace, to which it has pleased his Goodness to promise a Reward; a Doctrine so far from being unsuitable to the Sense of the Holy Scriptures, that it is their principal Design to invite and provoke us to a diligent observance of the Commandments, by promising Heaven as the Reward of our Obedience. 1 Tim. 4. 8. Godliness is profitable to all things, having the promise of this life, and of that which is to come. And, Rom. 2. 6. God will render to every man according to his deeds, to them, who by patient confidence in well doing, seek for Glory, and Honour, and Immortality, Eternal Life. And again, Rom. 8. 13. If you live after the flesh, you shall die; but if through the Spirit you mortify the deeds of the Body, you shall live. And Heb. 6. 10. God is not unjust to forget your work, and labour of love, which you have shewed for his name, &c. Nothing being so frequently repeated in the word of God, as his gracious Promises to recompense with Everlasting Glory the Faith and Obedience of his Servants: Nor is the Bounty of God barely according to our Works, but high and plentiful, even beyond our Capacities, giving full measure, heaped up, pressed down, and running over, into the bosoms of all that love him, Luc. 6. 38.

Thus we believe the Merit or Rewardableness of Holy Living (both which signify the same thing with us) as it is not from the self-value even of our best Actions, as they are ours; but from the Grace and Bounty of God: And for our selves, we sincerely profess, When we have done all those things which are commanded us, we are unprofitable servants, Luc. 17. 10. having done nothing but that which was our duty; so that our boasting is not in our selves, but all our glory is in Christ.

IV. We firmly believe, and highly reverence the Moral Law, being so solemnly delivered to Moses upon the Mount, Exod. 20. Matth. 19. Ecclef. 12. 13. so expressly confirmed by our Saviour in the Gospel, and containing in it self so perfect an Abridgment of our whole Duty both to God and Man.

Which Moral Law we believe obliges all Men to proceed with faithfulness and sincerity in their mutual Contracts, one towards another; and therefore our constant Profession is, That we are most strictly and absolutely bound to the exact and entire Performance of our Promises, made to any Persons, of what Religion soever; much more to the Magistrates and Civil Powers, under whose Protection we live, whom we are taught by the Word of God to obey, not only for fear, but conscience sake; and to whom we will most faithfully observe our Promises of Duty and Obedience, notwithstanding any Dispensation, Absolution, or other Proceedings of any Foreign Power or Authority whatsoever.

Wherefore we utterly deny and renounce that false and scandalous Position, that Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, as most uncharitably imputed to our Practices, and most unjustly pinned upon our Religion.

These we sincerely and solemnly profess, as in the sight of God, the Searcher of all Hearts, taking the words plainly and simply, in their usual and fami-
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STATUT

[Text continues below]
To the Reader.

Not many days since, I had some Papers put into my Hands; which so soon as I had an opportunity, I opened and perused. The first I found intituled, some Queries to Protestants. The next, Queries of Religion or Liberty. And the last, an Explanation of Roman Catholick's Beliefs, concerning these 4 points. Their Church, Worship, Justification, and Civil Government, as it was presented to some Persons of Quality for their particular Satisfaction. By these Papers I found that the Roman Emissaries were very busy, compassing Sea and Land to gain Proselytes. And because they have had no good luck by open and fair dealing, they now take another course; They creep into Houses, and privately insinuate themselves into the acquaintance of unwary People. Which when they have once done, they begin their work; which is by puzzling questions, and false representations of their Religion, to unfix the minds of men; and then take occasion of their unsettledness to draw them over to their party. Now seeing our Adversaries are so diligent, certainly it behooves us to be very watchfull; and by all lawfull ways and means to countermine their cunning Craftiness, and arm our selves against their devices. Upon this consideration, I thought it might be no disservice either to private Christians, or the Church of which I am a Member to take these Papers into consideration; and by JhsW, Anersor.
The Preface.

Answers to the Queries, and a brief Animadversion upon the Explanation, to put weapons into the hands of others, where with they might defend themselves against their Assaults.

This is the design of these few following sheets, wherein I have studied nothing more than Brevity and Plainness. To the first Paper of Queries I have given very short answers, but I hope both plain and full. To the second, because the Queries seem to be contrived with more art and cunning, my answers thereunto are somewhat more large, but I hope, not too long. And upon the Explanation of their Belief in those 4 great points, I have made such Animadversions, as I hope may satisfy any one, that the Explainer hath not dealt so fairly, nor so ingenuously with his Persons of Quality, as he ought to have done.

Whether what is here done, will answer the design of doing it, or no, I know not; but hope, by God's Blessing it may. In confidence therefore of the Divine blessing and assistance, I now, Reader, commit it into thy Hands; desiring only this favour, that to the reading of it, thou wilt bring an humble and teachable temper of mind; which if thou dost, I do not doubt but it may be in some measure serviceable to thee at this time. Which if it be, may God have the glory, and thou the comfort and advantage of it. This is and shall be the hearty Prayer of

Thy faithfull friend,
and fellow Christian.
Some Queries to Protestants answered.

**Qu. 1.** Whether Divine Revelation be not the entire object of Faith, which Faith is but one, &c? Eph. 4. 4.

*Ans.* Divine Revelation is both the rule and object of Faith, which Faith is but one.

**Qu. 2.** Whether Faith must not give an undoubted assent to all things revealed? Jam. 2. 18.

*Ans.* If the Revelation be Divine, there ought not to be doubting of the things revealed.

**Qu. 3.** Whether these Revelations do not contain in them many mysteries transcending the natural reach of humane wit or industry? 1 Cor. 1. 10. Matth. 16. 17.

*Ans.* There are many mysteries in Religion which are above the natural reach of humane wit and industry, above reason but not contrary to reason.

**Qu. 4.** Whether it did not become the divine wisdom and goodness to provide man some way or means whereby he might arrive to the knowledge of those Mysteries?

*Ans.* Divine Wisdom and goodness hath not been wanting in the provision of ways and means, whereby Man may arrive to the knowledge of those Mysteries, so far as is necessary for his happiness both here and hereafter.

**Qu. 5.** Whether these means must not be visible and apparent to all, proportionable to the capacity of all? Joh. 9. 14. Mat. 11. 25. 1 Joh. 5. 22.

*Ans.* The means appointed by God are visible or invisible, they are proportioned to the capacity of all, but it is not necessary they should be visible to all.

**Qu. 6.** Whether these Mysteries were not taught by Christ and the Holy Ghost to his Apostles?

*Ans.* Whatever is contained in the Divine Revelation, was certainly taught by Christ and the Holy Ghost to the Apostles, for he made known unto them the whole Will of God.

**Qu. 7.** Did not the Apostles teach these Doctrines in almost all places of the world, before the Scriptures were all of them written or acknowledged to be their writings, or collected into one Body?

*Ans.* The Apostles were faithful Stewards, and did disperse the Doctrine of the Gospel faithfully and sincerely in all places where they came, even before the Holy Scriptures were all written or collected into one Body.

A 3

**Qu. 8.**
Qu. 8. When they began to write the Scriptures, did they profess that they wrote in them all and every truth which had been delivered unto them, or did they only write them upon emergent occasions?

Ans. All and every truth necessary for the Salvation of mankind, is faithfully and fully delivered in the Holy Scriptures. And that being the design of them, we have no reason to be anxious or solicitous about any more.

Qu. 9. Were all divine truths necessary for the Salvation of mankind, for the Government of the Church, and the confounding of Errors designedly and expressly delivered in them?

Ans. The Scriptures are abundantly sufficient to instruct all men in those things which may secure their Salvation, and preserve them from error; and whatsoever essentially necessary to the Being or good Government of a Church may there be found; but whatsoever may be accidentally necessary in respect of time and place, is left to the prudence of Governours.

Qu. 10. Was not the sense and meaning of this written word delivered at the same time to the Apostles Successors?

Ans. The Apostles did explain the Mind and Will of God to all to whom they preached, and the written word being designed not only for the learned but unlearned, was set down in such intelligible words as might comport with the capacities of all.

Qu. 11. Were not those Successors of the Apostles obliged under pain of damnation to deliver the sense and meaning to their Successors, and so consequentially to our days, or at least no contrary sense?

Ans. The Successors of the Apostles in all Ages are undoubtedly oblig'd to deliver the true sense and meaning of the Holy Scriptures to others; and it were to be wished that none had failed of their duty therein.

Qu. 12. Whether all that is mentioned in Scripture be not true, according to the sense and meaning so delivered?

Ans. All that is mentioned in Scripture is undoubtedly true, according to the true sense and meaning thereof.

Qu. 13. Whether an obstinate Contradiction of any one truth thus delivered in Scripture (though there appear no necessity it should have been mentioned in Scripture) be not injurious to that divine Authority and veracity, and which unrepented of shall bring damnation?

Ans. An obstinate contradiction of any one plain truth delivered in Holy Scripture, is certainly a very great injury to divine authority and veracity.

Qu. 14. When difficulties did arise about the sense of Scriptures or matters of Faith, whether the decision of those controversies was carried, and whether the present Church of every Age was not to decide it?

Ans.
Ans. It was undoubtedly the practice, and is most rational that the present Church in every Age should decide such controversies. For, the Priest's Lips should preserve knowledge, and they should enquire the Law at his mouth. And no question the Church hath Authority to declare matters of Faith, but not to make any new Articles of Faith.

Qu. 15. Whether every particular person was to have an Authoritative power in this decision, or whether it was not universally left to the Heads and Governours of the Church Assembled together?

Ans. Every particular person hath undoubtedly a Judgment of discretion allow'd him in matters of that nature, but the Authoritative power of deciding and determining was in the Heads and Governours of the Church Assembled together for that end.

Qu. 16. Whether such a force of Hopes or Fears could possibly happen at once upon all the Heads of the universal Church Assembled together, or after consenting to those that were Assembled, as should make them declare that to be a truth revealed by Christ, which was not so delivered to them to have been the ever esteemed sense of Scripture or perpetual tradition which was not so?

Ans. Whilst men are men they will be liable to hopes and fears; and subject to the power and force of them; if therefore we consider the Heads and Governours of the Church as such we cannot allow them an Exemption therefrom; and consequently there may be no impossibility in the things propounded. We grant that in a General Council lawfully assembled, we have great reason to hope for the presence, direction and assistance of the Holy Ghost, but how far the passions and humours of men may frustrate our Hopes, we know not. This we certainly know, that the Acts of one Council have been made void by another; and therefore it is more than probable that one of them did declare something to be a truth revealed by Christ, which was not so delivered unto them.

Qu. 17. Whether the Decisions of such Assemblies or general Councils were not always esteemed obligatory in the Church; and whether particular Persons or Churches obstinately gainsaying such Decisions received by a much Major part of the Church disfus'd, were not always esteemed to have incurred those Anathema's pronounced by such Councils?

Ans. If those Assemblies or Councils be truly general, we do very much reverence their Authority, and think their decisions to be obligatory. But we do not think all to be such that are called so; As for instance, The Council of Trent is by some sort of men looked upon as a general Council, and all their Religion almost built upon the Authority thereof; and yet the Church of England never received the decisions of that Council, nor did the Gallican Church for many years; and
yet neither the one nor the other did for all that esteem themselves to have incurred the Anathema's pronounced by that Council.

