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Honour'd Cosen,

Through Kindred, Education, and known love all conspire to make me obnoxious to any good Counsel you please to give me; yet the versness I have from answering Books, permitted me not, in our last interview, to promise obedience to your directions. But, since that happiness of seeing you, an unanimous consent of other friends has made me more steadily reflect on what you desired; and considering besides, that the doctrine of Rushworth's Dialogues takes
Epistle

takes a path not much beaten by our modern Controvertists. I resolv'd to imitate the example of the penitent Son, who, after denial, perform'd his Father's commands. Behold then, here the brood hatch and brought forth by your advice: 'prye heaven it prove worthy your acknowledging! which I say not, to engage you in the patronage of what I deliver, farther the truth shall convince your judgment; or make the World imagine these Conceptions may find shelter in your breast: No, I am cruel to my writings, as the Ostridge to her Eggs: when once they are laid, let nature play her part to foster or smother the Chicks, as she pleases. Let truth condemn or commend my sayings. He that is ready to renounce falsity, and acknowledge weakness, is stronger than envy, and beyond the shot of malice. Neither have I occasion to suspect any imputation should fall upon you for this publishing my Present to you as I fear it happen'd to another friend. For, I apprehend, I may have written in some Periods, which none will expect should be approved by you. Only, who understand
Dedicated.

The amplitude of your soul, may know, it is able to harbour with indifference what is spoken against your own sense and consent; it being the gift and task of a wise man, Imperare liberis. What I have performed, wherein fail'd, is your part to judge for myself, I can profess I desire not to irritate the meanest person, nor seek I the glory of opposing the Greatest: my aim is, to open and establish truth; Frivolous and by-questions I have on set purpose avoided. Whether all objections of moment are answered, as I cannot affirm, so I can protest I am no more conscious of declining any, then of dissembling, when I write myself.

Your affectionate Colen.

Paris, Sept. 21. 1652. and humble servant,

Tho. White.
A
Second Dedication
to the same Person.

Learned, and by me ever to
be honour'd Cosen!

Is so long since the former Address
to you was written, that no won-
der it should now be ashamed to
come abroad without some ex-
cuse to justify the slowness of its
pace; which is no other, than a simple pro-
test, that it has not stuck in my hands for at
least a whole year and an half. Upon these
few words I could sit down and confidently
promise my self your pardon; But emer-
gent imputations force me to a larger Apo-
logy: The expedition in some other late
Works of mine rendring the seeming neglect
of this more obnoxious to exception; as
if I were rather ambitious to display the
errors of some of our own side, then the en-
ormities of professed Enemies; and your self
are conceiv'd to have a part in this suspi-
tion.

Now
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Now, since, from that long and constant commerce you have still maintain'd with true Vertue & Learning, I cannot but expect a great rationality and amplitude in your Soul, even to bear with the defective soules of others, as far as you see they govern themselves by that measure of understanding which God affords them, I find my self oblig'd to give you the best account I can of my proceedings, which I doubt not will prove so much an easier task, as you, with whom I am to deal, are of a higher strain, then our trivial discoursers; for, as I think, those who set up their rest, that there is no science to be attain'd by study, are pardonable, if they chuse opinions by pretence of devotion or reality of interest: So I give my cause for lost, if they be my Judges. But I hope the great fire of truth, which first kindled in my young breast a glowing of it, and an earnestnes of seeking it in St. Thomas his way, has not been by length of time as much quench'd in you, as quickn'd in me; and therefore with a full confidence I represent my Case to you, not doubting but the evidence produce will justify, if not the action it self, at least the necessity I have to act as long as the present perswasion is not forc'd from me.

To come then to my Plea, if St. Peter commands
mands us to be ready to give satisfaction to all that shall ask it, concerning the hope that is in us, by which is meant our belief, the basis and firm support of our hope; If the design of all that meddle with this sort of study should chiefly aim to shew, that the doctrines of Christianity are conformable to reason, and such as a prudent Person, though also learned, may imbrace, without prejudice either to his discretion, or knowledge: If the suggesting to our first parents, that God sought to govern them like fools, without the least discernment betwixt good or evil, be the greatest and unworthiest calumny Satan himself could invent to charge upon the Almighty: If it be the basest condition that can befall a rational Essence, and the most contrary both to God and man, whose natures consist in knowing and reasoning; what can I conclude, but that such Teachers, as, for ignorance or interest, obstinately resolve (in treating with those who are out of the Church) to maintain opinions, whereof no account can be made, either out of Antiquity or Reason, are unworthy the function they profess, and highly obstructive to the progress of the Catholik faith?

You, who have looked into the large Volumes of Controvertisits on both sides, cannot but know they are petty questions, and the
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Impugnances of private opinions, that swel those vast Tomes into such an unweldy and intolerable bulk; I'm sure not only I, but divers of my friends have had experience, that those very opinions (for opposing which, I am exclaimd against) have been the retardment of the most ingenious and disinterested party of Protestants; and that others, who were become Catholiks, out of a pure necessity which they saw of submitting themselves to some unerring authority, when they heard their faith declar'd in a rational way, found themselves eas'd, as it were, of chains and imprisonment, and translated into a natural state and liberty. I need not press, how ulcers in our vitals, are more dangerous then in our outward members; and that we cannot convince others, whilst our selves are ignorant in the Points we pretend to teach them. No wise Captain searches the Hospitals for Perdues & Forcers of breaches. It is a great step towards the reducing others to reason, if first we make our own thoughts rational. This is my endeavour, this is my fault, for which I am so deeply censur'd, even by Catholiks.

As for Persons, my writings neither name nor touch any: and those who make themselves pointed at by their forward boasts of defending the opinions I dispute against, either
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ther understand not me or themselves: for, did
it deserve the pains, I would undertake to
shew out of their printed Writers, that they
doe not, with any universality, maintain
those tenets I contradict. If in this present
Treatise I have in one place descended to
more particulars then my course and nature
incline me to, I appeal to your own Judgment,
whether I do more then follow my
Adversary, by replying upon his very
words; and therefore your commands ought
to be my excuse.

But some think, at least this conjunction
improper to begin this Work, & I wish they
could give me a good cause of delay; they
should finde me very ready to accept it; But
I know no time in which destructive Errors
should live unconfuted; our great Master,
securing us by his example, neque ad horam
cessimus; nor can your self be ignorant with
what fury and violence the opposite opinion
strives at this very day to possess the Church
of God, and break the eternal Rule of Christi-
ian faith. Wherefore, though conscious of
my own weaknes, and that, unless God ex-
traordinarily shews his power, my endeav-
ours will take no place, yet propter Sion non
tacebo, & propter Hierusalem non quiescam.

Your most obliged Cofen, and
27 March 1654.

obedient servant,

T. W.
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He Reader is desired to take notice, that this Apology particularly relates to the last Edition of Rushworth's Dialogues (in 80 of the Long-Primer-Letter 1654, as which alone has felt throughout this Author's last band) and principally undertakes the refutation of Lucius Lo. Falkland's Discours of Infallibility, and George Lo. Digby now Earl of Bristol's printed Letters to Sir Ken. Digby; which he performs in a stile modest and respective, answerable to the dignity their Persons, and civility of their Writings.

The Animadversions upon Daille are app'd to the English Translation by T. S. not to the French Original; wherein the Reader will easily pardon those uncourteous expressions he shall meet with, if he consider how little favour he deserves from his equals, that insolently condemns Betters; nay perhaps approve the justice of necessary a resentment; since 'twere unreasonable in him to pretend the least regard from his temporaries, that has compos'd so infamous and injurious a Libel against all Antiquity.
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The Introduction.

Hus it will sometimes happen, that events of greatest importance take their rise from small occasions. The Controversy, this following Treatise undertakes, began in a slight familiar conference between two intimate friends and kinsmen, as it were only for exercise to train themselves, and practice their postures: but since by the entrance of new Allies is become of so high concernment, that what at first was a private voluntary skirmish, seems now to spread it selfe into a publique and solemn War.
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War. Nor need I straie much to make good the phrase, since the eminent Names, on the one side, and the great advantage of ground on the other, may justly be admitted to supply the number of an Army in both.

And, because I desire to prepare myself with the fittest proportion I could for the assaults of my Adversaries, I have declin'd the Sword and Buckler, and taken up a single Rapier; chang'd the antique weapons of Dialogue, (though, in my opinion, they want neither ornament nor particular efficacy) into the modern mode of direct discourse: Wherein, as I confess, Their gilded Armour shines more, and dazles the eye; so I fear not, when we come to charge, our courser steel will prove substantial and impenetrable. However I shall not spend much time in parley; but after a short relation how I come to be drawn into the quarrel, and by what method I intend to carry it on, I shall immediately advance to a close encounter.

Before those Dialogues (wherein that original private conference is at larg delivered) were brought to light, or (as I think) fully conceiv'd in the Authors brain; an honoured friend, and Patron of mine had couch'd some small, but quintessential part of their doctrine in a little pithy Present to
for Tradition.

a new-converted Lady; and having cited it afterward for brevity fake, in a controver-
sfial Epistle to an eminent Friend, engag'd it therby into an almost fatal combat; nothing but truth being able to rescue it from so potent an enemy.

Besides, a deceased friend of mine having oblig'd me to declare my opinion concern-
ing a witty discourse made by one of his acquaintance, extorted from me an unlick'd Mola, representing suddenly and imperfectly, my judgement in reference to that Au-
thors work. This again, stirring the same humours, drew the doctrin into an eminent danger of encountering opposition. Never-
thelessse, God so ordering it, many years past, in calm and happy daies of peace, the two Adversaries ( whom these occasions had provoked ) not publishing their Labours, as things below their persons; till all-disco-
vering time ( as I believe ) against the Au-
thors intentions, brought them both to light, and, by consequence, an imputation on those Dialogues, and a necessity on me to dis-engage the honour of their Composfer.

In order to which, my intention is not to reply minutely to either of the Opponents works; muchles to handle any by-questions: but only to chuse out of them, or any o-
thers, what I conceive may possibly be thought
thought as yet unanswer'd, and consequently capable of prejudicing those Dialogues.

By this reserved and moderate temper, I hope to free my self from all such incivilities as necessarily attend on the undertaking to convince a particular person of weakness or inconsequence in his discours, from which kind of captious proceedings, besides my Reason, I am beholding to my Nature for its extream aversestes. Besides, in answering a writing, many impertinent quarrels are pick'd, the substantial controversie lost or confounded, and the Truth it self, by multiplicity, left more obscure then when the disputant began: for, where many questions are started and none deeply searched into, the Reader goes away without any resolution, more then what himself brought along with him. I intend therefore with all candor and fidelity, to select such objections as I think really interest the Controversie; and handle them without relation to Books or distinction of Authors, or citations of places: as one who seeks Truth, not the glory of confuting or vanity of answering.

But some may be unsatisfied with my proceedings, and demand, if this be my intention, why do I cite those Authors in particular; and, as it were, make a shew of answering, without any effect: I desire those to consider,
consider, that the names of Author's carry weight, among two sorts of Readers; One, such as diligently peruse the books written on both sides; to whom I offer this satisfaction, that they may find the solution to any difficulty which occurs concerning this subject, in their writings: The other, such who look no farther then the Title page, or whether a book be answer'd or no, are insolent upon the writers name, and impertinently clamorous, that 'tis a Piece beyond all possibility of reply, be it never so weak and trivial; to whom the simple profession that 'tis answer'd, is a wedg fit for their knot.

I must confess, next to the assurednesse of my Cause, 'tis my chiefest comfort to deal with Persons of such quality: such as the Protestant party never produced before: it seems to have chosen them to live by, or die with. Two, whose Merits found the way of honouring their Descents, by their generosity; whose eloquence none were found to exceed, whose wits none will be found to equal. What erudition in Languages, or acutenes in Logick could furnish, was treasure'd in their breasts: But above all, a comprehensive judgement, in managing the numerous and weighty affairs of a Kingdom to the very heightning that sublime and subtlest
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Subtlest Office, (Secretary of State) which they both, successively, exalted to such a pitch, that it must expect a fall in whoever shall succeed them.

