

RARE BOOK ROOM
BX
4809
S65 I3



18th. Bladon.
OF *his book.*
BY THE
AUTHOR

E

CH

Richard

2002
C. J. P.

Perin

RARE BOOK ROOM

BX

4809

S65 I3

1621. Bladon.

OF

his booke.

THE AVTHOR

quæ me AND

SVBSTANCE

OF THE

PROTESTANT CHVRCH

AND RELIGION,

TWO BOOKES.

Written first in Latin by R. S.

Doctour of Diuinity, *Smith, Richard*

AND

Now reuiewed by the Author, and translated into English by VV. Bas.

Fluctare si uisquærat Inpes, A charonta manebit.



Euery thing must be reduced to its beginning.

Tertull. Præscript. cap. 20.

Permissu Superiorum, M. DC. XXI.

1621

RARE BOOK
COLLECTION

BX
4809
S6513

The Scope of this Worke.

IF both Luther himselfe, and the famousst Protestant, of all sorts, have many wayes most plainly and most freely confessed, that Luther was the Author and Beginner of the Protestant Church and Religion (as in this worke doth manifestly appeare) then undoubtedly he was so.

And if Luther were the Author and Beginner thereof, assuredly, it is not the Church and Religion of Christ.

Read therefore and iudge indifferently; and thereby an end may be made of all Controversies in Religion betwixt the Catholiks and Protestants.

THE



THE 158569
PREFACE OF
THE AUTHOR TO
the Reader.

*Wherein the manner and profit of this Worke
is declared.*

HERE are two kinds of questions (gentle Reader) which are in controuersy betwixt the Catholikes and Protestantes; the one kind is of fact, to wit, *Whether Luther was the Author, and beginner of the Protestants Church and Religio; whether before him it were visible and had Pastours; whether he and the first Protestant Preachers were sent to preach Protestancy, and the like*: The other kind of question is of Christs doctrine or law: For example, *whether Christ taught good workes do instify, be necessary to saluation, meritorious, and*
such

The preface to the Reader .

Why a
a question
of Fact is
handled
rather the
of doctrine

1.

2.

3.

Prescrip.c.
35.

such others . At this present I treat not of this second kind of question, but only of the former and that for three causes . First the questions of Doctrine are innumerable, but the questions of Fact , few . And many have handled them, and that most exactly, but these, few have touched, and (for ought that I know) none of purpose hath hitherto written of the Authour of Protestancy, and in that manner as I intend to write.

Secondly there are few questions of doctrine of that nature, that all other controuersies of faith depend vpon them; but the most questions of Fact are such, as if they be well decided, al other Controuersies of religion are at an end . Such kind of question this especially is , which now I handle, *Whether Luther were Author and beginner of the Protestant church and Religion* For if it be made manifest , that he was the Author and Beginner of it, every one will straint see that it is not Christs Church & Religion, but Luthers deuise and inuention . Thirdly in questions of doctrine, or law, Protestants want not some pretext of Scripture (as neither any Heretikes wanted) and therefore diuers tymes they are ready to debate these kind of Questions, in which (as Tertullian sayth) *they pretend Scriptures, and with this their boldnes shake some, and in the dispute weary the constant, catch the weake, & send away the midale sort with scruple and doubts* . But in questi-

ons

The preface to the Reader :

ons of Fact they are destitute not only of al pre-
tence of Scripture, vnles it be some most vaine,
but also of all testimony of men and help of rea-
son, and stand only vpon their owne sayinges,
& are conuincd by the testimonies of the whol
world, and sometyme also by their owne con-
fessions, and therefore are brought to debate
these kind of questions no more willingly, then
is a theefe to his tryall. Neither do they in these
disputes either weary the constant, or catch the
weake; but shew their owne weaknes and wil-
fullnes vnto all kind of men. And this is the
cause why Ministers are so loath to dispute of
the Chnrch, because the Church, being a com-
pany of men, includeth many questions of fact,
as of antiquity, succession, continuance, visibi-
lity, mission, ordination of Pastours, and such
like; in which points there is little colour, or
shew on their part.

2. Fourthly, Protestants exact more diffi-
cult poofes in questions of doctrine, then they
can demand in matters of Fact. For in matters
of Fact, wherof the scripture speaketh nothing,
they must be content with testimonies of men,
against whome no iust exception can be made,
or they must refuse all triall of these kind of
questions. But in controuersies of doctrine,
they account those only to be lawfull proofes,
which are taken out of the scripture. Neither

The preface to the Reader.

(a) Melan.
& Brent.
in Hospin.
fol. 107.
Colloq.
Ratisb. sess.
21.

(b) Vorst.
respons. ad
Slad.

(c) Luth.
de seru.
arbitr. fol.
440.
Lib. 6.
confess. c.
40.

doe these fauffie them, vnlesse they be plaine & (a) expresse, and (as they lay) words (b) for words containe that which is in question, or at least be so pregnant and strong, that t'ey (c) stopp all in ns mouths that they can gainsay nothing. For it is the common fault of Protestants, which S. Augustin saith, himselfe was guilty of, while he was an heretike, that they will be as certaine of all things as that seauen and three make ten. Nay they yield not alwayes to these kind of proofs: For what can be sayd more expressely, more plainly, more literally, then the scripture saith, that man is iustified by workes, and not only by faith; that, that which our Sauiour gaue with his hands to his Apostles after his last supper, was his very body and bloud, and such like: & yet the Protestants yield not to these kind of testimonies, but deuise figures and shiftes to delude them. Catholiques proofes in controuerfies of doctrine are certainly Theological demonstrations, because they are clearly drawne from the proper principles of Diuinity, to wit, from cleare words of God confirmed by the tradition of the Church and vnanimous exposition of the Fathers; which kind of prooffe is as great and strong, as either Diuinity or law, or any Science whatsoever which is founded in words either doth affoord, or the nature of any law or science which is grounded in words (as

Diuinity

The preface to the Reader .

Diuinity is) can beare or affoord . And as the
Philosopher saith well, it were starck madnes to
exact any other kind of proofes of any Pro-
fession , then the nature therof can affoord . But
because heretiques expound what words soeuer
as they list , and litle set by the authority of the
Church or Fathers , and the vnlearned hardly
perceauē what kind of prooffe is a Theologicall
demonstration , & such as Diuinity can affoord
no greater , or which is the true sense of Gods
word , or how great the authority of the Church
and Fathers ought to be ; therefore with them ,
Catholiks proofs in points of doctrin, albeit in
truth they be Theological demonstrations, take
litle effect . Wheras on the other side Catholique
proofes in matter of Fact , are not only Theolo-
gicall , but also (that I may so speake) Mathe-
maticall demonstrations , because they consist
of one principle which is grounded not only
vpon the foundations of Diuinity , to wit the
word of God together with the expositiō of the
Church and Fathers , but also is manifest by the
light of reason : which kind of principles these
are , *That Gods Church hath alwayes bin : that it is
one : that it is the auncientest of all Churches : that
it is alwayes visible : hath alwayes Pastors , and the
like :* And of another principle , which may be
tryed by our sense and experience , as that the
foresayd properties agree neither to the Profes-

1. *Est . 1.*

The preface to the Reader .

tants nor to the Anabaptists , nor to any hereticall company . And therefore these kind of demonstrations moue euen the most obstinate heretiques, and are euident euen to the most ignorant and vnlearned persons .

3. And hence ariseth a fift cause of handling rather questions of Fact then of doctrin, because the fruit of debating those questions is reaped with more facility and of far more . For wheras few but diuines do themselues perceauethe true meaning of the testimonyes of Scripture wherewith the questions of doctrin are debated; as the true meaning of the law, few but lawyers themselues do see; all perceauethe meaning of those testimonyes wherewith the questions of fact are disputed, who will affoord an attentive eye to see, or eare to heare. And heerupō Casaubon wrote, *that for to insinuate into the mind of the Reader any opinion now in controuersie, Baronius historyes are of greater force, then Bellarmines disputes* . And sayd also sometye, as one most worthy of credit, who heard him, told me, that whiles he read Bellarmines disputations, he began to doubt of all Religion, but whiles he perused Baronius Annales, he felt himselfe by little & little drawn towards Papistry: which thing might wel haue befallen him and such others, not because Cardinall Bellarmine proueth lesse soundly, for the nature of the matter, the truth of Catholik Religion

Epist. dedicat. exercit. cont. Baron.

D. Flauignie .

The preface to the Reader.

ligion in questions of doctrine, then Cardinall
Baronius doth the same in questions of Fact, but
because such is the nature of the testimonies,
wherewith the truth of Catholike fayth in que-
stions of doctrine is proved, that they are lesse
evident then the testimonies wherewith the
Catholike truth in matters of Fact is proved,
and also have many things which seeme to be
contrary and repugnant to them. Whereupon
it falleth out that some hearing or reading con-
trouerfies of doctrine disputed between Catho-
likes and Heretikes, and not being able of the-
selves to discern betwixt truth & shew of truth,
either follow neither party, but become vncer-
taine or Atheistes, or content with any shew of
truth take that part to which any affection of
their will doth draw them. Whereas none by
hearing or reading controuerfies of Fact, becom-
meth not more confirmed in the Catholik faith
or more auerted from heresy. And therefore
Tertullian counsaileth vs, not to dispute with *Præscrip.*
Heretikes out of Scripture, by which que- *cap. 20.*
stions of doctrine are disputed, but aduiseeth vs
to appeale to antiquity, succession, and such like
which concerne questions of fact.

4. Lastly, though the fruit of disputing
both those kind of questions were equall, yet
sith the Author, by order of nature, goeth before
the thing whereof he is Authour, according to
the

The preface to the Reader.

Lib. 5. cont
Mar.

Lib 3. cont
Mar.

the order of Nature we ought to intreate of the Author of Protestancy before we dispute of Protestancy it selfe. For (as well sayth Tertulian) *nothing but God alone is without beginning which how much it goeth before in the state of all things, so much ought it to go before in the handling of them, that the state may be knowne.* And other where: *Nothing is knowne before the beginning is knowne.* Wherefore I will begin my first dispute concerning the Protestant Religion of the Author thereof: Yet before I do that, I must set downe and determine what a Protestant, or the Protestant Church and Religion is, and what is necessary for one to be a Protestant, and discover the vncertainty of Protestants. And this much touching the matter which I have made choice of to handle in this little worke and the causes thereof.

Why
proued
only out
of Prote-
stants,

5. As for the manner wherwith I vnder-
take to discusse this question of Fact, whether
Luther was the first Author & beginner of the
Protestant Church, and Religion, I purpose to
proue it only out of the confessions of Luther
himselfe, and of the three sorts of Protestants,
to wit, Lutherans, who professe to follow Lu-
ther in all points of doctrine; Sacramentaries,
who notoriously dissent from him touching the
reall presence of Christs body in the Sacrament;
and our English Protestants, who differ from
both

The preface to the Reader .

both the former at least in discipline & gouernment of their Church : because this kind of prooffe out of their owne wordes I find to be both necessary and most effectually with Protestants . Necessary , because of this question of Fact , neither the Scripture , or the Fathers say any thing , as also , because , seeing Protestants deny part of the scripture , and interpret the rest as they please , and will not stand to the sentence of the Church , Councils , or Fathers , account reason Sophistrie , & contemne the testimonies of Catholique writers , they haue left nothing but their own cōfessiōs , by which we may dispute with them . And I pray God they do giue place to their own most frequent and most plaine confessions , and not delude them by voluntary and friuolous interpretations ; for then hope may be , that there wilbe some end of these controuersies . At least we shall reape this profit by this labour , that by it shall be manifest to all , that either Protestants will beare no testimony , admit no iudgement , no not their owne , which is a most euident argument of a most desperat cause ; or that they shall be condemned by their owne verdict & sentence ; or lastly that there can be no forme of speech so plaine , no words so cleare , no sentence so manifest , which they with their faigned figures & deuises will not wrest , frustrate ,
and

necessary.

The p[re]face to the Reader .

and delude; which is in effect to disannull al kind of prooffe which is taken out of words or testimonies whatsoeuer . For I will bring so plaine testimonies of theirs , as plaine can scarce or not at all be deuised; I will bring so many, as themselves will require no more ; I will bring so weighty , as themselves will demaund none more weighty; I wil bring them also most freely and often iterated and repeated; lastly I will bring not only those which indirectly and by consequence proue that which I would , but those also, & that especially & ofteneft, which directly testify that which they are brought to confirme . Wherefore either they will not delude these words of theirs , or they wil delude all wordes whatsoeuer ; And either they will not refuse these their owne testimonies and confessions, or they will reiect all testimonies and iudgements whatsoeuer , which is in effect to confesse that their cause is most desperate and most worthy to be reiect[ed] and condemned of all .

Most effectually .

By reason .

• This māner also of prooffe is most effectually , for what can be of greater force to conuince a man , then his owne iudgement and acknowledgement of the truth? Surely vnlesse a man will professe himselfe to be en enemy of truth, and of the number of them who see good and follow bad , he must needs imbrace that truth

The preface to the Reader.

truth which himselfe confesseth. Experience
also sheweth the same. For when our Saviour By exper-
could neither by infinite miracles nor eident rience.
scriptures stop the mouthes of the Iewes, he so

conuincd them out of their owne words, that
(as the Euangelist writeth) *they answered him*
not a word nor from that day any durst aske him a Matt. 22.
question. And the Donatists, when they made

an sweare to the Catholikes argumets taken out
of scripture, were so intangled in their owne
fact touching the Maximinists, as (sayth S. (d) (d) in col-
Augustine) *they euer more stood dumbe at that* lat. 3. dist
c. 11.

And now we see, that Protestants are tongue-
tyed at no sort of bookes so much, as at those,
which are composed of their owne testimonies.

This manner of dealing vsed the holy Fathers By the
against the Pagans, as is to bee seen in Clement, Fathers.

Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Arnobius,
Lactantius, Augustin, and others; and against

heretiques also, as appeareth in the sayd S. Au-
gustin. S. Hierome, and others, most often,
and the same they most highly commend. For

thus writeth (e) S. Denis of Alexandria: *It* (e) In Eu-
helpeth me much, that I can disproue them out of ieb. 1. 7. c.
their owne wordes. S. (f) Gregorie Nazianzen: 6.

It is the greatest cunning and wisdom of speach to (f) Orat. de
bind (the Aduersary) with his owne wordes. S. Basil.

And (g) Tertullian, or Nouatian: *It is a* (g) De
strong kind of prooffe, which is taken of the ad- Tim. 6. 13.
uersary

The preface to the Reader .

(h) Lib. 2.
cap. 53.

(i) Lib.
cont. Se-
cund. c. 3.

(k) Lib. 2.
Retract. c.
20.

(l) Lib. 1.
cap. 35.

(m) Lib.
4. c. 14.

(n) Lib. de
anima 6. 3.

(o) Atha.
l. de carne
Christi .

(p) Hom.
3. in epist.
ad Tit .

(q) Lib. 1.
cont. Petil.
6. 27.

adversary that truth may be proved euē by the enemies
of truth. S. (h) Ireneus: *We often disgrace them by
their owne doctrine.* And (i) S. Augustine: *Nei-
ther will I bring against thee any other sentences for
to shew the errour of Manichee, then out of thyne
owne epistle:* Which worke of his he (k) prefer-
reth before al the other which he wrote against
that heresy. Nay, the same holy Fathers account
this manner of dealing with heretiks necessary,
and preferre it before all others. For thus sayth
S. Ireneus (l) *It is needfull to disproue the Valen-
tinians by their Mothers, Fathers and Ancestours.*
And in another (m) place: *That is a true and
vnanswerable prooffe which bringeth attestatiō frō
the aduersaryes themselues.* And (n) Tertullian:
*The aduersaryes testimony is est soones necessary. A-
gaine: I must strike them with their own weapons.*
And (o) S. Athanasius, who was most tryed in
combates with heretikes: *Against wranglers we
must oppose their owne arguments, in which (sayth
he) I haue the greatest hope of victory.* S. Chry-
sostome (p) also: *We must conuince them by this,
when we turne their owne ill sayings against them-
selues, as often as we make those who were the fa-
mouesest amongst them, their accusers.* And la-
stly (q) S. Augustine the most fortunate cham-
pion of the Church against heretiks seeing that
the Donatists could be evidently conuincd by
their owne dealing with the Maximinists, ex-
horteth

The p̄face to the Reader .

horteth Catholikes to let alone all other kind of arguments , and still to vrge this only : Remember (sayth he) *this only fact of the Max ministrs , cast this in their faces , answere to al obiections by the Maximinists alone . And (1) againe : I will not leaue (1)* *Bill. cap . 18 .*
this only fact which God hath put before their eyes to stop their mouthes , and to amend them if they be wise , or to confound them if they remayne obstinate . And in like manner , when he saw , that the Donatists cause was quite ouerthrowne by that saying of theirs : Neither one cause doth preiudice another , nor one person another , he thus speaketh vnto Catholiques : (2) I request you , I beseech you (2) *Sermon 22 de verb . Apostol .*
for Christs sake , that you remember it , speake it , and haue it euer in your mouthes . There could not be pronounced on our behalfe , a briefer , surer , and plainer sentence . Thus you see how greatly the Fathers esteeme of this kind of dealing with heretikes , and how earnestly they vrge vs for to vse it .

7 . And Protestants ought the more to allow this kind of proceeding with them , because they much commend it , and preferre it before all others . Luther : *There (3) is no stronger (3)* *De sero arbit . fol . 443 .*
prooffe , then his owne confession , who is accused , and his testimony against himselfe . And againe : No (4) *(4) Inc . 1 . 1 . Pet . fol . 449 .*
man can conuince a lyer better then by his own words . Heihufius : The (5) shortest way of al to conuince an (5) *Lib . de Cona .*
aduersary is that which is taken out of his owne confession .

The preface to the Reader.

(y) Epist.
Enchar.

(z) Loc.
ris. delu-
datis fol.
390.

(a) Suruey
c. 8. pag.
24^r.

(b) Cont.
292. c. 14.

(c) Praef.
in Cant.

(d) Apol.
l. 1. cap. 25.

Differen-
ces be-
twixt

Protest.
manner of
dealing &
ours.

Confession, wherewith he openly acknowledgeth that which is objected. Lucas (y) Ofiander: The confession and testimony of the aduersary is of greatest authority. Peter (z) Martyr: Surely amongst other testimonies that is of greatest weight, which is giuen by the enemies. D Bancroft: Let (a) vs take hold of that which they haue graunted. You may be bold to build vpon it for a truth, that they are so cōstrayned to yield vnto. D (b) Whitaker: It must needs be a strong argument, which is taken out of the confession of the Aduersaries. For the testimony of the aduersaries is of force against themselves. And (c) a-gaine: It is a notable matter and encreaseth much the triumph for to be proued by the testimony of the aduersaries. And D. Morton in the Epistle dedicatory of his answer to the Protestants Apology: Which kind of assistance of learned aduersaries the Apologists themselves haue layd down for the greatest reason of satisfaction. & We do accordingly admit Nay, they begin to vse this kind of arguing against vs, and vaunt much therof: VVho may not (sayth the sayd. D. (d) Morton) iustly congratulate the Protestants happines, whome truth it selfe proceeding out of their aduersaries mouths doth patronize?

8. But, by their leaue, there are many and great differences betweene their and our kind of proceeding in this matter. First many of the Catholikes, whome they produce against vs,

wrote

The preface to the Reader .

wrote before their Religion was risen, & therefore we answered that of them, which S. Hierom answered of the ancient Fathers, who liued before Arius appeared: *Before Arius* (sayth he) *arose in Alexandria like a noon-tide Diuell, they spake some things innocently and not so warily, which can not escape the obloquie of certaine peruerse men.* And which S. Augustin answered of S. Chrylostom when the Pelagians alleadged his testimony. *Discourfing* (sayth he) *in the Catholike Church, he thought not that he was otherwise understood None was yet troubled with such a question; you not yet iangling, he spake more securely.* But the Protestants which we produce liued al after that protestancy was both bred and hatched, & after the Catholike fayth had for many ages shined through out the world, and therefore could not be ignorant what wordes of theirs might make for the Catholike fayth, and preiudice their owne cause. Another difference is, that none of the Catholikes whose testimonyes Protestants alleage against vs, is accounted of vs for a man sent extraordinarily of God, and much lesse for a Prophet, Euangelist, or Apostle. Nay, many of them are obscure writers, and of small or no reckoning among vs, some of them are not held for Catholikes of vs, and some of them euen by the iudgments of Protestants themselues are our open enemyes. But the confessions of fayth

Lib. 2.
contr. Ru-
fin.

Lib. 1. contra
Iul. 6. 6.

Cassander
Erasmus.
Cornelius
Agrippa.
Marfil of
Padua.

Beatus
Rhenanus
Faber Sta-
pulenfis,
Orthui-
nus Gra-
tius.

**

which

The preface to the Reader.

which we cite against Protestants containe their
 (e) *Humf. ad Rat. 4.* faith, so that they cannot be reiected of them,
Camp. vnles they will renounce their fayth. And of
 (f) *Colloq. Aldebr. Schuffelb. Catal. 13.* the men whose testimonye we produce, one is
Hunius prefat. de liber. arbit. accounted of them a (c) God, another a Prophet
 (g) *danæ. lib. 4. de Eccles. c. 9.* an (f) Euangelist, an Apostle, a third Elias, an
Bez a ep. 6. Angell. His writings are held for inspired from
 (h) *Iustin. dial. cum Tryphon. August. l. de ciuit. Chrysoft. hom. 26. in 2. Cor. Cyril. l. 6. in Iulian.* heauen, for a rule of fayth, and equall to the
 writings of the Apostles. Another is called a
 (i) *Hier. cont. Vigilant. Ambros. serm. 5. de sanctis. Hilar. l. 1. & 6. de Trinit.* (B) great and admirable Prophet, others are est-
 ceemed for lights, lampes, bright starres, props,
 founders, parents, renewers of the Protestants
 church and religion. Others are men extraor-
 dinarily sent and diuinely raised to lighten the
 world; most of them for very learned, famous
 & well deseruing of the Protestant religion; &
 finally all for sincere Protestants. The holy Fa-
 thers were wont to refute both the (h) Pagans
 superstition and the (i) heretikes errors out of
 the Diuels confessions. Of which kind of proof
 (k) *Tertullian, vsing it, maketh this account:*
What more manifest then this fact? what more sure
then this prooffe? Believe them, they speake true of
themselues, who vse to credit them when they lye.
No man lyeth to his owne disgrace. And S. (l) Cy-
 prian: *VVho so sayest that thou worshipsst the Gods*
 believe euen them whom thou worshippest. And like-
 wise Minutius in Octauio: *Neither do they lye to*
 (l) *Lib. ad Demetr.* their owne shame, especially if some of you be by. Be-
 lieue

The preface to the Reader.

believe themselves witnessing that they are Devils, and confessing the truth of themselves. But our proofe taken out of the Protestants confessions of faith & out of Luther & such like famous Protestants testimony against Protestancy, is much more evident and stronger; both because it is more likely that men will confesse the truth, though against themselves, then the Diuell the father of lyes and sworne enemy of truth; as also because the confessions of the Diuel were extorted from him by force, as the Fathers themselves doe acknowledge, but these of Luther and his mates come most freely from them. Believe therefore (O Protestants) your chiefe leaders, your founders, Instructors Prophets, Euāgelists, & Apostles, in that which they freely & of their own accord cōfesse of themselves & of their doctrine. Euen by the testimony of your own Prophets & teachers believe, that Protestācy is newly risen, first founded by Luther, & before knowne to none. No man willingly lyeth to his owne shame; no man freely confesseth that which ouerthroweth his owne cause, but which he cannot deny. No man knew protestancy better then they, no man fauoured it more then they. *Who (sayth Calvin) is to be credited touching Popery, more then the Pope himselfe?* And whom shal we believe touching the author and hatching of protestancy amongit the Lutherans, rather then

Note.

De ver
Ecclesie
form.

The preface to the Reader .