Qu. 18. Whether the universal Church did not in all Ages practice this way of deciding controversies, and whether these be not as universal a tradition of this, as the practice was universal without interruption?

Anf. Universal practice will amount to an universal Tradition, and that this hath been the practice of the Church in all Ages; especially in matters of great weight, we deny not; nor should we oppose the same course now, provided the Council were free and general.

But the Enquirer goes on,

Some will perhaps say, that such Councils cannot Err in fundamentals but may in not fundamentals: I ask these,

Qu. What are fundamentals and what not?

Anf. Those things which are essentially necessary to the being of Religion may properly be called fundamental; but those things, which only respect order and decency therein, and vary according to time and place, and are alterable by the Governors of the Church, when they see cause there, these are not fundamental.

Qu. Whether there be not some things fundamental to the Church, which are not to every particular?

Anf. There may be some things fundamental to the Being of a Church, which are not so to every particular member of that Church, but whatsoever things are fundamental to the Being of Religion, are equally so to the whole Church and every member thereof.

Qu. Whether an obstinate denial of what is fundamental or necessary to the universal Church, or granting as I may say upon what is fundamental by a particular person, be not in time a fundamental Error, especially after an universal declaration of it as truth delivered by Christ and his Apostles?

Anf. This Query as it is here worded is hardly reconcilable to sense, but I suppose his meaning is, Whether for any particular person obstinately to deny what is fundamental or necessary to the universal Church, and declared to be a truth delivered by Christ and his Apostles, be not a fundamental Error? To which I answer. That every particular Christian ought with all deference to submit his own private Judgment to the publick Judgment of the Church, and though it do not appear so plain to him, yet he ought rather to suspect his own than that of the Church. But if in some things he cannot be satisfied, and therein happen to differ from the Church, provided he do not thereby break the peace and unity of the Church, it will hardly amount to a fundamental Error. But what if it be declared by the Church to be a truth.
a truth delivered by Christ and his Apostles, will not that make it so? To this I answer, That no declaration of the Church, how universal soever it be, can make that to be a truth delivered by Christ and his Apostles, which really is not so. And therefore in that case we must have recourse to their Writings, and if it be not either in express words contained therein, or by found consequence drawn therefrom, we ought not to comply with it, nor is it a fundamental Error to differ therein.

Qu. Whether the universal Church assembled in a General Council ought not to be justly esteemed the decider of what is fundamental, and what not?

Ans. When the universal Church by her proper Representatives is lawfully assembled in a Council truly General, that Council without all dispute will be a very proper Judge of what is fundamental, and what not; but this is rather to be prayed than hoped for.

Qu. Whether an obstinate denial of any one truth delivered by Jesus Christ or his Apostles (though the delivery was not absolutely necessary to Salvation) may not be called a fundamental Error, seeing it brings the rest delivered in question, as also his veracity?

Ans. The denial of any one truth delivered by Jesus Christ or his Apostles is a very great fault, and if that denial be obstinately continued in, after plain conviction that it is such a truth, it is a very dangerous Error.

Qu. Whether therefore the denial of any one truth delivered to us by an uninterrupted tradition, as taught by Christ and his Apostles, would not be a fundamental Error?

Ans. There is a great difference between a thing delivered as taught, and plainly taught, by Christ and his Apostles; for we meet with many things delivered as taught by them, and tradition pretended for them, which really and in truth were never taught by them, or either of them; and to deny such is so far from being a fundamental Error, that it is no Error at all. There is also a great difference between traditions. If by tradition he mean the holy Scriptures, we grant that to deny any thing that is plainly and clearly taught therein, is a very great Error: But if by tradition he mean such as is merely humane, and not clearly warranted by the Word of God, we think we ought to reject such, how uninterrupted soever they be; for if an Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel than hath been preached, let him be accursed, saith St. Paul.

Qu. And on the other side, whether the teaching of any Doctrine (only piously believed, but) sufficiently known not to have been expressly, or by a natural consequence delivered by Christ and his Apostles, and which may upon that account be false, not having Divine Revelation (which alone is infallible)
fallible) for its ground; whether, I say, the teaching such a Doctrine so
known, as one that was delivered by Christ, (when they know it was not)
would not be a fundamental Error?

Ans. Whosoever teacheth such Doctrines as are mentioned in this
Query, and in that manner, is highly guilty; and when the Enquirer
shall think fit to be more particular, and produce his instances, he may
expect a more particular answer, and perhaps be told at whose door
this charge will lie: In the mean time this general answer may suffice.

Qu. Whether Christ having taken care (as some grant) that his Church
should not err in fundamentals, hath not consequently taken care that she should
not teach anyone Doctrine as delivered by Christ, and consequently of Faith,
which was not taught by him, and consequently might be an Error?

Ans. Christ hath taken all care possible to secure his Church from
Error, and hath given her his gracious promise to be with her to the
end of the World. But the Church being composed of men, and such
as are fallible, the security is not promised to particulars. Particular
persons, and particular Churches too, we know, not only may, but
have, grossly erred. The security therefore is only promised to the Uni-
versal Church; and when he tells us what he means by that, he may
expect a more direct answer to his Query.

Qu. Whether those Doctrines, or most of them, controverted now by Pro-
testants, have not been taught and believed in the Church as Doctrines deliv-
ered by Christ, long before Luther, yea and delivered in the most General Coun-
cils those Ages would permit, and accepted of by the Church diffusive, none
that we know of dissenting, but those condemned in those Councils for Here-
ticks, and whose Herefies expired almost with themselves?

Ans. It is now plain that this Enquirer, by the Church, and universal
Church to often mentioned by him, both all along mean the Church of
Rome, which we are so far from complying with him in, though we
own that Church to be a Member, yet we cannot allow it to be a sound
Member of the Catholick Church. And if by the Decisions and Declara-
tions of the Church, he mean the determinations of that Church, they
are no further obligatory than to her own Members, nor many of them
to them neither, if strictly enquired into. As for Luther, we do not
receive our Religion from him, but from Jesus Christ; and for any
Doctrines now controverted, we are content to have the same determined
by the Holy Scriptures, and the four first General Councils. As for the
Councils our Enquirer hints at, we deny that they were truly General,
or that all their decisions were ever accepted of by the Church diffusive.
And he cannot but know that there were many more, not only Persons,
but whole Churches, which did differ from them.

Qu. Whether there was from the first 300 years, till the time of Luther,
any known body of Pastors and Teachers declaring a dissent in any Age from
those Doctrines, and opposing those Councils; and whether the Greek Churches
did not, and do to this very day consent with this Western Church in most points
now controverted by Protestants?

Ans. This Query is preposterously put, for how should any body of
Pastors and Teachers in the first 400 years oppose themselves to those
Councils which were not then in being, nor heard of till many hundred
years afterwards? But that the Fathers in those first Ages did teach the
same Doctrines we now do, we appeal to the Records of those times.
And that those after-Councils by him mentioned, were dissenters from
those of the first Ages, we are contented to be tried by comparing the
Acts of both together. And that the Greek Church did, or now doth,
agree with the Church of Rome in all or most of those points now in
difference between her and us, we utterly deny, and challenge him to
the proof of it.

Qu. Whether Luther (the first Author of Protestantism) did not separate
himself from the whole visible Church at that time spread over the West,
contradicting all the Prelates and Pastors then living in the universal practice
of that Church, and the General Councils received as such by the foregoing
Ages?

Ans: As for the names of Protestant and Papist, I look upon them as
names of distinction, not of Religion. The Religion we both own is
Christian: This we do not receive from Luther, nor they from Ignatius
Loyala, St. Francis, or any such, but both of us from Jesus Christ; The
only question is, Whether they or we hold that Religion in greatest
purity? 'Tis true that Luther in his time did more narrowly look into
the corruptions of the Church of Rome, declared against them, and on
that account separated from her Communion, and for any thing yet
appears may be very well justified in so doing. For, if any Church
shall make terms of her Communion so sinful and dangerous that no
man with safety to his Soul can continue in it, it will be high time to
come out of it.

Qu. Whether be we Protestants at present do pretend to such Demonstration
for those Tenets they hold contrary to the Roman Church, (the then only
visible Church in the West) that no understanding, to which it is sufficiently
proposed, can in the least doubt of it?

Ans. We have such evidence for the Doctrines which we hold and
teach in opposition to the Church of Rome, as, being sufficiently proposed,
no man can reasonably doubt of. And as for those who will scruple
without reason, notwithstanding the clearest evidence that the nature of
the thing will bear, we can only pity and pray for them.

Qu. Or whether they do not rather say, that being fallible, they may err,
even in what they think a Demonstration; and if they may err, perhaps they have erred even in their Reformation?

Ans. We do not pretend to infallibility, nor do we think that the claim which the Bishop of Rome makes to it is any more than a groundless pretence only. But *ad posse ad esse non valet consequentia*, from a bare possibility of erring, to argue a certainty that we have erred in every thing we have done, is an argument fitter to be offered to Children than Men.

Qu. Whether therefore denying these Doctrines thus delivered by the Church in all Ages, as Doctrines delivered by Christ and his Apostles, upon no better grounds than these, perhaps they may be true, and perhaps not, be not a putting ones self into the danger of erring even in fundamentals?

Ans. We deny no Doctrines delivered by the Church in all Ages, as Doctrines delivered by Christ and his Apostles; nor do we own any Doctrine upon such weak grounds, as perhaps they may be true, and perhaps not. But we say, that the present Church of Rome doth teach such Doctrines as the Doctrines of Christ and his Apostles, which were never taught by the Church in all Ages, nor delivered by Christ and his Apostles; And in these things we oppose our selves against them, and think we have great reason so to do, having the holy Scriptures and the Primitive Church on our side. And whilst we are thus supported, we have no fear of erring in fundamentals.

Queries of Religion or Liberty.

Who this Enquirer is, as I am at present ignorant, so am I not much concern’d to know; but I take him to be one who hath conceived a mighty opinion of himself and his performances. He thinks that by these Queries he hath struck at the root of Protestancy, (as he and those of his Persuasion call it) i.e. Reformed Christianity, that he hath given it a fatal blow, a mortal wound, and left it groveling in the dust without the least hopes of recovery. Like that overgrown, uncircumcised Philistine, he defieth the Armies of the Living God, and calls for a Man to fight with him; For, in the close of his Queries he maketh this proud and confident challenge.

If any give answer, (As if he should have said, if any be so bold and daring, so over confident and fool-hardy, as to undertake an Answer to these Queries) It is desired to be Categorical and short, without any Discourses of things not demanded.

Now whether this man do not triumph before the Victory, or whether those Queries be so unanswerable as he believes them to be, is the thing under consideration. And because he hath not only given the Challenge, but appointed the Weapon, I shall neither decline the one, nor
nor the other, but according to his own method shall undertake his Queries in the same order as he hath propounded them.

Qu. 1. Whether the Flock and Church of Christ (to whom was promised grace and eternal happiness) be that company and society of People christened in his Name, who by order of Government, Rules, and Decrees, from him and his Apostles, were united in Faith, Worship, Discipline, and manner of Life, called Religion?