One is, the right honourable George Lord Digby (now Earl of Bristol) ever mounting the scale of Honour to a degree so far above the reach of others, that 'tis even beyond their sight: The other, Lucius Lord Falkland, who crown'd his deserved Lawrell with a wreath of Oaken Scyons; dying in such a posture, as if mischief could not have ravag'd England, had it not made its passage through the breast of that Martyr of Peace. I can accuse him of nothing!, but that he left this Book behind him; it being too plain what unhappy impression it makes in his Friends, since myself, almost a stranger, cannot read those quaint and gentile expressions, those rarities of wit, those coruscations of Greek and Latin remarques, and (which most of all surprizes my admiration) those Noble sweetneſSES and civilities so unexpected in a quarrelling Treatife; but I feel in my heart an unusual sorrow and regret, that our thoughts cannot stay on him, without the sad check of a suit.

But, since we are out of hope to resuscitate him that's gon, like the day he died on; let us (by Davids example) leave these flattering
for Tradition:

tering weaknesses of nature, and seek severe reason in the controversy we pretend to manage.

THE FIRST ENCOUNTER,

Explicating the Argument, by which Rushworth proves the Infalibility of Tradition.

The Dialogues (in whose defence we now appear, as Second) govern their discourse by this fair method: First, they treat and settle these definitions; Tradition we call, the delivery of Christ's doctrine from hand to hand, in that part of the world which, with propriety, is call'd Christian: By Christ's doctrine, we mean that which was generally preach'd by the Apostles, and contains all such points as are necessary to the salvation of the World; not only in particular, to single persons, but for government of the Church, and bringing multitudes, with convenience, to perfection in this life, and felicity in the next. Which being establisht, they immediately proceed to this general Position, that All Christ taught, or the Holy Ghost suggested to the Apostles, of this nature, is
is, by a direct uninterrupted line, entirely and 
fully descended to the present Church, which 
communicates with, and acknowledges subjection 
to the Roman: Adding also the convers of 
that proposition, viz. Nothing is so descen-
ded, but such Truths; nor any thing held by 
this tenure, but what is so descended; which 
being cast up, amounts to this great Con-
clusion, No error was ever, or can be embraced 
by the Church, in quality of a matter of faith.

The proof consists in this: Since 'tis con-
essed the Catholik Church goes upon this 
Maxim, that Her Doctrine is received from 
Christ, and still handed along to the present 
generation; they who cavil at this assertion, 
should assign some Age when they conceive 
an error crept in; and the maintainer 
should prove it enter'd not in that Age, Be-
cause that Age held nothing was to be ad-
mitted, as of Faith, except what was deli-
ver'd to it by the former: but the Objectors 
themselves say, this supposed error was 
not deliver'd by the former, since they put 
it to be, now, first, believ'd; thersfore the 
Age in which they imagin this error crept 
in, could not be the first that believ'd it.

And, lest some might reply, though the 
present Roman Church stands now upon the 
proposed maxim, yet anciently it did not; 
the same argument may be thus reiterated,
If
If this principle which now governs the Church had not always done so, it must have been introduced in some Age since the Apostles: name therefore the Age, and immediately 'tis urged, either the Church had assurance, in that Age, all she held was descended lineally, as we spake, from the Apostles, or not: If so, then questionless she held her doctrine upon that maxim; For it is the only undoubted and self-evident principle: If not, then she wilfully belied herself, and conspired to damn all her posterity, voluntarily taking up this new Rule of faith and commanding it to be accepted by all the world, as the necessary doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, descended upon the present age by universal Tradition from their Ancestors, and for such to be delivered to their children; and all this against the express evidence of her own conscience. Thus far reaches the argument.

He that shall compare this perpetuation of the Church, with the constancy of propagating mankind; and proportion the love of happiness and natural inclination to truth, (which is in the superior part of mankind, and commands powerfully in it) to the material appetite of procuring corporeal succession, and weigh what accidents are able and necessary to interrupt the progress of
of one and the other, will find the propagation of Religion far stronger and less defe\ntible, then that of mankind; supposing them once rooted alike in universality and settledness. Since therefore the means of conducting nature to its true and chief end, Felicity, are more principally intended, then those by which it is simply preserv'd in being; this Contemplator will clearly discern, that if humane nature continue to the last and dreadful day, this succession also of a true Church must be carried on through the same extent of time: there appearing indeed no purpose why the world should endure a minute longer, if this once come to fail; that part of mankind, which arrives to bliss, being the end why the rest was made, as mankind is the end for which all the other material Creatures are set on work.

Again, if a rational discoursfer should plot in his head how, with condescendence to the weakness of our nature, he might bring mankind to bliss; and, to this end, plant in it a perpetual and constant knowledge of the true and straight way thither; & did observe that Man in his immature age is naturally subject to believe, and after his full growth, tenacious of what he had suck'd in with his milk: could he chuse but see, that to make the Mothers flatter into
into their Children the first elements of the acquisition of Beatitude, and continually go on nursing them up in the maxims of piety, till their stronger years gave a steadiness to their minds; must needs be the most sweet and connatural way that can be imagin'd, to beget a firm and undoubted assent to those happy principles.

If he think on, and chance to light on this truth, that the greatest part of mankind, some through dulness of understanding, some by the distractions of seeking necessaries for their subsistence, or at least conveniences for their accommodation, and others for the diffluence of nature to Pleasures and Vanities, are, to their very departing hour, wholly incapable of searching out their Religion, either by their own contemplation or the learned books of others: I cannot doubt but such a considerer would without the least difficulty or hesitation, conclude that, were it his design to set up a Religion, which he would have constantly and universally propagated, he must of necessity pitch upon this way; And so, with a resolute and pious confidence pronounce, if God has not already taken this course, certainly he should have done it.

To these considerations give my pen leave to add the confession of our Adversaries, who
who boldly acknowledge the Roman Church has had universal Tradition for the whole body of its faith ever since St. Gregory's days; which is now a thousand years, and very near two parts of the three that Christian Religion has endured. They confess those Doctrins, which are common to us and them, remain in our Church uncorrupted, and have still descended from Father to Son, by vertue of Tradition, since the very times of the Apostles. They will not deny the Ages, betwixt Constantine and St. Gregory, flourished with an infinity of Persons famous both for piety and learning; and the Church never more vigilant, never more jealous, being continually alarm'd by such Troops of powerful and subtle Hereticks: so that there is no likelihood, gross errors (such as Idolatry and Superstition import) could creep in undiscern'd, in those days. And perhaps, much less betwixt Constantine and the Apostles; the time being so short that it scarce exceeds the retrospection of those who liv'd with Constantine: At least that age could evidently know what was the faith of Christendom in the age of the Apostles great Grand-children, and they again be certainly assured of the Doctrin of the Apostles disciples, their Grandfathers. Which is an evidence beyond all testimony
mony of writers, that since Constantines time it was known by a kind of self-fight what the Grandchildren of the Apostles held, and it could not be doubted of them but they knew and held the doctrin of the Apostles; that, I say, in Constantines time, the publike doctrin of Christianity was the doctrin of the Apostles.

Besides, the communication of Christians being very difficult and infrequent, during those persecutions; the contagion also of heresies scatter'd it self slowly among Christians in those times. And here I shall note a ridiculous cavil, very common not only in the mouths of the more rash and shallow Protestants, but even in the writings of many of their gravest and most solemn Doctors, who cry out against the Ignorance of our Church, as the cause of our errors, and yet put the Ages in which they insult, that Frigebat Scriptura cum vetustis Autoribus, some hundreds of years after the time, wherein they acknowledg the doctrins, termed errors, were already flourishing; as if they could proceed, from a defect which follow'd them: A flander so palpably absur'd that all the charity I have can scarce persuade me to think they are not blinded rather with malice then ignorance, that dare vent such gross contradictions.
And now, having abridg'd as 'twere, the whole sense of Rushworths Dialogues concerning Tradition, into this short compendium; I will apply my pen to answer what exceptions are taken, against either the forme or matter of that Discourse.

THE SECOND ENCOUNTER,

Defeating three oppositions made against Tradition.

The first objection against the form is, that I put my Adversary to prove his position instead of going about to maintain my own. This they imagin, because I bid them assign the Age; which they take to be as much as a demand of them to prove that in such a time came in the error: but 'tis a plain mistake. For I do not require they should prove the errour began in such an Age; but only exact of them, for Argument sake, to name the Age in which they find most difficulty for me to conclude, or wherein they conceive the sinnew of my discours will be most slack and feeble: for the force of the main argument is indifferent to
any Age they can pitch upon, equally demonstrative in all, and so, by striking at every one, concludes against all. This I say not, any way to disclaim the advantage we Catholicks have, whilst we press our adversary to prove his Thesis, being no less a just then strong and secure retreat; and which I reserve my self the liberty of retiring to, perhaps, at another time: but now only urge him to name one Age at hazard, meerly to give way to the prosecution of the argument; a Justice I might do for my self, if I would, without his courtesie, and have all the laws of disputation bear out in it.

It is therefore to little purpose to demand, whether I ask of the first man that held such opinion, or when it came to be universal (though the question be plainly of this latter, for we hold it was ever so;) nor is there any art necessary to answer it, the argument made being indifferent to all. The still therefore required, is only to know what belongs to the form of demonstrating; or the most part, indeed, not found in the main discourses of Rhetoricians. But the adversary thinks, when the Question is put concerning a Doctrine's being Universal, it must suppose none to hold the contrary opinion; as if we could not know what is the
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the publick Faith of France, because perhaps a few conceal'd persons may believe from what different. Wherin, he reflects not, that Heresie signifies the cleaving to a private opinion: so that, when there were any such in former ages, that very thing made them Heretics (how good wits or great learning so ever they had) if they dissented from the doctrine deliver'd by their forefathers. He presses, Catholicks cannot tell when the communicating of Children began, since St. Austin thinks it an Apostolical Tradition. We answer, we are of that mind too but with this qualification, that it was Tradition begun by some Apostles, not all in some Countries, not all, in some circumstances, not all: And therefore 'twas neither superstition to use it, nor sacriledge to leave it off; how strongly for ever the opponents avers one of these two to be unavoidable.

The second opposition made against this form is, that 'tis a fallacy of that kind, called Sorite, in which the Scepticks found great difficulty, that they used to press them against the Stoicks and other dogmatists, as insoluble and manifestly demonstrating there was no science. But, to understand the meaning of this objection, the demonstration propos'd is to begin from the Apostles time: and so it must be suppose
fed, that the next Age after the Apostles, in any controversy against new docttins, examin'd no farther then on which side stood the verdict of the Apostles, whereof they could not be ignorant. The Argument therefore pressed that the next (that is, the third Age) must of necessity take the same method against its Novellists, convincing them of falsity, because their doctrine was contrary to that of those who had heard the Disciples of the Apostles speak. And so, since the Tradition of Faith was convey'd from age to age, stil with this caution, that the latter was to believe such a doctrin, because receiv'd from the former, upon this warrant that it descended lineally from Christ in the same manner, to them, as they deliver'd it to their posterity, it necessarily follows, that this doctrin could not but continue pure even to our present time: unless some age should prevaricate all bounds of truth and nature, and deliver something to the following age, as traditionally deriv'd from Christ, which had not been receiv'd.

This argument, so propos'd (though I now not whether so understood) seem'd to he opponent like the ratiocination of one Mr. Thinn, a melancholy Philosopher, who er swaded himself, a person might be found that,
that could leap from off Pauls (for sure he needed a high standing) to Rome, because it was possible some man might leap full twenty foot, and no doubt but another somewhat more, and still another more then he and so without end; therfore among all one quick springer would be found, who could make his jump from hence to the Capitol.