Luther himfelfe , Melancthon , the Century-
writers, Kemnice, Schuffelburg, and the like?
Or amongst the Sacramentaryes, rather then
Zuinglius, Bullinger, Bucer, Peter Martyr, Cal-
uin, Beza, Plessie, and such others? or amongst
English Protestants rather then Iewell, Fox,
Whitaker, Fulke, Humfrey, Perkins, and the
like, whose frequent and plaine confessions v'e
heerin produce. A third difference between our
and the Protestants manner of proceeding in
this kind of prooffe is, that Protestantes often-
tymes alleadge Catholikes testimonyes corrup-
ted, mangled, and falsified; and sometyms al-
so the obiections which they make against the-
selues, instead of their answeres, as Cardinall
Peron not long since shewed Plessie to haue don
before the French King, euen by the iudgment
of Protestant themselues. And it were easy to
demonstrate that D. (m) Morton hath done the
like in his Apology. But I produce the testimo-
nyes of Protestants certaine and entiere, at least
for that sence for which I alleadge them. For I
haue cited none in this worke which either I
haue not seene with myne owne eyes, and for
the most part haue quoted not only the bookes
and chapters but also the leaues and pages, or if
I haue wanted the booke, I haue cited them out
of some good Author. The fourth difference &
that of great moment is, that the Catholiques,
whose

conferen-
rence at
fountaine
Bel-caue .

(m) Apol.
part. 1. l. 1.
c. 23. l. 2. c.
41. part. 2.
l. c. 35. l. 2.
c. 41.

The preface to the Reader.

whose testimonies Protestants alleadge against is (if so be they were true Catholikes) were alwayes ready to reuoke and recall whatfoeuer they had written contrary to the catholik fayth, & to submit all their wordes or writings to the censure of the catholike Church, which to be the mind & disposition of all Catholiks, Protestants themselues confesse. For thus writeth D.

(n) Whitaker: *This is the condition, this the consent of the Popish Church, that all hang their salvation upon one man, and submit themselues to one mans iudgment.* And D. (o) Morton: *Is there any Papist that thinkes any decree of the Pope can be contemned or broken without cryme or heresy?*

(n) Contr.

2. q. 5. c. 8.

(o) Apol.

part. 1. l.

1. cap. 31.

Which sith it is so, in vaine do they object any Catholikes words against the Catholike fayth. For either they are not contrary thereto, or if they be, they are already reuoked, recalled and disanulled by himselfe. But the mind and proceeding of Protestants is far otherwise, who subiect not their opinions to the iudgment of the Church, but as they thinke that she may erre, so will they hold their opinions notwithstanding her sentence to the contrary; and therefore iustly may we produce their testimonies against their owne Church.

9. The first difference, & which is much to be noted, is, that Protestants alleadge Catholik witnesses in matters of doctrine, in which some

The preface to the Reader.

August. l.
11. cont.
Eauft. c. 5.

tymes by reason of the obscurity of the matter a man may chance to erre & slip; or els in such matters of fact, as were in times or places far distant from them, so that themselves could not search the truth, but believed the reports of others. Such a question is that of Pope *Ioane*, in which Protestants cite no Catholike author which liued not some ages after that time, wherin Pope *Ioan* is sayd to haue beene. Or if they produce any Catholike Author in any matter of fact, the truth wherof he might haue tried, either he is of no credit, or the matter is such, as it turneth to no preiudice of the Catholike faith. But we heer produce Protestants in a matter of fact, & such a matter as they could most easily know. For what was more easy, then for Luther and his fellowes to try either then or euer since, whether, when he first began, there was in the world any Protestant company, whether it were visible, whether it had Pastours, and the like? For who can thinke, that only the Protestant company could lye so close hid, that neither in all Luthers time or euer since, either he being, or the estate or condition, or place or Pastours, or any thing at all therof could be espied out of so many Arguses, which now in one whole age haue sifted all corners of the world to find it out? And besides, this is such a question of Fact, as vpon the decision therof

an

The preface to the Reader.

an end may be made of all cōtrouersies betwee-
ne Catholikes and Protestants. For (as I sayd
before) if Luther be the Author and beginner
of the Protestant Church , it is certaine , that
it is not the Church of Christ , nor to be follo-
wed of Christians, but to be forsaken & dete-
sted. To which I ad now, that if Luther himself
& such & so many learned & famous Protestants
as I haue cited, do by many wayes, & so plain-
ly confesse , that Luther was the Author therof,
it cannot be doubted , but that he was in truth
the Author of it For I alleadge not men of
small credit among Protestants , but such as are
of greatest authority with them ; nor a few ,
but many ; nor of one nation alone , but of
diuers , to wit , Germans , Italians , French ,
English , Scottes , Flemings and others ; nor
Protestants of one sort or sect , but of all three
namely Lutherans, Sacramētaries and English
Protestants . So that they could not beare faise
witnesse in this matter either for want of know-
ledge , because they were many and learned &
of different countries , and most diligent in
searching the matter , and the matter it selfe
most easy ; nor for want of good will towards
the cause , because they were all most earnest
Protestants . And to refuse the testimonies of
such witnesses in a matter of fact , in their owne
time , so easy to be knowne , and so diligently
searched

Note.

The p̄face to the Reader.

searched of them, what other thing is it, then obstinately to refuse to know the truth of this matter so important to be knowne, and whereby may be made an end of all contentions in Religion? Wherefore let Protestants say as they please, that in questions of doctrine they will not depend vpon Luther, Calvin, or any one, or all their doctours together, but vpon the scripture alone: Neuertheles in matter of fact, wherof the scripture saith nothing, such as this is (for the Scripture telleth not what was the state and condition of the Protestant Church when Luther began, in what place it was, what Pastours it had, who saw it, and the like) either they must confesse, that they refuse all triall & knowledge of so important a truth, or they must giue credit to the deposition of sufficient witnessses. And if euer men were or can be sufficiēt witnessses of any matter of Fact, Luther and those Protestants which here I produce, are sufficient witnessses of that which I bring them for to testify. And thus much touching the cause why I proue Luther to haue been the founder of Protestant Religiō only by the testimonies of Protestants.

Why so many Protestants testimonies are alleged.

10. As for the reason why I alleadge so many Protestants, that is, that it many appeare, that it is not the priuate testimony of some one or few, but the generall consent of them all, or

at

The preface to the Reader.

at least the common sentence of many of them. And if I seeme to any Catholike ouer tedious in heaping vp so many testimonies of Protestants, I pray him to cōsider, that I write not this book to Catholikes to confirme them in the Catholike faith, who I know to that end doe not need the testimonies of Protestants; but that I write it partly to Catholikes, for to furnish them with store of Protestants testimonies to stopp their mouthes, and to shew them that they are right Heretikes, that is, condemned (as the Apostle speaketh) by their owne iudgement, to which end a few testimonies of theirs would not suffice. And therefore to such as intend this end the multitude of testimonies will not be troublesome. For who, that indeauoureth to vāquish most obstinate enemies, will complain of the abundance of good soldiers wherof he may make choice? And if I had rehearsed only some few testimonies, and named the places where the rest may be found, some would haue cauilled, as M. Iewel did against D. Harding, that I had cited dumbe witnesses. Besides, seing the iudgments of men are diuers, it may fall out, that what kind of testimonyes seem strong & forcible to some, others acount but weake and litle to the purpose; and therefore it was behofull, that there should be as it were a store-house of Protestants testimonies, that euery one might

take

The preface to the Reader.

take what weapon he thinketh fittest for him, & vse it against them. But especially I gathered these testimonies of Protestants for the Protestants themselves, that by their owne mens iudgement I might withdraw them from their error. And therefore I was not so fearfull to bring too many for Catholikes, as careful to prouide inough for Protestants. In which I could hardly offend by multitude. For as S (p) Vigil saith, *Mans mind possessed with the error of a false opinion, is hard and slow to perceine truth, with how many witnesses so euer it be urged therto.* Or as (q) Tertullian writeth: *much talke in matter of edification is not foule if at any time it be foule.* And (r) S. Hierom: *delay is no losse, when by delay the victory is more assured* Wherupon S. Augustin counsaileth vs, not to regard and delay whatsoever, so we bring good prooffe of what we say. Besides, (s) Protestants deny that we ought to iudge of them by one or few; though they be Pastors, and (t) write that M. Brierly in his Protestants Apologie, although it be stuffed with all kind of Protestants testimonies, hath brought but a few testimonies. And as S. (x) Augustin saith of the Donatists, *they are ready to deny what they can.* Or as S (y) Hierome speaketh: *Shutting their eyes deny what they would vvere not.* For what could be more impudently denyed, then that which D. (z) Field denyeth

(p) Lib. 1.

(q) Lib. de Patient.

(r) Lib. 1. cont. 101.

(s) De gestis cum Emerit.

(t) V V hi. cont. 195.

c. 17. l. 1. de script. c.

21. sect. Sadeel. in Refut.

Posnan. c. 12.

(u) White in defen- ce of his way. c. 7.

(x) Lib. 3. cont. Cref. c. 6.

(y) Epist. ad Ctesiph.

(z) Lib. 3. de Eccles. s. 6. 8. 49.

denic
and g
Chur
thei
multi
such
to disc
Or as a
porta
ould b
eat w
recc
ainty
ne of d
light
(c) C
rothin
sch for
readi
before t
estimo
ne ma
forcible
the forc
be may
many.
11.
same P
may a

The p̄face to the Reader .

denieth that when Luther began , the publique and generall face of Religion in the Westerne Church was Papisticall? These men need haue their mouthes shut , and their eares stopt with multitude of testimonies . For as (a) Calvin saith) *it is the part of wicked & furious obstinacie,*

(a) Infit. 3. c. 25. §. 3.

so discredit so many and so authentick testimonies. Or as an (b) other sayth : *If in a matter of great importance one only witness were alleadged, what place would his testimony find? But vnder so many and so great witnesses as are heere produced, all pretext of not receauing the truth is taken away.*

(b) Prafa. Synt. conf.

In so great certainty of so many witnesses, how is there so great loue of darknes, that they open not their eyes to see the light? To which I add that saying of Varius

in (c) Cicero : *Either these witnesses will suffice, or nothing will suffice.* Neuertheleise, that I might

(c) Lib. 2. de finibus.

both somewhat ease the wearines of Catholikes in reading so many testimonies, and better set before the eyes of Protestants the force of their testimonies, I doe for the most part marke in the margent those testimonies which are most forcible, & after I haue recited them all, I gather the force and summe of them together which he may read, who loatheth to runne ouer so many.

Why many testimonies of the same mā.

II. I bring also diuers testimonies of the same Protestants, especially of Luther, that it may appeare, that that confession slippt not from him

him

The preface to the Reader .

(d) Praefa.
opusc. Cal.

Lobechius
praefat.
disput.
V P bitak.
ad Demon-
strat. 1.
Sanderi.

(e) Lib. de
peccat. ori-
gin. c. 22.

him vnawares and vnadvisedly, but that it was his constant iudgement, if there can be any constancy in heretikes. For I remember that (d) Beza, for to couer Caluins foule contradictiōs of himselfe, wrote; *As if of that vvhich one hath vvvritten briefly in some place, it vvwere to be gathered vvhhat he thought of euery point of doctrine.* I graunt notwithstanding, that I haue brought some testimonies which are not so cleare, as of themselves they would conuince the matter; Yet such they are as strengthen those that are cleare, and of them receiue light. For as in gathering an armie not only stout men but also some other are chosen, who may increate the strength of those that are stout, and likewise may be encouraged by them; so it fareth also in gathering testimonies. Neither yet did I gather all that occurred: but only such as seemed more to the purpose. It will also delight the reader to see how some Protestants plainly and roundly confesse the truth, others deale more craftily & closely, and in them he shal espy that difference which S. Austin (e) noted between Celestius, and Pelagius, of whome he writeth, *that he was more opē, this more close; he more obstinate, this more false, he more free, this more wily.* If any aske how it fell out, that Protestāts should giue such plain testimonies against their own cause; I answered, that there were many causes heerof. First the e-
vidence

The preface to the Reader.

vidence of truth, which maketh its enemies, yea the devils themselves sometimes to confesse it: (f) Lib. 2. cont. Eun.

The very coyner of lyes (sayth (f) S. Basil) oftentymes catcht with the evidence of truth, as with a snare, even against their wilts do witness it. Againe, It is the nature of lyes to bewray themselves, like (g) Lib. 5. cont. Mar.

Tertullian writeth: Theeves commonly leave something behind them, which bewrayeth them. For as S. Augustine (h) In sentenc. Prof. sayth: It is incredible, that he should not be taken by lyes, who lyeth to take others. (i) Lib. 1. cont. Eun.

Or as S. Basil (i) hath: So it is, that euill is not only contrary to good but also to it selfe. And Luther (k) In cap. 12. Mat. in cap. 4. & 37. Genes. himselfe: There is no heretike, who is not

found of spirituell men to speak aginst himself in his lyes. And els where: This happeneth to the wicked, that by lying they cannot beware not to bewray themselves by their wordes. They lye some while an some- (l) Resp. ad Nebul. & admon. vlt.

times, but continually they cannot. At last lyes bewray themselves especially with them who marke and (m) Conto. Castell. p. 421. obserue. For there escapeth some word from them

with which they are taken. The same confesse (n) Cont. 1. q. 2. c. 30. & q. 5. c. 8. Calvin, (m) Beza, (n) Whitaker, and others. (o) Zuin. 1. de relig. c. de Euch. Hospin. part. 2. fol. 90. colloq. Aldeb. fol. 154. Schusfelb. tom. 7. catal. p. 136.

Another cause is, because Protestants (as here, tiques are wont to do, and themselves confesse that they practise it) accommodate their

sayings and doctrine to time, place, and occasions, & therefore vtter those sayings which we here alleadge, before whome and when they

thinck they will make to their purpose; but where

The preface to the Reader.

where they see they will hurt their cause, either they deny them, or seeke by friuolous and fond expositions to auoyd and delude them. So the Donatists (as (p) Augustin noteth) would not confesse that, which would haue confounded them, when the Catholikes vrged it, *but after when an other point was in handling.* A fourth cause may be giuen, that as the Scorpion affordeth a remedy for her sting, and of the vipers flesh is made the counterpoyson; so God hath ordayned, that heretiques affoord sufficient meanes to refute their errors: *Neither yet therefore* (as S. (q) Augustin writeth) *giue we any thanks to them, but to God alone.* For that they should for our cause produce & discover all these things by speaking or writing, truth enforced them, not charity invited them. And (r) Luther himselfe: *So must the enemies of truth confound and mock themselves for a reward of their blasphemies.* And (s) againe: *Since God ordayneth that folly is always ioynea with malice, Cain betrayeth himselfe.* And for this cause the defence of truth is easy against the aduersaries therof. Wherupon (t) Holpinian thus writeth of the Lutherans: *They are become grieuous enemies and aduersaries, not so much of others, as of themselves; surely by a most eident testimony of Gods iudgment, and a worthy punishment and confession for these kind of ambitious and contentious men.* Which I would God Protestants would obserue,

(p) Lib.
ad Donat.
pass collat.

(q) Supr.
c. 33.

(r) Cont.
R. Angl.
fol. 343.

(s) Incap.
4. Genes.

(t) Hospi.
part. 2.
bistor, fol.
38.

The preface to the Reader.

obserue, not in Lutherans only, but also in other Protestants. For they should find, that they haue }
 no heauier aduerlayes then themselues, and that }
 Protestants (as (u) Lactantius wrote of Cice- (u) Lib. 20
 ro) cannot be more sorely confuted, then they ^{c. 9.}
 are by Protestants themselues.

*An error
 If you find it is, you may read
 it safely enough if you will*



Faultes escaped in the Printing.

Page Line Fault Correction.

In the Preface.			
12.	4.	plaine	playner
25.	17.	and	any
In the Booke.			
26.	12.	Feild	Fulke
38.	23.	Creed	Creedes
76.	25.	reclaimed	disclaimed
81.	11.	himself	himselfe
82.	27	vnles he	vnles he be
96.	6.	numb. 66.	numb. 96.
107.	19.	The	There
109.	23.	light of	dele of
120.	4.	credible	incredible
127.	7.	the	these

*Search not after
 faults in the first
 edition. Search
 what faults
 there are.*

Pag	Line	Fault	Correction.
131.	6.	dele	have been
137.	2.	be	be by
140.	6.	fourth	third
147.	33.	waye	waxe
154.	7.	in	is
168.	23.	sonde	sponge
169.	3.	one	our
170.	33.	1525.	1535.
181.	14.	should onely	should only say
184.	27.	predigious	prodigious
205.	31.	boasteth	boasteth that
219.	vlt.	Taye	Faye
221.	33.	of fayth	faith of
222.	21.	first	fifth
228.	32.	had	adde
229.	31.	Mouching	Touching
232.	13.	he	she
233.	3.	the	then the
259.	29.	Protestants	Protestant Pastor
260.	5.	we	is
286.	11.	accept	except
277.	24.	iniured	inured
290.	32.	speaketh	speaketh to
295.	vlt.	They protest	the Protestant
305.	vlt.	sophistry	a sophisme
309.	32.	saye	some say
316.	28.	the	to the
328.	23.	greatest	greatest lyers.

If any other faults have escaped, it is desired of the Gentle Reader, to correct them of his courtesy, the Author being farre absent from the Print.

THE

Tam sensorius hand fuit ut illi, quorum
nervi fuerit fuerit in auro. I



THE FIRST BOOKE.

*Of the substance of the Protestants Church
and Religion, and of their uncer-
tainty therein.*

CHAP. I.

BECAUSE, as after Plato and Aristotle, Tully sayth very truly: *Whosoever will according to the order of reason treat of any thing, must first define or explicate the nature thereof, that it may be knowne what it is whereof he speaketh; and Protestants agree, that the definition is the very ground* Lib. 1. offic

of all disputation; before I do shew, who was the first Caluin. 3.
Institut.
cap. 4. §. 1.
Sadeel, in
Refut.
Thes. Pos-
itan. cap. 20

author of the Protestant Church and Religion (which I will do in the second booke) I will in this first define and determine what is a Protestant, and what is the Protestant Church and Religion. And because Protestants in this matter (as in all others) are variable and inconstant, sometyms requiring many things to the making and constitution of a Protestant, & sometyms being content with very

A few

few things, sometyms stretching the bounds of their Church most largely, otherwhiles drawing the very strait, according as it serueth to their present purpose; I will first discover this their vncertainty about so weighty a matter, & afterward out of their owne principles and confessions of fayth, set downe what is indeed necessary to the very substance and being of a Protestant, and of their Church and Religion. And in this Chapter I will shew, how few they sometyms do admit to be of the Church, and how many things they require to the making of a Protestant; and in some chapters following, how many they at other tymes do graunt to be of their Church, and how few things they account necessary for to be a member thereof. That done I will make manifest, what is indeed necessary thereto.

They exclude Papists.

2. First of all therefore they sometyms exclude Catholiques, (whome they terme Papists) out of the Church, as is manifest by all their writings, in so much that the French Protestants in the 28. article of their confession say: *Ve openly affirme that where the word of God is not receined, nor there is any profession of obedience due thereto, nor any vse of Sacraments, there, properly speaking, we cannot iudge to be any Church. Wherfore we condemne the Popish Conuenticles.* And D. Whitaker in his second booke against Dureus & 2. section, is so earnest that he sayth: *I will not allow the very name of a lawfull Church vnto the Roman Church, because it hath nothing, which a true Church ought to haue.* And both he in his 2. Controuersy 6. question 3. Chapter, D. Sulline in his first booke of the Church 3. cap. and lib. 2. cap. 9. M. Perkins in his reformed Catholique towards the end, Calvin in his book against the Chaunter of Lyons, Beza in his of the notes of the Church, the

the Confession of Saxony in the Chapter of the Church, and many others do reckon diuers articles, for euery one whereof they pronounce Papists to be out of the Church. And because their opinion herein is well inough knowne, and hereafter also we shall haue occasiō to shew how haynously they condemne the Popedome or Papistry, I will heere rehearse no more of their sayings touching this point. The like sentence they sometymes pronounce of the Anabaptists and Arians. For thus speaketh the confession of Auspurg Cap. 9. *They condemne the Anabaptists, who disallow the baptisme of infants, and think them to be saued without baptisme.* And the Confession of Swit-zerland cap. 20. *Ve condemne the Anabaptists, who deny that infants ought to be baptized.* The same is manifest by the English Confession c. 38. & by the Confession of Basle c. 24. & others. Of Arians they giue this verdict in the forsayd Confession of Auspurg in the first article: *They condemne all heresies risen against this article (of the Trinity) as the Manichees, Arians, Eanomians &c.* And in like sort the French Confession art. 6. the English art. 1. the consent of Poland, and others; in so much as in England the Protestants haue burnt some Arians.

3. Sometymes also they thrust out all heretickes. For thus writeth Luther in his explication of the Creed. *Neither Gentile, Iew, Heretike, or any sinner is saued, vnlesse he make attonement with the Church, and in all things, thinke, do, and teach the same.* And the Magdeburgians in the preface of their 6. Century: *Neither Heretikes, nor deuisers or patrons of fanaticall opinions, are of Christ, but they are of Antichrist, and of the diuell, and appertaine to Antichrist and the diuell: they are the impostume and the plague of the people of God.* The ministers of the Prince

Sacra-
mentaries.

Electors of Saxony in the Conference held at Ald-
burg, in the 3. writ, cast out of the Church all, *VVho*
(say they) *wittingly and willingly defend such corruptions of*
doctrine, as haue byn condemned by the lawfull iudgment and
consent of the Catholike Church. And the Ministers of the
Duke of Saxony in the 4. writ of the sayd Confe-
rence, pronounce this sentence: *VVhosoever they are,*
that do cloak and defend corruptions of the word of God, that
is, of the articles of sayth, after they haue byn admonished; we
iudge not to be true members of Christ, vnlesse they repent. And
Urbanus Regius, one of the first and cheitest scho-
lers of Luther, in his Catechisme sayth: *All Heretikes*
are out of the Church. The same teacheth Schuffelburg,
a principall superintendent amongst the Lutherans in
his Catalogue of heresies, and many others. As for
the Sacramentaries, thus professeth the French Con-
fession in the 6. article: *VVe detest all Sects and heresies*
which haue byn reiected by the holy Fathers, as S. Hilary, S. A-
thanasie, S. Ambrose, S. Cyrill. Whereupon Sadtel in his
preface of his answer to the abiured articles, sayth:
Our Confession of sayth condemneth all Heretikes. Likewise
the Confession of Basle in 24. article writeth in this
sort: *VVe driue away all, whosoever dissenting from the so-*
cietie of the holy Church, do either bring in, or follow strange &
wicked doctrines. And Peter Martyr in his Common
places, in the title of heretiks: *This in summe I will say,*
heretikes are not otherwise to be dealt with all, then Infidells &
Iewes. Calvin also in his 2. booke of Institutions
cap. 15. number. 1. *Rightly Augustin denyeth Heretikes to*
haue the same foundation with the godly, albeit they preach the
name of Christ. And in his instruction against the Li-
bertines: *That we may speake properly, Heretikes are not on-*
ly like to wolues or theeues, but much worse. Beza in his book
of punishing Heretiks: *If one terme Heretikes saithlesse*
apostatas,

apostatas, he shall give them their due title. And againe: Heretikes affirme Christ in word, and deny him indeed. Daxus in his 5. Controverly and 691. pag. An heretike, condemned by lawfull judgement, and actually cast out of the Church, is not of the visible Church, nor of the invisible neither, actually or apparently, so long as he remaineth in that state. Polanus in his 7. booke which he termeth Syntagma, cap. 5. Heretikes, whiles they remayne such are not members of the Catholique Church. And Vortius in his Anti-bellarmin pag. 79. The Gospellers do esteem Antichrist in common to be euery heretike who opposeth himselfe eyther openly and plainly, or closely and indirectly to Christ and his doctrine. And in the 121. pag. There is no controverly betweene vs and our aduersaries touching heretikes, Schismatikes and Apostatas properly and truly so called, that they are altogether out of the Church of Christ. Thus forraine Protestants. In England, his Maiesty in his epistle to Cardinal Peron written by Casaubon: The King dam- neth and detesteth those, who either haue departed from the sayth of the Catholike Church, and are become heretikes, or from the Communion, and are become Schismatikes. The Apology of the Church of England part. 3. diuif. 3. VVe condemne all sortes of the old heretiks, as the Arians, the Eutichians &c. and shortly, all them that haue a wicked opinion either of God the Father, or of Christ, or of the holy Ghost, or of any other point of Christian Religion: for so much as they be confuted by the Gospell of Christ we plainly pronounce them for damnable and detestable persons, and defy them euen to the diuell. D. Whitaker in the preface of his Controverlies: If we be heretikes, it is reason they should warne all theirs to fly from vs. And Controver. 2. question. 1. cap. 4. That he proueth heretikes and Apostatas and Schismatikes not to be members of the true Church maketh nothing against vs. None of our men euer taught that. The like he hath question 5. cap. 1.