Anf. The Church of Christ is either Militant or Triumphant, the one on Earth, the other in Heaven; of the former of which we are now to speak. The Church Militant is either Universal, or Particular; the former comprehending all and every Member of Christ's Mystical Body, wherever dispersed upon the face of the whole Earth; the latter comprizing only a certain Number of Christians formed into a select Body or Society, under certain Laws and Rules not differing from those of the Universal Church. Such are all Provincial and National Churches; and though none of them may arrogate to themselves the Title of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, yet none will deny but that they are true Members thereof. This I have premised to prevent confusion and misunderstanding: for the confounding of these two, as it often happens in discourses of this kind, hath been the occasion of great mistakes. Those of the Romish Perswasion, by the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, do usually understand the Church of Rome, which though it be a manifest Contradiction, being the same with a Particular Universal, yet do they run away with it, and by that specious and gorgeous Title think to bear down all before them, aloud proclaiming that to be the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches. This thus premised, I shall now be as Categorical and short in my Answer to his Query, as he can desire: Viz. That the Flock and Church of Christ is a Company or Society of People christened in his Name, who by Order of Government, rules, and decrees from him and his Apostles, are united in Faith, Worship, Discipline, and Manner of Life, called Religion.

Qu. 2. Whether by Separation or Excommunication from that Society and Unity are lost those promises?

Anf. Separation and Excommunication are two things, for, though every one that is excommunicated be thereby separated from that body, of which before he was a member; yet a man may be in a state of Separation, without being under the doom of Excommunication. For Separation may be a voluntary Act, whereas Excommunication is a formal and Judicial Sentence, delivered by a lawful Judge, authorized and appointed by the Church to pronounce the same; by virtue whereof the sentenced person is divided from the Body, separated from
the Society, and shut out of the Communion of God's Church. The case thus stated, my answer to this Query will be as followeth, viz.

1. Whosoever, upon any pretence whatsoever, doth separate himself from the Society and Unity of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolical Church, doth in so doing cast himself out of the paternal care and protection of God. For, it is a certain and undoubted truth, He that hath not the Church for his Mother cannot have God for his Father. And consequently can have no pretence to the promises of grace here, or eternal happiness hereafter.

2. Whosoever without just cause, doth separate himself from the Society and Unity of that particular Church of which he is a member, is guilty of a sinful and dangerous Schism; and whilst he continues therein can have no reason to expect the blessing of those promises.

3. That there may be sometimes a just cause of Separation, as when a Church makes the conditions of her Communion such, as a man cannot communicate with her, without sin and danger. But in this case particular members ought to be mighty wary and cautious; for, it is not every dissatisfaction of their own, or every irregularity of that Church, that will be a sufficient cause of Separation, unless the terms of her Communion be manifestly and apparently sinful.

4. That the great end and design of Excommunication is the repentance and amendment of the person excommunicated. It doth not therefore make void the promises of God, nor utterly deprive the sentenced person of the benefits thereof, but onely by a temporary correction shews him his folly and danger, and calls upon him by a timely repentance and amendment to recover himself out of the one, and prevent the other. But it must be acknowledged, that if a man obstinately continue in that condition, and live and die under that sentence, his condition will be very dangerous.

These may serve as general Answers to this Query, but if by the Separation or Excommunication here mentioned, be meant, (as no question it is) a Separation of Excommunication from the Society and Unity of the Church of Rome; Then we have this further to say.

1. That the present Church of Rome hath separated herself from the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolical Church, by setting up such Doctrines and practices as were never taught, practised, nor allowed either by Christ or his Apostles, or their Successors in the Primitive Church.

2. That the present Church of Rome hath made the conditions of her Communion, such as none without sin and danger can Communicate with her, and by that means hath justified a Separation from her.

3. That the Church of Rome hath not, nor ever had any lawful Power
Power or Authority over the Church of England; nor are we Subject to the Jurisdiction of that See, whether we consider it as Episcopal, or as Metropolitan, or as Patriarchal; and therefore we cannot be justly charged with a Separation therefrom. It is true indeed that for some time she had Tyrannically usurped an unjust power over us, and kept us in Bondage and Slavery to her; but, God be thanked, we at last found an opportunity to shake off those Chains, and deliver our selves from the Servitude under which we had so long groaned. And this we have done, and are still ready to justice to the whole world to be no sinful Separation.

4. That an Excommunication thundered out by the Church of Rome against us of the Church of England, is but only Brutum fulmen, an insignificant Scare-Crow, which upon mature consideration, we have no cause to be afraid of; for she having no power over us, we are not accountable to her, nor subject to any sentence pronounced by her; and therefore notwithstanding that pretended Separation or Excommunication from the Society and Unity of that Church, which they make so much noise with, we are in no apprehension of losing the benefits of those promises, which God hath made to his One, Holy, Catholick and Apostolick Church, of Grace here and Eternal Happiness hereafter.

Qu. 3. Doth Christian Religion consist in matters of Morality or Ceremony, of indifference to be accepted or rejected, and altered at the Choice Judgment and well liking of private Persons, Corporations, or States?

Ans. Religion in general may be considered either in its Essentails, or as it is clothed with Circumtantsialls. The former of which are unalterable, but the latter may be subject to change. The Christian Religion in particular falls under the same consideration, the Being whereof consists indeed in matters of Morality, which being instituted and ordained by Christ are not alterable by Men. But the order and decency, which are things necessary to the well being of that Religion, consists in Ceremonies and things indifferent, which are in their own nature alterable, and being the institutions of Men, may be altered by Men; but not by any private Persons: For whatsoever hath been established by the whole Body, cannot be altered by any particular member, or any number of Men, who are members of that Body, nor by any Authority les than that, by which at first it was established. And here the Church of Rome may do well to consider by what power and authority she hath made so bold with the very Essentails of the Christian Religion, altering some and adding others, making new Articles of Faith, which were never taught by Christ nor his Apostles, and imposing them as necessary to be believed by all those of her Communion.

Qu. 4:
Qu. 4. Or doth it consist in the Laws and Rules of Faith, and life of Christians, so important, and binding, as that by the contempt thereof one must lose Eternal Happiness?

Anf. This Query is very little, different from the former, and hath, I think, received a sufficient answer in the solution of that. For by matters of Morality there, wherein I lay the Being of the Christian Religion doth consist; I mean Moral and unchangeable truths, which are to be received and believed by all Christians, and Moral actions which are to be done by them; and for our belief and performance of these things, we have such laws and rules delivered by Christ and his Apostles, as are binding unto all; the contempt whereof may very much endanger, and without a serious and reasonable repentance and amendment will certainly forfeit eternal happiness. And therefore it will highly concern the Church of Rome to consider, whether she be not guilty of such contempt, whether in some of her publick Orders and Decrees she have not apparently contradicted some of these important Laws and Rules?

Qu. 5. Whether those Laws and Rules taught by Christ and his Apostles bind as well the Christians of succeeding Ages (who could not be present to see and hear them) as they bound those who were present, heard them taught, and saw their Original Writings?

Anf. That these Laws and Rules are as binding to me now, as they were to any of the Disciples in our Saviour's or his Apostles' time, I willingly grant. And if this concession will do this Enquirer any service, much good may do him with it. For, if the seeing of the Original Writings of Christ and his Apostles, or being present to hear them deliver those Laws and Rules, were necessary to make them obligatory, then ought we to have Christ and his Apostles come down from Heaven, and write and preach the same things over again, not only in every Age, but in every year & every day of that year, and in all places of the world too. But let us proceed, and see what mighty use this Enquirer will make of this wire drawing this Query.

Qu. 6. Whether after the death of Christ and his Apostles, and Disciples, by his institution other persons successively in all Ages were in order chosen, and Authorized as Pastours and Church Magistrates, to preserve, teach, and promulgate those binding Rules to all Nations?

Anf. That the blessed Jesus, out of his abundant care and goodness, for the carrying on of that great work which he had begun, for the promoting of that holy Religion which he had instituted, and the well ordering of that Church which he had founded, did appoint certain orders of Men, and endow them with gifts which might qualify them for their several employments, we do verily believe. For St. Paul tells
us, God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers, after that Miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues, 1 Cor. 12. 28. And in another place he faith, He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastours and Teachers, Eph. 4. 11. But that he ever instituted any Officer in the Church, by the name of a Church-Magistrate, I never read. Yet if by his Church-Magistrate, he mean no more than St. Paul doth, by Governments, we shall not quarrel with him about the word. And that it was the work of these Officers to preserve those Laws and Rules which he left, and to teach and promulgate them to all Nations, we readily grant. But then what shall we think of those, who either add thereto, or diminish therefrom; who either alter those binding Laws and Rules, or make new ones of their own, and impose them upon others as if they were of equal Force and Authority with those delivered by Christ and his Apostles? I could easily give instances, to shew that the Church of Rome is guilty both ways; but I am not willing to transgress the method which the Enquirer hath propounded, by entering upon discourses of things not demanded.

Qu. 7: Were they Clergymen or Laymen by whom immediately they were chosen, and authorized in those high Functions?

Ans. We do verily believe, being well assured by the Holy Scriptures, by the Doctrine and practice of the Apostles and primitive Christians, and by the usage and custom of the Church of God in all Ages, that it only appertains to Clergymen, by the solemn imposition of hands to set apart others to those Sacred Functions, and that they have sufficient Power and Authority to authorize them to perform those Holy Offices. I never heard this denied by any of the Reformed Religion, and therefore this Enquirer might, if he had so pleased, have spared this Query.

Qu. 8: Were all Christians in succeeding Ages bound to believe what those succeeding Pastours or Supreme Church-Magistrates taught them, as binding Laws of Christ and his Apostles, and that the Writings by them collected, preserved, and delivered in a different Language from the Original, were the true Copies of Original Apostolick Writings, and that the sentence, interpretation and use thereof delivered by them in Supreme Councils for unity and peace, and to prevent Schisms and Errors, were Rules which all Christians were bound to follow?

Ans. This Query is a Song of three parts, to answer all which directly, I shall be obliged to take it in pieces, and consider the parts severally. And though the Answers thereunto would very well admit, and do almost necessarily require a long discourse; yet I remem-
ber the Enquirer hath confined me to a Method, which I have promi-
fed to observe, and therefore in my answers thereunto I shall be as short
as possible, without entering upon discourses of things not demanded.

Qu. 1. Were all Christians in succeeding Ages bound to believe what
these succeeding Pastors or Supreme Church-Magistrates taught them, as bind-
ing Laws of Christ and his Apostles.

Ans. Whatever hath been taught as a binding Law of Christ and his
Apostles, by all the Pastors and Governours of the Church in all Ages,
at all times, and in all places, we have no reason to suspect. For Christ
hath promised to be with his Church to the end of the World, Matt.
28, 20. And to build it upon a Rock, so that the Gates of Hell shall
not prevail against it, Matt. 16: 18. And by his spirit of truth, to guide
it into all truth, Job. 16. 13. The universal Church therefore being
thus secured from error, we have no apprehensions of being decei-
ved thereby. But though we owe this deference to the One, Holy,
Catholic and Apostolick Church, and the united Body of the Pastors
and Governours thereof, yet no particular Church, nor any particu-
lar Pastor or Governour thereof, nor any number of them, less than
the whole, have any reason to claim the same; for whilst Men are
Men, they are and will be fallible, and being so, they may and often-
times do err, and though the whole Body cannot yet any particular
Member may be deceived; and therefore we ought not greedily to
swallow all that is taught by them, but to examine well what they
reach, before we give our assent thereunto, otherwise we may easil
be imposed upon.