But certainly he that weigh'd the two arguments, might without extraordinary study, have found there was some difference in their form: Mr. Thinn, being oblig'd to tak variety of men undetermined: but this argument engaging only sixteen ages, and peradventure not needing above six, or in rigour, some three, and those such as hav had a real existence, whereas the Worlds du rance and latitude are not sufficient to finde men enough to justify Mr. Thinn's Process. This I say was obvious enough to any mean understanding, not preoccuped with pre judice against the conclusion. But one who had understood how Aristotle unwrapped Zeno's fallacies, might easily have known that Infinity it self could not add more then one full foot to Mr. Thinn's leapers: if the encrease were made by sub-pro portional parts, wherof the first was on half foot; and if by equal quantities, as Fee
or Inches, he would soon come to an end of his addition, unless he put mens strength and nimblenesse to be infinite. But to sir Judge of Religion, of eternal blifs and damnation, some curious and unhappy wits dare think requires not so much indifferency nor reflection as the composition of quantity.

Yet I cannot but admire it could scape a piercing ey to discern, that as the consequent of Mr. Thinnes discourse is ridiculous and impossible, so that of the proposed demonstration is evident and undeniable. For what ingenuous forehead will deny, but such verities as all the world allows to remain still untainted in the Church of Rome, have descended by this traditionary way to us from Christ? Wherfore both the possibility and actuality of this way is not only acknowledg'd by the unanimous confession of all parties, but its force and efficacy made evident by the downright violence of reason: all the controversy being meerly about the multitude and sufficiency of the things receiv'd, not the impotency of the means to convey them to us.

But, to make an end of this petty Question, I appeal to all Masters, nay even Scholars in Geometry, whether this form of arguing be not the same that Euclid, Archi-
medes and Apollonius use in their severest demonstrations? As when Euclid undertakes to demonstrate this plain and elementary Theoreme, that No Circle can touch another in more then one point; himself acts the part of the Denier, and according to the law of Mathematicks, supposes at random the other point, to see whether the Proposition be maintainable: and if the Contadins in the point assign'd be proved impossible, by an argument applicable to any other that can be offered, the Theoreme remains infallibly demonstrated, and the Rules of that precise and strict Science perfectly comply with.

The third opposition is drawn out of a conceited impossibility of the case; and so they demand how can it come to passe that all the Doctors of one age should meet together, to instruct the world of Scholar that are to succeed them in the next? an action, if not impossible, at least so incredible, as by no means to be aver'd without legitimate Authority, which they say, is wanting: And further, should we undertake, that not only all Doctors, but all men of one age met with the men of the next, to teach them; it were an enterprize highly impossible, as not to be thought of even among the wildest caprices of a Romanc
mance: yet to so hard straits are we driven, that we must defend the possibility of this later assertion.

Which to compasse, we distinguish this word, Together, as capable of signifying an unity either in place or time: and, if the Opponent mean one Age cannot meet another in a Town or great Hall, as Councils use, I am easily persuaded such interviews are impossible; but if this Assembly needs only the unity of time, I think it will require but a moderate stock of faith to believe, either that men of the same Age live together in that Age, or that Fathers meet with their Children. If then we put all Fathers and Mothers, all Pastors and Teachers to make one Age, and all Children and young persons, who come to be instructed, and afterward outlive their Tutors, to compose the other age; I see no great impossibility in this position, but a clear one in the contrary. For, I cannot believe the Opponents think, men, since Christ's time, start out of hole-hils with clods on their heads, as it seems Empedocles and Horace imagined, and the Toscans of their wise Tages, high Master of their skill in Augury.

And this answer cuts off another difficulty, urg'd by certain Speculations, that, because, in some rude times, they imagine the learned
learned were few, and therefore subject to corruption by hopes or fears, they might more easily be prevail'd with to proclaim a fall Tenet in that Age; whence, this claim of infallibility would remain broken: But the former answer saves it; for since neither the great multitude of Instructors, nor instructed persons can meet in any other assembly then that of the whole and open World, all possibility of corruption is evidently avoided.

THE THIRD ENCOUNTER,

Solving two other Objections against the infallibility of Tradition.

The fourth opposition denies the necessity of assigning any Age wherein an error may be said to have crept in; because (say they) an error might begin first in one Country, and insensibly steal over into another, without any notice taken of its novelty, so that there is no time wherein its beginning is discoverable: For proof, they instance in some error held by divers Hereticks in divers ages; and tell you, the best Historian
Historian knows who was first mentioned to have broacht that error: whereas perhaps a less diligent or careless Writer may cite some middle or late Author, attributing to him the original invention of that opinion.

To this we reply, 'tis too desperate an Answer to call a hundred years an insensible time, to suppose all the Pastors stupify'd, and the Doctors asleep for a whole century together. At least, let us ask this fair question, Was there no Doctor or Bishop made it his business to promote that new opinion within a hundred years? If you say, no; how could an innovation of any considerable importance get footing which had no eminent patron? If you say yes; see whether that was not the occasion of impugning all heresies, when extraordinary persons divulged them: I, but you'll say, it was so transcendent a Doctor that he overtop all. Here, I confess my weakness: for if some sky-fain Angel, indeed, should come, with tongue and pen more then humane, I doubt not but he might perhaps endanger a great part of the Church: but, if we make our comparison only betwixt men; who ever had the like reputation in the Greek Church, as Origen? yet he was condemned by the same Church. Who was more eloquent
quent then Eusebius Casariensis? more cunning then Eusebius Nicomediensis? more subtle then Arius? Let us add a faction so powerful, as to make ten Councils, to number three hundred Bishops; yet, notwithstanding all this, the Arians were condemned. The Dragon drew but a third part of the Stars; and the Apostle has armed us, even against the treachery of Angels; charging that, in spite of them, we cleave fast to what we have receiv'd, to what was Preach'd to us, that is, to Tradition: For rely but on what, in memory of our own age, the Church has universally held, and deliver'd, as from Christ, and no subtlety of men or Angels can make you mistake.

Yet, Let it be supposed, some unparallel'd Brain had the power to make a doctrine universal; could this stand with the still way of creeping in insensibly? Is not this position, that a Doctor was so great, & took so much pains to divulge his opinion, wrote so many Books in defence of it, that he overcame all opposers, and at last made it universal; and yet all this while the new doctrine stole in unawares, the Pastors of the Church never dreaming any such thing: is not this as very a Bull as to say, an Army shot off all their Artillery, that the Enemy might not discover where they lay? or to do, as is reported
ported of an acquaintance of mine, who being in good company, to ride through a Town, where he was afraid to be taken notice of, at his entrance set spurs to his horse, holding his Cane straight before him, and Trumpeted *Tararara Tararara* the whole length of the Town? Nevertheless, since this for our side (says the Zelot) 'tis an invincible demonstration.

But we desire leave to consider one point farther; In what times came in the errors, our Adversaries so loudly complain of? See whether they be not those ages when there were great quarrels about innovations encroaching on the Church, and multitudes of exceptions taken: So that, had any side entertain'd a new error, not common to both parties, especially if the novelties were any way notable, they could not have been pass'd over without mutual contradictions or upbraidings. The doctrines therefore which in those times pass'd unpremended, and were currantly admitted among all parties, as being common to them all, without question were not *Errata*, *sed Tradita*. Whence, certainly it must needs appear a manifest folly, to think any error could run through the Church so uncontral'd, as to gain, without the least sign of opposition, an universality: and much like
the story, that the great Turk, with an Army of three or four hundred thousand men, should steal upon Germany by night and take all the good fellows so fast asleep that not a man should escape, nor so much as a Goose gaggle to wake the drowsy neighbours, and, having thus silently run over the Empire, should pass into France, and thence into Spain, and still catch them all napping without the least notice or resistance: whereof, if any slow and dull heart should doubt, as seeming indeed somewhat an improbable story, the reporter should immediately prove all with a why not? since the Greeks had surpriz'd Troy so, and perhaps some other great Captain one single Town or Garrison.

Besides, if we venture to throw away a little faith on so extravagant a fable; the action will still remain unpossible to be conceal'd. Who shall hinder the Conqueror from proclaiming such unparalleled victories, to applaud himself and terrifie the rest of the world? who can forbid his souldiers to Chronicle their own valours, and everywhere boast such un-heard of exploits? Certainly, were there no Catholick testimonies of these late unhappy divisions from the Church, yet would succeeding ages find evidence enough (as to the matter of fact) even
even in the writings of the Reformers them- 
selves. How often do their Books insult o're 
The blindness of their Predecessors, and 
triumpb in the man of God Martin Luther, 
and the quicker light Jo. Calvin, as first di-
coverers of their new-found Gospel? can 
we think it possible distracted Europe should 
blot out of her memory the sad effects of 
Schism and heresy, before the tears they have 
caus'd be wiped from her eys? for my part, 
I am confident our once happy Island will 
ever forget the graceless disorders of Henry 
the rights unfortunate intemperance, though 
there were not one English Catholick left 
in the world, to remember them by the 
smart he endures ever since.

Add to all this, the points, wherein Prote-
stants accuse us, are the most palpably absurd 
positions that can fall into a Christian's 
head; as, making Gods of Saints or Sta-
tues, which were the dotages of the basest 
sort of Pagans.

Nor is the example of errors often 
sprung and often quell'd again, of any ad-
vantage to the Opponent. For our questii-
on concerns opinions remaining till this 
day, and by himself, supposed to have gain'd 
the mastery of the Church, and never fail'd 
since their beginning: because all doctrines, 
which appear to have a being before any age 
the
the Adversary can name, are thereby evidently proved perpetual Traditions; especially when the Authors were such as lived in Communion with the Catholik Church then extant, and remain’d in veneration with the Church succeeding.

Methinks also since the opposer maintain it was more then a whole Age in working itself up to this universality, if the error were gross, it must without doubt have been a long time in one Country, before it passed into another; else we shall scarce find a reason why it became not general in a shorter period of years; and so it would easily appear, until such an age that new doctrin was never heard of: and in every Country the beginnings would be mentioned by the Historians and other writers: as, who came out of Greece into France to plant Images, who first introduced the Priest’s power of absolution, who invented the doctrine of preferring the judgment of the Church before our own private interpretation of Scripture, all which we see exactly perform’d against every considerable Heresy, a minute and punctual account being still upon Record, who were the original contrivers, who the principal abettors, where they found patronage, where opposition, How long they lived, and when they died.
To evade this reason, is framed the next crimination, by saying what is answer'd has its probability, if the errors laid to our charge were contrary to Christian doctrine: But they only pretend to accuse us of superfluities, or false and defective additions to the Faith first planted; which excrescencies, only, the Reformers seek to take away. And, though it be manifest, when they come to charge us in particular, they instance in doctrines substantially opposite to the Faith of Christ, as Superstition and Idolatry, could their calumnies be justify'd against us: yet, because this objection civilly renounces such harsh and uncharitable language, let us see what may be intended by Superfluities.

Either the disliked additions are of truths, or of falsities. If, of truths, we expect they would demonstrate who has forbidden us to learn and advance our knowledge in Christian Religion, or matters belonging to it. Did God give his Law to Beasts, that have no discourse nor capacity, by joyning two revealed truths to arrive at the discovery of a third? Again, where is it prohibited for the Doctor and Preacher to know more than the Ideot and old wife? What fault then can even the proud and peevish humour of this age find in this point? If Hereticks
reticks will raise dust, and obscure the clea-
rest articles of Christian faith, and that so
maliciously, as without setting some further
explication, the people are in danger of
being perverted: is it a sin to establish such
defences and Ramparts against encroaching
errors?

If the addition be of falsities; let us exa-
min how the Opposer knows they are false?
If he reply, because they are contrary to
clear Scripture: then they are also contrary
to that Faith which deliver'd Scripture to
be true. If the points be not against Scrip-
ture: either they crosse some known Article
of Faith, or only the Principles of natu-
rall reason. If they be purely objects of
natural reason (though truths) they belong
not so to Religion, as to be accounted Arti-
cles of Faith: if they contradict some other
fore-taught Article, then the Argument be-
fore explicated (concerning the infallibi-

dy of Tradition, and the creeping in of
Errours against it) returns to its force. If
neither of these, why are they false, or upon
what grounds condemned?