English
Prote-
stants.

and 18. D. Sutiue in his first booke of the Church cap. 1. Heretikes are not of the Church. D. Morton in his Apology 1. part. 1. booke cap. 3 affirmeth, that Heretikes are not to be accounted of the Church in truth but in name, not indeed but equiuocally. Finally D. White in his way to the Church pag 110. All hereticks teach the truth in some things, and yet we deny them to be the Church of God. And in the defence of the same way cap. 8. sect. 1. There is little or no difference betweene the Diuell and an Apostata, or Heretike.

They exclude Schismatiks.

Lutherās.

Sacramētaries.

4. The same censure they sometymes give of Schismatikes, as appeareth by the words of his Maicsty, D. Whitaker, and Vortius already rehearsed. Besides, Luther in his great Catechisme tom. 5. pag. 628. affirmeth the sense of that article, *The Communion of Saints*, to be this: *I believe that there is on earth a little Congregation of Saints, agreeing in all things without sectes or Schismes.* And Melancthon in his book against Swenfeild tom. 2. pag. 201. *Neither is there more then one Church, the Spouse of Christ, neither doth this company consist of diuers Sectes.* Salomon Gelnecus in his Common places the 24. place of the Church: *Catholiks are opposite to Schismatikes & heretiks.* The same teacheth Schuselburg in his 8. tome of the Catalogue of heretikes, pag. 726. 727. Amongst the Sacramentaries, the Switzers in their Confession, article 17. do thus professe: *Ve so much esteeme the Communion with the true Church of Christ, as that we teach, that those cannot liue before God, who communicate not with his true Church.* And the French Protestants in theirs, article 26. *Ve believe, that none can lawfully withdraw themselves from the assemblies.* Bullinger in his Epitome or Compendium of fayth 6. booke, II. cap: *They be out of this Church, who vpon enuy or contention separate themselves from her, & without cause*

cause will haue something peculiar to themselues. Musculus also in his common places, in the title of the church: The vnity of Heretiks and Schismatikes is bastard and diuided. True, entier, and Catholike vnity is not among Schismatikes. And in the title of Schismatikes: A Schismatike putteth himselfe in daunger of losse of his saluation, in departing from the Communion of the flock of the Lord. For by that departure, he is not only separated and diuided from that Ecclesiasticall and externall society of the faythfull, but also from participation of the bloud and spirit of Christ. Calvin likewise in his treatise of the necessity of reforming the Church: VVe do professe the vnity of the Church, such as is described by S. Paul, to be most deare vnto vs; and we accurse all them, that shall any way violate it. And in his fourth booke of Institutions chap. 1. numb. 2: Vnlesse vnder Christ our head, we be vnited to all the rest of his members, there is no hope for vs of the euerlasting inheritance. For we cannot haue two or three (Churches) vnlesse Christ be torne in pieces. And numb. 4. Out of the lap the Church there is no saluation: departure from thence is alwayes pernicious. Againe numb. 10: God maketh so great account of the Communion with his Church as he holdeth him for a renagate and fugitiue, whosoever obstinately separateth himselfe from any Christian society, which retaineth the true vse of the word and Sacraments. And he addeth, that the forlaking of the Church, Is the deniall of God and Christ. The like doctrine he deliuereth in his Catechisme, vpon the 1. Cor. cap. 1. and other where Polanus in his Theses part. 2. sayth: Schismaticall Churches are to be forsaken. And Bucanus in his places, loc. 41. of the Church, quest. 33. auoucheth Schismatiks to be out of the Church, and quest. 5. that they are not vninocally a Church, that is, they haue not the true nature of a Church. The same sayth Danæus in his treatise of Antichrist cap. 17. And in his 3. booke of the Church cap. 5. writeth

A 4

thus:

thus: Schismatikes actually excommunicated and cast out of the Church by lawfull sentence, are no more of the visible Church. For (sayth he) the marke that you be of the visible Church, is this, that you outwardly professe the sayth, and communicate in Sacraments with the rest of the Church. And he addeth, that such are neither actually of the invisible Church, but only in possibility, and that the holy Fathers liken such to Heathens, Pagans, and Infidells. And in his Apology for the Switzers Churches he defineth Schisme to be a separation from the rest of the body of the Catholike Church. Zanchius also in his treatise of the Church cap. 7. teacheth, that Schismatikes are not in the Church. And Iunius in his 3. booke of the Church c. 5. approveth the same of such Schismatikes, as separate themselves from the whole Church. The strangers in England writing to Beza in the 24. epistle have these words in their 13. article: *VVhosoever is lawfully excommunicated of a particuler Church, or cutteth himselfe of vpon vnlawfull causes, and with scandall, in that doth loose all priuiledge of the Catholike Church.* And Beza answereth them in the name of the Church of Geneva in this manner: *Your thirteenth article we wholly receiue as most orthodoxall.* Casaubon in his 15. exercitation against Baronius num. 6. *It is an vndoubted truth, that how often soeuer a pious flock is ioyned to a true Bishop; there is a Church of God; in so much that if any forsake that Church, it cannot be doubted, but that he is out of the Church.* Finally, Chamier in his epistle to Armand, excludeth Schismatikes out of the Church, because (sayth he) *they want the sincerity of the Sacraments.* Amongst our English Protestants, his Maiesty in his foresayd epistle to Cardinall Peron. *All those testimonies of Augustin, proue only this, that there is no hope of saluation for those, who leaue the Communion of the Catholike Church; which the King willingly graunteth.* D. Whitaker

English
Protestants

taker in his 2. controuer. 5. quest. 6. cap. sayth: It is false, that hereticall and Schismaticall Churches be true Churches. Againe: The Catholike Church consisteth not of diuided, but of vnited members. And cap. 2: The true and Catholike Church is that, which consisteth of Catholiks. D. Fulke in his booke of the succession of the Church: *What auailed it them to eternall saluation, to haue byn sound in Religion and doctrine, seing they were cut of from the Communion of the true Church, in which alone saluation is, and from her true head? What skilleth it whether one, being drawne by heresy or Schisme, from the body of Christ, be subiect to euerlasting damnation?* D. Humtrey in his answer to the 3. reason of F. Campian: *We confesse, that he is vndone, who is separated from the fellowship of the Church.* And D. Feild in his first booke of the Church, cap. 7: *The name of the Catholike Church is applyed to distinguish men holding the fayth in vnity, from Schismatiks.* And in his 2. booke c. 2. he sayth, that Schismatikes are not Catholike Christians. Thus we see how Protestants sometymes do teach, that the true Church consisteth of Catholiks, & of members vnited not deuided, that it hath no Schismes or Sects: That Schismatiks are not Catholiks, that their vnity is not true, nor Catholike, that their Churches ought to be forsaken, that they are not vniuocally Churches, nor true Churches, that they are not members of the true Church, but out of the Church, altogether out of the Church, and actually neither of the visible nor inuisible Church, and that this is an vndoubted truth: which confession of theirs must be well noted and kept in mind, for thereby is overthrowne (as we shall see in the 2. booke) their only argument wherwith they endeavour to proue, that their Church was before Luther, and also is defaced their only essentiall mark of finding the true Church,

Church, by the truth of doctrine. For Schismatikes (as we shall heare them confesse in the 2. booke) hold true doctrine, and neuertheles (as here they acknowledge) are not of the true Church.

They exclude those that deny any fundamentall article.

Lutherans.

Sacramentaries.

5. In like manner they do commonly debarre from their Church, all such as deny any principall or fundamentall point of fayth; Melancthon in his booke of common places in the title of the Church: *They are not members of the Church who pertinaciously maintaine errors opposite to the foundation.* And in his answer to the Bauarian articles: *Saints may haue errors, but not such as ouerthrow the foundation.* In his examen of those that are to take orders: *Agreement in the foundation, is a thing necessary to the vnitie of the Church.* And vpon the 3. cap. of the 1. epistle to Timothy: *The foundation is held in the Church, otherwise there should be no Church at all.* And in his 79. proposition, tom. 4: *It is most certaine, that those companies are not the Church of God, who either are altogether ignorant of the Gospell, or impugne some article of the foundation, that is, some article of fayth or doctrine of the decalogue, or maintaine open idols.* Chemnitius in his common places pa. 3. title of the Church: *Neither can these be acknowledged for the true Church, who embrace fundamentall errors.* And the Lutherans in the conference at Ratisbon, Ses. 14. Hutter in his Analysis of the Confession of Auspurg, Gesner in his 24. place, Adam Francis in his 11. place, and other Lutherans commonly agree, that the Church cannot erre Fundamentally, or in the Foundation. And the Confession of Saxony giueth this note, to know who are in the Church: *Those who hold the Foundation.* As for Sacramentaries, Calvin in his 4. booke of Institutions cap. 2. num. 1: *So soone as a lye hath broken into the castle of Religion, the summe of necessary doctrine is inuerted, the vse of*

SACRA-

Sacraments is fallen, certainly the destruction of the Church ensueth, euen as a mans life is lost, when his throat is cut, or his vitall parts deadly wounded. And soone after: It is certaine, that there is no Church, where lyes and error haue gotten to the toppe. And cap. 19. num. 17: Without doubt the Church of the saythfull must agree in all the heads of our Religion. Sadecl in his answer to the Theles held at Posna cap. 12: I thinke the matter is thus to be defined by the word of God, that if any in what Church soeuer dissent in the foundation of sayth, and be obstinate in their errors: such appertaine not to the vniety of the Church. The like he hath in his answer to Arthure, cap. 12. Vesinus in his Catechisme quest. 54. cap. 4: The whole Church erreth not, nor wholly, nor in the foundation. Polanus in his Theles of the Church sayth: The Church erreth not in the foundation. The same teacheth Zanchius in his treatise of the Church c. 7. Lubbertus in his 2. booke of the Church c. 3. Vorstius in his Anti-bellarmin pag. 139. Bucanus in his 41. place, and other Sacramentaries commonly. And with them herein agree our English Protestants. For thus sayth his Majesty in his epistle to Cardinall Peron: The Churches are vnited in vniety of sayth and doctrine, in those heads which are necessary to saluation. And D. Whitaker in the preface of his Controversies: The foundations of sayth are of that nature, that one being shaken, nothing in all religion remaineth sound. And Contr. 2. quest. 4. cap. 1: We say, that the Church cannot erre in things simply necessary. Which he often repeateth in the 2. cap. And quest. 5. cap. 17: If any fundamentall doctrine be taken away, the Church straight way falleth. And cap. 18: The fundamentall articles are those, on which our sayth relyeth, as the house vpon the foundation. Againe: If any fundamrentall and essentiall principle of sayth be querturned or shaken, it cannot be truly called a Church.

And

And quest. 6. cap. 3: That is no true Church which taketh away one only foundation. The same he teacheth in his 1. booke of the scripture cap. 7. sect. 8. and cap. 12. sect. 3. M. Perkins in his explication of the Creed: If any man or Church, retaine, or defend, obstinately, or of willfull ignorance, a fundamentall error, we must not account them anymore Christians or Churches. D. Sutline in his first booke of the Church cap. 1: Those blemishes take away the name of the true Church, which are against the grounds of fayth. D. Feild in his 2. booke of the Church cap. 3: Purity free from fundamentall and essentiall error, is necessarily required in the Church. D. Morton in the 1. part of his Apology, booke 2. cap 38: Purity of doctrine in fundamentall principles of fayth, is required to the being and constitution of the Church. And in his answer to the Protestants Apology l. 4. c. 3. Sect. 5: The deniall of fundamentall doctrines, doth exclude men from saluation, and disannulleth the name of the Church in the gainsayers. D. White in his way to the Church pag. 110: VVe do not thinke euery company to be the true Church, that holdeth only some points of the true fayth: but it is requisite that the foundation be holden. And in his defence of the way cap. 17: A fundamentall point is that which belongs to the substance of fayth, and is so necessary that there can be no saluation without the knowledge and explicite fayth thereof. And surely they all, and at all tymes, ought to affirme this, seeing they deliuer truth of doctrine, as an essentiall marke of the Church, which they must needs vnderstand (and so Vorstius in his Anti-bellarmin pag. 148. expresseth it) of true doctrine in fundamentall points. And this their doctrine touching this matter, I earnestly commend to the memory of the Reader, because it is necessary to find out, what a Protestant is, and also is one of the grounds, whereby it may appeare, that

that there was no Protestant Church before Luther, because before him there was no company which held all the same fundamentall points of doctrine which Protestants do hold.

6. Finally; they sometymes shut out of their Church all those, who deny any one point of fayth, be it fundamentall or other. For thus writeth the Apology of the Confession of Auspurg: *The Church of Christ is not among them, who defend naughty opinions, contrary to the Ghospell. And Luther in his pittle to Count Albert: It is not inough, if in other things he confesse Christ and his Ghospell. For who denieth Christ in one article or word, denieth him, who is denied in all, because there is but one Christ, the same in all his words. And vpon the 17. cap. of Deuteronomy: Faith suffereth nothing, and the word tolerateth nothing, but the word must be perfectly pure, and the doctrine alwayes sound throughout. And vpon the 17. cap. of S. Matthew: Fayth must be round, that is, believing all articles, though small ones. For who belieueth not one article rightly, belieueth nothing rightly, as Iames sayth, VVho offendeth in one, is guilty of all: and so who in one article doubteth or belieueth not (at least obstinatly) dissolueth the roundnes of the graine, and so can do no good. And vpon the 5. cap. to the Galathians: In diuinity a small errour ouerthroweth all the doctrine. Doctrine is like to a Mathematicall point, it cannot be deuided, that is, it cannot suffer either addition or detraction. And when Zuin- glius and his followers desired of the Lutherans to be esteemed as their brethren, Melancthon (as Hof- pinian reporteth in his Sacramentarian history fol. 81.) roughly sayd vnto them: VVe meruaile with what conscience they can account vs for brethren, whome they iudge to erre in doctrine. And againe fol. 82. Luther grauely spake vnto them, saying: be greatly meruciled how they could hold him for a brother, if they thought his doctrine to be vntue. And the same*

They ex-
clude all
that deny
any arti-
cle of
fayth.

Lutherās.

same Melancthon together with Brentius writeth thus to the Lantgraue: Perhaps Christians, who are entangled in some error, which they do not obstinately defend, may be tolerated as brethren, but they which not only bring false doctrine into the Church, but also maintaine it, are not to be acknowledged for brethren. And againe Melancthon in his examen of those who are to take orders, tom. 3. There are in that company (of the Church) many who are not Saints, but yet agreeing in doctrine. The Deuines of Wittemberg in their refutation of the orthodoxall consent pag. 73: Like as he who keepeth the whole law and offendeth in one (as Iames the Apostle witnesseth) is guilty of all: so who belieneth not one word of Christ, albeit he seeme to belieue the other articles of the Creed, yet belieueth nothing, and is to be damned as incredulous. For euery heretike did not impugne euery article of sayth, but commonly each of them of purpose impugned some one or other, whome neuertheles the Church iustly condemned as heretikes, if they pertinaciously stood in their errours. Schuffelburg also in his 3. tom. of the Catalogue of Heretiks, pag. 85. Christian sayth is one copulative, and who denieth one article of sayth, calleth in doubt the whole body of the heauenly doctrine. Which he repeateth againe in the next pag. And tome 8. pag. 361: The Lutherans do fly him, who depraue the doctrine of truth in any article whatsoever. And in his 2. booke of Calvinisticall diuinity, article 1: VVe are certaine by the testimony of Gods word, that an error in one false doctrine, obstinately defended, maketh an heretike. For S. Chrysostome vpon the epistle to the Galatians sayd most truly, that he corrupteth the whole doctrine who ouerthroweth it in the least article. And Ambrose wrote rightly to the Virgin Demetrias, That he is out of the number of the saythfull, and hath no part in the inheritance of Saints, who disagreeeth in any thing from the Catholike truth. Thus the Lutherans. Peter Martyr in his epistle to the straungers in England tom.

Sacramen-
taries.

tom. 2. loc. col. 126 : *VVe* answer, all the words of God, as farre forth as they proceeded from him, are of equall waight and authority, and therefore none may receiue this, and reiect that as false. James sayth boldly, who sinneth in one, becommeth guilty of all. That, if it haue place in keeping of the commandements, is also true in points of fayth. Sadeel in his index of Turriā's Repetitions pag. 806 : I sayd, that it was no true Church, which teacheth doctrine repugnant to the written word of God. And his Maiesty in his Monitory epistle pag. 97. in Latin: I call God to witnes, that I hold him not for a Christian who in this learned age belieueth that. (to wit, that Enoch and Elias are to come.) And D. Morton in his answer to the Protestants Apology lib. 4. c. 2. sect. 3. after he had sayd, that in a Church, albeit corrupted with errour and superstition, yet if it do not ruinate the foundation, the erroneous & superstitious professors may be saued, adddeth : *VV*hich notwithstanding we must so vnderstand, as that the errour and superstition do not proceed from knowledge but from ignorance, which ignorance is not affected but simple. Thus we see that Protestants somtymes confesse that true fayth is like a graine, or Mathematicall point, which cannot be parted; that the articles of fayth are one copulatiue, and cannot be deuided, that who so obstinately denieth one article, belieueth, truly, none; that the obstinate deniall of any one poynt of fayth is sufficient to damne, or to make an heretik, and no brother of the faythfull, or member of the Church. And finally, that she is no true Church, who willfully maintaineth any one thing repugnant to the Ghospell or word of God. Which indeed is most true, and is the doctrine of the holy Fathers and Catholiks, and I would to God Protestants would constantly stand vnto it.

7: By all, which hath byn rehearsed in this chapter

English
Protestants

chapter out of Protestants, it appeareth how many sortes of Christians, Protestants do sometymes exclude out of the Church, namely Papists, Anabaptists, Arians, al Heretiks, all Schismatiks, all those, who deny any fundamentall point of fayth, and finally al who obstinately deny any point whatsoeuer of fayth, or of the word of God. And how many things they sometymes require to the making and being of a Protestant, to wit, that he belieue all and euery point of their fayth, and obstinately dissent in none. To which their doctrine, if they would (as I haue sayd) alwayes constantly stand, it would easily appeare, first how small a company the Protestants Church is, and how little it is spread through the world, and much lesse Catholike or vniuersal, seeing there is no Prouince, nor scarce any citty, in which all Protestants agree amongst themselues in al points of their doctrine. Secondly it would easily appeare that the Protestant Church was neuer before *Luther*, seeing there is no apparence, that before him there was any company of Christians who in all points of doctrine agreed with Protestants. But Protestants (as I sayd in the Preface) accommodate their doctrine and opinions to tymes and occasions. And the tymes, when they deny Papists to be of the Church, are when they exhort them to leaue the Roman Church, or excuse their owne reuolting from her, or when they dehort others from returning to her. For at all these tymes, it serueth to their purpose to deny that Papists are of the Church, or in the way of saluation; which at other tymes, as we shall see in the next chapter, they are content to graunt. And the tymes when they exclude Anabaptists, Arians, Heretiks, Schismatiks, and all that deny either fundamental

damentall or other articles of fayth, out of the Church, are, when either the evidence of truth enforceeth them thereto, or when they are ashamed to acknowledge such vgly monsters for brethien and members of their Church, or would exhort such as haue left their company to returne vnto them, and keep others from forsaking them: or finally would drag of the agreement and purity in doctrine of their company. For at those tymes it serueth their turne to renoūce all the foresayd kind of men, whom at other tymes, especially when we demaund of them, who were of their Church before Luther, they are most willing to receiue, as their kind brethren; diligently scraping & gathering such shreds and clouts, when they perceiue their owne nakednes and beggary, which themselves, when they thought they were rich and had no need thereof, most disdainfully cast on the dunghills, as shall appeare in the chapters following.

C H A P. II.

*That Protestants sometymes account Papists
for members of their Church.*

IN the former chapter we haue scene how sparing Protestants sometymes be in admitting others into their Church, now we shall see how liberall they be at other tymes, in so much that they graunt, not only all those, whome in the former chapter they reiected, but also their professed enemies, idolaters, Infidells, Atheists, Antichrist himselfe, and all, whosoever vnder the name of Christians, impugne the deeds or
B doctrine

doctrine of the Pope, to be their brethren, their fellows, and members of their Church. This we will shew concerning the Papists in this chapter, and of the others afterward.

1. That Protestants sometymes do acknowledge Papists to be in the Church is manifest. First by their open confession thereof. For in the preface of their Confession of Auspurg, speaking of themselves and Papists, they say: *We are all soldiers vnder one Christ.* And Luther in his epistle against the Anabaptists (as Calvin in his booke against the Chaunter of Lions, and D. Whitaker in the place hereafter cited do confesse) writeth: *That in Popery is true Christianity, yea the kernell of Christianity, and many piow and great Saints.* Againe: *If Christianity be vnder the Pope, then it must be the body and member of Christ.* And vpon the 28. chapter of Genesis: *We confesse, that there is a Church among the Papists, because they haue Baptisme, absolution, the text of the Gospell, and many godly men are among them.* Calvin in his 140. epistle to Sozin: *I think I haue sufficiently proued, that in Popery there remayneth some Church, albeit halfe destroyed, and if you will, broken and deformed.* And vpon the 2. chap. of the 2. epistle to the Thessalonians: *I confesse it is the temple of God, in which the Pope ruleth; and he calleth it the very sanctuary of God.* And, *de veratiform.* pag. 332. sayth, *that S. Paul affirmeth that Antichrist (whom he will haue to be the Pope) shall sit in the temple of God.* And *lib. de scandalis* pag. 103: *In the midst of Gods temple.* And *lib. cont. Precentorem* pag. 372: *In the very sanctuary of God,* And *Respons. ad Sadolet*: *In the midst of Gods sanctuary.* Surely this is to graunt, that the Romane Church, in which the Pope sitteth, is the very temple and very sanctuary of God. And in his answer to Sadolet: *We deny not those to be Churches of Christ,*

Lutherās.

Papists
serue vn-
der christ.The ker-
nel of
Christia-
nity in
Popery.The Body
of Christ.Sacramē-
taries.