Qu. 2. Were all Christians in succeeding Ages bound to believe; that the
writings collected by those succeeding Pastors or Supreme Church-Ma-
gistrates, and by them preserved and delivered in a different Language
from the Original, were the true Copies of Original Apostolick Writings ?

Ans. That the Holy Scriptures were faithfully collected and preser-
vied by the Church, and that the Copies handed down to us, though
in a Language different from the Original, are true Copies, we do not
at all doubt. For, we cannot imagine that the universal Church
should conspire together to impose a falsehood upon posterity. But
that these Scriptures are the Word of God we believe not only upon
the Authority of the Church, but for several other reasons, as this
Gem. cannot but know, if he have been conversant in our Writings:
which reasons might here fitly be produced, if I were not confined by
the Enquirer to a short Method, and had promised to observe the same.
I shall therefore only add that if, by being bound to believe, he means,
that it is a binding Law of Christ and his Apostles, that for this rea-
son, we should believe those Copies to be true; we deny it, because
we:
we cannot find any such Law delivered by them. But if (by being bound to believe) he only mean, that considering by whom they are handed to us, we have no reason to doubt of them; we readily comply with him.

Qu. 3. Were all Christians in succeeding Ages bound to believe, that the sentence, interpretations and use of those Writings delivered by those Pastors or Supreme Church-Magistrates in Supreme Councils for Unity and Peace, and to prevent Schisms and Errors, were Rules which all Christians were bound to follow?

Ans. What this Enquirer meaneth by Supreme Church-Magistrates and Supreme Councils, is somewhat hard to be understood; for to constitute two Supremes in one and the same body will make it look a little monstrous. If by the Council being Supreme, he mean that is above the Supreme Church-Magistrate (i.e. the Pope, for I do not doubt but that he intends him all along by that Expression) I am afraid his Holy Father will give him but small thanks for that opinion. But if, by his Supreme Church-Magistrate, he mean that the Pope is above the Council, then what signifieth the sentence or interpretation of a Council, if not confirmed by him? So that till this case be rightly stated, and agreed upon amongst them, both they and we shall be at a loss, whose declaration is to be the Rule, which we are bound to follow. We do highly reverence the Authority of Councils truly general, and for any thing in difference between us and the Church of Rome, we dare appeal and stand to the determination of the four first general Councils. But to be Hood-winkt, and bound up by an implicit Faith, to receive and embrace every thing, that is offered to us, by those who call themselves Pastors, or Supreme Church-Magistrates, or by every Convention which calls it self a Supreme Council, is more than we can consent to, and more indeed than either Christ or his Apostles required of their hearers. When neither the Doctrine preached by Christ, nor the Miracles done by him for the confirmation of that Doctrine, could convince the stubborn and unbelieving Jews, that he was the Messiah, whither doth he send them? he bids them search the Scriptures, Job. 5. 39. And St. Paul highly commends the Bereans, saying, They were more noble than those of Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so, Acts. 17. 10, 11. Our Saviour and his Apostle St. Paul, did not trouble their hearers with puzzling questions. Whether those Writings were the Word of God? How they were assured that they were so? What was the sense and meaning of them? How they came to know it, &c. Nor did they send them to the Sanhedrim, or any other Council to be instructed therein;
therein; but they send them directly and immediately to the Scriptures themselves. It was taken for granted then, and ought to be so now, that the Writings transmitted to them and us, did really and indeed contain the Word of God, and both our Saviour and St. Paul well knew, that God had delivered his mind in words so intelligible, that there was no fear of sending any one thereunto. And indeed it were an unreasonable thing that every private Christian should be obliged to consult what sense and meaning is put upon the Holy Scriptures by a general Council, before he receive and embrace them. Nor will it suffice to say, that they may learn it from their Pastors and Teachers, for how shall they know that their Pastors and Teachers understand it any better than they do, or if they do, that they give them the true and genuine sense and interpretation, for they may with as much reason suspect them, as they can those Copies of the Sacred Writings which they have, though in a Language different from the Original. So that at this rate, Christians will be involved in such Intricacies and Meanders, that they will never know what they should believe, and what not. And therefore, though we have a great veneration for what is delivered by Councils truly General, yet can we not consent that that is the only rule which all Christians ought to follow.

Qu. 9. If not then, what other order was there left by Christ and his Apostles for the Christians of succeeding Ages, to be truly and undoubtedly informed what Christ and his Apostles taught, or wrought so many Ages before, as binding Laws to them that should come after, who never heard them speak, nor saw any of their Original Writings?

Ans. Even the same which our blessed Saviour recommended to the Jews, and St. Paul so highly commended in the Bereans, i.e. to search the Scriptures, which whosoever doth, and that with an humble and teachable temper of mind, may therein easily discover such evident footsteps of Divinity, as will plainly speak their Original, and sufficiently inform us whence they are, and by what manner of Persons they were written. Therein may we find all things necessary to our Salvation writ in Characters so legible that he that runs may reade them, so plain and easie, that the meanest capacity may understand them. So that to fortifie our perswasion that these are the Laws and Rules delivered by Christ and his Apostles, if we had no other way left us, this alone might suffice. But if any private Christian meet with any thing therein, which requires some help for satisfaction, he hath Pastors and Teachers at hand to apply himself unto, who are an Order of men instituted by Christ for that very end and purpose; and in whom, if he hath not some apparent reason to the contrary, he ought to repose great confidence.

Qu. 10.
Qu. 10. Whether to the Testimonies and Decrees of those succeeding Pastors and Supreme Church-Magistrates, and to their sentence given upon the Controversies of Religion, rifen in divers Ages, is due, at least, as much Credit and Obedience (although perhaps some of them might be vicious in Life) as in temporal matters is due to the Laws, Interpretations and Sentences of Supreme Civil Magistrates?

Ans. That as much Credit and Obedience is due to the Testimonies and Decrees of the Pastors and Governours of the Church in matters of Religion, as to the Laws, Interpretations and Sentences of Civil Magistrates in temporal matters, I readily grant. But then we may do well to consider how far that Credit and Obedience ought to extend both in the one and other Case. For, as in temporal matters, if the Commands of the Civil Magistrate do concern matters of Faith, i.e. things which I am required to believe; in that Case his Laws ought to be so clear and evident, as may convince my reason and judgment, otherwise I am not bound, by a blind resignation to surrender up my faith and belief; for it is not in the power of man to make me think otherwise than I do, without such convincing reasons as may satisfy me that I think amiss. But if I cannot believe as he would have me to believe, yet ought I not by publickly opposing his Sentiments, to raise a Faction, and thereby disturb the Peace of that State in which I live. Or if the Commands of the Civil Magistrate concern matters of Fact, wherein my obedience is required; in that case if I can with a safe conscience and without disobeying God do it, I ought actively to obey the Civil Magistrate, but if I cannot do it without displeasing God, and wounding my own Conscience, in that case I ought not to resist, but passively to obey; For, here the Apostle’s Rule will hold good. Whether it be better to obey God or Man, judge ye? So in matters of Religion. If the Testimonies and Decrees of the Pastors and Governours of the Church do concern matters of Faith, I do acknowledge that there is a great deference due to their sentence and opinion, and unless there be very clear evidence to the contrary, I ought rather to suspect my own than theirs; yet whatsoever Testimonies and Decrees are propounded by the Church, they are propounded to rational men; and it must necessarily be supposed, that men ought to exercise that reason which God hath endowed them withal, in judging of the evidence upon which those Testimonies and Decrees are built, which evidences, if they do not prove convincing, and satisfactory, they cannot command their own belief; much less can any Power or Authority do it. For, to act by an implicit faith in that case were to act more like Brutes than Men. And therefore though we willingly own that there is as much credit
credit due to them, as to Civil Magistrates in the like case, yet can we not grant any more. Or if their Testimonies and Decrees concern matters of Fact, wherein our Obedience is required, i.e. matters of Discipline, which respect the order and decency of Religion, we grant that obedience is due to them, and as much obedience as is due to Civil Magistrates in the like case; yet still a Judgment of discretion is to be allowed to the Subject, how far he can with a safe Conscience actively obey, and when and where he is to exercise his passive obedience. But this caution ought to be observed by every private Christian, that by an imprudent management of his different Sentiments he do not disturb the Peace, nor break the Order and Unity of the Church.

Qu. 11. Or hath Christ left such liberty to all succeeding Christians, that they need not believe, credit, or obey any the Testimonies, Laws, Interpretations, or Sentences given by any supreme Legal Governours, Civil or Ecclesiastical, in their respective Councils, further than every particular person in his private Judgment shall like, chuse, and accept of?

Ans. This Query I take to be fully answered in the Answer to that immediately preceding, wherein the case is plainly stated. How far the Credit and Obedience of Inferiours is due to the Sentences and Determinations of their Superiours, whether Civil or Ecclesiastical, And thereupon without saying the same things over again, or enlarging thereupon, I shall refer you thereunto.

Qu. 12. Whether a few particular persons, or some few of the Magistrates Civil or Ecclesiastical, for discontent or differing in Judgment, from the united body of the rest, may under pretence of Conscience or Reformation separate themselves from the United body and Society, and make new translations and interpretations of written Laws different from the former, and by force and persecution draw People from their old Society, Unity and Obedience, to new Congregations, Institutions and Rules of their framing, opposite and destructive to the former?

Ans. This Query consists of several parts, and therefore to give a direct and apposite Answer thereunto, I shall endeavour to obviate the several parts thereof by these Propositions following, viz.

1. That no person or number of men, whether they be private Persons, or Magistrates Civil or Ecclesiastical, ought to separate themselves, on any pretence whatsoever, from the body of the One, Holy, Catholick and Apostolick Church.

2. That discontent or differing in Judgment only, are no sufficient grounds of separation from any particular Church, whereof we are Members.

3. That a bare pretence of Conscience and Reformation will not justify
justifie a Schism, nor excuse those who are guilty of a Schismatical separation either in Church or State. For, the peace of the whole Community is far more valuable than any private man's satisfaction, and ought not to be laid open to the attempts of any Schismatical pretenders whatsoever.

4. That the written and established Laws of God or his Vicegerents upon Earth, are not reversible, nor alterable by any man, or number of men. Because they cannot pretend to that Authority, by which at first they were established, and without that they cannot be altered. For, if we, or an Angel from Heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed, faith St. Paul. Gal. 1. 8.

5. That it is not lawfull for any person or persons who are Members of an established Church, either by force or perswasion to draw People from the Communion of that Church, and to break the Unity, and disturb the Peace thereof; or by any Artifices what ever either to undermine or batter down the Ramparts, i.e. the established Laws and Constitutions of that Church.

These Propositions put together, may suffice as a general Answer to this Query; but now to apply them to the matter in hand, i.e. the difference between us and the Church of Rome, for on that account was the Query propounded. And this I shall now do in these following particulars.