But peradventure he excepts not against
the Truths, but the obligation to believe
and profess them. Admitting then the ad-
ditional points to be, in themselves, true;
why will not the Opposer assent to them?
for Tradition.

has he a demonstration against them? No; for then they could not be true. Has he such Arguments, that nothing opposite is equivalent to their eminent credibility? No; for, setting aside demonstration, no argument can be comparable to the Churches Authority. The reason therefore, if the inward thoughts be faithfully sifted, will at length appeare no other, then the preferring his own Opinion before the judgement of the Church: which being the effect of an obstinate and malepert pride, makes no legitimate excuse for not believing.

---

THE FOURTH ENCOUNTER.

That unlearned Catholiks rely upon the infallibility of Tradition.

The next exception is of main importance; for it undermines the demonstration at the very root, denying that the Church of Rome relys on Tradition: and having divided the believers into learned and unlearned, first undertakes to prove the unlearn'd not to be grounded on Tradition; at least, not for their whole Faith.

For,
An Apologie

For, if a question arise never thought of before, and once a Council determine the Controversie, that decree is accepted, as if it had come from Christ by Tradition; and all profess a readiness to obey, and therefore are like to perform their word, if occasion be offered. Besides, in Catechisms and instructions, the Common-people are not taught, that the doctrine comes handed down to them from the Apostles. In Sermons, we see, when any proposition of difficulty or concernment is treated, proofs are all encouraged out of Scripture and ancient Fathers: a practice even the fathers themselves continually observe, who, having proposed a point, are ready to add, it is not they alone that teach this doctrine, but the Apostles or Christ, or some renowned Father; never mentioning Tradition, unless to oppose or disable it, when some Heretics have laid claim to it, as the Quartadecimans, Chyliasts, Communicants of Infants, and the like.

The charge I confess is fierce; let us see what powder it bears, what shot. We agree, the Church comprehends both learned and unlearned, and so are bound to maintain that both sorts rely on Tradition. As for the first objection then, concerning the readiness to embrace a Councils definition,
for Tradition.

with the same assent, as if the truth were
descended by Tradition; I can either and in-
differently grant or deny it: Since, if I please
to grant it, I have this secure retreat, that a
conditional proposition has no force, unless
the condition be possible: and for the pos-
bility of the condition, I distinguish the
subject; which may be matter of Practice
and Obedience, or a speculative propo-
sition. Of the first I can allow the assent
be the same; that is, an equal willing-
ess to observe it: Of the second, I deny it
ver was or can be, that a Council should
define a question otherwise than by Tradi-
tion; Therefore, to rely on the Councils
definition takes not away, but confirms the
lying on Tradition. This, if need were,
could easily justify, by the expresse pro-
ceedings of all the principal Councils. Thus
the condition having never been put, nor
supposed ever will be, all this Argument
its solely on the Objectors credit, and
with as much ease rejected as it was pro-
osed.

Now should I chuse (according to my a-
ove reserv'd liberty) to deny such equality
affent; the Opponent has offerd no proof,
and so the quarrel is ended: for though I
ould produce instances to the contrary,
think it not fit to multiply questions when

D
the argument can be solved with a simple denial.

But how the Opponent can justify the second branch of his exception, that in 

*Catechisms* this doctrin is not taught, I am wholly ignorant. As far as my memory will serve me, I never heard the *Creed* explicate but, when the Catechist came to the Article of the *Catholic* Church, he told them how *Catholic* signify'd an universality of place and time; and that, for this title of *Catholic*, we were to rely on her testimony.

Likewise, in the word *Apostolick*, he noted that the Apostles were the founders of the Church, and her doctrin theirs, as being first receiv'd from them and conserv'd by the Church ever since; and that for this reason we were to believe her Authority. The you see, that famous phrase of the *Collie faith* is built on this very principle we maintain. True it is, Catechists do not ordinarily descend to so minute particularities, to tel ignorant people whether any position may be exempt from this general Law. But then we also know the rule, *Qui nihil except, omnia includit*.

Sermons (upon which the third instance is grounded) are of another nature; the intention being, not so much literally to teach the Articles of *Christian doctrin*, as
erswade and make what is already believed into the Auditory, with a kind of wilfulness & easiness, that their faith be quickened into a principle of action to govern their lives, the principal end perhaps for which Scripture was deliver'd and recommended to us. Therefore, neither the common practice, nor proper design or use of Sermons aches home, to make us understand on that grounds the hearts of Catholicks rely; no after all disputations, retire themselves this safe guard, To believe what the Catholic Church teaches; as none can be ignorant that has had the least convers with such Catholicks as profess not themselves Divines. For the last period of this objection, here the Fathers are brought in to cry out against Tradition, and Hereticks made the pretenders to that title: 'tis a bare action, without so much as a thin rag of proof to cover it; of which, I believe, hereafter, we shall have particular occasion to discourse more largely. Thus cannot all diligence I am able to use find any bound of difficulty in the belief of the learned, but that assuredly their faith is established on Tradition, if they rely on the Church as it is Catholic and Apostolick, which all profess, from the gray hair to that but now begins to lips his Creed.
THE FIFTH ENCOUNTER

That Catholick Divines rely on the same infallibility of Tradition.

This time now to come to the second part and see what is objected against the learnedest sort and the Long Robe's Resolution of their faith into Tradition: At first is brought on the stage a couple of great Cardinals, Perron and Bellarmin; the former saying, out of St. Austin, that the Trinity, Freewill, Penance, and the Church were never exactly disputed, before the Arians, Novatians, Pelagians and Donatists: Whence is it infer'd that, as more was disputed, so more was concluded; therefore more known and consequently not all deriv'd by Tradition.

But if we should answer, that disputing betwixt Catholicks and Hereticks, is, the Catholick part, no other than proving and defending those points which were deriv'd by Tradition, and found in Christ's action and behaviour, this argument was cut up by the roots, and all pretence a
flour of it taken away: Which is the very truth of the business: this being inseparably the difference betwixt Heresy and Catholicism, that when those perverse novelles first peep out of their dark grots, the atholick Religion securely possessesthe world; and upon such opposition is at first surpriz'd, and the Divines, perhaps, put about for plausible defences and rounds to satisfy unstable heads, who easil-conceive themselves wiser then their forethers, and scorn authority, unless reason proportion'd to their capacity or humour arshal it in.

Nevertheless, because disputing cannot use but bring to light some deductions, consequent to the first & principally-defended Position; I shall not deny the Church ay, come to know somwhat, which haply fore she never reflected on. But then those truths belong to the science we call theology, not to Faith; and, even for those, the Church rely's on Tradition, as far as they themselvs emerge from doctrins deliver'd by Tradition: so that the truth attested by the learned Cardinal out of St.ustin, is, that, by much canvassing, more proofs and answers are discovered, or ample Theological science concerning such mysteries, acquir'd.
Bellarmon is brought in excusing *Pope John 22.* from being an Heretick, though he held no souls were admitted to the vision of God, before the day of Judgment; because the Church had not as yet defin'd any thing concerning it: I confess, many more might be produc'd deprehended in the like actions; and, before all, *St. Austin excusing St. Cyprian* on the same score. Now, to draw a conclusion from hence, this is to be added, that surely if there had been a Tradition, neither the Pope nor St. Cyprian could be ignorant of it, and therefore not excusable upon that account. But, in truth, I wonder this point is no harder press'd; for, if any would take pains and look into our Schoolmen, they might find very many of them maintain, that Tradition is necessary only for some points not clearly express'd in Scripture: whence it seems to follow they build not the whole body of their Faith upon Tradition.

For satisfaction of this difficulty, I must note, there is a vast difference betwixt relying on Tradition, and saying or thinking we do so. The Platonists and Peripatetick are divided about the manner of vision; Aristotle teaching, that the object works upon the eye; Plato, that the eye sends out a line of Spirits or rays to the object: Yet nothing were...
The Platonists saw in one fashion, the Peripatetics in another. Some (as I fear may be experienced in too many of our modern Scepticks) are of this desperate and unreasonable opinion, that we have no maxims evident by Nature; but contradictories may be true at once; the rest of Philosophers think otherwise: yet we see, in all natural and civil actions, both sides proceed, as if those maxims were evident and irresistible. So likewise, there is a wide distance between these two questions what a man relys on for his assent or Faith, & what he says or thinks he relys on. Look but among the Protestants or other Sectaries, they are all taught to answer, they rest wholly on the Bible, the Bible, for their Faith; but nine parts of ten seek no farther than the Commands of their own Church: that is, all those who either cannot read or make it not their study to be cunning in the Scriptures, or have so much modesty as to know themselves unable to resolve those many intricate controverted points by the bare letter of the Text; who, perhaps, are not the less numerous, but certainly the more excusable part of Protestants.

Whence, farther, it is clear that, to ask on what a private person grounds his belief, and on what, the Church? is yet
a more different question; especially, if you enquire into what he thinks the Church resolves her faith. For, supposing the Church, as to some verity, should rely on Scripture or Councils; a Divine may know the Church holds such a position, and yet (though of a just size of learning) not know, or, at least, not remember on what ground she maintains it: and in that case, no doubt but his faith stands on the same foundation with that of the Church; yet he cannot, perhaps, suddenly tell whether it be resolved into Scripture or Councils. To conclude therefore this demand, whether Bellarmin himself rely’d on Tradition, for all points? has not the least resemblance with this other, whether he thought the Church did so? And, to come yet closer to the question; ’tis evident, every believer, under that notion, as a believer, is unlearned and ignorant: For, as such, he rests upon his teacher, who in our present case is, undoubtedly, the Church as Catholic and Apostolick; so far, therefore, the Coëter and Bellarmin depend on the same Authority. As for the other part of the interrogatory, on what he thinks the Church rely’s for her doctrin? it may be enquir’d either in common or particular. In common (relating generally to the body and substance of Catholick doctrin,) there is no doubt,
for Tradition.

doubt, among Catholicks, but their reliance is upon Tradition, this being the main profession of great and small, learned and unlearned, that Christian Religion is and has been continued in our Church, since the days of our Saviour, the very same faith the Apostles taught all Nations, and, upon that core, they receive it: Speaking thus therefore, no Catholick makes any scruple but Religion comes to him by Tradition.

There remains now, only, what learned men think, concerning the ground wherupon the Church rely's, in some particular cases: which we have already shewn concerns not their private belief, as 'tis the foundation of their Spiritual life; for, so, they rely on the Church, and what the Church rely's on: and by consequence, it will prove but a matter of opinion in an unnecessary question belonging purely to Theology, not Faith, whatever is said in it. Whence Divines in this may vary without any prejudice to the Church or salvation, either in private or in order to Government; seeing the main foundation is surely establisht, that every believer, as such, rely's on the Church immediatly. This difficulty therefore is so far resolv'd, that it little imports what opinion Bellarmin or any other private Doctor holds in the point: since it follows not
not that the Church, or any particular member therof, rely's on such a ground; no not Bellarmin himself, though he conceive, in some points, the Church rely's on Scripture or Councils.

But, since St. Austin marches in the head of this Troop for defence of St. Cyprian, let us proceed with more diligence and respect in reconciling the difficulty. We are to remember, 'tis a different question, to ask Whether an opinion be Herefy? and, Whether the Maintainer be an Heretick? the opinion becomes heretical by being against Tradition, without circumstances; but the Person is not an Heretick, unless he knows there is such a Tradition. Now, St. Cyprians case was about a doctrin included in a practice, which, he saw well, was the custome of the African, but knew not to be so of the universal Church, till some congregation of the whole Christian World had made it evident. And herein consists the excuse St. Austin alledges for St. Cyprian; 'tis true, I have no assurance this Apology can be alledged for John 22. but another perhaps may, that the multitude of Fathers (which he conceiv'd to be on his side) might perswade him, the opposite opinion could not be a constant Tradition. There remains only Bellarmins excuse to be justify'd
justify'd, which is not of so great moment: Divines helping themselves by the way that occurs best to them, and missing in such reasons, without any scandal to their neighbours.