Christ, which you governe. In his 4. booke of Institutions, chap. 2. num. 11. he sayth, that among Papists Gods covenant remaind inuiolable. And num. 12. We deny not, that there are Churches among them. Neither deny we, but there remaine Churches vnder his (the Pope he meaneth) tyranny, but which he hath almost killed. Iunius in his booke of the Church, cap. 17. writeth that the Popish Church, as farre as it hath that which belongeth to the definition of a Church, is a Church; that it hath not giuen vp the ghost, that it hath all diuine things, and of Gods part is yet the Church. Zanchius in the preface of his booke of the nature of God: Satan euen in the very Roman Church could not bring all things to that passe, that it should no more haue the forme of a Christian Church. And loone after: VVberfore the Roman Church is yet the Church of Christ. Plessy in his booke of the Church 2. chap. auoucheth, that the Roman Church is the Spouse of Christ, is not yet forsaken of him, that as a Mother, she beareth children to God (which he repeateth againe in the 10. chap.) that she retaineth life, and that the name of the Church ought no more to be denied to her, then the name of a man vnto a liuing man. Bucan in his 41. place of the Church, quest. 5: The assemblies of Papists are Churches, as a man infected with leprosy or besides his wittes, doth not leaue to be a man. Polanns in his first part and Thesis of the Church: The Roman Church truly is a Church; because Antichrist sitteth in the Church. And in his Syntagme of diuinity lib. 7. c. 8: The present Roman Church is yet the Church of Christ. Serauia in his defence of the degrees of ministers, pag. 30: The Roman Church, is a Church, and mark what I say more, she is our mother, in whome and by whom, God did regenerate vs. And pag. 31: The conenant of God remaineth this day in the Latin Church. Boysscul in his confutation of Sponde pag. 6: I ex-

Not yet
killed.Not yet
dead.Yet the
Church
of Christ.Spouse of
Christ.

clude not the Roman Church out of the vniuersall Church. I acknowledge her to be yet in the couenant of God; which he repeateth oftentymes. And pag. 12: The Roman Church, is the Church of God. Pag 19: It is a member of the vniuersall Church. p. 283: It is yet the Church, Spouse and temple of God. And pag. 822: VVe deny not, that the Roman Church is the Spouse & Church of Iesus Christ, redeemed by him. Vorstius in his temple of Anti-bellarmin p. 188: The vulgar Roman church hath not yet lost all spirituall life, is not yet openly deuorced from Christ. And Pcter Martyr in his epistle to Bullinger, writeth, that he gaue counsaile, that the Papists & they should not call one the other Heretiks, but account themselves for brethren. As for English Protestants, his Maicesty in his speach to the Parliament, anno 1605. 9. of Nouember, and put forth in print, speaketh thus: VVe do iustly confesse, that many Papists, especially our forefathers, laying their only trust vpon Christ and his merits, may be, and oftentymes are saued; detesting in that point, and thinking the cruelty of Puritans worthy of fire, that will admit no saluation to any Papist. And in his epistle to Cardinall Perron: The Roman, the Greek &c Churches, are members of the Catholike Church. And D. Andrews in his Tortura Forti towards the end, (speaketh thus to the Papists: VVe are content to call you members of the Catholike Church, though not sound members. Hooker in his 3. book of Ecclesiasticall policy pag. 128: VVe gladly acknowledge them to be of the family of Iesus Christ. And lib. 5. pag. 188: They should acknowledge so much neuertheles still due to the same Church (of Rome) as to be held and reputed a part of the house of God, a limme of the visible Church of Christ. D. Couel in his defence of Hooker pag. 68. sayth: VVe affirme them of the Church of Rome, to be parts of the Church of Christ, and that those that liue and dye in that Church, may notwithstanding be saued. D. Barlow in his 3. sermon ad Clerum:

Yet the Church Spouse & temple of God.

Yet aliuē.

English Protestants

Papists may be saued.

Members of the Catholike Church.

Of the family of Christ.

May be saued. Note,

Clerum:

Clerum: The learned writers do acknowledge the Church of Rome, to be the Church of God. M. Bunny in his treatise of Pacification, sect. 18: Neither of vs (Papists & Protestants) may iustly account the other to be none of the Church of God. VVe are no seuerall Church from them, nor they from vs. D. Some against Penry in diuers places auouceth, That Papists are not altogether aliens from Gods couenant. That in the iudgement of all learned men, and all reformed Churches, there is in Popery a Church, a Ministry, a true Christ: If you think that all the Popish sect which dyed in the Popish Church, are damned, you think absurdly, and dissent from the iudgement of the learned Protestants. D. Whitaker in his fourth controuersy quest. 5. cap. 3. calleth the Papists Church, the temple of God, more then halfe dead, and almost decayed. And that temple, wherein the Apottle sayth, that Antichrist shall sit, and which he affirmeth to be the Roman Church, he termeth the very Church of God, the true Church of God, the society of the saythfull, the liuely temple composed of liuely stones; such as are the saythfull & the elect. And he addeth: There is among them (Papists) some Ministry and some preaching of the word, which doubtlesse affordeth saluation vnto some. And as the giftes of God are without repentance; so the couenant which God made with Christian people, is not quite broken. And cont. 2. quest. 5. cap. 15. after he had confessed, that Luther had sayd, that in Popery are all the goods belonging to Christians, the keyes, the office of preaching, true Christianity, and the very kernell of Christianity; he addeth: These things are indeed among them. M. Powell in his 2. booke of Antichrist, cap. 2. graunteth the Roman Church to be the true Church, albeit with a new kind of distinction he deny the Popish church. And D. Rainolds in his 5. Thesis, albeit he say that the Roman Church be more then sickly and weak,

yet he dares not say that he is quite dead. And D. White in his way, p. 352. sayth, That Popery in as much as it differeth from vs, is not to be imagined by vs to be another Church distinct in place and contries from the true Church of Christ: but we affirme it to be a contagion, raging in the midst of the Church of Christ it selfe. And in his defence c. 37. pag. 355: I neuer denied the Church of Rome to be the visible Church of God, wherein our auncestors professed the truth, and were saved. And cap. 41. pag. 408: Professing the Church of Rome it selfe in all ages, to haue byn the visible Church of God. Lastly D. Hall in his Rome Irreconcilable lect. 1. sayth, that the Roman Church is a true visible Church, but not sound, and that it differeth from the Protestant Church, as the sick from the whole. Heere to I adde, that oftentimes they call the Roman Church their Mother, which hath borne them to Christ, as we shall rehearse hereafter, & that before Luthers tyme they seeke their Church in Popery, and amongst the Papists.

Secondly I prooue this same out of that which diuers tymes they graunt, that the Roman Church holdeth all the fundamentall articles of which diuers tymes they graunt, that the Roman Church holdeth all the fundamentall articles of

That Pa- Church holdeth all the fundamentall articles of
pists hold fayth, which themselues commonly teach (as here-
the foun- after shall be shewed) to suffice to make a Church.
dation of Their Confession of Auspurg in the 21. chapter
fayth. hath these words: This is almost the summe of doctrine
among vs, in which as it may seeme, there is nothing which
differeth from scripture, or from the Catholike Church, or
Lutherās. from the Roman Church, so farre as it appeareth by writers.
All the dissention is about some few abuses, which haue crept
into Churches without certaine authority. Whereby we see
The sume that the first and auncientest Protestants, publik-
of faith in ly professed, that they differed not from the Ro-
Popery. man Church in the summe of doctrine, but that all
their

their disagreement was about some few abuses. And albeit the wordes be somewhat altered in the printed copies; yet that they were in the originall copie which was presented to Charles 5. Emperour, is manifest by Fabricius, who repeateth them so out of that copie; by Pappus, in his 3. defence against *Sturnius*, who so also reporteth them; by Zanchius in his dispute between two Deuines, where he repeateth these wordes out of the said Confession: *There is nothing in our doctrine which differeth from the church of Rome, as far as it is knowne by writers: and finally by Hieremias Patriarch of Constantinople in his censure vpon the said Confession, it being sent vnto him by the Protestants, where he thus writeth to them: Yee say, yee agree in all things with the Latins, and that the difference betwixt you and them, is only touching some abuses: likewise Luther in his forelaid epist. cont. Anabap: VVe confesse that in Popery is much good belonging to Christians, yea all Christian good, to wit, that in Popery is the true Scripture, true baptisme, the true Sacrament of the altar, the true keyes for remission of sinnes, the true office of preaching, the true Catechisme, as the Lords prayer, the ten commandments, and the articles of faith. Whereupon Schuffelburg in his 8. tome of the Catalogue of heretikes pag. 439. saith: VVe deny not but that Luther sayd that all Christian goods are in Popery, and came from thence vnto vs. John Regius in his consideration of the censure &c: Albeit the Ministry of Papists be corrupted with many traditions and intentions of men, yet it had that which was necessary to saluation, to wit the Canonick scripture, the Creed &c. Leonard Crenzen: The bishop of Rome holdeth the same foundation of the Catholike faith 1. Cor. 3. which I and the Catholik apostolik Church do acknowledge, although there be some difference of opinions in certaine circumstances.*

Cocleus
anno 1518
Vléberg.
causa 17.

All Christi-
an good.

What
was need-
full to sal-
uation.

The fou-
ndation of
Fayth,

B 4

Thus

Thus the Lutherans. Of the Sacramentaries Junius
 Sacramē- in his 5. controuersy lib. 3. cap. 19. writeth thus of
 taries. Papists, Lutherans, and Calvinists: *VVe agree in the
 essentiall foundation.* Zanchius in his foresayd preface:
 Essentiall *In despite of the Diuell that Church (of Rome) hath kept the*
 foundati- *principall grounds of sayth.* Boyssoul also in his torenamed
 on. *confutation pag. 79: VVe acknowledge that it is pure in the
 cheise articles of Christian Religion.* And Vortius in his
 Principall *Anti-bellarmin pag. 188. It is manifest that there are ma-*
 grounds *ny in that company (of Papists) who rightly hold the funda-*
 of sayth. *mentall points of our Religion.* And of the English Prote-
 itants, his Maiesty in his monitory epistle pag. 148.
 The fun- plainly intimateth that Papists do stick vnto the auncient
 damentall *foundations of the old true Catholike and Apostolike sayth.* M.
 points. Hooker in his 3. booke of Ecclesiasticall policy pag.
 128. sayth: *Touching those maine points of Christian truth,
 wherein they constantly still persist, we gladly acknowledge them
 to be of the family of iesus Christ.* D. Whitaker in his 2.
 English *cont. quest. 5. cap. 14: Papists haue the Scripture, Baptisme,
 Protestats Catechisme, the articles of sayth, the ten commandments, the
 Lords prayer; and those things came to vs from them.* D. Whit-
 The main *gift in his answere to the admonition pag. 40: Papistry
 points. confesseth the same articles of sayth that we do, although not sin-
 cerely. And pag. 62: Papists belicue the same articles of sayth
 that we do.* M. Perkins in the preface of his reformed
 Catholike: *By a reformed Catholike I vnderstand any one
 that holds the same necessary heads of Religion, with the Roman
 Church, yet so as he paxes of, and reiects all errours in doctrine,
 whereby the sayd religion is corrupted.* D. Morton in his an-
 The ne- *swere to the Protestants Apology lib. 3. cap. 18. lect.
 cessary- 1: VVe may graunt, that God may cooperate with them to the
 heads. conuersion of Infidels, so far as the Gospell of Christ, which is
 the ghos- *the power of God to saluation, is preached by them.* D. White
 pell of *in defence of his way cap. 38: In the substantiall articles
 saluation.**

of sayth, we agree with them. Lastly D. Hall in his fore-
 sayd booke sayth, that the Romane Church is one **The sub-**
 touching the common principles of sayth. Those things which she **stantiall**
 holdeth together with vs, make a Church. As farre as she holdeth **articles.**
 the foundation, she is a church.

3. Thirdly, the same point is proued, by that **The arti-**
 they graunt some to be saints, whom they acknow- **cles which**
 ledge also to haue liued and died Papists. For of S. **make a**
 Bernards holines thus writeth Luther vpon the 4. cap. **Church.**
 to the Galathians: Bernard a man so holy, pious, chaste, &c.
 The Apology of the Confession of Auspurg in the
 chapter of answere to the Argumets: Antony, Bernard, **That they**
 Francis, Dominicke, and other holy Fathers. Brentius in his **say some**
 Apology for the Confession of Wirtenberg pag. 297: **Papists be**
 I iudge Bernard to haue byn a man indued with great piety, and **saints.**
 to liue now happily with Christ. Caluin in his 4. booke of
 institutions c. 7. num. 22: Gregory and Bernard holy men.
 Vorstius in Anti-bellarmin pag. 181: VVe graunt Ber-
 nard indeed to haue byn pious. Lubbert in his 6. booke of
 the church c. 7: VVe think Bernard to haue byn truly holy.
 D. Whitaker cont. 3. quest. 5. c. 14: I take Bernard to haue
 byn holy indeed. And D. Morton in his Apology part. 2.
 lib. 2. c. 23: I confesse Bernard was a Saint. And as plainly
 do they confesse that he was a Papist. For thus Lu-
 ther in the place now cited: Let vs imagine that Religion
 and discipline of the ancient Popery to flourish now, and to be ob-
 serued with that rigour, with which the Eremites, Hierome,
 Augustin, Bernard, Francis, and many others obserued it. And
 in his booke of abrogating Masse: Bernard, Bonaventure,
 Francis, Dominicke, with their followers, not knowing the Pope,
 did honour his Kingdome; believing all things thereof to be good
 and iust, and of God. The Magdeburgians in their 12.
 Century col. 1637. speake thus of him: He worshipped
 the God of Massim (they meane the masse) till the last mo-

ment of his life. And in the next colunne: He was a most eager defender of the seat of Antichrist. Melancthon in his booke of the Church, and vpon the 14. cap. to the Romanes: He yelded to many errours, as to the Abuses of the Masse, to the Popes power, to vowes, to the worship of Saints. Danæus in his controuersies, pag. 313. sayth: He approved the Popery. M. Iewell in his defence of the Apology 21. art. diuis. 8 pag. 450: Bernard was a monk, and liuing in a tynge of such corruption, and being carryea with the tempest and violence of the same, must &c. Bale in his 2. century of writers pag. 177: He increased the authority of the bishop of Rome, as much as he could. D. Feild vpon the 14. of S. Matthew: Bernard was deceiued with the error of Peters superiority. And D. Whitaker in his answer to the 7. reason of Father Campian: Bernard, whome alone your church in many yeares hath brought forth a holy man. And in his 4. controuersy quest. 2. c. 17. he affirmeth that he endeaoureth to confirme the Popes superiority. Seing therefore by the confession of Protestants, he was both an earnest Papist vnto his dying day, for all his life tyme he honoured masse, beleiued the Popes superiority (in which two points Protestants say the essence and soule of a Papist doth consist) and briefly belieued all things belonging to the Pope to come from God: and also was a very holy man, in his life tyme, and now a blessed Saint in heauen; they must needs confesse, that euen the most vchemēt Papist may be of the church; because neither true sanctity, nor saluatiō can be found out of the church. Whereunto the Protestants in the late Conference at Ratisbon Sess. 13. say: If they were truly saints, then their error was not of that kind which ouerturneth the foundation. For it implieth contradiction, that one should be a true Saint, and yet foster error which ouerturneth the ground of sal-
uation

uation. In like sort they graunt diuers others to be true saints, and yet withall Papists, but for breuities sake I will content my selfe with this example of S. Bernard. But I will not omit to say, that they confesse our Christian forefathers before Luthers tyme to haue byn Papists, from the top to the toe, from the first to the last, as shall be shewed in the 2. booke cap. 3. and notwithstanding dare not say, that they be damned, yea confesse them to be saued. Luther in his booke of private masse enquireth, what is to be thought of our auncestors who haue founded innumerable Masses; and answereth: I cannot tell certainly. But vpon the 41. cap. of Genesis, he sayth: Doubtlesse many haue byn saued vnder Popery. And vpon the 5. of S. Mattheu: Neither do we condemne the Christians who liued vnder the Pope. Brentius in the preface of his Recognition: VVe doubt not, but that many haue obtayned true saluation in Popery. Olander in his Manual englished: VVe do not condemne our godly auncestors who liued in tyme of Popery. Zuinglius in his actes of disputation fol. 638: It is impious to pronounce our auncestors to be damned. D. Morton in his Apology part. 1. l. 1. c. 90: Be this impiety far from vs, to adudge our auncestours, to damnation. And D. White in his defence pag. 356: I neuer denyed the church of Rome to be the visible church of God, wherein our auncestors possessed the true faith and were saued. But how could our Popish auncestors be not damned, how could they be saued, vnles they were in the true church, out of which euen Protestants themselves confesse, that there is no saluation, but only damnation.

4. Fourthly I prooue that Protestants cannot deny Papists to be of the true Church, because they oftentimes both by word and deed acknowledge the vocation and Mission of Popish Pastors, to be

Our Popish forefathers saued.

That they confesse true mission and Pastors in Popery.

be

be lawfull and sufficient to make a true Pastour of the Church. Luther vpon the 5. cap. of S. Matthew: *Ve confesse that amongst Papists are pulpits, Baptisme, Sacraments, and all other things belonging to Apostolicall vocation and function.* And in his booke of priuate masse: *There remaineth in Popery, Vocation, Ordination, Ministry of the word, and keyes to bind and loose.* Againe: *Christ hath conserued his Ministry vnder Popery.* And as is before cited: *There is all Christian good in Popery, the keyes, the charge of preaching &c.* Iohn Regius in *considerat. Censuræ* pag. 93: *Although it be true that the Popish ministry was depraued with sunary traditions and deuises of men, yet had it those things which were necessary to saluation.* Bucer in *Rom. 8.* pag. 427. telling vs by what authority and right he preached Protestantisme, sayth: *I had by lawfull meanes already attained the charge to preach Christ, and to teach those things which he commanded.* Iunius lib. *singulari de eccles.* cap. 17: *God calleth the church wherein Popery raigneth, by his spirit, by his word, by the publike instrument of that holy marriage by the ministry, by sacred affaires & actions.* On Gods part these things are apparantly in that church. Plesy lib. *de Eccles.* cap. 11. p. 361. *The vocation (of our men) is the same that they (the Papists) boast of.* Pag. 362: *Our aduersaries and our first ministers had the same Ecclesiasticall calling.* Boysscul in *confutat. Spondæi* pag. 486: *It is no reproach for our Pastors to haue issued out of yours; or, as you say, to haue had their vocation from yours.* Moulins lib. 1. *de vocat.* cap. 5. pag. 20. *endeauouring to vphold the calling of their first Reformers,* sayth: *They haue that calling which is ordinary in the church of Rome* Pa. 21: *They had their calling of the Pope.* cap. 9. pag. 36: *They haue the same ordinary calling which our aduersaries haue.* And lib. 2. tract. 1. cap. 1. pag. 172: *The calling they had in the church of Rome, sufficed to bind them to preach.* And pag. 173: *Their commission was no other then the ordinary*

ordinary charge. Scraua in deien. Grad. minist. cap. 2. pag. 31. We ought not to thinke, that in the church of Rome ecclesiasticall ministry is decayed. And pag. 33: I like not their forwardnes, who acknowledge no ministry in the church of Rome, but deeme all that is there, diuelish. Ibid: Beza doth exagitate Popish orders ouer much, wherein I feare least he preiudice a good cause. D. Whitaker contr. 4. quest. 5. cap. 3. pag. 682: The Papists haue some sort of ministry, and some preaching of the word, which doubtles auaileth many to saluation. And other where (as is before cited) Among the Papists there are the keyes, the office of preaching, &c. M. Bell in his first booke of the Popes funerall cap. 5. affirmeth that he had reiected only the accidents of his Popish orders, but retayned the substance still. M. Mason in his 5. booke of the ordination of ministers, cap. 12. sayth, that Popish ordination consistes of two parts, to wit, of power to offer sacrifice, & of power to administer the word and Sacraments, and albeit he reiecteth the former, yet the later he approues, as that wherein true ministry consisteth. Sadeel respon. ad artic. abiurat. 61. And Vorstius in Anti-bellarmin pag. 177. teach the same; and so must all others do, who hold the mission of Luther and their first ministers to haue byn ordinary, and receiued from the Papists: which opinion most Protestants do now follow, retracting, vpon better aduise their former assertion, & confessing that the mission of their new Reformers, was not in substance extraordinary. And their deeds and actions do no lesse declare their approbation and esteeme of the mission and Pastorall charge which is in the church of Rome. For as Turrian reporteth lib. 2. de Eccles. cap. 3. and Luther intimateth tom. 2. epist. ad Bohemos, when the Catholike Bishops giue orders, the Hussites of Bohemia

steale

steale in priuily among the rest. The Lutherans also made sute to the estats of the Empire, that their ministers might receiue orders from the bishops of Misnia and Numburg. And in artic. 10. Smalcaid. they professe thus: *If the bishops (of the church of Rome) would truly execute their office, and looke carefully to the church and word of God, it might be permitted them to giue orders vnto vs and our preachers.* You may adde herunto; that neither Luther nor any Reformer else euer sought other ordination, then what they had receiued of Papists; and that in the beginning of Queene Elizabeths raigne, the supposed Prelates earnestly besought a Catholike Bishop to consecrate them. And euen to this day, if any renegate Priest ioyne himselfe to the Protestants, they order him not anew, but deeme him fit for their ministeriall function, by vertue of the orders he receiued of Papists. Now if Papists haue true Mission, true pastorall charge, and true Pastors, surely they haue also the true church; it being impossible, that the church should be severed from the true Pastours; or that the keys of heauen which are in the true Pastours hands, should be out of the church, or that the power to remit sinnes, the prerogatiue of true Pastours, should be where the church is not. Nay, the Protestants themseloes confesse as much. Luther tom. 4. in cap. 4. Olex fol. 295: *True it is, that the Ministry is only in the Church.* Melancthon tom. 1. Lutheri disput de Eccles. Polit. fol. 483: *The ordination of Ministers is one of the peculiar gistes of the Church.* Calvin lib. de necess. reform. Eccles. pag. 57: *This one reason is as good as thousands, that is he so hath shewed himselfe an enemy to true doctrine, hath lost all authority in the Church.* D. Whitaker ad demonstrat 18. Sanderi: *Out of the Church there is no other seate but the seate of errour, of pestilence.*

True mis-
sion and
Pastors
insepara-
ble from the
Church.

and everlasting destruction. The same teacheth Sadecl ad Sophism. Turrian loc. 10. D. Feild in his 1. booke of the church cap. 14. and others.

5. Fittly it is evident by the doctrine of the Sacramentaries, who hold that the children of Papists are in the covenant of God, and estate of saluation, through the fayth of their parents; and may therefore be baptised: much more then must they teach, that the parents themselues are for their owne fayth in the couenant of God and estate of saluation; which could not be, were they not in the Church. The antecedent is manifest by the saying of many Protestants. For thus writeth Luther lib. de capt. Babylon. tom. 2. fol. 77: Here I say that which all say, that infants are holpen by the fayth of them which offer them. Calvin in his Catechisme cap. de lege: God extendeth his bounty so farre vnto the faythfull, that for their sake he is good to their children, not only blessing their affaires in this world, but also sanctifying their soules, that they may be accounted of his flock. Contr. Seructum. pag. 601: VVe think, that there will be no vse of Baptisme vntill this promise, I will be thy God and of thy seed, be apprehended by fayth; but euery one apprehendeth it not only to himselfe, but also to his issue. Bezapart. 2. Respon. ad acta Montisbel. pag. 118: Parents through Gods grace do apprehend grace by true fayth, according to the forme of the Couenant, as well to their posterity as to themselves. Which he oftentimes repeateth. And likewise in Confes. cap. 4. sect. 48. and cap. 5. sect. 9. and pag. 126 M. Perkins de Sacramento Baptismi tom. 1. col. 846: Others say, that the fayth of the Parents is also the fayth of their children, all the tyme of their infancy or childhood, and that because parents do by their fayth apprehend the promise both for themselves and for their children: VVhich opinion seeweb to me the fittest of all. The like he sayth in cap. 3. Galat. The sequels like-

Papists children saued by the fayth of their parents.

wise

wise is vndoubted. For if the fayth of Popish parents be of force to establish their very children in the Couenant of God and estate of saluation, though it reside not in them, nor be their act; much more doth it establish the parents themselues, who haue the fayth in them, and whose act it is. Nor do the instances D. Morton brings against it in his answer to the Protestants Apology, lib. 4. cap. 6. make any thing to the purpose; as that in case of necessity an hereticall Priest or Schismatike may absolue from sinnes; and an Infidell administer Baptisme. Againe: That if such as were free of a citty and are arraigned of treason, should haue issue after their condemnation, their children neuertheless shall enioy the title and right of cittizens, whereof their parents were destitute. These examples (I say) are not to the purpose; because he, who is eyther baptized by an Infidell, or absolued by an hereticall Priest, enters not into the couenant of God and estate of saluation for ought that is in the person which baptizeth or absolueth him; but for the Sacrament of Baptisme or Pennance, which he receiueth indeed by the others administration, but hath it in himselfe. And the sonne of a traytor is not made a Cittizen, in regard of any thing that is in the father alone, but for his owne birth which appertaines to himselfe, though his Father be author thereof. But the Sacramentaries teach, that the child of a Papist is in the couenant of God and estate of saluation, not for his owne fayth (for they say he hath none) but for the beliefe of his father; which is no way possible, if the same fayth be not of force to worke the like effect in the father himselfe; seeing it belongs farre more to him, then to his child, and therefore must looner giue him in-

terest

terest in the covenant, then the child that is descended of him. For how can the fathers believe lay hold on the promises and covenant of God for his children, and cannot do it for himselfe?