1. That the Church of Rome (though she mightly pretend to it) is not that One, Holy, Catholick and Apostolick Church. That she is a Member of the Catholick Church we grant, though we can scarce allow her to be a found Member thereof; but that she should pretend to be the One, Holy, Catholick and Apostolick Church, either diffusive or representative we cannot consent, nor hath she ever yet, or ever will be able to make good her claim thereunto:

2. That the present Church of Rome is guilty of a sinfull and Schismatical Separation from the United Body of the One, Holy, Catholick and Apostolick Church, we affirm. And that for these reasons, 1. Because she usurps an higher place and power in the Body Ecclesiastical, than of right is due unto her, thereby breaking the Union, and disturbing the Peace of the Church. 2. Because she hath voluntarily divided the Catholick Church, both in Faith, Worship, and Government, by her innovations. 3. By separating, both by her Doctrines and Censures, three parts of the Christian World from her Communion, and as much as in her lyes, from the Communion of Christ. 4. By rebelling against general Councils, and usurping an Authority over them. 5. By breaking or taking away all the lines of Apostolical Success.
Succession except their own, and appropriating all Original Jurisdiction to themselves. 6 By challenging a temporal power over Princes, either directly or indirectly, which hath been a great occasion not only of Schism in the Church, but of Sedition and Rebellion in the State. All which instances have been charged upon, and made good against the Church of Rome by our Writers, and may be so again, whenever we are called to it.

3. It is not therefore we that have separated from them, but they from us; whilst we adhere to the united Body of the Holy, Catholick and Apostolick Church, which they have forfaken.

4. Nor is it we but they, who have altered the written and established Laws of God and his Church, by adding new Articles of Faith, such as were never delivered by Christ or his Apostles, nor taught by the primitive Church, nor comprised in any of those Creeds received by the Church; and making them necessary Conditions of their Communion. As the Doctrines of Supremacy and Infallibility, of Indulgences and Purgatory, of Transubstantiation, &c.

5. It is they therefore, and not we, who by force and persuasion, and by all manner of Arts and endeavours to draw People from the Unity and Obedience of the Holy Catholick Church, unto new Congregations, Institutions and Rules of their own framing, opposite to, and destructive of the former. Like the Scribes and Pharisees of old, they compass Sea and Land to make one Proselyte, and when he is made, they make him twofold more the Child of Hell than themselves.

Matthew 23. 15.

Qu. 13. Whether Persons so acting are better than Rebels and Usurpers, or such as Simon Magus and those that deserted the Apostles to follow him; and therefore to be avoided as Persons separated from the flock of Christ?

Anf. That they are no better than such as he hath here named and described, we willingly grant; and upon that very account is it, that we now avoid Communion with the present Church of Rome.

Thus have I given an Answer, and I hope a sufficient one, to these Enquiries; and that short, without entering upon discourses of things not demanded, or at least, not implied in those demands; and so observed the Method propounded by the Enquirer.
An Explanation of Roman Catholick's Belief concerning these
IV. Points, Their Church, Worship, Justification, and Civil
Government, as it was presented to some Persons of Quality
for their particular Satisfaction.

These are four great Points, and if well and truly explained, the
Explanation of them may be of very great use; but if otherwise,
if he only guild the Pill, that the Patient may be more easily perswaded
to swallow it, it may prove of dangerous Consequence; instead
of informing, it may debauch the minds and understandings of men.
Let us therefore look before we leap, let us consider well whether this
Explainer hath been honest and faithfull in his Explanation, before
we receive all he faith for Gospel. And for your assistance herein, I
shall set down his own words, then animadvert thereupon, and
when that is done, present you with both for your better satisfaction.

The EXPLAINER.

1. We believe the Holy Scriptures to be of Divine Inspiration and Infallible
Authority, and whatsoever is therein contained we firmly assent unto
as to the word of God, the Author of all truth.

But since in the Holy Scriptures there are some things hard to be under-
stood which the ignorant and unstable wrest to their own destruction, we
therefore profess (for the ending of all Controversies in our Religion, and
setting of Peace in our Consciences) to submit our private Judgments to the
Judgment of the Church in a free general Council.

The ANIMADVERTER.

1. The Explainer tells us that the Roman Catholicks do believe the
Holy Scriptures to be of Divine Inspiration and Infallible Author-
ity, &c.

A very fair and good profession, wherein we do heartily joyn with them; And is it not a great pity there should be a secret reserve to
spoil and overthrow it? They believe this, but is this all they believe? Do they not believe also that some things which before the Church's
definition of them might have been innocently disbelieved, yet after
they are once defined and determined by the Church, to be matters
of Faith, and of equal Authority with any other things delivered by
Christ and his Apostles? Do they not believe also that some Apocry-
phal
phal Books are of Divine Inspiration also, and of as infallible Authority as the Writings of the Prophets and Apostles? Do they not believe Traditions to be the unwritten Word of God, to be divinely inspired, and of Equal infallible Authority with the written Word? If they do, then the Explainer hath not been so fair and candid, so just and faithfull as he ought to have been in his Explication; though he hath told us the truth, he hath not told us the whole truth. And that they do believe all this, though I might easily produce a Cloud of Witnesses, and those none of the least admired of their own Authors; yet because I design brevity, I shall content myself at present with the Evidence and Authority of one of their most magnified Councils, which they call both free and general, (though in truth it was neither,) and that is the Council of Trent. Which Seis. 4. 8, Apr. de Cano. Script. takes the Books of Tobit, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and Maccabees, into the Canon of Scripture, (though they could not, but know, that they never were in the Jewish Canon, nor ever universally received by the Christian Church) and anathematized all those who do not upon this Declaration believe them to be Canonical. And the same Council, in the same Seis. professes to receive and reverence Traditions with no less pious Affection, than the Books of the Old and New Testament; and that not in matter of Rite and History only, but of Faith and Manners also. Now what is this but to add to the Scriptures, and to accuse them of insufficiency and imperfection? And if so, then what doth this Explainer do, but deceive those Persons of Quality, to whom he presents this as the Summ of their Belief?

But the Explainer goes on, and faith, since in the Holy Scriptures there are some things hard to be understood, which the ignorant and unstable wrest to their own destruction. And here I shall by the way only remark these two things.

1. The Apostle indeed faith there are some things hard (but not impossible) to be understood. For, if men will use the means, if they will apply themselves with an humble and teachable temper of mind diligently to read the Holy Scriptures, if they will seriously meditate on what they reade, and earnestly and devoutly pray unto God for the assistance and direction of his Holy Spirit therein; the difficulty may be removed, and they may be enabled rightly to understand those Scriptures, at least so far as is necessary for them to know.

2. The Apostle tells us, to whom those things are hard to be understood; viz. the ignorant and unstable. So that the difficulty seems to be not in the things themselves, but in the incapacities of men. For, if men will be ignorant still, and not use the means to know better; or if they will content themselves with some airy Notions, which
float and fluctuate in the brain, without ever endeavouring to bring
them to a consistency; not only some, but all things in Scripture, and
even the clearest declarations of the Church may be hard to be under-
tood by them, and so they will be as much at a loss in the one as in
the other. But how much this Text is misunderstood and misapplied,
a Reverend and Learned Divine of our Church, in a Treatise intituled,
Search the Scriptures, hath plainly demonstrated, to which I refer
the Reader. But let us see what Inference he draws from hence,
Therefore (faith he) we profess (for the ending of all Controversies
in our Religion, and settling of peace in our Consciences) to submit
our private Judgments to the Judgment of the Church in a free General
Council.

In which Inference I cannot but remarque these things.

1. This Inference doth plainly imply a necessity of a visible Judge
of Controversies, to whom, in all matters in difference, there should
be an Appeal, and whose decision should be final. Now if this be re-
ally so, Then, 1. It is mighty strange that Christ and his Apostles, who
pretended faithfully to deliver the whole mind and will of God to
mankind, should never once mention such an Officer in the Church.
Or, 2. If they should omit to mention so necessary a thing in their
writings, and only deliver it by word of mouth to their immediate
Successors, it is no les strange that they should either not know, or
never make use of such an Expedient for the ending of those Contro-
versies that arose in their days. 3. We must conclude, that either
the Church hath been mighty careless of her own peace, or that this
Judge hath been very negligent in his business, to suffer so great and
so fatal Controversies to continue so long in the Church of God,
when there was so ready a way to put an end to them.

2. Our Explainer in this Inference acquaints us with the great ends,
for the sake of which such a Judge is necessary: viz. The ending of
all controversies in our Religion, and settling of peace in our Conscien-
esc. These indeed are great things, and greatly to be desired. But
whether there be any such Expedient, or if there be, whether it be
sufficient for these ends, are the things in question. Now, that from
the first foundation of the Christian Church to this very day, these
great ends have not been universally attained, is very plain and evi-
dent; which to me is a very great Argument that either God never
instituted any such expedient, or if he did, that it was not sufficient
for these ends; which would be a mighty reflection upon the power
and wisdom of God.

But because some things in Scripture are hard to be understood, doth
it therefore necessarily follow that there must be a visible Judge of Con-
troversies,
troversies, to deliver the sense of those places to us, without whom we
can never attain thereunto, and from whose decision there lies no ap-
peal? I confess I cannot see the necessity of this consequence: For, if
it be granted, as it is on all hands, that the Scriptures which we now
have are the Word of God, revealed by him, and of infallible Author-
ity, we must believe that either God would not, or could not explain
his mind to the sons of men in words as plain and intelligible as any
such Judge will or can do, or else there can be no such necessity of any
such Judge upon that account. If there be no other way to attain the
sense of Scripture, but only the decision of such a Judge, then what
way or means is left us to understand the sense of the declaration of
that Judge? will there not want another Judge to determine that, and
another to explain his, and so in infinitum?

But let us for once suppose, though we do not grant it, that there
ought to be a Judge of Controversies in order to the attaining of these
great ends, let us see how he ought to be qualified, and where we
shall find him. This Judge must be a person or number of people,
who must have a superiority not only of order, but influence over all
others, to whose decisions and determinations all Christian people
ought to conform their judgments and practices. Nor must that influ-
ence be precarious but authoritative, for nothing can warrant their Im-
positions, but the Authority by which they are imposed: Nor can any
Authority suffice to oblige mankind to believe that, which is neither
necessary as to its matter, nor evident as to its proof, antecedently to
the definition of such an Authority, but only such an one as is infalli-
ble. Now where shall we find such an one, seeing there are so many
pretenders to it? If we believe the Popes themselves, the Jesuits, and
the rest of the high Papalins, then his holiness will carry away the Bell;
but if we believe General Councils, and those who defend their Supre-
macy, then they will carry it from the Pope; and if we believe others
of equal credit, then the Catholick Church diffusive will carry it from
both. So that if there ought to be such a Judge, you see it is not a-
greed upon among themselves who he is. But,

3. Our Explainer determines this Controversie, telling us, that it is
the Judgment of the Church in a free General Council, that we ought
to submit to.