One of these two solutions will generally satisfy all such objections as are drawn from some fathers mistakes against the common Faith. For nothing can be more certain, then, if any Father had known the doctrin, contrary to his error, to have been universally taught in the Catholik Church, by a derivation from their ancestors, beyond the memory of any beginning, he would readily without dispute have submitted to such an Authority, and so much the sooner, as he being neerer the Fountain, could less doubt that the stream, of which he saw no other rise, reach'd home to the Spring-head. This therefore is evident, that whoever erred, knew nothing of such a Tradition, whencesoever that ignorance took its root: the several causes of which depend upon the several cases of their mistakes, here not pressed, and therefore not examin'd.

THE
THE SIXTH ENCOUNTER,

Disabling three other Arguments brought against Tradition.

The seventh objection pretends, not only different, but opposite Traditions might be deriv'd from the Apostles. And this they support with these two crutches: one consists in a demurrer, that the contrary is not proved: the other in an Instance, that it plainly hapned so in the case of the Quattuordecimani, who inherited from St. John a certain custom, which was condemned by a practice deriv'd from some other Apostles. But the weakness of this objection appears by its very proposal: For, since all Catholicks, when they speak of Tradition deliberately and exactly, define it to be a Doctrine universally taught by the Apostles, we may safely conclude, where two Apostles teach differently, neither is Tradition: And that this word, universally, may not seem, by flight of hand, cog'd into the definition, on purpose to take away this objection; the necessity of it is evident: because, all that wear the
the name of Christian unanimously agreeing that, in point of truth, one Apostle could not contradict another; wherever two such Traditions are possible to be found, it absolutely follows, no point of truth is engaged: An inference expressly verified in the example of the Quartadecimans; their contention being merely about a Ceremony, not an Article of Faith. Wherfore, only indifferent and unnecessary practices are subjects of such a double Tradition: and, by consequence, such Traditions are not of Christian believe, or concerning matters here, in controversy; this very definition rather directly excluding them.

The eighth Argument seems to take its rise from our own confessions; telling us, We acknowledge some points of Faith to have come in later then others, and give the cause of it, that the Tradition (whereon such points rely) was, at the beginning, a particular one, but so that yet at the time when it became universal, it had a testimony even beyond exception, by which it gain'd such a general acknowledgment.

The example of this is in certain Books of Scripture, as the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalyps; whereof, in St. Jerom's time, the Greek Churches refus'd the one, and the Latin the other; yet now both have prevaild into
into an universal reception. To which I return this clear answer: 'tis the nature of things acted, (that depend on Physical and mutable causes,) to have divers degrees in divers parts, according to the unequall working of the Causes: and so, Christ having deliver'd, by the hands of his Apostles, two things to his Church, his Doctirin, as the necessary and substantial aliment thereof, and his Scriptures, ad abundantiam; it was convenient, the strength of Tradition, for one, should far exceed its strength for the other; yet so, that even the weaker should not fail to be assured and certain. Upon this reason, the Doctirin was deliver'd to all the Apostles, and by them to the whol communuity of Christians: the Scriptures, to some particular person or Church, (yet such whose credit was untainted,) and from them, by degrees, to be spread through the whol Church, and communicated to the Pastors, in the Books themselvus; to the people, by their Pastors reading and explications. For, who does not know, before Printing was invented, the Bible was not every mans money? Whence it appears, Scriptures are derived to us by a lower degree of Tradition, then that of Catholik doctirin; and consequently our Faith and acceptance due to them is not of so high a nature as what we are bound to
in respect of doctrin. For the sense of Scripture is to be judged by the doctrin: as the Church and customs of Antiquity teaches us: alwaies commanding and practisng, that no man exercise his wits in interpreting the holy Scripture against the receiv'd Faith of the Church; as, in all matters of science, they who are Masters in the Art, judge the text of Books written upon such subjects by their unwritten skil and practical experience.

And here I would willingly ask, what such Protestants as object this to us, can answer for themselves? since they directly protest not to know Scripture by the Spirit, and therefore must necessarily rely on Tradition; especially those who take for their rule to accept only such Books for Canonical, as were never doubted of: for they cannot deny, but the Scriptures were receiv'd in one Church before another; as the Epistles of St. Paul, St. John, or St. Mark's Gospel, &c. and how do they admit the Apocalyps, so long refused by the Greek Churches, whom they use to prefer before the Latin?

But they press us farther; that, if a particular Tradition became universal, this depended on the Logick of those Ages, to discern what testimony was beyond exception. I demand what signifies Logick? do they
they mean common fense, sufficient to know three and four make seven; or wit enough to comprehend and manage with a just degree of discretion, the ordinary occurrences in humane actions? If they do; I must confess it depends on Logick: For I cannot think God Almighty deliver'd the Scriptures to Apes or Elephants, who have a meer imitation of reason in their outward carriage; but to Men, that have truly understanding, and a capacity of evidence within their Souls. But, if they take Logick for an ability to discourse beyond the reach of ordinary prudence, and that human evidence which governs our lives; I see no occasion of expecting any such Logick in our present question.

The ninth attempt consists in a diligent survey of our Fortifications, to spy out some breach, or weaker place, by which error may creep into the Church. This I cannot call an Argument; for none are so unwise as to make such a consequence: It may be therfore'tis; unleffe they bring strong proof of this necessity in some particular instance, that may shew it to be an exception from the common maxim, à posse ad esse non valent consequentia: And yet, in this discourse, I find not so much as the very posse, which I thus declare. If any should deny that

George
George could leap over Paul's-steeple; and a quaint Oratour (to maintain the affirmative) should largely discourse, how the rise of the last footing, the help of a good staff, the cast of his body, and many such circumstances give advantage to the leap; but never think of comparing these with the height of the Steeple: no sensible person would say, he had proved the possibility of performing such a wild and extravagant enterprise. So, he that discourses at large how errors use to slide into man's life, without comparing the power of the causes of error to the strength of resisting, which consists in this principle, Nothing is to be admitted, but what descends by Tradition; as also, without considering the heat and zeal still preserved alive in the Churches bowels from the great fire of Pentecost, says no more towards proving an error's overrunning the Church, then the Oratour we exemplified, for George's leaping over the Steeple. Wherfore this attempt is so far from the business, it deserves not the honour of being accounted an Argument.

Yet, because we compar'd the propagation of the Catholique Faith, to the perpetuation of Human kind, let us propose the like discourse against it: and say, that in Africa or the Land of Senega, there are under earth, great
great mines of Arsnick: Whereof one may at some time or other, vapour a contagious smoak, which, encountering with a strong wind from the South, may breed so great Plague in all the North Countries, that none can escape it; and hereupon presently conclude, that all, on this side the Line, are quite dead, and those who seem to live and discourse are but phantasms and have nothing of real in them: though I believe the instances (brought in, for declaration of groundless a conceit) may seem better to deserve that name.

THE SEVENTH ENCOUNTER

Answering the Greeks and some Divine, who object new Beliefs to the Catholic Church.

The first is of the Greeks; Hieremie Nil and Barlaam, who profess to stand on Tradition and the first seven General Councils, and can be no way disprov'd, say's their objectors, unless by what shall be as forcible against the Catholick cause. But truly this instance is so lame, it needs a new making, before it be answered: For the Au
nor expresses not in what points of difference betwixt us and them, he intends to urge it. If, about shavings or fastings and the like; we shall have no quarrel against him; about the Procession of the holy Ghost, I doubt he will find himself entangled in an equivocation, betwixt the matter and manner of that mystery. However, that all arguments against them will serve against us, is but the Authors liberal addition, without my proof or means to guess at it. That they accuse us, to corrupt Tradition by sowing tares among it, has two parts; the justify's my plea, that we rely on Tradition, since they charge us with endeavouring to corrupt, not disclaim it: the other, that we do indeed corrupt it, is only said not proved; and farther shews that the plea of the Greeks is non-Tradition, alledgeing only this, that their Fathers do not deliver the doctrin of the procession of the Holy Ghost, not that they say the contrary; which clearly demonstrates, there are no opposite Traditions between them and us.

As little force has the Note cited out of Tertullian, to prove that he thought more as to be believ'd, then what was drawn from antiquity; because he was content private men might begin good customs in their own houses: For sure he could not believe,
believe, that omnis fidelis could constitueretur for
the whole Church, or even for his neigh-
bours house. So that we need a great deal
of Logick to draw from this remark, the
creeping of an error into the Church: no
a word being so much as intimated, that
this good custom should be against what
was already receiv'd; which had been e-
nough to make it rejected, and not com-
hended, in Tertullians known judgment.

There is another instance, strongly urg
and largely dilated; but, if I guess right, so
much less credit, the more 'tis open;
It is out of a history by one Wadding, an
Irish man, concerning two Treaties of tw
Kings of Spain, with two Popes, to tear from
them a definition for the Immaculatene-
s our Ladies Conception. (I follow an Author
words, who has read the book, and it seem
found a great violence in the carriage of the
business, which made him express it, by the
word tearing.) Who this Wadding is
know not; for I have heard of more than
one; but whether this be any of them, I am
totally ignorant, having never seen the
Book nor any other signs by which to dis-
cover the Author.

Out of this Book they collect three argu-
ments: One from Waddings testimony;
other from the State of the question.
for Tradition.

...andles: a third, from his practice, jointly with the practice of divers others of the same degree. For the first, I am desirous notice should be taken of the Authors condition; When he wrote this book, he was secretary to the Bishop of Carthagena, and his Kings Ambassador, to move the Pope to define our Ladies Conception without original sin; and, in soliciting this, to use an extraordinary importunity: Wherin I see two circumstances that concern the qualification of his Book; One, that he was to act business of great heat; and, if his zeal were not conformable to the eagerness of his senders, he was like to have little thanks for his pains; The second that he was Secretary to an Ambassador, by which he had priviledg to say and publish Dicenda Tacentia, whether they were his own opinions or τυχόντω, so they any way advance'd his cause.

Now, this encouraged Secretary undertakes to affirm, that many things have been defined against the opinions of some Fathers; and in the present case, he says, peradventure, it has been defin'd, that our Lady was free from all actual sin: He adds, the validity of Hereticks Baptism, the beatifical vision before the day of Judgment, the spirituality of Angels, the souls being immediatly
mediatly created, and not ex traduce, th
Assumption of our Lady, and her delivery
without pain. To Wadding we may add
Salmeron, who has the boldness to say Do
cetes quo juniores eo perspicaciores. Pdoa i
no less audacious, in citing opinions defin't
against the Fathers. Erasminus says myriade
Articulorum proruperunt. Fisher, Bishop and
Martyr, and as learned as any in his age
confents that Purgatory was brought in by
little and little: and Indulgences, after men
had trembled a while at the torments of
Purgatory. Alphonsus de Castro puts, in the
rank of newly receiv'd Doctrines, Indulgen-
ces, Transubstantiation, and the procession of
the holy Ghost. But beyond all, is the fact of
Clement the eighth, a grave and wise Pope
who, desirous to end the controversy be-
tween the Dominicans and the Jesuits accus-
ed by them of Pelagianism, neither sent
for learned men, by way of a Council, to
know what their Forefathers had taught
them, nor examin'd with which of them the
purest Ages sided: but refer'd the whole
matter to what St. Austin said: and so it
had been defin'd, had not Cardinal Perron's
advice prevail'd. And St. Austin was so
various in his own opinion, that he knew
not himself what he held: whereas, be-
fore him all the ancients sided with the
Jesuits
for Tradition.

Thus far that Book: I know this term Defining, is frequently used by our Divines in matter of the Churches determinations; nor do I see any great inconvenience in the word, if the thing be understood, to wit, that Defining is nothing else but the acknowledging and clearing a Tradition, from the dirt and rubbidg opposers had cast upon it. For the rest, that some Fathers have had their eys ty'd, in particular points, so far as not to see the force of Tradition, by which the Church had notice of the truth of some Doctrin, is a thing not to be doubted. And, if it were fit or necessary, I could bring instances of Divines, in our daies, so blinded by arguments, that they see not the light of Tradition in some particular questions: wherein, the expressions only changed, they hold condemned heresies: So short is the sphere of our discours, if not directed by a carefulnes to wel-employ our Logick, or by a secret grace, steering us towards truth beyond the ability of our Reason.