6. These allegations demonstrate, that by the Confession of the Protestants, the starkest Papists (such as are of believe that the masse, the Popes primacy, and all things else of his are good, vpright and of God) are soldiers vnder Christ, may attaine to saluation, may be Saints; yea that there are among them both many and great Saints. That there is in the Church of Rome what so is necessary to saluation, the summe of sayth, the ground-works, the essentiall ground-works, the principall grounds of sayth, the chiefe articles, the fundamentall heads, the necessary heads, the chiefe parts, the Gospell of saluation, the kernell of Christianity, and all Christiangoood. Lastly that the Church of Rome, is a limme and member of the vniuersall Church, of the Catolike Church, a member of the true Church, and is of the family of Iesus Christ; that it is mother to the children of God, that it is the Church of God, the temple of God, the body of Christ, the Spouse of Christ, that it abides yet in the covenant, is not yet cast of, or put away, is not yet killed, but is yet alive. Which words plainly import that the Roman or Popish Church is a true Church in the sight of God.

The same of Protestants Confessio touching Papists.

7. But is it credible, that such as make profession of Christian religion, should mount to that height of impiety, as dare to reiect & diuorce themselves, from that Church which they confesse remaines yet in the covenant of God, & which Christ hath not yet reiected? Is it credible, that they feare not to impugne, to make bitter inuectiues, to discharge curses and execrations against her, whom they acknowledge to be their Mother, which bore them to Christ, to be the Church of God, to be the body

Note.

C

and

and Espouse of Christ? What can be more lewd and impious, then to rage and raile against their owne mother, against the Church of God, against the very body and Espouse of Christ? What strang and monstrous blindnes is it, not to perceiue, that whiles they confesse the church of Rome to be the church of God & Espouse of Christ, they acknowledge their owne to be the Synagogue of Antichrist and strumpet of the Diuell? For Christ cannot haue two Espouses, repugnant each to other. Now the Protestant church and church of Rome are parts so opposite, as can neuer make one. For they iarre and disagree mainly in diuers weighty points, as namely touching the canon and exposition of the Scripture, touching sacrifice and the Sacraments, touching the worship of God, & his Saints; touching the meanes to obtaine remission of sinnes, and many the like. Whereupon Beza in Confel. cap. 7. pag. 56: *VVe dissent* (sayth he) *from the Papists, about they very summe of saluatiō.* And others say no lesse, as shall be shewed hereafter in the 2. booke and 6. cap: *If ours be true Religion* (sayth S. Augustin to the Donatists which yet came nearer to Catholiks then Protestants do) *yours is superstition.* Againe: *If our communion be the Church of Christ, yours is not Christs Church; for that is but one, which so euer it be.* And in another place: *VVhen they approue that Church, which (as is manifest) we communicate with all, and they do not; by that their testimony they acknowledge themselves conuincd, and giue you plaine notice (if you be wise) what you ought to forgoe, and what it behoues you to cleaue to and retaine.* And S. Cyprian epistle 76: *If the Church were on Nouatius side, it was not with Cornelius.*

Lib. 2. cōt.
Gaud. c. 11.

Lib. 1. de
Bapt. c. 11.

Lib ad Do-
nat. 1 of
col. 128

Num. 4.

8. The Protestants now and then perceiue as much, when they ascertain vs (as hath byn shewed

in the first chapter) that who so severeth himselfe from any particuler congregation, which is a true Church, excludes himselfe wholly from the church. Calvin saw it, when 4. Insti. c. 2. §. 10. he wrote thus: *We cannot graunt them (Papists) that they are the church, but the necessity of subiectiō & obediēce will befall vs. If they be churches, the power of the keyes is in their possession. If they be churches, that promise of Christ: VVhatsoever ye bind on earth shall be bound in heauen, takes effect in them.* M. Perkins perceiued it to, when in his explicatiō of the Creed col. 794. he sayd: *As long as any church forsakes not Christ, we may not withdraw our selues from it.* The reason is apparant, because in so doing we should depart from Christ, or Christ should be parted, euen as we are rent and disioynted from the church wherein he is. And in his Reformed Catholike tract. 22. col. 470. Where he sayth: *WVe ought not to deuide our selues from any nation or people, which hath not before cut it selfe of from Christ.* D. Feild likewise saw it in his 3. booke of the Church c. 47. Where he makes this acknowledgement: *Surely if he can proue that we confesseit (the Church of Rome) to be the true Church, he needeth not vse any other argument.* But we haue clearly prooued it by sundry plaine confessions of many famous Protestants. And hitherto we haue discovered how they sometyme harbour and receiue Papists into their church: now we will shew that they vse the like curtesy towards the rest.

Zanchius
lib. 1. de
Eecl. c. 7.

C H A P. III.

That Protestants acknowledge for members of their Church, sometyme those that deny as well fundamentall as other articles of their fayth; sometymes Heretiks, Schismatiks, yea their profest and sworne enemies.

THAT they esteeme all such to be members of their Church, as swarue from the Christian fayth only in points not fundamentall, themselves in the preface of the Switzers Confession declare in these words: *Mutuall consent and agreement in the principall points of doctrine, in orthodoxe sense, and brotherly charity, was of religious antiquity thought abundantly sufficient.* And D. Whitaker cont. 4. quest. 1. c. 2. pag. 527: *God forbid that they should be no longer of the number of the saythfull, who are in some points of a contrary opinion, so they assent in the cheife and principall and necessary matters.* And for as much as the Protestants opinion herein is well knowne (for whē it is obiected vnto them, that their churches disagree in points of fayth, this serues them for excuse) I thinke it needlesse to alleage any more of their sayings. He that will may looke the Confession of Saxony cap. de Eccles. Luther tom. 7. lib. de not. Eccles. fol. 149. Melancthon tom. 4. in ca. 3. 1. Cor. Kemnitius 1. part. Examinis tit. de bonis operibus pag. 332. Zuinglius tom. 1. in Prefat. lib. de Prouident. Calvin. 4. Institut. cap. 1. §. 12. and cap. 2. §. 1. Beza epist. 2. Zanchius in prefat. lib. de natura Dei. Hospin, part. 1. Hister. lib. 1. cap. 2. Vorstius in Anti-bellarmin. pag. 116. and others moe. And as their iudgements are different touching

touching the fundamentall articles of fayth, so in determining who are to be accounted members of their Church their opinions are vnlike. Some of the say, that the summe, the cheife and principall heads of fayth, and all things necessary to be believed are comprized in the Apostles Creed. The principall heads of fayth (sayth Calvin 2. Institut. c. 16. §. 8) are set downe in the Creed. And it is (as D. Whitaker sayth lib. 3. de Scriptura cap. 3. sect. 1.) a list of the cheife heads of fayth. It containes (sayth M. Perkins in his Reformed Catholik col. 476.) all points of Religion which we are necessarily to belieue. Hemingius in Syntagmate pag. 196: It containes the ground work of the whole frame of Religion. Ursinus in Catechesi: The summe of those things which the Gospell proposeth vnto vs to belieue, that we may be partakers of Gods couenant, is comprehended in the Apostles Creed. Pareus lib. 1. de Iustificat. cap. 9. hath these words: In the Creed is layd open the summe of that doctrine, which we must belieue to saluation. The same teacheth Luther tom. 7. in 3. Symbol. fol. 138. Confessio Palatina in initio, pefat. Syntagmat. Confes. the French Catechisme, Brentius in Prolegomenis, pag. 244. The Catechisme of Heidelberg part. 2. Bullinger in compendio fidei lib. 6. cap. 2. and tom. 1. decad. 5. serm. 2. Polanus in Analyti. Catechismi Bassie. Boyssoul in confutat. Spondei p. 10. Raynolds in Apol. Thes. pag. 241. Carleton in Consensu tract. de Eccles. c. 9. The same is intimated by Zanchius lib. 1. epist. pag. 219. and by Musculus in locistit. de Eccles. pag. 309. These men then, if the sequelle of their doctrine be correspondent to the premises, must needs acknowledge, that the profession of the Apostles Creed, though ioyned with the denyall of whatsoeuer other articles of fayth, sufficeth to make a Protestant, and a limme of their Church.

The Apostles Creed.

Beliefe
of the
Apostles
Creed suf-
ficient to
saluation.

And some of them there be who contelle it. For Bullinger lib. cit. cap. 11. fol. 83. sayth: All that we comprise in the 12. articles, is the true and Christian fayth, vnto which whosoener cleaneeth, he belieueth right, is approved of God, is iustified, and made part ner of euerlasting life, Calvin conc. Gentil. pag. 659: The confession of fayth contained in the Apostles Creed, ought to be inough for all modest Christians. And Musculus in the place lair quoted. They are wonderfull vnreasonable and vmaduised, who not content with this beliefe, exact of the faythfull, that they belieue yet other things which are neither mentioned in the Apostles Creed, nor in bapisme. Aretius in locis part 3. fol. 67: The articles necessary to saluation are those, which the Creed hath set vs downe. As for the rest, since the matter cannot be decided, variety of iudgements must be borne with all. Polanus also in the place before cited: These articles (of the Creed.) if they be vnfaynedly belieued suffice to purchase saluation; nor is it required we should beliene ought besides. And Hall in iua Roma irreconcil. lect. 1: We are all one and the same Church, as many as in any part of the earth worship Iesus Christ the only Sonne of God and Saviour of the world, and professe the same common beliefe comprised in the Creed.

The
Creeds.

2. Some of them will haue the grounds of fayth to be contained in the Creed; as Plessy lib. de Eccles. c. 5. Hereupon Marke Antony de Dominis in consil. sua profect. pag. 18. & 20. sayth: Restore peace and charity to all Christian Churches, which professe Christ by the essentiall cognisances of beliefe. Others as to the Creeds the 4. generall Councils or at least one of them, as D. Andrews in Respons. ad Apol. Bellarmin. cap. 1. pag. 52: That which is set downe in the Creeds and 4. generall councils, is to vs a sufficient object of fayth. And in Tortura Torti pag. 127: Nor do we lightly discern and try heresy by other touch-stone, then by examining whether it be repugnant to

The
Creeds &
the 4. ge-
nerall
councils.

any

any of the three ancient Creeds, or 4. ancient generall councilis. And Melancthon tom. 3. l. de iudicijs Synodorum fol. 389. sayth of himself, that he is not without the Church, because he saythfully embraceth all the articles of the Apostles and Nycen Creed. Musculus also in the place above quoted puts downe this conclusion: *As many as believe the Apostles and Athanasius Creed, hold all the Catholike faith, and are not heretikes but Catholiks.* Some of them are of opinion, that all the fundamentall points of beliefe are contayned in the Creed and decalogue; as Melancthon tom. 1. in cap. 7. Matth. pag. 402. tom. 2. in respon. ad art. Bauar. fol. 263. Virsius in Miscellaneis Theol. 8. pag. 114. M. Perkins in his exposition of the Creed col. 789. Some of them say, they are in the Creed, the decalogue, and Lords prayer; as Luther tom. 7. in Enchirid. fol. 118. Beza lib. de notis Eccles. pag. 52. Keckerman lib. 1. Syltem. Theol. 201. D. White in the preface of his way, and in his defence of the same cap. 8. pag. 54. Others reckon the 10. commandments, the Creed, the Lords prayer, & the Sacraments; as D. Whitaker cont. 1. quest. 4. cap. 4. pag. 342. (howbeit quest. 5. cap. 9. pag. 362. he omitteth Sacraments, & putteth in Catechisme in exchange.) Vorstius in Antibellarm. pag. 24. vnto which Ieslerus lib. de bello Euchar. pag. 40, adioyneth the ministry. And these men according to their severall decisions concerning the fundamentall points of beliefe, must with like diuersity require in a limme of the Protestant Church either the beliefe of the Creed alone, and decalogue; or must adde besides (as each think it needfull) the Lords prayer, the Sacraments, the Catechisme, and the Ministry.

The creed and Decalogue.

The creed Decalogue, and Lords prayer.

The creed Decalogue, Lords prayer, & Sacraments.

And the Ministry.

Baptisme and worship of Christ.

3. But sometymes they give larger scope, & demaund farre lesse, to wit, Baptisme only, or faith

in Christ. Let him see *Christiamystad* (said D. Andrews in respons. cit. cap. 5. pag. 126) in baptism and worship of Christ. Mr. Morton in his booke of the Kingdome of Israel and the Church pag. 91: In what place soever any society of men adore true God in Christ, they professe the substance of Christian Religion: *Ierlachius disput. 22. de Eccles.* pag. 662: *VV*here soever baptism remains entier in regard of its substance, thither reacheth the territory of the Catholike Church: *Againe*: If they acknowledge true baptism both in ours and in other congregations, they must yeld, that in the same there is likewise the Catholike Church. *And Hucerus in his Analysis of the Confession of Aesburge pag. 525*: As many as are enrolled for Christs soldiers by sacred baptism, or at least wise are ioyned to him, by profession of fayth, are euery one of them members of the Church simply taken, as it signifieth the company of them that are called. *Serania defens. contra Bezam cap. 2. pag. 31*: As long as there remains amongst them the new and old testament, together with the Sacrament of baptism, and beliese in God the Father, and in the Sonne, and holy Ghost; and they trust to be saued by the Sonne of God and his death; albeit they adioyne a number of their owne wicked sergeries, they are notwithstanding parts and members of the vniuersall Church. *The ministers of the scattered Church of the Netherlands in sua narrat. pag. 71*: No man can, nor ought to, giue sentence in the Church of an others condemnation, of whome it is not publikely knowne, that he is fallen away from the foundation of the Apostolicall Confession, vttered by the mouth of Peter. *Oecolampadius epist. ad Buccerum apud Hospin. part. 2. Histor. fol. 112*: *VVe* are gladly at peace withall those that confesse with vs and teach Iesus Christ true God and true man in vnity of person. *And Buccerus apud eundem fol. 84*: *VV*ho so preach the same Christ with vs, we account them ours, what estimate soever they make of vs. *Beza de lib. notis Eccles. pag. 30*: *VVe* say it is a true definition

Baptisme alone.

Luther de Notis Eccles. fol. 150.

Professio of Christ.

Professio of Christ God and man.

definition of the true Church, whether generally considered or in particular, wherein it is sayd to be a company which acknowledgeth one Saviour. For (sayth he) this alone is the only groundwork of that spirituall house of God; Christ Iesus is the soule of that mysticall body, the only rule and square of that building. And the Confession of Bohemia artic. 8. defines the Catholike Church to be all Christians, That are associated in one beliefe concerning Christ and the holy Trinity. The faith The Confession of Basle artic. 5. hath this assertion: of Christ We believe the holy Christian Church &c. VVherein all those and the are Citizens, that confesse Iesus to be Christ, the lambe of God Trinity. which taketh away the sinnes of the world, and shew openly the same beliefe by works of charity. Acontius l. 3. Stratagem. Satanae pag. 119. concludes that nothing else is necessarily to be believed, but That there is one God and Christ Beliefe of his Sonne, made man and raised from the dead; and that saluation is purchased by his name, and not by any other name, nor by one God & Christ. the works of the law. And Luther vpon the 7. of Matb. fol. 86. closeth vpon all with this epilogue: That God summe of Christian doctrine is this: that God sent and gave his Sonne, by whome alone he pardoneth our offences, and doth iustify and saue vs. This (sayth he) and nothing else, it behoues thee Christ. firmly to believe. Sometime to believe their article of The only iustification by only fayth is as much as they require article of in a limme of their Church, or think needfull to iustification suffi- saluation. Luther tom. 7. tract. in 3. symbol. fol. 140: ceth. I haue found by experience, that who so haue truly and sincerely believed that principall article of Christian fayth concerning Iesus Christ, though they had their errours and faults, haue at last notwithstanding byn saued. And tom. 4. in cap. 42. Isaia: Parens in fol. 178: If we abide in this article, we are secure from here- 1. Galas. lect. 8. lies, and retaine remission of sinnes; which pardoneth our weak- Iezler. de nes in ciuill dueties and beliefe. And in cap. 43. fol. 200: bello Euch. VVho so belieueth this article, is out of danger for euer falling into fol. 77.

error, and the holy Ghost must needs assist him. And Brocard vpon the 2. cap. of the Apocalips fol. 45: The former Ministers who were before the first councell of Trent, determined, that we ought not to contend, but that their Supper should be common, which had receiued one doctrine touching iustification. Calvin de vera Eccles. reform. pag. 316. writeth thus: I know it is the common saying of a great many, that so the doctrine of vnderdeserued iustification continue sound, we should not be so stisly contentious about the rest. And the Author of the Preface in Syntagma Confess. after he had affirmed that the article of iustification is the ground work, the forme and soule of Christian religion, makes this demand: How can they then but haue peace one with another, who soeuer are fellow-partners of so great good? And he saith, it is, An vnseemly and hainous thing, that betweene such there should be enmity and debate. And indeed all Protestants should teach so, since they make this article the definition, the summe, and very soule of Protestantisme, as shall be hereafter shewed in the 6. chapter. Sometymes in a member of their Church, they require only some one point of Christianity, or but the profession of Christs name. For Sturmius apud Hospin. in Concord. discord. c. 24. testifieth that Bucer sayd: He would neuer condemne any one, in whome he saw any point of Christianity. And Plessy lib de Eccles. cap. 2. affirmeth that the Church may be infected with heresy from top to toe, & yet be a part of the vniuersall Church, as long as it professeth the name of Christ. And Moulin in his buckler of sayth pag. 43. The vniuersall visible Church is the company of all them who professe themselves to be Christians. Thus we see, that to a member of the visible Church, yea to sayth, to Christianity, to a member of the true and Catholike Church, to eternall saluation (as Protestants some tyme iudge and determine) little or nothing sufficeth.

Any point
of Christi-
anity.

Do not these men go about to expole the Church & meanes of saluation vnto scorne and mockery? What Jew or Turke did euer make his Synagogue so common?

4. Albeit the former allegations do sufficiently conuince, that when Protestants calculate the limmes and members of their Church, they take, to make vp the number, such as renounce the very fundamentall articles of their beliefe; yet to make it more eident, and to preuent all colour of doubt, I will adde other proofes besides. And first we haue in this behalfe their owne Confessions. For Beza lib. de Notis Eccles. pag. 45. teacheth plainly, that some errors euen in some fundamentall heads of sayth, may creep into the Catholike Church. And D. Whitaker cont. 2. quest. 4. cap. 3. pag. 490: It is manifest, that the true Church may erre for a tyme euen in necessary points. The like hath Hutterus in Analyfi Confessionis Augustanæ pag. 453. and Iunius doth intimate as much lib. 3. de Eccles. cap. 17. D. Whitaker againe cont 2. quest. 5 cap. 17: VVe gather, that the Church may for a tyme swarue from the truth euen in some fundamentall points, and be notwithstanding safe. And Zanchius lib. 1. epist. pag. 221. will not haue vs forsake any cōpany on occasion of false opinions, which swarue from the groundwork of sayth. D. Hall likewise in sua Roma irreconc. lect. 1. sayth, that the true Church may foster such errors, As by deduction and consequence d. stroy the foundations of beliefe. D. Fulke in his serm. vpon the Apocalips, hauing made this obiection to himselfe, that seing the Church is the Espouse of Christ, it cannot be, that he suffered it to be possessed so many ages with damnable errors; answeares it in this manner: VVhat? Christ himselfe hath sayd: that the errors of false Prophets should be exceeding great, in as much as the very elect,

Protestants challenge those that deny euē fundamentall articles.

elect, if it might be, should be led into error. And lib. de Succel. Eccel. pag. 122. he sayth: It seemes not fitting to take from the Grecians the name of a Church; whom notwithstanding he confesseth to be ensnared with grievous errors. Now a grievous error (according to D. Whitaker cont. 2. quest 4. cap. 1.) dissolves the foundation, and may therefore be termed fundamentall. M. Perkins in his exposition of the Creed, col. 790: VVhen an error is repugnant to the foundation, either directly or by necessary consequence if it proceed of weaknes, he in whome it is, ought to be reputed a member of the vniuersali Church. And vpon i. Galat. v. 2: If a Church through frailty fall into error, although it concerne the foundation, notwithstanding it remaynes yet a Church, as is certaine by the example of the Galathians. And vpon the epistle of Iude v. 19: The Church of Galatia through weaknesse remoued it selfe vnto another Ghospell, and erred in the foundation, yet Paul writeth to it as to the Church of God. D. Willet affirmeth the same in his Synopsi cont. 2. q. 3. pag. 104. And Melancthon tom. 2. lib. de Eccel. pag. 123. toucheth the same string when he sayth: The true Church it selfe may haue errors which obscure and darken the articles of sayth. And tom. 4. in cap. 9. Rom: God gathereth alwayes some company, in which the foundation is kept, sometymes lesse pure, sometymes more. D. White in his way pag. 111: Some articles lying in the very foundation may be believed not so clearly. Nay sometymes they dare auouch, that those very Corinthians that denyed the resurrection, and those Galatians also that changed the Ghospell of Christ into another Ghospell, were of the Church. For thus the Switzers Confession c. 17: VVe are not ignorant, what manner of Churches those of the Corinthians and Galathians were in the Apostles tyme: which the Apostle accuseth of many and grievous crimes, and yet termeth them the holy Churches of Christ. And Calvin 4. Institue. cap. 11

Luther. in
1. cap. Ga-
lat. fol. 215.
Perkins
loc. cit.

VVe are not ignorant, what manner of Churches those of the Corinthians and Galathians were in the Apostles tyme: which the Apostle accuseth of many and grievous crimes, and yet termeth them the holy Churches of Christ. And Calvin 4. Institue.

cap. 11

cap. 1. §. 27: Most greivous finnes possesse sometymes whole Churches. The Apostasy of the Galathians was no small offence; the Corinthians were lesse excusable then they; howbeit neither of them are excluded from the Lords mercy. Sadcl in his answer ad Thel. Polnan. cap. 12. pag. 866: The Galathians and Corinthians, though corrupted with error, and disagreeing each from other about the cheise groundwork of beliefe, and that not concerning the manner but touching the matter it selfe, retained notwithstanding the name of a true Church. And hence he gathereth, that the debate and disagreement betweene the Lutherans and Calvinists concerning the Eucharist, doth not let either of them from being of the true Church.

5. The deeds of the Lutherans and Sacramentaries yeld vs a second kind of prooffe. For the Elector all or milde Lutherans in colloq. Aldeburg. scripto 8 call themselves, Fellowes and companions of the same Ministry, fellow-cittizens and fellow-soldiers of those of Saxony or rigorous Lutherans: of whome notwithstanding scripto 6. pag. 111. they give this censure: They haue shewed themselves to dissent from our Churches in the foundation. Againe: VVe will make it euident, that they impugne the fundamentall doctrine. And scripto 4. pag. 4: Our opinion is that we disagree not about impertinent matters only, or things of no consequence; but about the maine and cheifest matters. And scripto 7: This one thing they ayme at, and bend all their endeavours to vndermine and ouerturne the groundwork of sauing doctrine. And pag. 374. they complaine that those of Saxony do often cry out of them, that they are worse then any idolaters. And the Sacramentaries in Præfat. Apologet. Orthodoxi consensus, write thus of the Lutherans: They haue hitherto suffered among them, such as call in question the doctrine of iustification, of originall sinne, of free will, of the Gospell, of the law and vse thereof, of Christs

Lutherans
professe
that the-
selues dif-
fer funda-
mentally.

descent

Sacramen-
taries
challenge
Lutherans.