And in this we heartily joyn with him, for we profess to have as
great a deference for the Judgment of the Church in a free
General Council, as they have or can have, and to have as great a
regard to the sense of the whole Christian Church in all Ages since the
Apostles as they, nay it may be greater than they will pretend to
have; for, we are so far from declining it, that as to the matters in
difference:
difference between them and us, we appeal thereunto, and are willing to be concluded thereby; being as well assured as the Records of those Ages still remaining can allure us, that it is on our side. But if by Church here, he mean the present Church of Rome, as it stands divided from other Communions, we deny that she hath any more authority to impose a sense of Scripture upon us, than we upon her, or any other particular Church upon either of us. Or if by Councils, he mean those Western Councils which have been held in these parts of the World in latter Ages, we cannot allow them either to be free or general, and consequently cannot grant, nor have they any reason to claim any such authority over us. But if by Councils, he mean those primitive Councils, which indeed were the most free and general, and best deserved to be styled the Church Representative; we have to great a veneration for their Opinion and Judgment, that we shall not decline to submit the Umbrage of our Cause to them. But what is all this to the present Church of Rome, which at this day so arrogantly claims a right and authority to interpret Scripture, and impose her sense upon us? For, unless she can prove her self infallible, all her pretended authority in this case will fall to the ground: If she be indeed infallible, she would do well to let the world know whence she had her Infallibility. She must have it either immediately from God, or by delegation from the Catholick Church diffusive; If from God, let her produce her Charter; If from the Catholick Church diffusive, then it depends upon her authority, and by the same authority she may recall it again when she pleaseth: So that upon this ground it will prove but a very Fallible Infallibility. We know she challenges it by virtue of those promises of the Spirit in the Scriptures, which promises they themselves do confess to have been made only to the Catholick Church; and therefore, though an Infallibility, even in Judgment, were granted to belong to the Catholick Church, yet that can signify nothing to her, till she hath proved her self to be that Catholick Church, to which alone those promises confessedly belong.

Thus you see how candid and faithfull our Explainer hath been in this first Point; and now let us examine whether he acquit himself any better in the next.

The EXPLAINER.

2. We humbly believe the Sacred Mystery of the blessed Trinity, One Eternal Almighty and Incomprehensible God, whom only we adore and worship, as alone having Sovereign Dominion over all things, to whom alone, (1 Tim. i. 17.) we acknowledge as due from Men and Angels all Glory, Service.
Service and Obedience; abhorring from our Hearts, as a most detestable Sacrilege, to give our Creator's Honour to any Creatures whatsoever. And therefore we solemnly protest, That by the Prayers we address to Angels and Saints, we intend no other than humbly to solicit their assistance before the Throne of God, as we desire the Prayers of one another here upon Earth, not that we hope anything from them as Original Authors thereof, but from God the Fountain of all Goodness through Jesus Christ our only Mediator and Redeemer.

Neither do we believe any divinity or vertue to be in Images, for which they ought to be worshipped, as the Gentiles did their Idols; but we retain them with due and decent respect in our Churches, as Instruments, which we find by experience do often assist our memories and excite our affections.

The ANIMADVERTER.

Our Explainer here, in behalf of the Roman Catholicks, makes a very good confession of Faith, telling us, That they humbly believe the sacred mystery of the blessed Trinity, One Eternal, Almighty and Incomprehensible God, whom only they adore and worship, as alone having Sovereign Dominion over all things, to whom alone (1 Tim. i. 17) they acknowledge as due, from Men and Angels, all glory, service and obedience, abhorring from their hearts, as a most detestable Sacrilege, to give their Creator's honour to any Creatures whatsoever.

This is true Primitive Christianity, good Catholic Divinity without any mixture of Popery, and is it not great pity that any thing should be added thereto, or mixed therewith, to spoil so good a Confession? Thus far we can readily and heartily join with them; but when they superadded Articles of their own, such as were never delivered by Christ or his Apostles, nor owned by the primitive Catholic Church, and set them in equal place with those of Divine Revelation, and primitive practice; then we cannot keep pace with them, but are forced to stay behind, and sit down contented with primitive Christianity; so that in truth it is not we that leave them, but they that leave us, and consequently are guilty of the Separation.

And this is the case here between us and our Explainer. For after all this glorious profecision of adoring and worshipping the One Eternal Almighty and Incomprehensible God and him only, and abhorring the giving of his glory to any Creatures as a most detestable Sacrilege; he introduces Prayers to Saints and Angels, and the Worship of or before Images, as things equally necessary to be performed by Christians. Now, if Prayers and Adoration be acts of religious worship, and the Objects to which they are offered be Creatures, then it must needs
needs follow, that either all Religious Worship is not due to God alone, or else that they do give part of his honour to something that is not God. It is true indeed that he endeavours to palliate these practices with some pretended qualifications, thereby to shift off the weight of this charge which lieth so heavy upon them; but they are so thin and threaddare, so empty and insignificant, and have been so miserably baffled of late, especially in the Answer to A Papist Misrepresented and Represented, as also in two other little Treatises, the one intituled A Discourse concerning Invocation of Saints, printed in the year 1684, and the other intituled, A Discourse concerning the Object of Religious Worship, &c. printed 1685, that I cannot but admire at our Explainer's confidence to produce them at this time. These Treatises are, or upon easy terms may be, in every man's hands; and there is therein so much said upon this Subject, and so much to the purpose, as may very well spare me the labour of enlarging thereupon; to them therefore I shall refer the Reader for further satisfaction. But by these short Remarks, which I have made upon this part of our Explainer's Confession, it is plain that he hath been no more candid and ingenuous in this than in the former. Let us therefore try him in the next.

The EXPLAINER.

3. We firmly believe, that no force of Nature, or dignity of our best Works can merit our Justification, but we are justified freely by Grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, (Rom. 3. 24.) And though we should by the grace of God persevere unto the end in a godly life, and holy obedience to the Commandments; yet our hopes of eternal glory, are still built upon the mercy of God, and the merits of Christ Jesus.

All other Merits, according to our sense of the word, signify no more than Actions done by the assistance of God's Grace, to which it hath pleased his goodness to promise a Reward. A Doctrine so far from being unsuitable to the sense of the Holy Scriptures, that it is their principal design to invite and provoke us to a diligent observance of the Commandments, by promising Heaven as a reward of our obedience. 1 Tim. 4. 8. Rom. 2. 6. Rom. 8. 13. Hebr. 6. 10. Nothing being so frequently repeated in the word of God, as his gracious promises to recompence with everlasting glory the Faith and Obedience of his Servants. Nor is the bounty of God barely according to our Works, but high and plentiful even beyond our Capacities, giving full measure, heaped up, and pressed down, and running over, into the bosomes of all that love him. Luke 6. 38.

Thus we believe the merit or rewardableness of holy living, (both which signify the same thing with us) arise not from the self-value even of our best actions,
actions, as they are ours, but from the grace and bounty of God. And for our selves we sincerely profess, when we have done all those things which are commanded us, we are unprofitable Servants (Luke 17. 10.) having done nothing but that which was our Duty; so that our boasting is not in our selves, but all our Glory is in Christ.

The ANIMADVERTER.

If this be really the Faith of Roman Catholicks, we shall not stick to acknowledge it is ours too, and then we shall have no occasion to differ in this point. But I am afraid our so near an Agreement is too good news to be true; Our Explainer, I doubt, hath either mistaken or to gain a Proselyte, or for some other end which might be serviceable to Holy Church, hath very much misrepresented the Doctrine of his own Church in this point. For sure I am, the Council of Trent, which they so much magnifie, and on whose decisions they so much depend, hath a quite different Notion of Justification and Merit. That Council after some Months debate upon the Point of Justification, at last came to a decision, and declared, That the only formal Caufe of our Justification is God’s Justice, not by which he himself is just, but by which he makes us just; wherewith being endowed by him, we are renewed in the Spirit of our Minds, and are not only reputed, but are made truly just; receiving every man his own measure of justice, which the Holy Ghost divides to him, according to each man’s pre-disposition of himself, and co-operation. And withall denounceth a flat Anathema to all those who shall dare to say, that we are formally justified by Christ’s righteousness, or by the sole imputation of that righteousness, or by the sole remission of our sins, and not by our inherent grace, diffused into our hearts by the Holy Ghost. Sejj. 6: Can. 10, 11. And the same Council, speaking of the Merit of good Works, faith, If any man shall say, that the good Works of a justified Person do not truly merit the increase of Grace and eternal Life, let him be Anathema. Sejj. 6 Can. 32.

Now one would think the choice were very easie, which of these to believe, whether the Council of Trent or this Explainer. The accounts they give are too different to be both believed; and can there be any question which of them is most authoritative? Certainly our Explainer must be a very bold Person, who in defiance of such a celebrated Council, durst deliver what he hath done for the belief of Roman Catholicks in this point; and he must look upon his Persons of Quality, to whom he presents it, as a parcel of unthinking and inconsiderate Animals, who would swallow any thing without Examination. Either
Either he was in earnest, or he had a mind to put a cheat upon them; if the latter, he plainly discovers how good a Christian, and how true a Catholick he is. If the former, surely he did not well consider, how fatal the Consequences of that Doctrine would be to the Church of Rome. For, 1. If this be really the Faith of Roman Catholicks, then, What becomes of that gainful Trade of Indulgences, which is wholly founded upon the Treasure of the Church, wherein are heaped up piles of satisfactions of Saints, of which the Pope only keeps the Keys, and hath power to dispense them where he lists. There was a time indeed, when Indulgences were look'd upon to be nothing else but a Mitigation or Relaxation, upon just Causes, of Canonical Penances, which are or may be enjoyned by the Pastors of the Church on penitent Sinners, according to their several Degrees of Demerits. But this is a Doctrine out of date with the present Church of Rome, insomuch that Greg. de Valenia faith, That this Opinion differs not from that of the Hereticks, and makes Indulgences to be useless and dangerous things, de Indulg. c. 2. And their great Champion Bellarmine, among several other Arguments against this Doctrine, brings this for one, That if this were so, there would be no need of the Treasure of the Church, which he takes a great deal of pains to prove to be the Foundation of Indulgences. But, 2. What will become of the profitable Doctrine of Purgatory, which is built upon Indulgences, and they upon the Treasure of the Church, wherein the Merits of Saints are kept, to be dispensed by the Pope for the delivery of Souls out of Purgatory? But, 3. What will become of the Pope's Coiffers, which being once emptied, and this Spring dried up, which should have supplied them, can have no prospect of any other so effectual way to replenish them again. Had our Explainer well considered these ill Consequences of his Explanation, he would certainly have thought of it more than once, before he had expos'd it. I cannot imagine what should perfwade him to such an Explanation, unless he had obtained a dispensation to build his Bait, the more easily to catch what he angled for. And if this be it, is it not a great Argument of the Candour and Ingenuity of our Explainer, and a mighty motive to his Persons of Quality to swallow all that shall be propounded by him?

And now we are come to the last point which he undertakes to explain, and shall examine whether he be more ingenuous in that than he 'hath been in the other.
4. We firmly believe and highly reverence the Moral Law, being so solemnly delivered to Moses upon the Mount. Exodus 20. Matth. 19. Ecclef. 12. 13, so expressly confirmed by our Saviour in the Gospel, and containing in it self so perfect an Abridgment of our whole Duty both to God and Man.