But, what prejudice can be infer'd out of these sayings, against Tradition, I understand not: unless this be taken for a Maxim, that every one must necessarily know, of a special point, that it is deriv'd by Tradition, because really 'tis so; an inconse-
quence, I hope already sufficiently demonstrated. Now, if these two can stand together, that, truly the Church has a Tradition for a point, and nevertheless some learned man may be ignorant of it; this argument has no force at all.

As to the positions he cites for newly adopted into the family of faith, he fairly shews the privilege he and his Master had to speak any thing that founded to his purpose, and let his adversaries take care whether true or no. For, nothing is more clear, then that the validity of Baptism by Herticks was a Tradition, and decided by It: so, the Beatific vision of the Saints before the day of judgment. The spirituality of Angels is not yet held a matter of Faith, but only a Theological Conclusion: as likewise, the souls being concreted to the perfecting of the body. Then for the blessed Virgin's being free from actual sin, as also her Assumption, and her delivery without pain (which others add) these either are known by Tradition, or not matters of Catholik Faith: and so, no ways advance our Adversaries pretences. For Alphonfus de Castro, 'tis plain by his very expressions, either he means the manner only, or at most some circumstances unessential to the things, and therefore certainly not cited without some
some violence offered to his words.

Pozzi is a condemned Author: and *Sal-
eron's saying not to be followed, or to be
understood (as it is, whence he took it) in
such things as later disputes have beaten out
more plainly; *Erasmus was learned in Cri-
icism, and one whom, if not others, his very
English Patrons, *Warham of Canterbury,
Fisher of Rochester, and More in the Chancery,
exempt from all calumny of being a deser-
or of the ancient Faith: besides his own
Books, especially his Epistle *Ad Fratres in-
ferioris Germaniae, by effects demonstrate
his loyalty; whatever bad impressions a cer-
tain liberty of practising his wit too freely
may have made in some even great and emi-
nent persons. But, what he speaks concern-
ing Articles of Faith, he either took from
the scoldings of some ignorant Divines,
(who are ready to call every word, they
found not in their books, when they were
Schollers, Heresie) or else because, truly, he
understood not what belong'd to Decisions
in that kind.

There remain two Authorities really
considerable; one of the holy Bishop Fisher;
the other, of the prudent Pope. As for the
first, I conceive there is a great equivocation
through want of care and wariness in di-
stinguishing. For, let us take either the Coun-
cil
cil of Florence or Trent, in which we have the Churches sense concerning both Purgatory and Indulgences; and see whether the holy Bishop says any of the points, those Councils defin'd, are either denied by the Greeks, or brought in by private revelations or new interpretations of Scripture. For, how could he be ignorant, that the Greeks had agreed to the Latin Church, about the definition of Purgatory, in the Council of Florence; or forget himself so far, as not to remember a publick practice, Indulgences, in all the ancient Church, for remission of the Penal injunctions laid upon sinners? Besides, he says, the Latins did not receive Purgatory at once, but by little and little. Whence it is evident, by the name Purgatory, he means not only so much as is established in the Council, but the manner also and circumstances were introduced by revelations of private persons and argumentations of Divines. The like he expresses of Indulgences, saying, They began, after men had trembled a while at the pains of purgatory. Whence it is plain, he contented not himself with the precise subject of the Councils Definitions, or the sense of the Church; but included also such interpretations as Divines give of them. So that, by speaking in general terms, and not distinguishing the substance of Purgatory
gatory, from the Accidents and dressing of it; as likewise, in Indulgences, not separating what the Church has alwaies practiz'd from the interpretative extention which Divines attribute to them; he is mistaken to suppose new Articles of Faith may be brought into the Church. Neither imports it, that he uses those words, No Orthodox man now doubts; for that's true of such Conclusions as are termed Theological and generally receiv'd in the Schools, yet are not arriv'd to the pitch of making a point of Catholick belief: besides, he expresses himself, that this generality extends no farther, then That there is a Purgatory.

In Clement the eighth's action, the main point is to consider, on what grounds he fought to establish the Definition he went about to make. And, upon the immediate step, we both joyntly stand; to wit, that it was to finde out, whether parties opinion was conformable to St. Austin: But, if I mistake not, my Adversaries make not the same apprehension of it that I do. They seem to take St. Austin for one Doctour, peradventure a great one, peradventure the chief, but yet only one: I apprehend him as the leading Champion of the Church in the Question of Grace; whence it follows, that the Doctrin of St. Augustin was the Doctrin of all those Catho-
Catholick Writers, by whose demonstrati-
ons and authority the Pelagians were con-
demned; that is, it was the faith of the
Church in that age, and consequently, which
the Church continued ever after.

Farther, because St. Austin neither had
the Authority to bring in a new Faith, nor
pretends it; but both proves his doctrin to
have descended from his Forefathers, and
found Pelagius his opinion condemned, be-
fore he medled with it, by some Council;
that is, by the apprehensions of the then
present Church; and, as it spread from
Country to Country, was stil found con-
trary to the receiv'd doctrin, every where
planted in their hearts before Pelagius con-
tradicted it. Therefore, I say, I cannot but
esteem, that, in the point of Grace, it is all
one to say, the Doctrin of St. Austin, and the
Doctrin of the Apostles, planted by them and
continued to St. Austins daies, illustrated
by him, and transmitted to his posterity,
even to our present time. If this be true,
(as no Catholik can deny, nor prudent per-
son doubt but we esteem it so) Pope Clement
had great reason to endeavour the decision
of that question by the Authority of St. Au-
stin: since the doctrin of St. Austin was
evidently the faith of that Age; and the
faith of that Age the faith of the Christian
Church
Church, from the Apostles to us.

But we have another quarrel about St. Augustin's doctrine, that it is so uncertain, himself knew not what he held. Nor do I wonder such a thought should fall into the head of a Gentleman-Divine; especially in a Liberty of wit, to censure, without the least respect or reverence of Antiquity: But I tremble to hear, that some (of whom we are in justice as well as charity bound to expect more steadiness and Religion) seem so wedded to their own Sect, as to mutter the same. My answer, I believe, is already understood.

I say therefore, such as have made it a principal employment of their lives, to be perfect in St. Augustin; those who with great attention had read his Polemical Treatises against the Pelagians, (as I take it) some five and thirty times, were of another mind: And so are all those who at this day study him, not to make him speak what they think, but to make themselves speak what he thinks.

But this question transit in rem judicatam, since, when it was handled at Rome before the Congregations, when both oppositions and defences were solemnly made by the proof of present books, when the maintainers of the opinion accus'd of Pelagianism,
nism, were the choicest wits and ancientest Scholers could be pickt out of that so famed Society: nevertheless, almost in every Congregation the sentence of St. Austin was judged to be against them; as is evident, both out of the printed Compendium of the Acts of those Congregations, and the very manuscript Acts themselves, extant at this day.

But, let us hear the Pope himself speak. Upon the 8. of July was held the second Congregation; His Holines began with these words. Nos personaliter vidimus congregiem locorum, quam vos, qui Molinam defendistis, induxistis ex Augustino; & nullus inventus est qui faveat, immo contrarium tenuit Augustinus: Unde mirum quod tot artibus utamini. And hence it seems they were forc’d to corrupt St. Austin to the Popes face the 30 of September following; which being discovered, the Author died of melancholy and disgrace. Again, in the tenth Congregation, the same Pope taxed them, Quod Scholastici, maxime suis, non Scripturâ, Conciliis, Patribus, uterentur. A sign how found their way of doctrine is, how sincere their proceedings to defend it.

Yet, 'tis urged farther, that the Fathers who lived before St. Austin, are generally of the contrary opinion. This is a simple affer-
assertion without proof, and my name is Thomas: I would entreat therefore such of my Readers as light on this objection, to remember that the question, of the force of Grace, and liberty of Free will, consists of two truths; that seem, like the Symplegades, to butt at one another, as long as we look at them afar off; but if we make a nearer approach, they shew a fair passage betwixt them. So then, it is not hard that one who studieth the question for pleasure, especially in such Fathers as wrote before the combating of the truth by Heresies, should be deceiv'd, by the seeming overlaying of that side, which the Fathers had occasion to inculcate; though they meant nothing else then to prejudice the verity, which stands firm on the other side the fretum of this disputation. Adde to this, that St. Austin himself examin'd the Fathers, and found in them the doctrin he maintain'd; nor could it be otherwise, the general apprehension of the Church being against Pelagius. Therfore I shall follow the advice of the Proverb, and be fearful to leap before I look: especially, since a great reader of St. Chrysostom solemnly profes'd he could shew as strong places in him for Grace, as in St. Austin; though he be the man chiefly set up against St. Austin.
THE EIGHTH ENCOUNTER,

Shewing, our Ladies immaculate conception is not likely to become an Article of Faith.

As for the state of the question, about our Ladies being conceiv'd in Original sin, some would willingly perswade us, the Negative is in great probability to be defined; whereas certainly there is no Tradition for it (if Wadding's sayings be rightly reported.) But if defining signifies the clearing of Tradition, (as we explicate it) nothing can be more evident, then that there is no probability of defining the negative part: rather it may be in danger of being, at least, censured, for rashly putting an exception in the general rule of Scripture, which expressly condemns all but our Saviour to Original sin; except the defenders can shew good ground for the privilege they pretend, which I much doubt. For, as far as I can understand, the warrant of that opinion stands upon a devotion to our Lady, arising chiefly from
perswasion that original sin is a disgrace to the person in whom 'tis found: So that, if the people were taught original sin is nothing but a disposition to evil, or a natural weakness, which, unless prevented, brings infallibly sin and damnation; and that in itself it deserves neither reproach nor punishment, as long as it proceeds not to actual sin, the heat of vulgar devotion would cool'd, and the question not thought worth the examining.

However, there's no great appearance of deciding that point in favour of the negative; since the earnest solicitations of two potent Kings could so little prevail towards it: For, all that was done had only his design, to appeal the seditions sprung in Sivil by occasion of a Dominicans Conclusions, in which he affirm'd that our Lady was Conspiracata with Original sin. But, the controversy was so uncivilly carried, that scandaliz'd our English Merchants; as one of them there present told me not long after, meeting him at Dunkirk: So that, But because this objection is much urged, we see the probabilities of its being de-

The first is, that the maintainers of the Affirmative are only a few of one Order, and some few taught by them. But, if good count be made, I believe these few will prove
prove some thousand or fifteen hundred the most learned in the Christian world. Their Order is known to have always been the flower of the Schools; to have had the Inquisition many ages in their hands to have a style of Divinity of a higher strain than ordinary; by their great study and adhesion to the Doctrine of St. Thomas of Aquino: Their Monasteries numerous, especially in Spain and Italy; no great Convent wherein there are not a dozen or more great and learned Divines, almost all the honours amongst them being distributed according to the probate of ability in knowledge: so that the Order is no contemptible part of the Learning of the Church. Neither is it credible their Scholars can be few, much less, as this Author passionately tells them, unus et alter.

He objects farther, the subscriptions many Prelates, Orders and Universities the general acclamation of the people, a weighty necessity of cutting off scandal. That some Universities oblige the Scholars to make vows to maintain the negative; and in a word that the Affirmers hold against the whole Church. Nor do I doubt that many Prelates, Orders and Universities subscribed the Negative, a peradventure to the Petition, or that the people
for Tradition.

People (who follow the greater cry) did demand the same: but, that the Affirmers held against the whole Church, I totally deny, and shew manifestly the contrary. for, Bulls having been accepted and standing force, by which all Censure against the Affirmative is forbidden, and no one syllable obtain'd any way derogatory to the probability of the opinion; but generally, caveat to the contrary expressly put into such instruments and the Defenders of the Negative submitting to them: 'tis clear, that all the maintainers of the Negative allow the Affirmative to be probable, and by consequence not against the consent of the Church; since it seems to imply a flat contradiction, that the Church should believe Negative to be true, and yet at the same time admit the Affirmative may be true.