And yet
say they
differ fun-
damentally
from the.

descent into hell, of his person, of the election of Gods children, and many other articles of no small moment; which things they easily put vp, because all these go vnder the name of Lutherans. Now that the Sacramentaries likewise acknowledg the Lutherans for their brethren, is apparent by the Apology of the Church of England, by the consent of Poland, by the preface of the Syntagme of Confessions, by the Conferences of Marspurg and Montbelgard, and other publike writings and registred acts: and yet they see and openly exclaime against their errours in fundamental points of fayth. Of Luther thus writeth Zuinglius tom. 2. Resp. ad Luther. fol. 401: *VVe iudge thee a worse seductour, impostour, and denyer of Christ, then was Marcion himselfe.* And fol. 430. *Luther as yet, is entangled and sticks fast in two errours exceeding grieuous, and in most foule ignorance.* Of Melancthon thus sayth Calvin epist. 183: *Either he openly impugne th true doctrine in the cheifest heads, or else hideth his meaning craftily or not very honestly.* And epist. 179. he complaineth that Melancthon endeauoureth to ouerthrow his doctrine of predestination: *VVithout which (sayth he) the knowledge of Gods free and vnderferued mercy is vtterly lost.* The like he sayth, epist. 141. *Sturmius lib. de Ratione incundæ Concordiæ, sayth plainly, that the Lutherans do pluck vp the foundation of Christian Religion.* And Bullinger in fundamento firmo writeth, that the very infidelity of the Iewes and Gentils is by the Lutherans brought into the Churches. *Cureus in Exegeſi Sacramentaria pag. 91: Surely the controuersy (between the Lutherans and Sacramentaries) is concerning the foundation.* The Sacramentaries in the Preface of the Conference at Mulbrun say, that the Lutherans. *Teare in preces and adulterate the articles of the incarnation, of the true humane nature &c. VVhich articles (say they) no Christian man can*
doubt

doubt but are the groundwork of saluation. And in the for-
 sayd preface: They are at variance, not about the Lords sup-
 per only, but touching the person of Christ, touching the vnion of
 his diuine and humane nature, touching the vbiqutty of his body
 and corporall manducation thereof common both to good and bad,
 touching his ascending vp to heauen, and his sitting at the right
 hand of his Father: of all these points they contend, and that with
 such exceeding heat of disputation, as that old heresies not a few,
 long since abolished and condemned, begin againe to lift vp their
 head as if they were recalled from hell. The like they haue
 ibidem in Prolegomenis. Of the controuerly which
 is betweene the Lutherans & Sacramentaries about
 the reall presence of Christs body in the Eucharist,
 Martyr in locis tom. 2. p. 156. giues this iudgement:
 The contention and difference therein concernes the cheife heads
 of Religion. Calvin epist. 292. sayth, that the opinion of
 the Lutherans doth, By mischeiuous iuglings and legierde-
 mains ouerturne the principles of sayth. Beza in his 5. epist.
 that it destroyeth the verity of Christs body. And epist. 81.
 that it recalleth from hell the folly and doting errors of Mar-
 cion and Entiches. Bucer citca by Holpin. part. 2. Hist.
 fol. 84: It followeth thereupon, that Christ is not true man.
 Paræus in cap. 3. Galat. lection. 37: There is nothing more
 directly opposite to Christian Religion, then to think that the body
 of Christ doth indeed lye hid really vnder the bread, and that the
 same is truly eaten with the mouth. Sadecl. in tract. de Con-
 iunctione &c. pag. 369. that it overthroweth the true na-
 ture of the true body and blood of Christ. VVhich thing (sayth
 he) we still lay to their charge. And tract. de Sacramen-
 tali manducatione pag. 26. that it is a word of euils. pag.
 267: That it traines after it idolatry. And pag. 268: that it
 cannot stand with the verity of Christs body. Holpin. part. 2.
 citat. fol. 2. that it is the foundation of Papistry. And fol.
 381: The base and pillar which sustaineth all the whole blended
 and

and disordered heape of abuses, and all the bread-worship which hath vnder the Popedome byn deuised and brought in. Lauaterus lib. de dissid. Euchar. fol. 7. that it is the Foundation of the Popedome. Curcius in Spongia, that it is the foundation, the strength, the throne of the God Maozim, and of the Popish state. And Ursinus in Catechism. quest. 78. cap. 3. sayth: *As long as the opinion of the corporall presence is maintained, Popish adoration, and oblation, and the whole Popish masse is kept on foot.* And there is not one Sacramentary, but thinks the verity of Christs body, and his ascension, & sitting at the right hand of the Father cleane taken away, if he should say he were substantially in the Eucharist. Whereupon Zanchius tom. 1. Miscell. in iudicio de dissidio Coenæ pag. 553. sayth: *There are two maine reasons why the one party (to wit the Sacramentaries) renounce the presence of the body: The one, that the article of Christs ascension into heauen may be kept entire: the other that the nature and verity of his humane body be not destroyed.* Nay some of the Sacramentaries in their Confessions of faith condemne the opinion of the Lutherans as mad and blasphemous. For Confess. Crengerina cap. de coena Domini, sayth: *Ve condemne their madnes, who auouch and maintaine flesh-eating, that is, who hold, that Christs naturall and very body, raw and bloody without any change or transubstantiation at all, is receiued with the very mouth.* And the Scots in their Confess. pag. 159. say they, *Detest that blasphemous opinion, which auoucheth Christs reall presence in the bread & wine, and that he is receiued by the wicked or taken into the belly.* This and much more of the like is sometymes the Sacramentaries plea against the reall presence of Christs body in the Eucharist; and yet at other tymes they professe that this controuerly is not of so great weight and moment, as that it should dissolue Ecclesiasticall Communion and fel.

Caluin de
Coena p. 8.
& in Cōf.
pag. 754.
Bezā in fo.
6. v. 23. 62.
& ad 4.
Demonstr.
Illyrici.
Zanchius
in Confess.
c. 10. sect.
12.

fellowship. Forso teacheth Martin apud Simletum
 in vitacius, the author of the orthodoxe Conteat.
 Prefat. Apologet. Hospinian part. 2. Histor. fol. 78.
 Calvin de scandalis pag. 95. In Consens. p. 764. Beza
 lib. de coena cont. Westphalum. pag. 258. M. Perkins
 in his exposition of the Creed, col. 792. and others.
 Nay (as we sayd before) these men belought the Lu-
 therans, who stedfastly maintaine the reall presence,
 to hold them for brethren and members of their
 Church. They can then find in their conscience to
 haue fellowship and Communion with those men,
 whose doctrine they condemne, As Frantike & blasphe-
 mous; whose doctrine (they say) destroyeth Christs ascension, What
 and the verity of his humane nature; sabuerteth the principles of kind of
 fayth and cheifest points of religion; recalleth the doeing follies of men Sa-
 Marcion and Eutyches, establisbeth the Kingdome of Antichrist, ^{cramentari-}
 traines after it idolatry and a world of euills. Fy on these me- ^{ries chal-}
 believe, who think the maintenance of an opinion, ^{lenge for}
 which (as themselues professe) ouerthroweth the ^{brethren.}
 principall articles of Christian fayth, drawes after (a) Beza
 it idolatry, and most foule heresies, layeth the foun- ^{respons. ad}
 dation whercon Antichristianity is raised; of so ^{acta mon-}
 sleight consequence as it ought not to dissolue fra- ^{risb. l. page}
 ternity and Communion. What regard of fayth or ^{252.}
 saluation may we think these men haue? There is (b) Caluin
 yet another point of Luteranisme touching the vbi- ^{4. Instit. co-}
 quity, or presence of Christs body euery where re- ^{17 p. 17.}
 proued of the Sacramentaries, and held in extreme (c) Hospo-
 dislike; of which they likewise exclaime: that it is (2) (d) Per-
 forged and composed of Eutychnisme and Nestorianisme: that ^{kins expos.}
 the heresies of (b) Marcion and Eutyches, yea well nigh (c) all old ^{Symb. coll.}
 heresies are by it raised againe from hell; that it sabuerteth the ^{792.}
 whole (d) Creed; that it takes away the (e) cheise heads of Chri- ^{(e) Sadeab.}
 stian Religion; & that there is scant any one article of Christian ^{de verit.}
^{bum. 130.}

D

beliese

believe which it doth not viterly abolish. And yet these selfe
 (f) Sadeel. same Sacramentaries stile them who defend this opi-
 sup. nion (f) Most flourishing Churches; and made earnest sute
 (g) Beza in to be held for (g) brethren of those very men, who
 colloq. mō- vpheld this doctrine against them, and maintayned
 risbel. pag. it to their face. Nay the particuler Churches of Sa-
 462. cramentaries themselves consist of parts mainly dis-
 Sacramē- ioyned in matters of believe. Examples hereof we
 taries say need not seeke abroad. Our owne Protestants tell vs,
 there is how the Puritans their brethren allow not of the
 fundamē- booke of common prayer, but hold it to be full of (*) cor-
 tall diffe- ruptions and all abominations, and teach that Protestants
 rēce amōg (b) wickedly mangle and wrest the Scriptures, that they haue no
 them. (c) Pastours, that they haue not a true Church, yea not so much
 (a) Whit- (c) Pastours, that they haue not a true Church, yea not so much
 gift. resp. as the outward face of a Church; and that they exhort the Conrs
 ad Admo- of Parliament with perfect (d) hatred to detest the present state
 nit. p. 149. of the Church; that no (e) Iew, no Turke, no Papist, could pos-
 357. sibly haue spoken more spitefully of their Church and state, and
 (b) Ib. resp. that they seeke to shake, nay to ouerthrow the (f) foundations,
 ad schedas. grounds, and pillars of their Church. Finally, that the Pu-
 (c) Resp. sitans will not account the Protestants their (g) brethren, and
 cit. pag. 6. yet the Protestants neuerthelesse acknowledge Puri-
 (d) Pag. 32. tans for their (h) brethren and fellow-labourers in the Lords
 (e) Pag. 33. harvest. In Scotland likewise (as his Maiesty witnesseth)
 (f) Pag. 6. That which was Catechisticall doctrine in one assembly,
 (g) R. sp. was hardly admitted for sound and orthodoxe in another; and
 ad schedas. Bancrofts yet these assemblies excluded not one another from
 suruey c. 33 the Church. What can be therefore more cleare and
 (h) Resp. eident, then that both the Lutherans and Sacra-
 ad schedas mentaries acknowledge (when they list) those to be
 Oxon. resp. members of their Church, who deny fundamentall
 ad Millen. articles of their fayth?
 Confer. ad Hampton
 Court. p.
 44.

6. A third prooffe may be drawne from the
Protestants demeanour and carriage towards the
Fathers,

Fathers, whom they claime and challenge for their fellow-citizens, and yet confesse plainly (to omit what they acknowledge concerning other points) that they were of a contrary beliefe in the article of Iustification by sole fayth; wherein (as shall be hereafter shewed) they say the soule, the summe, and definition of Protestantisme consisteth. Luther tom. 1. colloq. German. apud Coccium tom. 1. pag. 131: *In which errour (that works ioyned with fayth do iustify) were many of the Fathers.* And tom. 5. in cap. 3. Galat. fol. 358. he sayth, that of the difference, which he espied between the law and the Gospell, as that the law taught iustification by works, the Gospell by sole beliefe. *There is nothing to be found in the works of the old Fathers. Augustin held it in part, Hierome and the rest knew it not. Melancthon tom. 1. in Dominicam Trinitatis pag. 89: It is meruaile, that the cheife Doctours had no knowledge of the iustice of fayth. Tom. 2. lib. de Eccles. pag. 134: Chrysostome reckons vp many wayes and meanes to obtaine remission of sinnes, as almes. deeds, teares, and other works. The Centuriatours of Magdeburg. cent. 3. cap. 4. col. 79. & seqq. say, that the Doctours of the third age Make workes the cause of our iustice in Gods sight. Cent. 4. c. 4. col. 293: In this article of iustification this age reuolted wholly from the doctrine of the Apostles. And Cent. 5. in Prefat. they say of the Fathers of that age: Chrysostome and the residue attribute iustice vnto works, they make workes the meanes of saluation, and ascribe iustification either in part, or formally, or wholly vnto workes. Gerlachius tom. 2. disput. 13: The ancient Fathers would haue the iustice, life, and saluation of a Christian man consist in obseruing Gods commaundements, as Hilary, Origen, Tertullian, Eusebius, Chrysostome, Augustine, &c. Kemnitius in locis part 1. tit. de Iustificat. pag. 242. sayth that the Fathers Intermingled some-*

Protestants
say the fa-
thers dis-
sent fun-
damētally
from the.

In the art.
of iustifi-
cation by
only faith.

The summe
of the fa-
thers do-
ctrine is
iustifica-
tion by
works.

tymes and entwyned the doctrine of good workes with the article of iustification, sometymes plied and bended the article of iustification to good workes. And part. 2. tit. de lege pag. 106: If the Fathers disputes be all layd together, the summe of them is this in effect, that sinne and infirmity of nature is manifested by the law, to the end we may search out a Physitian, by whose grace is may be so healed, as it be able to satisfy and fullfill the law, and so we be saued. And ibidem in orat. de lectione Patrum pag. 3. he sayth of S. Cyprian, He had a fundamentall error. And pag. 4. of S. Hilary: He held an erroneous opinion touching the foundation. Calvin also lib. cont. Versipellens pag. 353: Three maine points of our sayth, to wit, the corruption of our nature, free and vnderdeserued iustification, and Christs Priesthood, are so darkly and obscurely touched in the ancientest writers, that no certainty can be drawne thence. Againe: VVe shall neuer learne by the Fathers, how we may be reconciled to God, how the obedience of Christ is freely and vnderdeseruedly reputed ours. Martyr in locis cit. de scriptura col. 1432: Other Fathers think good workes much auailable to iustification. Hospin. in epist. dedicat. part. 1. Histor: All the Fathers well nigh do now and then sprinkle and cast on with all the leauen of good workes, and attribute iustification to them, either in part, or formally or wholly. Pareus lib. 4, de Iustificat. c. 12: The Fathers both Greek and Latin especially those that wrote before the Pelagian bickerings, fancied ouer much, and tooke too great a liking to the Philosophers doctrine, concerning the iustification of workes. Finally M. Perkins in Problem. cap. de Iustificat. sayth, that the old writers confound the law with the Ghospell, and do not distinguish the iustice of the law from the iustice of the Ghospell.

7. To them, who in this manner ioyne friendship and Communion as well with such as renounce fundamentall articles of fayth, as with those whose beliefe is contrary in articles not fundamental, what
meruaile

meruaile is it, if all heretiks and Schismatiks seeme fit companions, and worthy to be accounted their brethren and fellow-cittizens? But let vs heare their owne words, wherein they acquaint vs, what ranke heretiks & Schismatiks hold amongst them. Luther tom. 7. serm. de Dominica 20. post Trinit. fol. 262. sayth: *They are frantique and beside themselves who go about to seuer the Church corporally from heretikes.* Hemingius in Syntag. Institut. pag. 192: *In the outward society of the Church, are many heretiks and Schismatiks.* Salomon Gelsner in locis loc. 24: *Are heretiks then in the Church? By any meanes.* Brentius in Præfat. Recognit: *Christ giues not ouer the conseruation of his sheep in the midst of heresies, but they must be such, as do not quite take away the foundation and Ministry.* Reineccius tom. 4. Armatur. cap. 6. pag. 35: *Ve affirme there are heretiques euen in the true Church.* Hutteus in Analyti Confess. August. pag. 425: *Neither were heresies without the territory and limits of the true Church.* Plessy in his booke of the Church cap. 2. affirmeth plainly, that all hereticall and Schismaticall congregations are truly the Church. And ibid. pag. 25. he sayth: *Although particular Churches be infected with heresies, from top to toe, neuerthelesse they are parts of the vniuersall Church as long as they professe the name of Christ.* Moulin in his Bukler of fayth part. 1. sect. 89: *An hereticall Church may be sayd to be a true Church, euen as man blemished with a canker or infected with the plague is notwithstanding a true man.* Sonis Respons. ad Spondeum c. 10. pag. 365. *Heretiks are within the Church.* Lubbert lib. 2. de Eccles. cap. 3: *It is manifest, that heretikes are, some as yet in the visible Church, some also in the church of the elect.* Iunius lib. 3. de Eccles. cap. 4: *Heretiks absolutely are of the Church, vnlesse they be such as ouerthrow fundamentall articles of religion.* Bullinger teacheth the same Decad. 2. serm. 8. and it is the common doctrine of

Cap. 3: n. 18

Lib. de car-
ne Christi.
cap. 25.

the Protestants, who (as is before proved) exclude none from being members of their Church, that deny only such articles as are not fundamentall. Howbeit some of them vpon hereticall priuiledge (as Tertullian speaketh) will not haue such called heretiks; being indeed more ashamed of the name then of the thing it selfe. Zanchius likewise lib. 1. epist. ad Dudit. pag. 150. sayth, that hereticall and Schismaticall sects are within the Church. Tilenus in Syntag. disput. 14: Heretiks, even those that subuert the foundation, and Schismaticks in regard of outward Communion, are in the Church, till either of themselues they go to the enemies side, or are cast out by the lawfull iudgement of the Church. And D. Feild in his first booke of the Church cap. 14: Seing God gaue the power of the keyes and the dispensation of his word and Sacraments only to his Church, if Heretiks be not of the Church, they do not then baptize. And cap. 7: They that are partakers of the heauenly calling, and sanctified by the profession of diuine truth, and the vse of the meanes of saluation, are of very diuers sortes; as heretikes, Schismaticks, hypocrites, and those that professe the whole saving truth in vnitie and sinceritie of a good and sanctified heart. All these are partakers of the heauenly calling, and sanctified by the profession of truth, and consequently are all in some degree and sort of that society of men, whome God calleth out vnto himselfe, & separateth from Insidels, which is rightly named the Church. D. Whitaker contr. 4. quest. 5. c. 3. pag. 679: All heretiks are within the Church. Hooker in his 3. booke of Ecclesiasticall policy pag. 128: VVe must acknowledge euen heretikes themselues to be, though a maymed part, yet a part of a visible Church: Againe: If an Insidell should pursue to death an heretike professing Christianity only for Christian Profession sake, could we deny vnto him the honour of Martyrdome? By which words it is plaine, that they admit heretiks not only into the visible

Church,

Church, but into the invisible also, or company of the elect and predestinate to saluation. And D. Andrews in his answer to Bellarmines Apology cap. 5. pag. 121. denyeth that the words, *Catholik* and *Heretike* are opposite; wherefore vnlesse he will debarre and shut out some Catholiks from the Church, he must needs giue admittance to heretiks, seing by his owne verdict they may be Catholiks. D. White in defence of his way cap. 38. pag. 367: *The second sort of the militant Church are hypocrites and vnfound members, that are not called effectually, but disobey the truth whereof they make profession, such are heretiks, schismatiks &c.* Touching their acceptations of Schismatiks, besides what hath byn already alleaged, D. Feild in his first booke of the Church cap. 13. writeth thus: *The departure of Schismatiks is not such, but that, notwithstanding their schisme, they are and remaine parts of the Church of God.* Iunius in the place before quoted layeth clayme to those Schismatikes, *Who (sayth he) seuer not themselues from the whole Church but only from a part thereof.* But D. Morton in the 1. part of his Apology lib. 1. cap. 2. sayth absolutely without any exception or restraint at all: *Schismatiks are of the Church.* And lib. 2. cap. 10. pag. 288: *Variances (sayth he) and schismes do not betoken the false Church.* And D. Willet in his Synopsis cont. 2. quest. 3. pag. 104: *We say that Schismatiks, though they hold some false points of doctrine, yet if their errours be not fundamentall, and if they retaine the purity of doctrine in all points necessary to saluation, and the administration of the Sacraments, may make a particuler Church by themselves.* These are their acknowledgements touching Heretikes and Schismatikes in generall. Let vs now descend to particularities, and see the courteous admission they giue to some of them by name.

They challenge Schismatiks.

They acknowledge the Grecians.

8. The Grecians and other Easterne Schismatiks,

D 4

matiks, yea heretiks to, for the most part, find that fauour at their hands, as they vouchsafe to account them members of their Church. His Maicesty epist. ad Card. Peron pa. 13 hath thus: *The Churches of Rome, Greece, Antioch, Aegipt, Aethiopia, Muscouy, and others more are members of the Catholike church.* D. White in defence of his way c. 37. pag. 355: *The visible churches of Greece, Aethiope, Armenia, and Rome, with the nations containd therein, haue in them the true church of God, wherein men may be saued.* D. Morton in his answer to the Protestants Apology lib. 4. cap. 2. sect. 7. sayth, that the Assyrian Churches keep the true foundation of Christian fayth. The same, (especially of the Grecians) teacheth Luther tom. 2. lib. de captiu. Babylon. fol. 65. & in Assert. art. 37. fol. 114. Iunius cont. 4 lib. 4. cap. 6. Sadeel. Respons. ad Thes. Polnan. cap. 12. D. Whitaker lib. 7. cont. Duræum sect. 3. Bucanus loco 41. quest. 5 D. Feild lib. 3. de Eccles. cap. 5. & 28. D. Fulke de Success. pag. 120. Burhill pro Tortura Torti c. 15. and others.

They challenge the Anabaptists.

9. And sometymes they are not lesse free-hearted towards westerne heretiks. Melancthon in locis à Manlio editis tit. de Eccles. pag. 491. writeth, that two girles, who were burnt (as he sayth) for Anabaptisme, held the foundation of fayth, and died in a good Confession. And Zuinglius tom. 2. lib. de Author. sedit. fol. 134. & seq. exhorting his followers, not to reuolt from his doctrine, for the debates and quarels between the Protestants and the Anabaptists, calleth both parts most learned and sonnes of the same Father. Neither must thou (sayth he) giue any man way to shake and weaken thy fayth, although thou see that men of the greatest learning moue disputes, and fall by the eares with much eagernesse of consention, touching externall matters (he meanes baptisme)

but

but let this be rather thy stedfast persuasion, that by the Sonne of God we are all made sonnes of the same Father. Againc: Neither am I wont to speake those things, for that I am so greatly moued with the baptisme of children. And ibidem lib. de Baptismo fol. 96. he sayth, that baptisme is a matter of ceremony, which the church may omit or take quite away. Oecolampadius in his 2. booke of epistles p. 363. sayth, baptisme is an externall thing, which by the law of charity may be dispensed withall. And Musculus in locis tit. de hæresi pag. 605. reckons the Anabaptists amongst those, who (sayth he) keeping the foundations of sayth, about secondary matters haue fallen into misbeliefe. And Bucanus loc. 41. de Eccles. quest. 5. auoucheth plainly, that Anabaptists are a Church, Like as a man attainted with leprosy or out of his wits, is a man. His Maiesty epist. ad Card. Peron pag. 25. sayth: Some reckon baptisme among those things, which whether we haue or want, the matter is not great. And D. Whitaker cont. 4. quest. 7. cap. 2. pag. 716. sayth we may abstaine from baptisme, so there be no contépt and scandall in the fact. Finally D. Morton in his answer to the Protestants Apology lib. 4. albeit in the 6. chapter he make a doubt whether Anabaptists retaine and hold the foundation, yet in the 2. cap. sect. 10. speaketh thus: The Anabaptists exclude Protestants and all different professions from the hope of spirituall life, yet do not Protestants iudge the state of euery Anabaptist to be so vtterly desperate. We see how they teach that Anabaptists hold the foundation, and deny but an externall, secondary, and ceremoniall matter, and such as may be omitted, so it be don without scandall; that Anabaptists and themselues are sonnes of the same Father, that they are in the state of saluation, and that they are a church as a man tainted with leprosy is a man. Now concerning the Arrians of these tymes, M. Morton in his booke of the Kingdome of Israel, and the Church

And the
Arians.

Danens in
a. 53. Aug.
de baref.

V Whitak.
ad Rat. 10.

pag. 241.

Parentius
in Instruct

Gall. p. 27.

They lay
claime to
their pro-
fessed eni-
mies.

In Council,
Trid. In
Censura
Oriens.

pag. 94. auoucheth plainly, that their Churches are to be accounted the Churches of God, *Because* (sayth he) *they hold the foundation of the Gospell.* Hooker in his 4. booke of Ecclesiasticall policy pag. 181. writeth thus: *The Arians in the reformed churches of Poland &c.* Nay some of the Protestants lay clayme to that old heretike Aërius, for that he agreed with them in denyall of prayer for the dead, and some other points; yet that he was stained with Arianisme, S. Epiphanius, who liued in those tymes hæc. 75. and S. Augustin 53. (witnesses whole credit herein can no way be impeached) do plainly testify.