Which Moral Law we believe obliges all men to proceed with faithfulness and sincerity in their mutual Contracts one towards another, and therefore our constant profession is, That we are most strictly and absolutely bound to the exact and intire performance of our promises made to any Persons of what Religion soever, much more to the Magistrates and Civil Powers under whose Protection we live, whom we are taught by the Word of God to obey not only for fear but Conscience sake, and to whom we will most faithfully observe our Promises of Duty and Obedience, notwithstanding any Dispensation, Absolution, or other proceedings of any foreign Power or Authority whatsoever.

Wherefore we utterly deny and renounce that false and scandalous Position, That Faith is not to be kept with Heretics, as most uncharitably imputed to our Practices, and most unjustly pinned upon our Religion.

These we sincerely and solemnly profess, as in the sight of God, the searcher of all hearts, taking the words plainly and simply in their usual and familiar sense, without any Equivocation or Mental Reservation whatsoever.

The ANIMADER.

Our Explainer would have the World believe, that those of his Communion do highly reverence, and have a mighty regard for the Moral Law. We do the same; but we know and believe the Second Commandment to be part of that Law, and therefore dare not be guilty of Image-Worship, which perhaps the Explainer did not think of.

He further tells us, that they believe, that this Law doth contain in it self a perfect Abridgment of our whole Duty both to God and Man. We believe the same, and we do further believe, that whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. James 2. 10. And therefore we dare not worship Images, nor give divine Honour to any Creatures, nor disobey Magistrates, nor deal falsely with our Neighbours under any pretence whatsoever, nor do any thing that is there forbidden, nor leave undone any thing that is there commanded. Whether the Explainer thought of all this, I know not; but he cannot but know that the Practices of those of his Communion are not correspondent thereunto.
But the two great things that he would have the World believe of them upon the Credit of his Explanation, are these, viz. Their sincerity and Loyalty, which he would fain insinuate to be the natural Offspring of their Principles, and the constant Rule of their Practices. These therefore are the things which we are now to take under Consideration, and that we may be the more clear therein, I shall consider them severally.

1. And first as to their pretence of sincerity. The Explainer tells us, They believe, That the Moral Law obliges all men to proceed with faithfulness and sincerity in their mutual Contracts one towards another, and therefore their constant profession is, that they are most strictly and absolutely bound to the exact and entire performance of their promises made to any Person of what Religion soever. And as an Argument to evince the truth hereof, he farther tells us, that they utterly deny and renounce, that false and scandalous position, That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, as most uncharitably imputed to their Practices, and most unjustly pinned upon their Religion.

If this position, That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, be untruly charged upon them, then we must acknowledge that it were uncharitably to impute it to their practices, and unjust to pin it upon their Religion; but if it appear to be the Doctrine and Practice of their Church, then it will undoubtedly overthrow all their pretentions to Faithfulness and Sincerity.

And that this is really the Doctrine and Practice of their Church, we have the suffrage of a whole Council, by them styled General, viz. the Council of Conftance, by whom this Doctrine was own'd, affirmed and practised. And John Hus, Hierom of Prague, and Savanarola, though they had the publick Faith for their safe conduct and return, yet in defiance thereof, by virtue of this Doctrine, they were proceeded against, and severely suffered. The same thing was also fiercely disputed in the Diet at Worms, in the case of Luther. And had not Cæsar been a better Christian than the Ecclesiasticks, and more a Gentleman than his Holiness, Luther, notwithstanding his Safe Conduct, had not returned safely from thence. But left any secular Princes hereafter, should, either through Scruple of Conscience, or in point of honour, think themselves obliged to keep their Word, and so hinder them of their prey when it is in their hands; the Doctrine is now improved, and we are told, There are two distinct Tribunals, and the Ecclesiastical is the Superiour; and therefore, if a secular Prince gives his Subjects a Safe Conduct, he cannot extend it to the Superiour Tribunal, nor by any security given hinder the Bishop or the Pope to exercise their Jurisdiction. Becanmus in Theol. Scholast.
This Doctrine is also confidently taught, and the practice thereof encouraged by their most eminent Doctors and Casuists. Some instances whereof (for it would fill a Volume to give you all) I shall now present you with for your better satisfaction in this point.

Cardinal Tolet. de instruèt. Sacerd. l. 1. c. 13. expressly avows, That if a man be bound by the Bond of Fidelity or Oath, he shall be freed from that Bond, if he, to whom he is bound, fall into Excommunication; and during that, Debtors are absolved from the Obligation of paying to the Creditor that debt which is contracted by words. And the same Tolet. l. 4. c. 21, 22. positively declares, That Equivocation upon Oath before a Magistrate is lawfull.

Thomas à Jesu the Carmelite, de coverl. Gentium, dub. 4. p. 218. puts this question, Whether one that denyeth it, when he is asked by an Heretic whether he be a Priest, or a Religious man, or whether he heard divine Service, doth sin against the Confession of Faith? To which he answers, No. For that is no denying himself to be a Christian or Catholic. For it is lawfull to dissemble or hide the Person of a Clergyman, or a Religious man, without a Lye in words, lest a man be betrayed and in danger of his life; and for the same cause he may lay by his Habit, omit Prayers, and because humane Laws for the most part bind not the Subject's Conscience, when there is great hazard of life, as in this case Azorius hath well taught.

And Cardinal Tolet. de Instruèt. Sacerd. l. 8. c. 39. n. 4. thus determines a Case propounded. If (faith he) the times be hard, or the Judge unequal; a man that cannot sell his Wine at a due price, may lawfully make his measures less than is appointed; or mingle water with his Wine and sell it for pure, so he do not lye; and yet if he doth, it is no mortal sin, nor obligeth him to restitution. A man may swear to positive untruths by the Law of directing the Intention, faith F. Southwel, Tract. de Equivocat. c. 8. p. 42, 43.

If a man hath taken an Oath of a thing honest and lawfull, and in his power; yet if it hinders him from doing a greater good, the Pope can dispense with his Oath, and take off the obligation, faith Canus Bishop of the Canar. Relèt. de pænitent.

If a man hath promised to a Woman to marry her, and is betrothed to her, and hath sworn it; yet if he will, before the Consummation, enter into a Monastery, his Oath shall not bind him, his promise is null; but his second promise that shall stand. He that denies this is accursed by the Council of Trent. Sess. 8. Can. 6.

I am weary with transcribing such nauseous stuff, and therefore omitting many more, I shall only add one instance more. Pope Pius V. upon occasion of some Missionaries to be sent into England, declared, That...
That if they were summon'd before the Judges, they might Sophistice jurare & Sophistice respondere; and that they were not bound to answer according to the intention of the Judges, but according to some true sense of their own; i.e. which was made true by the help of a Mental Reservation. Apud. G. Abbot. de Mendacio, &c. in pref. p. 6, &c.

By these instances you may perceive that the Doctors and Causists of the Romish Church are not of our Explainer's opinion; which to me is a very great Argument, that he hath not dealt so fairly and candidly as he ought to have done in his Explanation. It may be he will tell us that these were but private Persons, and that the Doctrine of their Church is not to be measured by their private Opinions, which if he do, I shall readily own, That the private Opinions of particular men ought not, in reason, to be charged upon that Society to which they belong; And if so, then our Explainer ought not to take it amiss, if we do not receive his Explanation as the Doctrine of that Church of which he pretends to be a Member. But if the united force of the Council of Constance, and that of Trent (both which they themselves reckon to be General) with the concurrent opinions of so many eminent Doctors and Causists of their own Church too (none of which, that we know, have ever received the least check for publishing their opinions) if these, I say, will outweigh any Authority which this Explanation can pretend to, then what becomes of all this goodly Profession which he here makes? where shall we find all that faithfulness and sincerity which he here boasts of? if making and breaking of promises, if swearing and forswearing, if the violation of all the most sacred Bonds, where with mankind can be obliged, may pass for faithfulness and sincerity, we may expect great store of it amongst them. And indeed whilst there is a power given to the Pope to dispense with Oaths and Promises, and a liberty given to the People to make good all they lay or swear by the Law of directing the Intentions, by the Power of Equivocation, and the force of Mental Reservation, I cannot see any reason why we should expect better. But if this be the Faithfulness and Sincerity they boast of, we bless God that we know none such amongst us; and we hope this will never prove an Argument sufficient to persuade any of ours to desert the Communion they are of, for a Communion that allows such things as these. And thus have I given you an account of their Faithfulness and Sincerity.

2. The other thing which he boasts of is, their Loyalty. For he tells us, They are most strictly and absolutely bound to an exact and entire
performance of their promises made to the Magistrates and Civil Powers, under whose protection they live, whom they are taught by the word of God to obey, not only for fear but Conscience sake, and to whom they will most faithfully observe their promises and duty of Obedience, notwithstanding any dispensation, absolution, or other proceedings of any foreign Power or Authority whatsoever.

We do indeed firmly believe, That both they, and we, and all Subjects are most strictly and absolutely bound to an exact and entire performance of all those promises which we make to Magistrates and Civil Powers, and that there is no power on earth either Foreign or Domestic that can dispence with our Oaths and Promises, or absolve us from our Duty and Allegiance. But whether this be the Belief of Roman Catholicks we are not so well assured: If we will take it upon the bare word of our Explainer, it is; but having found him faulty and dicingenuous in the former points, we may suspect him in this, and therefore must not swallow all that he saith for Gospel, till we have examined it. We very well know that the Doctrines of learned and allowed Cufuits, and Practices of those who have greatest authority in the Roman Church have been quite contrary to this Explanation, and we never found any disposition in them to so great a condescension, nor ever heard that there was any such Reformation made in their principles and practices by any publick Authority among them. If our Explainer had produced any authentick Records of any such thing, we should with a great deal of readiness and rejoicing have embraced them; but we cannot admit of his bare word as a sufficient evidence in this case.

Our blessed Saviour affureth us, that no man can serve two Masters, Matt. 6. 24. Whilst therefore those of the Roman Communion do own the Pope as Supreme Head of the Church, and allow him a sovereign and uncontrollable power over them both in Temporals and Spirituals, by virtue of which he can dispense with their Oaths and Promises when he pleaseth; we cannot see how they can be so exact in the performance of their promises made to Civil Powers. For, it is not only possible but often happens, that the Civil Power, under whose protection they live, doth not own the Papacy, nor hath any regard for the pretended power and dominion thereof; and in such a case it is very likely their commands will interfere: which if they do (as we know they very often do) how a Roman Catholic will carry himself even, and so exactly divide his obedience to these different Sovereigns, and their different commands, as to please both, I cannot as yet imagine. How our Explainer will resolve this case, I know not; but I very well know, that the Doctors and Cufuits of the Roman Church,
Church, and their Popes too, will roundly tell us, That the Power of the Pope is superior to that of the Prince, and therefore he is to be obeyed in the first place. And if so, then what becomes of all that Loyalty and Fidelity to Civil Powers, which our Explainer so much boasts of?

To shew you therefore, that notwithstanding this so specious Explanation of their Faith in this point; we have sufficient reason to suspect the candour and ingenuity of the Explainer, and the truth of what he says; I shall only confront him with the declared Doctrines, and avowed Practices of their own Church in this case.