Now, as for Universities, there are entireies for the Affirmative; and that, not on the score of St. Thomas, but of the Fathers. That Universities strive for the Negative, so nckly as to make men take vows; I know it: The Article of Paris, as I hear, is only, that they shall not teach it in the University; else where every one is free. As for hindring scandals, 'tis a necessary part Government; but certainly obliges not a defining or deciding of Truths according
An Apologie

Ding to the inclinations of the people, push'd on by the clamours of violent Preachers.

Notwithstanding all this, our adversary presumes this very point may prove an Article of Faith; especially, if a Council should meet about the decision: wherein he proceeds with a very high confidence, it being, as he thinks, now ready to topple into a matter necessary to salvation. But I am far from that mind: for I see the fervours of the Schools are a quite different thing from the judgments of the Church, and how little all those tumults moved the Court of Rome, and certainly would have made far less impression in a general Council. The controversy betwixt the Jesuits and the Dominicans, what a busle makes it in the School and in the world; while it stands upon the fairer tongue, upon motives esteemable by the people, and meer plausibilities? Wheras coming to be examin'd before the Pope in Congregations, it could not hold water; but the weaker part was forc'd to break off the court of judgment, by mingling Princes quarrels into Ecclesiastical questions. I dare confidently say, if the Point of our Ladies Conception were to be handled, either in a Council or grave Congregation: the party that free her setting
ting aside the passions of Princes) would be distressed to find an argument that themselves should hope would endure the discussing. And so, the pretty gradations of our imaginative adversaries, who so easily frame a ladder for this opinion to climb up into a matter of Faith, is like an odd attempt of an acquaintance of mine; who, being come out of Lancashire to go beyond-sea, and repuls'd at Dover for want of a Pass, put off his hose and shoes and began to wade into the sea; when, being asked what he meant, he answer'd he would go on foot, since they would not let him pass in the Boat; for, said he, I have often waded through the Beck at my Father's door when the bridge was taken away. By which counterfeiting of simplicity he got to be admitted into the ship: whereas those who make their argument from the School-discussions to Church-definitions, will (if I am not mistaken) remain on the wrong side of the water.
THE
NINTH ENCOUNTER.

Shewing the unanimous agreement of
Divines, that all infallibility is from
Tradition.

The third argument is drawn from this
Waddings proceedings and his consorts,
with the addition of another not unlearned
man (according to the course of these times)
who puts Scripture and definitions of the
Church to be the adequate ground into
which our Faith is resolv'd. Besides, 'tis
urg'd, that even those who speak of Tradi-
tion, seek it not in the testimony of the
present Church, but of the ancient Fathers.
This being already answer'd in the sixth
Objection, we need not here add much to
it; For what imports it, if Wadding and his
associates understood not upon what
grounds the Church uses to resolve and
decide controversies, (and therefore bring
Revelations, Metaphorical expressions of
Scripture, the cry of the people, a multitude
of School Divines, and the like arguments,
so that in their lives and believing or acting
as Christians, they proceed not out of these grounds, but, by the Collier's principle, rely on the Church, and by her, on what she rely's. Galileo dislikes the notions of wet and dry, which Aristotle gives: do they therefore disagree or not know one another's meaning, when they talk of a wet and dry cloth? Among our modern Philosophers great quarrels there are about the explication of time and place: yet this hinders not, but that in common discourse, when they speak of years and days, Country's and Towns, they make a shift to understand one another.

The reason is; because these conceptions (used in ordinary discourse) are planted in them by nature; the same objects working the same effect upon souls of one nature: But the other notions are made by study and artificial proceeding, and prove fallc or true according as the precedent discourses are fallible or solid. Even so, believing is made by nature in us, and is all alike in those to whom the object is proposed alike: But to explicate and declare it, happens differently among Doctors, as they understand better or worse.

Now then admit all those we call Schoolmen were against the doctrine I maintain; though I conceive such an universal agreement
ment impossible, unless they be supposed to, demonstrate their Tenets, (which if they do, I readily submit; if not,) what doth it impeach the opinion I defend? or what would it avail to bring one or more on my behalf, whose authorities may be rejected with the same facility as offer'd; since they neither carry with them security from error, nor evidence of Truth? let us therefore permit Divines to try out their own quarrels in their own Schools: not mingleing them in our business.

Yet, to give some satisfaction, let the objector answer me himself: Does not the greater part of Divines seek out Tradition? Yes will he say: but not that Tradition which rely's on the present Church: for they seek it in laborious quotations of Fathers, in all ages. Let's agree then in this, They seek Tradition as well as I: But I pray what do they intend by so great labour in heaping of Fathers? do they mean it was those Fathers opinion? and so make their conclusion good, because such a number of Doctors held it: or do they farther pretend, out of these Fathers testimonies, to shew it was the publick doctrin of the Ages in which they lived? If the adversary be as ingenuous as he is ingenious, he will confess they pretend to argue the publick belief out
out of this numerous Catalogue. Nevertheless, for fear some other may be more reserv’d, let’s remember, what was before objected, that some points have been defin’d, notwithstanding the opposition of many Fathers; and this, by the verdict of these Divines: Whence it clearly appears that this numbring of Fathers would not make a doctrin certain to them; unless they thought the sense of the respective Ages were imply’d in it: Therfore, in conclusion, it is evident that they also rely, for Faith, upon the succession of it through divers ages; which is the same as the Doctrin’s being handed from the Apostles to us. So that you see we all agree; and I, whom you took to be particular in this conceit, am thus far of the common opinion.

But the adversary urges, that I come to the knowledge of this succession, by the testimony of the present Church; whereas they who search it in Fathers find it by the consent of antiquity. Suppose it be so: what difference makes this? It is too great a servility to be bound not to say any word but what has before faln in my adversaries way: Yet, at least, can he justify this? do not those Divines according to what himself would have them say, profess that the present Churches’ definition makes a certainty in
Admit then the present Church (in a Council or otherways, as it shall please those Divines) should define, that a point doubted of were come down by Tradition, from the Apostles to us; would not they say, Tradition were sufficiently known by such a Testimony? Surely it cannot be deny'd; I ask again: whether the professing a point of doctrine to be hers, by receiving it from hand to hand, be not to testify and define that Tradition stands for this doctrine? Therefore all such Divines confess Tradition may be known by the testimony of the present Church.

Why then do they use such diligence in collecting so many passages out of Fathers? chiefly for this reason, because Sectaries deny that principle: therefore they are forc'd for their satisfaction (not for instruction of Catholicks) to take so much pains with little thanks many times. Though it be true their learned labours confirm, besides, some weak believer, and enlighten the borders of Catholick Faith: and so in themselves are both ornamental and profitable to the Church.

And now, what if I should add, that these very Doctors hold there is no security of Faith, but only by Tradition? I know I am thought subject to talk Paradoxes: nevertheless
thelefs, because it is a point important to the unity of the rule of Catholick Faith, out it shall go, and the discourse be neither long nor obscure. I ask therefore, do not these Doctors require to the certainty of a Definition, that the Definers proceed without malice or negligence, and use all human endeavours to discover the truth? I cannot answer for every particular, but am sure the principal Divines require these conditions: otherwise they doubt not but the definitions may be erroneous. I ask again; what certainty can we have of this proceeding of the Definitors? or was there ever Council yet, against which the condemned Party did not cry out, that they had fail'd in observing them? I conclude therefore two things; first, that, in the Churches definitions of this nature, there can be no more then the certainty of moral Prudence, according to these mens opinions, (if they follow their own grounds:) Secondly, that there is no Moral quarrel betwixt Sectaries and them, concerning the infallibility of such definitions: for the exception generally, in the first condemnation of any heresy, rises from this part, Whether the Judg proceeded equally? and not, Whether, if he did so, his authority were to be rejected? there being seldom found so blind a boldness in any as to say, a Judg
Judge does him wrong, and yet proceeds rightly: for either he judges what he understands not, and that's rashness; or, seeing the right, he pronounces wrong, and that's malice: both which are unexcusable from injustice. So that, I believe, in this point, they do not allure the Church against Here-ticks, though both sides should agree in the speculative part, that the Definitors were infallible.

I know, Divines say, Catholiks are bound to believe the Definitor proceeded as he ought, unless the contrary be evident; and I see they speak with a great deal of reason: but withall, I see this maxim is a principle of Obedience and Action, not of Infallibility and belief.

I have yet a little scruple about this doctrin. For, either the Definitors are assur'd the doctrin they define is true, or no: If not, how can it be said they proceed rationally, who determin a position, as certain, which they see not to be so? If they are, then the Opinion was certain, before the Definition, on some ground precedent to, and independent of it; and so, not made certain by the definition, but only declar'd to the ignorant, by the Authority of the Definer, that it was and is certain, upon other grounds. Now, excepting Tradition, Scripture and Definiti-
for Tradition.

I know not any thing men seek into for an irrefragable Authority: Therefore, what is defin'd, must be, before, certain, either by Scripture, or by Tradition.

Let those Divines, now, chuse which they think fittest to cleave to: For Rushworth has declared his opinion sufficiently; and it is clear enough, what all they must say, Catholiks or Protestants, who think the Scripture needs Explicators, to make a point certain. Neither can we doubt of this, if we look into the actions of the Catholik Church; where we see an Heretick is term'd so, for chusing an Opinion against the Faith certainly received, and in possession of the Church from which he separates himself. But this separation is, at the beginning of the errour, and before the interposure of the Church: He is therefore an Heretick, before any decision makes him so.

THE TENTH ENCOUNTER

That there was no Tradition for the errour of the Chiliasts.

Besides the objections we have already endeavoured to answer, some other instances
flances are urged: As, of Origen, whose doc-
trin being explicated in such large vo-
lumes, how an Adversary can draw it into
the compass of Tradition, or how it can be
argued, that the condemning of him was a
breach of Tradition, I know not. But
chiefly they insist upon the Chilianas error,
as an unquestionable Apostolical Tradition.
To try the busines, let us remember,
we call'd Tradition, the handling of a doctrin,
preach'd and setled in the Church of God by
the Apostles, down to later ages. Now then,
to prove the Chilian opinion was of that
nature, the first point is to evince, that it
was publish'd and setled by the Apostles :
the contrary whereof is manifest out of Eu-
sebius History, who relates that the root of
it was a by-report collected by Papias, a
good, but credulous and simple man. His
goodness surpris'd St. Irenæus; who (as
may be infer'd out of his Presbyteri memine-
runt) learned it of Papias, (for the plural
number does not infer that there was more
then one, as all know that look into the na-
ture of words; or, if there were more, they
may be such as had it from Papias) St. Justin
the Martyr esteem'd it not, as a point neces-
sary to salvation; but rather a piece of
Learning higher then the common: since he
both acknowledges other Catholicks held
the
the contrary, and entitles those of his persuasion καθατάκτα καθορισμούς, right in all opinions, that is, wholy of his own mind; for no man can think another right in any position, wherein he dissentes from him: Nay, he shews that the Jew (against whom he disputes) suspected his truth, as not believing any Christian held this opinion; so rare was it among Christians; nor does he ever mention Tradition for it, but proves it meerly out of the Prophets. Whence it appears, there is no ground or probability this was ever a Tradition, or any other then the opinion of some Fathers, occasioned by Papias, and confirm'd by certain places of Scripture, not well understood, most errors being indeed bolster'd up by the like misapplications; a scandal that ever since the practice of the Tempter upon Christ himself, may it wel be expected to importune Christians.

But first is objected in behalf of the Christians, that they had no Tradition against them. To which I reply, A contrary Tradition might be two waies in force against them; one formally, as if it had been taught by the Apostles directly, Christ shall not reign upon earth a thousand yeares, as a temporall King: The other, that something incompossible with such a corporal raign was taught
taught by Them: and of this I finde two one general, another particular; the general one is, that the pleasures and reward promised to Christians are spiritual, and the whole design of the Christian Law aim at the taking away all affections toward corporal Objects; whereas this Error appoints corporal contentments for the reward of Martyrs, and by consequence, either encreases, or at least fosters the affection to bodily pleasures and temporal goods: The particular one is, that Christ being ascended to Heaven, is to remain there till the universal judgment: Wherfore it is evident, by the later, that it is against Tradition: and, by the former, that it is not only so, but a Mahumetan; or at least, a Jewish error, drawing men essentially to damnation: as teaching them to fix all their hopes and expectation hereafter on a life agreeable to the appetites of flesh and blood.