10. Lastly they forbear not sometymes to challenge for their owne, such as were their profest enemies, as is certaine by their clayme to the Papists and Grecians, who condemned and branded their doctrine with the marck of heresy. And the Sacramentaries pretend a right to Luther and the Lutherans, howbeit it is well known, that both the Master and the sect haue diuers tymes censured and condemned their doctrine by name, as in the Confessions of Auspurg, Mansfeld, Antwerpe, & that of Sueucland set forth anno 1563. in the booke of Concord, in the visitation of Saxony, and else where it appeareth. And that in the Conference of Marpurg and Montbelgard they gaue them the repulse and flatly refused to admit them for brethren. Nay, as Lauatherus writeth lib. de diffid. Euchar. anno 1556: *There haue byn many Synodes held (by the Lutherans) wherein they consulted what way they might take to quell and make an end of the Sacramentaries.* And they shew the same encroaching desire in personall Claimes. For Illyricus in his Catalogue lib. 19. col. 1917, enrolleth amongst his witnesses Clichthouzeus, an earnest and vehement aduersary

say both of Luther and Occolampadius. D. Humfrey in vita Iuelli claymeth Erasmus, for a maintayner and Champion of the truth. M. Fox vouchsafes him a place in his kalender of Protestant Saints, and Verheiden sets his pourtraiture amongst the Worthies and Pairs of their religion. Vortius in Append. Respons. ad Sladum pag. 136. accounteth him one of his owne, *that is (sayth he) one of the reformed.* D. Whitaker Contr. 4. quest. 5. cap. 3. pag. 693 sayth: *It is most apparent that Erasmus thought the same of religion that we do.* And yet Erasmus himselfe lib. 16. epist. 11. professeth, that he acknowledgeth not Luther, and impugneth openly both him and his doctrine. And (as Amdorfius writeth in epist. apud Lutherum tom. 2. fol. 487.): *The summe of Erasmus doctrine is this, that Luthers doctrine is heresy.* Otho Brunfelsius in his answer to Erasmus sponge, sayth these things to his charge: *Thou makest protestation neuer to haue conuersation or fellowship with those men, who imbrace the ghospell vnder Luthers name.* Againc: *It is well knowne and confest, that of so many enemies of the (Protestant) ghospell, no one euer did it more harme then thou.* Hutterus in Expostulat. Hospin. part. 2. Histor. fol. 72. James Andrew lib. cont. Hofium p. 110. D. James l. de corrupt. scripturæ & Patrum pag. 66. and others, say the like of him. D. Humphrey ad Rat. 3. Campiani will haue King Henry 8. to haue byn a member of their Church. D. Fulke lib. cont. Heskins. & Sander. sect. 82. sayth, *he was a member of the Catholike church of Christ.* And D. Andrews in Reso. ad Apoll. Bellarm. cap. 1. sayth: *He was a true defender of the true sayth.* Bucer epist. dedicat. Comment. ad Rom: *He imbraced the pure Ghospell of Christ reiecting those forgeries of men which are repugnant to it.* And yet, it is most certaine, that he sharply persecuted and pursued Protestants

Rainolds l.
1. de Idolat.
cap. 2.

stants

stants euen vnto death. And as Melancthon writeth to him in epist. tom. 4: He oppressed the truth then appearing and shewing it selfe . And as Cambden sayth in Apparatu Annalium Anglic. Protestants be burnt for heretikes. Of Charles 5. Scultetus in Conc. secular. pag. 10. writeth thus: It is knowne by vndoubted demonstration, that Charles 5. departed this life trusting to the same comfort and the same sayth, which Luther drew from the sacred welsprings, and broached to the people, (James Andrews lib. cont. Hosiua pag. 233. hath the like) and yet in the same sermon p. 27. he sayth: To this alone he bent his whole endeauours, that he might pluck vp the Lutheran religion by the rootes. M. Doue in his booke of Recusancy will needs persuade vs, that Bellarmine himselfe is a Protestant, or at least no right Papist. What meruaile is it, if these men be so hardy as to challenge the ancient Fathers, seing they are not ashamed to claime in this manner their professed enemies, such as are knowne to all the world, and are yet aliue .

*That Protestants sometymes acknowledge Idolators,
Infidels, Antichrist himselfe, and Atheists
to be members of their Church.*

C H A P. IV.

I. **T**HAT they sometymes confesse idolators are members of their Church, is euident. First **Protestants** challenge for that they refuse not to receiue Papists, (as we **idolators,** haue heard before) in exclamations and outcries against whose idolatry, their tongues and pennes are set most a worke, for to their worship of the Eucharist, of Saints, of images, of reliques, they afford no mildes

milder name. And secondly it appeareth by their owne words. For M. Hooker in his 3. booke of Ecclesiasticall Policy pag. 126. sayth: *Christians by externall profession they are all, whose marke of recogniscance bath in is those things which we haue mentioned; yea although they be impious idolaters, wicked heretikes, persons excommunicable.* Againe: *Those whose knees were bowed vnto Baal, euen they were also of the visible Church of God.* Boyssoul in Contut. p. 822. answering to the place where Spondeus obie-cted that if the Church of Rome be an Idolatresse, (as Boyssoul had auouched) it is not the Church of Christ; makes this reply: *And why not as well as Israel?* And D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 3. pag. 475. saith: *Although this error (Idolatry in adoring the calfe) were most grieuous, yet it destroyed not the whole nature of the Church.*

2. That they sometymes comprize also Infidels in the Church, is manifest, first because they affirme that such may be saued; For M. Fox in his Martyrologe pag. 495. reporteth that a certaine Protestant Martyr whole learning piety & zeale he greatly commendeth, taught that a Turke, Saracen, or any Mahamet an what soeuer may be saued; if he trust in one God and keep his law. M. Bale in his 6. Century pag. 464. bids vs beware that we condemne not rashly any Turke. And Zu- inglius tom. 1. lib. de prouid. fol. 370. sayth: *It is not vniuersally true, that who so hath no fayth is damned.* Againe: As for the damnation of vnbelieuers it is meant only of those, who heard and did not belieue. And tom. 2. declarat. de peccat. orig. fol. 118: *This saying (who so doth not belieue shall be condemned) must in no wise be absolutely vnderstood, but it is to be vnderstood of those, who hauing heard the ghospell would not belieue.* And ibidem in exposit. fidei fol. 559. he sayth, that in heauen Christians shall meet many

And Infidells

See Homid in Specim. Contr. ar. 2.

27: heathens,

heathens, whose names he there sets downe, and amongst the rest that cruel Theseus, and Magician Numa, the founder of heathenish superstitions amongst the Romans. Which opinion of his those of Zurich in Apolog. Gualter. in pefat. tom. 1. Zuin- glij, Simler. in vita Bullengeri, and others seeks to patronize and make good. Now it were folly and madnes, to auouch that these men were of the number of the faythfull. They belieue then that infidels may be saued. But S. Augustin was of a farre different beliefe lib. 4. cont. Iul. cap. 3. where he writes thus: *What one of those, who would be accounted Christians, will say an Infidell is iust, be it euen Fabritius.*

3. Secondly their doctrine touching the predestinate carrieth with it a necessary acknowledgement of their Communion with Infidels. For they teach, that who so is predestinate is alwayes a member of the Church. Hus his first article condemned by the Council of Constance was this: *The predestinate remayneth euer a member of the Church.* And Luther tom. 2. in Assert. art. 30: *I say the opinions of Iohn Hus are all Evangelicall and Christian.* Againe: *I admit all the condemned articles of Iohn Hus.* And tom. 1. in disput. Lypsic. fol. 254. he maintaineth openly this article of Hus: *The Church is the whole multitude of the predestinate.* Vorstius in Anti-bellarmino page 125: *We affirme that the Council of Constance, which condemned the doctrine of Hus (that who so is predestinate is alwayes a member of the Church) was surely in this respect Antichristian.* Danæus in Resp. ad Bellarm. Contr. 4. lib. 3. cap. 2. sayth: *The first opinion (which was the opinion of Hus) is true, and is ours.* Againe: *our opinion is that the Church is the whole company of men, whome God hath predestinated to saluation.* And cap. 7: *It must be answered that Paul was alwayes (but not alwayes apparently*

without baptisme; as the Protestants in the collog. Ratisbon. And Zuinglius tom. 2. Declarat. de peccat. orig. fol. 119: Concerning Christians children we are assured, that they are not damned for originall sin; of others we haue not the like assurance: howbeit, to confesse ingenuously, the opinion we taught heretofore, to wit, that we ought not to iudge rashly of beathens children, seemes to vs the more probable Voritius in Anti-bellarmino pag. 542: Zuinglius and some other gospellers auouch, that all children whatsoever are by the grace of Christ saued; others for the most part hold, that at leastwise all the elect, whether extract from saythfull or other parents do euen vnbaptized attaine to saluation. Whereof he sayth: The opinion of these later is surely the safest; and yet the first opinion is probable inough and ought not to be rashly condemned. Now as D. Whitaker sayth Cont. 2. quest. 1. cap. 5. & 6: All that are saued are really and actually in the church. And D. Morton part. 1. Apol. lib. 1. cap. 4: To be of the church in possibility, sufficeth not to saluation. Lubbertus lib. 2. de Eccles. cap. 2: Neither can any one be saued except he be actually and really in the church. Whence Martyr in 1. Cor. 7. fol. 177. sayth: Infants must of necessity appertaine vnto the church, seing there is no saluation without it. They teach moreover, that Infants haue no sayth, and consequently that they are infidels, whence it ensueth that they account some infidels to be actually of the church. Calvin 4. Institut. cap. 16. §. 19: I will not lightly affirme, that they (infants) are endued with the same sayth we find in our selues. And §. seq. he sayth: Infants are baptized for future repentance and sayth. Now if they dye before they are of yeares, God reneweth them by the vertue of his spirit, which we do not comprehend, in such manner as himselfe alone knoweth how to bring to passe. Lib. cont. Seruet. pag. 647. he sayth, that that sentence of the Scripture: VVho soeuer belieueth not in the Sonne of God abideth in death, and the wrath of God remaineth

Infants
without
all faith
according
to Prote-
stants.

upon

upon him, belongeth not to infants, but only to such as are obstinate. And in cap. 5. Rom. v. 17 : That you may be partaker of iustice, it is needfull that you be saythfull, because it is receiued by sayth. To infants it is communicated by a speciall manner. Bucer in cap. 19. Matthæi pag. 404 : Paul sayth that sayth cometh by hearing the word preached, and in the same sort all the Scripture speaketh of sayth. Seing therefore infants beare not the word preached, they cannot haue this kind of sayth. But out of that, that infants want sayth, nothing lesse can be concluded, then (which some thinke) that therefore they cannot please God. Infants are blessed by the grace of God and merits of Christ. But if they be taken hence in their infancy, they shall know God and reape felicity by some other knowledge then sayth. Musculus in locis tit. de baptismo : Infants haue yet no sayth. Againe : Infants are saued by Gods election, though they be taken out of this life not only vnbaptized, but euen before they haue sayth. Beza in Confess. cap. 4. sect. 48 : It doth not appeare to vs that infants are endowed with that habit of sayth, which we sayd was required to the receiuing of the matter and effect of the Sacraments, nor is it likely that they are. And in colloq. Montisbel. pag. 407 : VVherefore, though the children of the saythfull want sayth, yet is not baptisme vnprofitable to them. And part. 2. Respons. ad acta Montisbel. pag. 124 : All eu infants haue no sayth of their owne, especially actuall; yet rightly are they baptized according to the forme of the Couenant, I will be thy God, and of thy seed, which is apprehended by the parents to themselves and their children. And pag. 129 : I confesse that sayth is required, that infants comprehended in the Couenant may please God; but I deny, that they can or ought to be endowed with their owne sayth inherent in them. Dancus l. 4. de baptismo cap. 10. pag. 268. proposeth to himselfe this question : VVhat is the sayth which in baptisme we require in infants? and answereth : None. Ursinus in defens. argument. Bezz. God receiueth infants into the Church with-

Infants
haue not
so much
as the
habit of
sayth.

E

out

out sayth. Peter Martyr in 1. Cor. 7. pag. 94 : Seing the ho-
 ly Scripture doth not tell me, that infants beliene, or those mira-
 cles are wrought in them, neither see I that it is necessary for their
 saluation, I think it is inough that they be thought to be saued, be-
 cause by election and predestination they belong to the people of
 God, & are endued with the holy Ghost, who is the author of
 sayth, hope, and Charity. Perhaps they will answeare out of Au-
 gustins opinion, that they are saued by the sayth of others, to wit
 of their parents. But the Prophet sayth that euery one is saued by
 his owne sayth, not by other mens sayth. VVherefore we answeare
 more easily, who exactt expresse and actuall sayth in those that are
 of yeares, but in the children of Christians, who are brought to be
 Christened, we say sayth is begun in its principle & root, because
 they haue the holy Ghost firm whence all both sayth and other ver-
 tues do flow. D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 6. c. 3. pag. 566:
 Baptisme doth not infuse any sayth or grace into infants. And
 he sayth plainly, that infants haue no sayth. And lib. 8.
 cont. Duræum sect. 77 : Albeit in the Sacraments sayth
 which receiueth the word of promise, be necessary, yet that sayth
 is not needfull in infants, albeit it be not to be doubted but the ho-
 ly Ghost effectually worketh in them after a secret and wonderfull
 manner. M. Perkins de prædestinat. tom. I. col. 149 : In-
 fants which dye in the Couenant, we believe to be saued by tenour
 of that Couenant, but they were not chosen for sayth or according
 to sayth, which yet they had not. And in serie caular. cap.
 25 : Elected infants dying in the wombe or soone after they be
 borne, are saued after a hidden and vnspeakeable manner in-
 grafted in Christ by the spirit of God. Luther tom. 6. in cap.
 25. Gen. fol. 322 : Vnbaptized infants haue no sayth. Melan-
 cthon in locis tit. de baptismo to. 3. fol. 228: It is most
 true, that sayth is required in all that are of years. But concer-
 ning infants (sayth he) the matter is otherwise. Kem-
 nitius part. 2. Exam. tit. de baptisim. pag. 89. telleth vs
 that some Protestants are of opinion, that infants are in-
 fidele

Infants
 saued
 without
 sayth.

Seed saved by the grace of God, but without fayth. Nor doth their saying that the seed or root of fayth, or else an inclination or disposition to fayth (which some of them affirme infants to haue) help them any thing at all, both because Scharpe cont. i. de Iustifi. graunteth that this seed *can neither haue the knowledge nor applying of the promises*, and therefore is not Protestant faith, and because Musculus in locis it. de fide art. 7. confesseth, that they distinguish and put a difference betweene fayth and this bidden seed. Now if it be no fayth, it maketh not him faythfull in whome it is. And lastly because (as themselves acknowledge) they are not assured, whither infants haue any such seed or no. For Calvin lib. 4. cap. 16. § 9. cit: *VVhether they haue at all any knowledge like vnto fayth, I choose rather to leaue it vndetermined*. And he addeth, that the manner of their renewing is knowne to God alone. To these allegations you may adde, that M. Perkins in his Reformed Catholicke cont. 16. sayth, a man may be saued by a desire to haue fayth: And neuerthelesse confesseth that this desire is not indeed fayth. And in 2. Galat. col. 91: *God accepteth the will and desire to belieue, for beliefe it selfe*. Now as long as a man hath not fayth but only a desire thereof, he is an infidel.

5. You might think, that hauing made this graunt of saluation to infidels, their liberality wold rest here, and not passe these bounds; but they go yet further, and bestow it sometymes euen vpon him, whom they swear, yea belieue as an article of their fayth (and that with as great certainty and assurance as they belieue God is in heauen, or Christ is the Messias) to be that notable Antichrist foretold in Scripture. For thus writeth M. Powell lib. de Antichristo cap. 33. pag. 338: *I will in no wise say, that all the*

Protestants
challenge
Antichrist,

E 2

Popes

Popes from the tyme wherein Papistry was first revealed to be Antichristianity, are damned. Howbeit in the beginning of his booke he makes this protestation: I solemnly take God to record, that I as certainly know the Bishop of Rome to be that great Antichrist, and the Popish church to be the Synagogue of Antichrist, as I know God to be in the heavens, or Iesus Christ to be the true Messias promised to the Fathers. D. Whitaker likewise cont. 4. q. 5. cap. 3. pag. 694. sayth: Let vs cry aloud and swere by him who liues for euer, that the Bishop of Rome is Antichrist. And to D. Sanders last demonstration that the Pope is not Antichrist pag. 799: VVe may take that most sacred and most true oath, and sweare by him who liues for euer, that the Bishoppe of Rome is the very Antichrist. And neuerthelesse in his answer to the first demonstration he sayth with M. Powell: I will not say, that from the tyme that Papistry began to be Antichristianity, the Popes themselues haue byn all damned. And both he cap. cit. pag. 679. & 682. & other Protestants ordinarily affirme that Antichrists Sea shalbe in the true Church, among the company of the saythfull, and that he shal be a citizen, and inhabitant, and Pastour of the Church. To whom I pray will these men deny saluation, or a place in their Church, who graunt it vnto Antichrist the sworne enemy of Christ, whome the scripture it self styleth: Christs aduersary, the man of sin, the sonne of perdition? I see not why they should henceforward vpbraid vs with Antichrist, since they themselues clayme him for a member of their Church.

that they
challenge
Atheists.

6. It is also certaine, that they challenge Atheists. For Illyricus in Catal. lib. 9. col. 1916. D. Humfrey respons. ad Rat. 3. Camp. M. Fox in his Acts printed anno 1596. pag. 646. allot that Atheist Machiavel an honorable roome among the witnesses and maintayners of the truth. And Luther apud
Menlium

Manlium in loc. tit. de Eccl. pag. 488. sayth of Valla, that he gaue place to none but Epicure himfelfe, and professed openly, that he held opinions repugnant to the foundation of sayth. Neuerthelesse the same Luther respons. ad Louan. & Colen. tom. 2. fol. 38. writeth thus of him: Valla in my iudgement was eisher a remanent sparke, or some fewellof the primitive Church, whose like in constancy and vn- Jayned zeale of Christian sayth Italy or the whole Church had not for many ages. One Epicure then in Luthers iudgement was the remanent sparke, and fewell of the Church.

That sometymes Protestants account all those their brethren, who vnder the name of Christians oppose themselues any way against the Pope.

CHAP. V.

1. **T**HAT Protestants sometymes acknowledge all those for members of their Church, who vnder the name of Christians do any way oppose themselues against the Pope, I proue: First because some of them do openly so professe. For (as Kennice reporteth in locis tit. de Eccles. pag. 122.) Some faine the Church to be a rable of all Sects, of Anabaptists, Sacramentaries, Swinsfeldians, and others, so they be not Papists. And Capito in Calvin. epist. 6. Some haue brought in a liberty, as if all were of the Ghospells side, whosoener haue cast of the Popes yoke. Musculus also in locis tit. de cæna pag. 522. sayth: I embrace all for brethren in the Lord, howsoener they disagree from me or among themselues, as long as they wayntaine not the Popish impiety. Secondly, because they professe, that

the end of their preaching was to lessen the authority of the Pope, and Bishops, and to be contrary to them. For thus Luther writeth of himselfe epist. ad Frederic. Elect. tom. 2. fol. 330: *The Ecclesiasticall tyranny is now weakned and broaken, which only I purposed in writing.* Or as Sleidan lib. 3. reporteth, *He writeth, that the Ecclesiasticall tyranny is now weakned, & that, that alone was his designe at the first.* And epist. ad Waldenses in Holpin. part 2. fol. 8. he sayth, *that he impugned transubstantiation only for enny of the Papists.* And in parua Contest. apud eundem fol. 13. that he impugned the Eleuation only to spite the Papists. Calvin 4. Institut. cap. 10. §. 1. sayth: *The end of our contention is, to bridle that infinite and barbarous Dominion, which those, who would be accounted Pastors, haue vsurped ouer soules.* Zuinglius lib. de Auctor. Sedit. tom. 2. fol. 125. affirmeth, that there is a sort of Protestants, which for no other cause do heare the doctrine of the Ghospell, then because they extremely hate the Popedome, and enuy Papists their felicity and glory. Bucer lib. de regno Christi cap. 4: *The greatest part of men seeme to haue sought only these things of the ghospell. First that they might shake of the tyranny of the Romane Antichrist, and of the false Bishops &c.* Luther also tom. 2. German. fol. 22. telleth what was the end of the Sacramentaries & Anabaptists: *I heare (sayth he) that some embrace Anabaptisme for this only end, that so they may spite the Bishop of Rome, euen as the Sacramentaries do only in hatred of the Romish Bishop, deny that there is any thing in the sacrament beside bread and wine.* Of the new Arians end thus writeth Zanchius lib. 1. epist. pag. 154: *Our Arians haue determined to ouerturne from the foundation whatsoever is in the Church of Rome.* And what end Illyricus had, thus telleth D. Whitaker ad Rat. 8. Campiani: *Illyricus went farther then he should, as I think to be the further of from you, whom he hated.*

2. Thirdly, because they call the departure from the Pope and Popish doctrine, the foundation, a good part, and the summe of the Protestant building. Sadeel Respons. ad Arthu. cap. 12: Protestants agree in this foundation, that the Church ought to be reformed out of the word of God, and that Popish errors must be removed out of the Church. Seravia epist. dedicat ad Episc. Angliæ: It is to be wondered, how much almost all the Reformers please themselves in this point, that they will have nothing common with the church of Rome. Grotius apud Homium in Specimine &c: Neither can I forebeare to shew the fountaine and offspring of this and other calamities; VVe think that we are so much the purer, the further we go from points of Romish doctrine without any difference. Vergerius dial. 1. pag. 20: VVe hope, that shortly all matters will be composed. VVe could do, by Gods helpe, that which seemed the cheifest of all, and the hardest and well nigh impossible, that is, pull our selues and ridde vs of the Papists tyranny. VVherefore nothing is to be doubted, but we shall compass other matters of lesse moment. For a good foundation is layd, yea a good part of the building is set vp. And Zuinglius Respons. ad Billi. tom. 2. fol. 261. When one objected vnto him the dissention amongst the Sacramentaries in expounding Christs words of the supper, answereth: No man ought to be offended with this diuersity, more then with the difference among many captaines, who go about to conquer a castle, whiles one would haue it battered, another vndermined, and a third would haue it scaled. For all agree to destroy the castle, the difference is only about the way, not about the summe of the matter. And so concludeth, that if any Sacramentaries haue erred, They erred (sayth he) in the letter not in spirit, in the summe they agree all. The summe therefore wherein all Protestants agree, is to ouerthrow the Popish castle, and Catholike fayth, (in which also the ancient heretikes agreed amongst themselues as

Tertull.
præf. c. 41.
Athanas.
orat. 1. cōt.
Arian.
Hieron. ad
Ctesiphont.
August. in
Psal. 80.
Beda l. 1. in
Iob. 6. 7.

the holy Fathers do testify) and who attempteth that by what meanes soever, erreth not in spirit, but in letter only, not in the summe but in some circumstance only of Protestacy. But with what spirit they are led herein, let them heare of their owne Prophet Luther, defens. verb. cœnz tom. 7. f. 411: *What a kind of spirit is that (sayth he) which hath no other end, but to weaken the aduerse party? without all doubt it is no other spirit then the Diuell.*

3. Fourthly, because they describe, paint, & name a Protestant by departure from the Pope and Popish doctrine. The Confession of Wittenberg in Prefat. describeth Protestants to be such, *as haue changed in their Churches a kind of (Popish) doctrine, which had byn vsed for many yeares, and some other ancient ceremonies.* M. Perkins in the Preface of his Reformed Catholik, sayth: *By a Reformed Catholike (so he termeth a Protestant) I vnderstand any one, that holds the same necessary heads of Religion with the Roman Church, yet so as he pates of and rejects all errors in doctrine, whereby the sayd religion is corrupted.* D. Willet in the Preface of his Synopsis: *A Protestant is he that professeth the gospell of Iesus Christ, and hath renounced the iurisdiction of the Sea of Rome, and the forced and vnnaturall obedience to the Pope.* Schuffelburg tom. 13. Catal. Hæret. pag. 22: *A Lutheran or true Christian is he, who hath seuered himselfe from Papists &c.* And tom. 8. pag. 363: *True Lutherans are they who imbrace the doctrine of the gospell amending Popish abuses.* You see how in all these descriptions of a Protestant, the denyall of the Pope and Popish doctrine is put as a certaine difference, which concurreth to the making and distinguishing of a Protestant from all others. Hereupon D. Andrews Apol. Cont. Bellarm. cap. 1. sayth: *Sauing this Protestation (that they will not suffer certaine Popish*

errors

errors and abuses) our fayth is no other then yours is, or ought to be. And he addeth, that they call their religion reformed, only because it is purged from certaine deuises and corruptions, which had crept into it. And sayth, that Bucer and Peter Martyr did only pluck vp certaine cockle, which Papists had sowed. In like sort Boylseul in his Confutation of Spondèpag. 724. sayth: Take away your Popery & that which dependeth thereof, and you and we shall be but one church, because we shall haue but one Confession of fayth. Moreover Plessy in the forefront of his mystery of iniquity, painteth a Protestant with a torch in his hand, setting fire to the tower of Babylon, by which he vnderstandeth the Popedome. And finally Luther in exempl. Theol. Papist. tom. 2. fol. 401. calleth himselfe an *Anti-papist*, as of his principall end or office, and sayth, that he was called by diuine reuelation to destroy the Popes Kingdom. D. Humfrey also termeth Ochinus a *stout Anti-papist*, as if to be a Protestant and an *Anti-papist* were all one.