All the Jurisdiction of all the Kings and Princes of the World dependeth on the Pope; faith P. Clem. 5. in Concil. Viam.

And Pope Pius 5. in his Bull against Queen Elizabeth, doth strictly will and command all her Subjects to take Arms against that Heretical and Excommunicate Queen.

The Deposing and King-killing Doctrine, dispensing with Oaths of Allegiance, &c. were made Articles of their Faith, by the fourth General Council at Lateran, under Pope Innocent 3.

And it is pleasant to observe how nicely scrupulous some of their great men are in resolving this case, gravely telling us, That private men may not kill a King till he be deposed; but if once he be communicate, then he is no King; (and then they may kill him without scruple) Or if he be an Heretick (which the Pope can make him when he pleaseth) then they may kill the Heretick, but not the King. Thus Suarez advers. Sect. Anglic. l. 6. c. 4. Sect. 14. And c. 6.Sect. 22.24. Thus also Azorius the Jesuite. Institt. Moral. part. 1. l. 8. c. 13. And thus Mariana, de Reg. Instit. l. 1. c. 7, &c.

The Rebellion of a Clergyman against his Prince is not Treason, because he is not his Prince’s Subject, faith Emman. SÁ. Aphor. verb. Clericus.

When a Prince is Excommunicate, before the Denunciation, the Subjects are not absolved from their Oath of Allegiance, (as Cajetan says well) yet when it is denounced, they are not only absolved from their Obedience, but are bound not to obey, unless the fear of Death, or loss of Goods excuse them, which was the case of the English Catholics in the time of Henry the Eighth, faith Card. Tolet. concer. Eccles. in Angl. fol. 326.

It is the Sentence of all Catholics, that Subjects are bound to expell Heretical Princes, if they have strength enough, and that to this they are tied by the Commandment of God, the most strict. tie. of Conscience, and the extreme danger of their Souls, faith F. Creswel, in Philopat. Sect. 2. n. 160, 161.

Nay.
Nay even before the Sentence is declared, though the Subjects are
not bound to it, yet lawfully they may deny Obedience to an Heres-
tical Prince, faith Greg. de Valentia. Tom. 3 disp. 1. q. 12. punct. 2.

An Excommunicate King may with impunity be deposed or killed
by any one, faith Suarez, Defens. Fid. 1. 6 c. 6. Sect. 24.
The Pope can make, that he who is a King, shall be no King, and
then you are disobliged, faith Bellarm. contr. Barc. 6. 7.
The Secular power is subject to the Spiritual. The Pope hath a
sovereign power over Christian Kings and Princes, to correct, depose,
and appoint others in their places. If a King be guilty of Heresie,
Schism, or any intolerable crime against his People; if he be guilty of
negligence or sloth in his government; if he fail in the performance of
his Oaths and Promises, or oppresses the Church; the Pope may divest
him of his Royal Dignity; faith Abrab. Browius, de Pontif. Roman.
c. 46. p. 621. Col. 2. Which Book was printed at Cologne, Anno 1619,
and solemnly recommended and approved by his Superiours, and Li-
censed by the Apostolick Inquisitor.

I might be infinite in instances of this kind, but having almost wea-
rried my self with raking in such a Dunghill, I am not willing to tire
my Reader too. I shall therefore only produce one unexceptionable
Witness more, and that shall be their great and renowned Champion
Bellarmine, out of whose 5th. Book De Romano Pontifice, I shall take
the pains to transcribe some passages; and having subjoyneyed thereunto
some instances of their practices suitable to their declared principles, I
shall then leave it to the judgment of any indifferent person, what
kind of Loyalty and Fidelity Sovereign Princes (especially those who
are of a different persuasion) may hope to find from their Roman Ca-
tholick Subjects.

Bellarmine in the first Chapter of his fifth Book De Romano Pontifice,
having rejected two extreme Opinions concerning the Pope's power;
the one taught and maintained by Augustinus Triumphus, Alvarus
Pelagius, Hesienst, and others of his own Communion, viz. That
the Pope by a Divine Right hath a most plenary power over all the
World as well in Political as Ecclesiastical affairs. And the other
delivered by Calvin, Peter Martyr, Brentius and others whom he calls
Heretics, viz. That the Pope, as Pope, hath not by Divine Right
any Temporal power at all, nor upon any account can command Se-
cular Princes, much less deprive them of their Kingdoms and Princi-
palities; and that Spiritual persons ought not to exercise Temporal
Dominion. He at last lays down a middle Opinion between both,
which he tells us is the common Opinion of Catholick Divines, viz.
That the Pope, as Pope, hath not directly and immediately any Temporal
power,
power, but only a spiritual: yet by virtue of that Spiritual power he hath indirectly at least a supreme power in Temporals.

This Opinion he undertakes to explain in his Sixth Chapter, where he tells us, That in Order to a Spiritual good, he hath a Supreme Power of disposing all the Temporal things of all Christian People.

Which Power is just such over Princes, as the Soul hath over the Body or sensitive Appetite; by Virtue of this Power he may change Kingdoms, and take them from one and give them to another; he may make and alter, suspend and abrogate Civil Laws, as the Chief Spiritual Prince, if it be for the safety of Souls.

In his Seventh Chapter he endeavours to prove this Exorbitant Power of the Pope by reasons: all which are founded in the Subordination and Submission of the Temporal to the Spiritual Sword, (which is a Foundation that will certainly fail him.) However upon this Foundation he thus builds.

The Ecclesiastical Republick can command and compel the Temporal, which is indeed its Subject, to change the Administration, and to depose Princes, and to appoint others, when it cannot otherwise defend the Spiritual good. And again, it is not lawful for Christians to suffer an Infidel or Heretical King, if he endeavour to draw his Subjects to his Heresie or Unbelief. But to judge whether a King do draw to Heresie or not, belongeth to the Pope, to whom the care of Religion is committed; therefore it belongs to the Pope to judge whether a King be to be deposed or not. And if any one ask why the Christians of old, did not depose Nero, and Diocletian, and Julian the Apostate, and Valens the Arian? He roundly answers, it was not because they wanted Right, but because they wanted Power to do it.

But lest any scrupulous Christian should boggle at those horrid things, which these declared Principles must of necessity lead them to, as Rebellion, Murder, Breach of Faith, Violation of Oaths, &c. He will tell them that they are not answerable for any of these things; For, if the Pope should mistake, and command Vice, and forbid Virtue; yet it were a sin against Conscience, for the Church not to believe those Vices to be good, and those Virtues to be evil.

All these instances that I have now laid before you, were of men who lived and died in the Communion of the Church of Rome, and most of them men of great Eminency both for their Parts and Places; and therefore very likely to understand the Religion they professed. Now either these men, or our Explainer must be very much out, and strangely unacquainted with the Principles of their Religion; or else the Explainer must industriously design to put a cheat upon those Persons of Quality to whom he presents his Scheme. For, nothing can be
be more different than his Explanation, and this Declaration which
these men have left upon Record. But, I think, the choice is very
easy which of these ought to be believed in this case; and if this Cloud
of Witnesses carry it (as undoubtedly they will against one single
unauthorized Explainer, then certainly he was in the wrong box, when
the so much boasted of the Loyalty of the Roman Catholics.

And now I shall only subjoin an account of some few of their Prac-
tices, correspondent to these Principles, and they being put together
will, I suppose, sufficiently discover the mistake of our Explainer.

Leo Isaurus Emperour of Constantinople was excommunicated by Pope
Gregory the II. his Country given away to the Lombards; by which
means he and his Successors lost all the Western Empire, which the
Pope and the French King afterwards shared between them.

Henry the IVth. Emperour of Germany was excommunicated by Pope
Gregory the VIIth. his Subjects absolved from their Obedience, Rodulph
Duke of Sweden and Burgundy set up against him, to whom a Crown
was sent by the Pope, with this Inscription, The Rock gave the Crown
to Peter, and Peter gives it to Rodulph.

Childericus King of France, by the Advice and Authority of Pope
Zachary the II. had his Head shaven, was thrust into a Monastery,
and Pipinus Son of Carolus Martellus (who was but a Subject and Ser-
vant to the King) was anointed King in his stead.

Henry the IIId. King of France was killed at the Siege of Paris, with
an empoisoned Knife by a Jacobine Fryar called Jaques Clemens: Which
Murther, Pope Sixtus the Vth. by a solemn Oration in the Constituted
September the 2d. 1589. commended to the Skies, as Rarum, insigne,
& memorabile facinus. So publickly was the King-killing Doctrine
owned by them at that time.

And what effect this Papal approbation did produce, is evident; for
upon this encouragement King Henry the IVth. Successor to Henry the
IIIrd. was also stabbed with a consecrated Dagger, by a Jesuite named
Ravilliac. How frequent the excommunicating and defoing of Prin-
ces, the absolving of Subjects from their Duty and Obedience, and the
stirring up of Tumults and Seditions against them by Popes and Papa-
lins, hath heretofore been; History is so full, that it would be an Her-
culean labour to transcribe all the instances thereof.

Now these declared Principles and avowed Practices of Roman Catholicks being put together, and compared with our Explainer's
profession; may sufficiently evince how much he hath abused those
Persons of Quality, and how unfairly and dishonestly he hath dealt
with them in his Explanation of the Roman Catholick's Belief in this
Point.

But
But one would think he durft not deal thus, considering what a solemn Protestation he makes in the Clofe of his Explanation; For, thus he concludes.

These we sincerely and solemnly profefs, as in the sight of God the searcher of all Hearts, taking the words plainly and simply in their usual and familiar sense, without any Equivocation or Mental Reservation whatsoever.

Were we not so well acquainted with the Power of Dispensations, and the force of Mental Reservation among them; did we not know that by these Artifices they can elude the most solemn Protestations, make void all Oaths and Promises, and dissolve any the most sacred Bonds which can be invented to oblige men; it would look very uncharitably to suspect any man after such a solemn Protestation. But that they can do all this, and think they can do it with a safe Conscience, notwithstanding their Protestation to the contrary, is a ruled Case among their Cauifts: I shall only at present trouble you with one instance, which is very applicable to the case in hand, and with that conclude.

On occasion of the Powder-plot here in England, an Oath of Allegiance was thought necessary to prevent such horrid attempts in time to come; which a Roman Doctor (cited by Arch-Bishop Usher under this Character, B. P. Epifol. I. R. Impref. An. 1609.) taking notice of, laughs aloud at the simplicity of it. His words are worth remembring, Sed vide in tanta astutia, quanta simplicitas! &c. But see what simplicity here is in so great Craft! When he had placed all his security in that Oath, he thought he had framed such a manner of Oath, with so many Circumstances, which no man could any way dissolve with a safe Conscience. But he could not see, that if the Pope dissolve the Oath, all its Knots, whether of being faithfull to the King, or of admitting no Dispensation, are accordingly dissolved. Yea, I will say a thing more admirable; you know, I believe, that an unjust Oath, if it be evidently known to be such, or openly declared such, it obligeth no man: That the King's Oath is unjust, is sufficiently declared by the Pastor of the Church himself. You see now that the Obligation of it is vanished into smoke, and that the Bond which so many wise men thought was made of Iron, was less than Straw.

FINIS.