4. Fiftly, because the same opinions which in Papists they detest, in other who are opposite to the Pope, they dissemble or extenuate. Lubbert. lib. 1. Replicat. cap. 4. sayth: *The Lutherans dispute not with vs about the Canon of Scriptures, nor we with them.* And lib. 4. de Concil. cap. vlt: *Ve contend not with the Churches of Saxony, which keep images in the Churches.* And yet they dispute most eagerly against Catholiks about the Canon of scriptures, and images. The Scots in their general Confession professe to detest Popery, for maintaining the reall presence of Christs body in the Eucharist, for making the signe of the Crosse, for denying infants without baptisme to be saued. And in their other Confession c. 22. they say they shunne the

Conf. Au- Communion of the Popish Church, because her mi-
 gustanavi- nisters are not Ministers of Christ, because she per-
 ft. Saxon. mitteth women to christen in case of necessity; and
 Liturgia. yet dissemble, that the Lutheran Protestants allow
 Anglica. all these points; and that the English Protestants ad-
 Conference mit Popish Priests for sufficient ministers, command
 at Hampst. the making of the crosse in baptisme, & allow wo-
 Court. mens baptisme in case of necessity; but because they
 (a) Lasco are against the Pope, as well as the Scots, their op-
 & Erasius position to the Pope, like sole fayth couereth all, and
 in Schuffel. maketh that the Scots impute not these matters to
 l. 4. Theol. them. And if at any tyme the Catholiks do set before
 Calvin p. their eyes the errors or dissentions amongst them, ei-
 216. Peild ther they impudently (*) deny them or greatly exte-
 l. 3. of the nuate them, (aying, that they are not about the (b) founda-
 Church tion, not of (c) weighty matters, of light matters, not of the (d)
 cap. 24. matter but of the manner, of (e) things indifferent, of I know not
 (b) Apol. what titles, and finally only of (f) words. Surely I imagine,
 Anglic. as they say, that all sinnes in the elect faythfull are
 (c) Whit. veniall, but in others all are mortall: so they deeme,
 Cot. 2 q. 5. that all errors in those that are opposite to the Pope
 cap. 8. are veniall and light; but in Papists all are haynous
 (d) Bucer and mortall. So much the alteration of the person
 in Schuffel. changeth the case with them. Hereupon Q. Eliza-
 lib. cit. Cal- beth enacted, not that it should be treason for any
 uin de rat. one to dissuade frō that religion which she had esta-
 concord. p. blished, vnlesse it were done with intention to in-
 862. duce him who was dissuaded, to the obedience of
 (e) Epist. the Bishop of Rome. And hereupon also some of
 Monitor. them openly professe, that they more esteeme Turks
 (f) Mart. then Papists; forsooth because the Turke agreeth
 in loc. tit. with them in hatred of the Pope and Popery, in re-
 de Euchar. spect whereof they little regard the consent in the
 §. 65. Hosp mysteries of the Trinity, and Incarnation and Pas-
 part. 2 fol. sion,
 134. 16).
 209.
 Brunsfeld.
 resp. ad
 Erasmo.

tion, and other articles of Christian fayth. Sixtly they make the forsaking of Popery an euident argument of true religion, and oppole their consent therein, as a sufficient cloake to couer all their dissentions in other matters. Zuinglius Prefat. Ecclesiast. tom. 1. fol. 39 : *It is an euident argument of true Religion among you, that you cast out all the filth of (Popish) idolatry and bridle the floathfull company of Priests and put them from the Church.* And when Cardinall Hosius objected to Protestants their disagreement about the Eucharist, Iames Andrews in his answere pag 367. sayth : *What is this dissention to you Papists? Be it we truly disagree in this point, yet in that we especially agree, that with one mind we impugne your Popery as true Antichristianisme.* And Brentius in the Preface of the same booke : *Otherwise with one consent they fight against Popery.* And to the same obiection Calvin in Confutat. Holland. pag. 576 sayth thus : *True; yet with one consent we all teach, that (Popish) idolatry is to be detested.* In like manner Beza in Hospin. part. 2. Hist. fol. 300 : *I confesse; yet in this we all agree with vnited minds to impugne your transubstantiation.* Sadeel also Respons. ad Sophism. Turriani pag. 562 : *Yet neuerthelesse this my litle booke will be witnesse with how conioyned strength all our Churches do set vpon the Popish errors.* And in indice Repet. pag. 808 : *It is well that all they who conioyned themselues to the reformed Church, with one consent reiect the Popes Primacy.* And D. Whitaker Contr. 2. quest. 5. cap. 8. pag. 521 : *Yet in the meane tyme we all agree against the Pope.* And in this vnity of theirs to be against the Pope, they greatly triumph. His maicesty in his monitory epistle p. 1743 *Almost the halfe part of the Christian world is gon out of Babylon.* And D. Andrews respons. ad Apol. Bellarm. cap. 14 : *Almost halfe of the Christian world is so farre vnited in one profession, as that they are gon out of Babylon.* And when Beza

In what
Protestants
especially
agrec.

nus

nushad found fault with him, because he sayd, *The King of great Britany and the Kings of Denmark and Sweden with the Princes of Germany who are of one beliefe with him, are a part of the Lords flock; because the Kings of Denmark and Sweden be Lutherans, and therefore are not of one beliefe, with the King of great Britany; Burhill in defence of him cap. 15. answereth: That, who are of one beliefe with King James, is put in steed of who with him refuse to be vnder the Pope. They meane then, that all those are of one beliefe with them, and be part of the Lords flock, who refuse to be vnder the Pope. Which kind of vnity is that, which his Maiesty in his declaration against Vorstius noted Heretiques to keep, saying pag. 49: There are in Hungary and Bohemia innumerable Heretiks, who agree together only in hatred of the Pope. But not only Heretiks, but also Iewes, Turcks and Infidells agree with Protestants in this point. An excellent vnity surely, & worthy of Christians, wherein they shall haue such partners and fellowes. Seauenthy I proue it, because when they be asked, who were Protestants before Luther, they produce no other then such as were aduersaries to the Pope. Illyricus being to make a role of witnesses, dares not call them Protestants or witnesses of the Protestant truth, but simply witnesses of the truth, or witnesses who reclaymed against the Pope and Popish errors. And in the Preface professeth, that he gathereth, as farrc as he cold, all those, who in any sort did before Luther giue testimony to the truth of Christ against the errors and suries of Antichrist. And l. 20. col. 1951. after he had brought forth all his witnesses, he sayth of them thus: They desired a fuller manifestation of the truth, which at last (sayth he) we in this sixteenth age haue obtained. That is, his witnesses attained not to the knowledge of Protestant truth, which*

*Editio
Lugdun.*

which was revealed but in the sixteenth age. Nevertheless they seemed witnesses good enough for Illyricus, because in some sort they were opposite to the doctrine and deeds of the Pope. Beza also lib. de notis Eccles. pag. 80. when he had objected to himself, that in former times their Church was not visible, answereth: *I say, that from the Apostles tyme there was scarce any age, in which as soone as this Antichrist (the Pope) began to put out his head, God did not raise some, who opposed themselves against his tyranny.* And to the same question thus answereth Sadeel in Refutat. art. 61. Polnan. pag. 851: *We are ready to shew, that there was no age, in which there were not some, who reprov'd your false Church.* Surely these men imagine Protestantcy to consist in opposition to the Pope and Popery, or they say nothing to the question proposed. Likewise D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 3. cap. 2. pag. 474. proueth, that the Protestant Church hath alwayes byn in Popery, because therein haue byn some, who though they communicated with Papists, yet before death reiect'd their opinions; which kind of prooffe supposeth, that it sufficeth to a Protestant to reiect Popish opinions.

5. You see then, that the cheife ringleaders of the Protestants confesse, that theirs and their followers end was to abate the authority of the Pope; that they decme the forsaking of the Pope to be the foundation, a good part, and summe of the Protestant building; that they account the leauing of Popery an euident argument of true religion; that they define, describe, paint, and name a Protestant by opposition to the Pope; that they say their faith differeth not from ours, but in denyall of some of our articles; that they deny, dissemble, and extenuate whatsoever they dislike in those, who are aduersaries

to the Pope; that they oppose their consent in opposition against the Pope as a buckler against all objections about their dissentions in other articles; & finally that being bidden to produce Protestants before Luther, they name such as any way opposed themselves against the Pope. What do all these things declare, but that which some of them say in plaine words, that the Protestant Church is a rable of all sects which are not Papists.

6. But out of all things which haue byn sayd in this and the former chapters. First we see, what great power Protestants take to themselves, that according as they please they include, or exclude the same men out of the Church. *VVho will not* (to vse S. Augustins words) *feare these men, who haue receiued such wonderfull power ouer men.* Secondly we see, that they imitate the old heretiks, who (as Tertullian sayth) make peace generally with all, and with whome diuision is their very vnity. For (as S. Augustin noteth) *the diuell hath stirred vp heretikes, as if they might be indifferently permitted in the city of God without amendment, as the city of confusion indifferently bad Philosophers of different, yea of contrary opinions.* Thirdly we see, how infamous a society Protestancy is, into which all heretikes and Schismatikes, likewise Idolaters, Infidels, Antichrist, Atheists, are admitted. What sinke euer did receiue such filth? Surely such a rable deserueth better the name of hell, then of the holy Church. Fourthly we see, how monstrous a company it is which consisteth of so different and opposite members. Fiftly, we may gather, what Protestants meane, when they say Protestants haue byn alwayes, or before Luther. For they meane not, that there haue byn alwayes some, who believed at least all their fundamentall articles, but

1.
What
followeth
of all hi-
therto
sayd.

2.
lib. 3. cont.
Crescon. c.
20.
Præscript.
c. 41. 42.
L. 12. de
Cicit. c. 50.

3.

4.

5.

What
they
meane by
a Prote-
stant in
sympast.

but that there were alwayes some, who (as they speake) opposed themselves against the Pope or his errors, whether they were otherwise Schismatics, Heretiks, infidels, or Atheists. Of which kind of men I deny not but there haue byn alwayes some rable, but none but a mad man will say, that it was the holy Church & spouse of Christ. Sixtly we see how litle Protestants account of their Church, fayth, and religion; and belieue nothing lesse then that it is the church of God, or fayth of Christ. For who doubteth, but Schisme, heresy, infidelity, Atheisme, are most pestilent plagues and internall darknesse directly opposite to ecclesiasticall Communion and fayth, which are the forme, life, & soule of the Church? And who can imagin, that he can associate and vnite together formes so contrary as are light and darknesse, life and death, truth and lies? or that the society in darknesse, lies, and death, as are the societies in Schisme, Heresy, and infidelity, can become one with the society in light, life, & truth, as the Church is? If therefore seriously they be- lieued their Church to be the church of Christ, they would neuer thinke, that she could become one with the society in Schisme, heresy, and infidelity. And this sometymes Protestants themselves perceiue. For Brentius in Appendice Recognit. thus speaketh to the Sacramentaries, when they desired to be held for brethren of the Lutherans, whom yet they condemned of heresy: *If they iudge our opinion to be impious, with what face do they desire to ioyne themselves with that Church which maintayneth impious doctrine, and to be held of her for brethren? VVhat fellowship (sayth Paul) is there of iniustice with iniustice? or what Comunion of light with darknesse, or what agreement of Christ with Belial? or what for the faythfull with the infidell? VVherefore if they desire this sincerely, and*

Note.

60

in earnest; they manifestly shew, that they make mockery of religion, as if it skil'd not which one follow, so he may passe his life peaceably and quietly. In like manner those of Wittenberge in their Refutation of the orthodoxall content pag. 636. say: *VVe cannot wounder inough, that seing they not only accuse the doctours of our Church of horrible and damned heresies, but also haue long since condemned them, to wit, of Arianisme, Nestorianisme, Eutichianisme, Marcionisme, Manicheisme, and the Monothelites heresies; neuerthelesse they dare account vs for brethren and desire our brotherhood. VVho that is carefull of piety and truth can persuade himselfe, that these Sectmasters do in earnest handle religion? For if we be such as we are indged of them, our friendship and fraternity is to be detested, not desired. Thus I speake the Lutherans to the Sacramentaries, which no whit lesse falleth vpon themselves, because they also challenge the Hussites and other old heretiks, whome they cannot excuse from holding vile heresies. Finally we see, how vncertaine Protestants be in determing what a Protestant is, and what is necessary to the essence & making of a Protestant; & consequently how vncertaine they must be, whome to hold for one of their household, whome for a stranger, whome for a brother, whom for an enemy; which church or company they must embrace, which they must fly, which they must account the spouse of Christ, which the Synagogue of Satan. Then the which vncertainty nothing can be more miserable in matter of religion. Wherefore sith they are so vncertaine in this matter, we must therein settle some certainty, and that according to their own principles.*

*That it is necessary for a Protestant to believe
with only speciall fayth that himselfe
is iustified.*

C H A P. VI.

1. **A** B O V E all things it is most necessary to an
invisible or true Protestant in the sight of
God (as they terme him) that with only speciall or
peculiar fayth he believe some thing belonging to
himselfe, to wit, that he is iustified in Christ, or (as
they vse to speake) that with fayth he apprehend
Christs iustice, and apply it vnto himself in particu-
lar. And to a visible Protestant in sight of men it is in
like sort necessary, that he professe himself to believe
with such a fayth that he is iustified in Christ. For
example; For Luther to haue byn a true Protestant
before God, it is needfull that he haue truly believed
himselfe to be iustified by only the foresayd speciall
fayth, which he had of his own iustice; which faith
they call speciall or particuler, because it was parti-
cular to Luther, no man being bound to believe Lu-
ther to be iustified besides himselfe. And for Luther
to haue byn a visible Protestant in the sight of men,
it was needful in like manner to haue professed him-
self to haue believed that he was iustified by only the
sayd fayth. The same I say of Calvin and of euery
Protestant in particuler. That according to their
doctrine it is most necessary to a Protestant that he
believe himselfe to be iustified by only speciall fayth
is manifest. First because they teach, that a man is iu-
stified by only speciall fayth, wherwith he belieueth
F some-

something belonging to himselfe alone, not by an vniuersall or Catholike fayth whereby he belieueth the mysteriyes of Christian religion common to all, and which euery one must belieue, for this fayth they call historicall, and say it may be in such as are not iust, yea in hipocrites and Deuills. Seing therefore in their opinion no man is a true Protestant in the sight of God, but only he that is iust, nor any iust but who hath a speciall or peculiar fayth wherewith he apprehendeth Christs iustice to himselfe, it is manifest, that according to their principles, none can be a true Protestant before God, vnlesse he haue the foresayd speciall fayth; and in like manner that none can be a visible Protestant before men, vnlesse he professe to belieue iustification by only speciall fayth; because none can be accounted to be of any religion, vnlesse he professe to belieue those means of obtayning iustification and remission of sins, which that religion teacheth. Calvin 3. Instit. cap. 2. §. 16: *None is a true faythfull man, but he, who with a solid persuasion that God loueth him, assureth himselfe of all things from his goodnes &c.* And §. 39. he sayth: *VVithout this, Christianity standeth not.* And in Rom. 1. v. 7: *Hence we gather, that none do rightly account themselues faythfull, vnlesse they certainly assure themselues that God loueth them.* M. Perkins in his exposition of the Creed col. 780: *No man can belieue himselfe to be a member of the Church, vnlesse he firmly and certainly persuaded that he is predestinated to eternall life.* Besides Calvin in his litle Catechisme cap. de fide defineth iustifying fayth, to be *a certaine and stedfast knowledge of our heauenly Fathers goodwill towards vs.* The like definition he hath 3. Instit. cap 2. §. 2, Luther in cap. 4. Ioelis tom. 4. and generally all Lutherans and Sacramentaries, except that where some define it to be a know-

None
faythfull
without
speciall
fayth.

What
fayth is
according
to Prote-
stants.

Parents l. I.
de Iustif.
cap. II,

a knowledge, others say it is an assurance or confidence of Gods favour. Hence it is manifest, that they account none a iust or faythfull man, vnlesse he haue a speciall fayth of his iuitification and Gods favour towards him.

2. Secondly I proue the same out of diuers commendations of Protestants touching the necessity and excellency of this article. For Luther tom. 1. in dilp. fol. 410. sayth: *In vaine he belieueth other articles, who denieth that we are iustified by only fayth.* And tom. 2. lib. cont. Millam fol. 390. he sayth, that this article *The* is the summe of his doctrine and Ghospell. And lib. de votis *Suame.* fol. 278. that this is the definition of a Christian, who belieueth to be iustified by the only works of Christ alone, without his *The De-* owne. Tom 3. in Psalm. Grad. fol. 573: That the only *finition.* knowledge of this article conserueth the Church. And fol. 576. that it is the summe of Christian doctrine, the sunne *The Sun.* which lightneth the Church, which falling the Church falleth. Tom. 4. in cap. 53. Isaia fol. 200. he writeth, that it is as it were the foundation on which the Gospell relyeth, and which alone distinguisheth his religion from all others. Fol. 201. that it is like the liuely fountaine whence all treasures of diuine wisdom do flow, and the foundation of all the Church and Chri- *The fou-* stianity. And Prefat. in Ionam, that it is the cheise of *dation.* Christian doctrine, and the summe of all the scripture. Tom. 5. Prefat. in Galat. fol. 269. he affirmeth, that it is the only rock of the Church. And 273: *The rock.* VVho holdeth not this article, are (sayth he) either Iewes, or Turks, or Papists, or Heretiques. And fol. 274. that in this doctrine alone the Church is made and consisteth. And fol. 333. he plainly confesseth, that it is his only defence, without which (as he speaketh) both we and heretiks together with vs, had long since *Their* perished. Tom. 6. in cap. 21. Genes. fol. 265. he termeth *defeace.* it the cheifest article of fayth. And tom. 7. epist. ad Liouenes

fol. 499. auoucheth, that it is the only way to heauen, and
 The only way. the summe of Christian life. And finally in the first article
 concluded at Smalcald: In this article are and consist all
 which in our life we teach, witnesse, and do against the Pope, the
 Diuell, and all the world. This and much more writeth
 Luther in commendation of the necessity and ex-
 cellency of the article touching iustification by only
 fayth. And of the contrary beliefe concerning iusti-
 fication by works tom. 5. in cap. 3. Galat. fol. 257. he
 sayth: It is the sinck of all euills. And in cap. 4. fol. 402:
 That it taketh away the truth of the Ghospell, fayth, & Christ
 himselfe.

3. With Luther herein agree the Lutherans.
 For the Confession of Auspurg cap. de discrimine ci-
 borum, sayth, that this article is the proper doctrine of the
 ghospell. And the Apology therof cap. de iustificat. that
 it is the principall place of Christian doctrine. And cap. de
 poenit: the cheifest place and principallest article about which
 they fight with their aduersaries; and the knowledge wherof they
 account most necessary to all. The Confession of Saxony,
 that this article being extinguished, there is no difference be-
 twixt the Church and other men. The Confession of Bo-
 hemia, that this article is held of them for the cheifest of all, as
 which is the summe of all Christianity and piety. The vniuer-
 sity of Wittemberg. tom. 2. Lutheri. fol. 248: It is the
 cheifest article of the ghospell. The Ministers of the Prince
 Electour in Colloq. Aldeburg. pag. 1. say, that this
 article is as it were the summe and last end, to which all the
 other articles do look vnto. And those of the D. of Saxony
 pag. 132. affirme, that as long as this doctrine standeth, Lu-
 ther standeth, yea Paul, yea God. This doctrine falling, Luther
 falleth, Paul falleth, God falleth; and all men are necessarily
 This fall- ling, God
 falleth. This article the stay of saluation. Melancthon tom. 2.

Lutheri

Lutheri fol. 506. termeth it the cheifest article. Kemnicc part. 1. Examen. tit. de Iustificat. pag. 231: The cheifest place. And in locis part. 1. tit. de Iustificat. pag. 216. writeth, that it is like the castle and principall bulwarck of all Christian doctrine and religion. Lobeckius disput. 22. pag. 515. addeth, that it is one of the cheifest points of our sayth, because the prore and poupe of Christianity is containd therein, and on it hangeth the hinges of our saluation. Scnuffelburg. tom 8. Catal. hæret. affirmeth, it to be the cheifest article, wherem consisteth our saluation, and which is the head of our religion. Finally (to omit other Lutherans) Brentius in Apolog. Wittemberg. part. 3. pag. 703. sayth, that the essentiall difference betwixt a Protestant and a Papist is, that of the Protestant religion these are the first principles: The scriptur, Christ the Sonne of God, & sayth or assurance of Gods sanour towards vs for Christs sake.

The Bulwarck.

The essentiall difference.

4. Neither do Sacramentaries dissent herein from the Lutherans, For the Confession of Balle auoucheth it to be the first and cheifest point in Euangelicall doctrine. The French Confess. art. 18. calleth it the foundation. Zuinglius in Hagoge fol. 268. sayth it is the summe of the Ghospell. Bucer Respons. ad Abrincens. pag. 612. And Gualter Prefat. in Ioan. write, that about this article is almost all the whole substance of dispute with them and Papists. Bullinger in Compend. lib. 5. cap. 1. termeth it the cheifest point of holy, Euangelicall, and Apostolicall doctrine. And lib. 8. cap. 8: The highest and cheifest head of Christian doctrine and of sayth. Peter Martyr in locis tit. de Iustif. col. 939. sayth, it is the head, fountaine, and stay of all piety. Tom. 2. epist. ad Peregrin. col. 136: It is the summe of summes, and cheifest head. Calvin 4. Institut. cap. 11. §. 1. that it is the cheifest proppe of religion. lib. 11. §. 17: The summe of all piety. And Respons. and Sadolet. pag. 125. that the knowledge thereof being gone, Christs glory is x-

The summe of Summes.

tinct, religion abolished, and hope of saluation wholly ouerturned.
 And lib. de Necess. Reform. fol. 47. that the safety of the
 Church dependeth vpon this doctrine no lesse then mans life depen-
 deth of his soule, Pareus in Procem. lib. de Iustificat: On
 this alone the hinges of our comfort and saluation do hang. And
 lib. 2. cap. 2. affirmeth that it was the cheifest cause of the
 separation of the Protestant Church from Popery. And lib. 4.
 cap. 2. sayth: The only doctrine of obtayning iustice and salua-
 tion by only fayth and of loosing them by incredulity, is the sincere
 and proper gospell; all other doctrine in the scripture belongeth
 to the law. And those of Geneva Prefat. Syntag. Con-
 fess. avouch, that this article is the groundworke, forme,
 and soule of Christian religion; the summe of Euangelicall do-
 ctine, of which men are called faythfull and true Christians,
 without which the knowledge of other articles hath no wholesome
 fruit. For it is the substantiall, inward, and formall
 cause of saluation; of which all Sacraments instituted by God
 are and were pledges and seales, vnto which article all the
 other do tend as to their center, and in which mans felicity con-
 sisteth.

The Prore
 & Puppe.

5. Neither do our English Protestants make
 lesse account of this their article of iustification by
 only fayth. For D. Whitaker Cont. 2. quest. 6. cap. 3.
 pag. 562. sayth: It seemes to be the cheifest of all, and most
 fundamentall, as in which the Prore and puppe of our saluation
 consisteth; and who faine any other meanes of iustification, do
 ouerthrow the foundation and most necessary heads of Christian
 religion, and are fallen from saluation and eueylasting life. And
 Respons. ad Rat. r. Camp. he writeth thus of their
 doctrine of Iustification by only fayth: If Iames, or a
 beaucnly Angell disallow it, he is impure, wicked, and to be de-
 tested to hell. D. Humfrey in his oration de vitando fer-
 mento calleth this article, The cheifest point and hinges of
 fayth. D. Fulke de Success. pag. 4. The principall head of the
 gospell.