'Tis opposed also, that the Fathers of the purest Ages receiv'd it, as deliver'd from the Apostles. A fair parade! but, if we understand by the Fathers, One, St. Irenæus; and him deluded by the good Zeal of Papias (as Eusebius testifies) but good even to folly (for leſſe cannot be said of it,) where is the force of this so plausible argument? Adde to this that the very expression of Irenæus
neus proves it to be no Tradition; for he
sets down the supposed words of our Sa-

viour, which plainly shews it is a Story, not
a Tradition; a Tradition (as we have ex-
plicated it) being a sense delivered not in
act words, but settled in the Auditors
hearts, by hundreds of different expres-
sions explicating the same meaning.

There follows Justin Martyr's testimony,
That All Orthodox Christians in his age
held it; (for δοξα and γυμνα (say they )
are not so different, but one may be taken
for the other.) Yet there is no
saying in Justin; for, however δοξα and
γυμνα may pass, one for the other, yet the
word ὄροφες-ξε has (by Ecclesiastical use) an
appropriation to the Catholik or Christian
right believers, which descends not from
the Primitive, and so cannot be transfe'd
to the Derivatives from γυμνα; Wherfore
this is neither fairly nor truly trans-
lated Orthodox.

No more does it help the Adversaries
taue, that Justin compares the maintainers
of the contrary opinion to the Sadduces am-
ong the Jews: For, he mentions two sorts
of persons denying his position; whereof
one he resembles to the Sadduces, the other
he acknowledges to be good Christians,
and says they are many, or (in the elo-
quent
quent usage of the word παλαῖς) the Communion of Christians.

Nor will the next Objection give us much trouble, That none oppos'd the Millenar error before Dionysius Alexandrinus: To which we apply this answer: First, for anything we know, it was hidden and inconsiderable till his time, and then began to make a noise, and cause people to look into it. Secondly, there are probable Motives to perswade, it was impugn'd long before: For, it being clear, that both Hereticks and Catholicks sustaine'd the contrary, we cannot well suppose it was never contradicted till then, though the report of it came not to their ears; since, who considers the few monuments we have of their first Ages, must easily discern the hundred part is not deriv'd to us, of what was then done. But lastly, admit there was no writing against it till Dionysius Alexandrinus does it follow, there was no preaching neither?

As little can be gathered out of St. Hierom's being half afraid to write against it both because he did write against it, as it clear in his comment upon St. Matthew and upon Ezekiel, where he calls it a Jewish Fable, 1. ii. and because the multitude he speaks of, argues nothing of Tradition, but th
the numerosity of that sort of believers, occasion'd by the writings of the Heretick Apollinaris, as the same Saint testifies, Comment. 10. in Esaiam. Neither doth St. Austin stick to condemn it, since those words c. 7. 24. de Civit. Dei, esset utcunque tolerabilis, signify, that it is not tolerable.

Yet truly I cannot but admire, that he who puts the Chiliasm's opinion to have been deriv'd duly and really from the Apostles by verbal Tradition, should conceive that either St. Hierom or St. Austin could think such a Tradition to be no sign of the Churches doctrin, or not care whether it were or no: which seems to me the same as to impute to these Saints a neglect of what they thought to be the Churches opinion; or else, to the Church, a neglect of what was Christ's doctrin, if She would not accept what She knew was descended verbally from Him; or, at least that St. Austin and St. Hierom lay this great slander, of neglecting the known doctrin of Christ, upon the Church.
That there was Tradition for the Trinity before the Council of Nice.

The Chiliasm error seems to have been only an Usher to the Arian; which speaks far louder for itself. And that learned Cardinal Perron is placed in the front of their Evidence, whose testimony is, that the Arians would gladly have been try'd by the writings yet remaining of those Authors who lived before the Council of Nice, for in them will be found certain propositions, which now (since the Church-Language is more examin'd) would make the Speaker thought an Arian. From whence the Opposers infer, that before the Council of Nice, there was no Tradition for the mystery of the blessed Trinity. But to maintain this consequence, I see no proof for the Cardinal's words clearly import that the Fathers before that Council (though being Catholiks, they knew and held the mystery of the Trinity, yet) in some phrase spake like Arians: How then can any ma-
draw out of this Antecedent, that these Fathers believ'd not the Trinity, or had not receiv'd by Tradition the knowledg of that Mystery? I confess myself unable to see the least probability in such an inference.

If it be permitted to guess what they aim at that make this objection: I believe it is that, some propositions concerning the Trinity, by disputation and discussion, have been either deduced or clear'd, which before were not remark'd to draw so much consequence upon the mystery, as since is found they do: out of which they think it follows that such propositions were not delivered by Tradition, and so not our whole Faith. To this the answer is ready; that, as he who says a Mystery was taught by the Apostles, does not intend to say the Apostles taught what the words were, in every Language, which were to signify this Mystery; so neither is his meaning that they taught, how many ways the phrase in one language might be varied, keeping the same sense: But, as they left the former to the natural diom of the Speaker or writer, so the latter to the Rules of Grammar; as likewise they left it to the Speaker's skil in Logick, to contrive explications or definitions for the terms wherein they deliver'd the Mysteries.

It is not therfore to be expected that men, 
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who had receiv'd the Mystery simply and plainly, should, without both art and attention, know how in different cases, to explain it according to the exact rules of Science. And thus, the defect of the argument or arguer is, that he supposes, not only the main verity should be formally convey'd by Tradition; but all manner of explication and in all terms, which the subtlety or importance of Hereticks could afterward drive the Catholicks to express this Mystery by: a task both impossible to be perform'd, and most unreasonable to require, and perhaps unprofitable if it were done.

Nor therefore does it follow that something is to be believ'd, which came not down by Tradition: For, as he that says Peter is a man, says he is a living creature, a body, a substance, (though he uses not those words,) because all is comprehended in the term Man; so, he that delivers One God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, delivers, that those persons are not Alius but Alij, and that truly the Son is not an Instrument, a commanded servant &c. Yet, as it may happen, that one man sees another to be, but knows not what the definition of him is; nor needs he ordinarily know it, because he knows the thing defined: so may it also chance that some Fathers, who knew well
well enough the mystery, might falter in explicating it precisely according to the rigour of Logick; and 'tis no good consequence, The Fathers were less exact in some expressions concerning the Trinity, therefore they held it not or had not learn'd it by Tradition.

Yet I must also intimate, these differences of speech proceeded many times from the various usage of the words; as the Greeks generally say, the Father is cause of the Son; the Latines abhor it, calling him Principium: which difference is not in the meaning, but in the equivocation of the expression. So we read in St. Athanasius, that he found an opposition in some people; one sort saying there were in the Trinity three Hypostases and one Osia; another three Ossia's and one Hypostasis: and St. Hierom, though perfect in the Greek Tongue, was so exceedingly troubled with this question, that he sent to St. Damasius for the resolution of it; yet he well knew there was no difference in the sense, but only in the terms; however he fear'd lest, by the wrong use of the words, he might unawares be drawn into a wrong meaning. So likewise did St. Athanasius find, that the two former parties, of which we spake, agreed in the Catholick sense, though their words were opposite.
The reason of this opposition is the nature of these two words, Οὐσία and Ὑποστάσις, which primarily and radically signify the same thing; Aristotle telling us, that Ὑποστάσις is prima or primò substantia, which in Greek is Οὐσία: whence it appears, this word, Οὐσία, does not signify what in Latin is call’d natura, (to which the word substantia, by use, is now appropriated, when we speak of this mystery,) but only in a secondary sense. Again, the word Ὑποστάσις is deriv’d from Substantio, or Subsistendo, and therefore usually translated Substæntia and might properly be express by Substantia.

Now, applying this to the mystery of the Trinity, Because in God there is one common Nature, abstrahible from three properties; therefore the nature seems to subsist to the said properties and so deserve the name Ὑποστάσις: whereupon some explicated the Trinity to be una hypostasis, et tres Ousiae. For Ousia being deriv’d from έν or Ενσ, and Ενσ or Substantia and (in Greek) Ousia signifying primarily what the Schools term Suppositum (that we see with our eyes, a demonstrable singular, named substance, as Encephalus, Athos &c. which among men (if restrain’d to particulars) is call’d Socrates or Pluto, (if used at large) in the common name a person,) these men, very Catholikly, said three Ousia’s.
n. a's and one Hypostasis, meaning three Persons and one God. But, the Fathers of the Council of Nice (by much pondering these words, by their debates with the Arians, and to determine a rule in speaking, that Catholicks might not be subject, through equivocation, to be drawn into error,) agreed upon the contrary; because Hypostasis was more commonly in use for that we call a Person, and Ou sia was rather a School term fetch'd from Philosophers books, and therefore might, with less violence to common language, be taken in a secondary sense. Thus it became the rule of speaking in the Church, to say three Hypostases and one Ousia.

Besides, those speeches which Perron cites are not so harsh, but as, in a rigorous interpretation, they are fall, so, in a moderate sense, they contain undeniable truths. Philosophers divide instruments into Conjunct and Separata; and, among the Conjunctia, number up our Arms and Legs &c. which are our very substance: It does not therefore follow, if the Son be called an Instrument, that his substance is distinguish'd from the Substance of his Father; because the Instrumentality consists in nothing but the difference of their notional conceits of Being and Knowledge, wherof Knowledge seems to be
but the *Vebiculum of Being* towards the operation or effect: So likewise, whoever works by a power that is not in himself, otherwise than from another in whom 'tis principialiter and (as the Greek speaks both anciently and at this day,) Authoritative may not improperly, be said to be commanded; though the other be not his Master or Better. Neither is there such rigour in the genders of *aliud* and *alus*, but that *aliud* is many times apply'd to the person; and only Ecclesiastical use, grounded on the height of propriety and distinction of Genders, binds us to this manner of speaking, which for unity and charity sake we observe.

Out of what has been discours'd about the name *Ousia*, we may easily solve the seeming contradiction of the Council of Antioch to that of Nice: for, if *Ousia* may signify a person, (as we have shew'd it does, in its best and chiefest signification;) then *Homoousion* signifies the same person. So that the Council of Antioch, denying Christ to be *Homoousios* to his Father, deny'd no more then that he was the same person with his Father; which no subtlety can ever prove to be against the Fathers of the Nicean Council. Nor is this said to reconcile contradiictories, but discover equivocations: For that this was the true reason of the opposition
tion, is easily deduc'd out of both St. Athanasius and St. Hilary, and the question which St. Hierom made to St. Damasius.

But it may be urged, if there were a verbal Tradition, how could the Christians, through want of caution, contradict one another: or, had it been as known a part of Religion as the Resurrection, how could Constantine have so slighted it, when it first rose, or Alexander the holy Bishop for a while have remain'd in suspense? To this I answer, If, by verbal Tradition, be understood, that the Tradition was deliver'd in set words; certainly those set words could not be doubted of, though their sense must needs be capable of eternal controversy: but the meaning of verbal, here intended, is only as contradistingu'd from written Tradition; which (being in set words, whose interpretation is continually subject to dispute) is therfore opposed to Oral or mental, where the sense is known, and all the question is about the words and expressions.

Nevertheless, suppose it had been deliver'd in a set and determinate phrase, and that Hereticks began to use other words; a controversy might be about those terms which the Hereticks introduc'd, and many might demur, uncertain of the question in such new expressions: as we see, those who rely
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rely on Scripture are in perpetual quarrels about the sense; whereas, to Catholicks, the sense of their Faith is certain, though the words be sometimes in question.

The reason therefore, why, at Arius his first broaching that desperate heresy, Alexander remain'd a while in suspense, was not that he understood not his own Faith, but because he apprehended not what Arius meant, nor whether his propositions were contrary to the receiv'd truth: But when once Arius broke into those speeches, that Christ was a creature, and that there was a time when Christ was not; then that holy Bishop likewise broke into those words, *Quis unquam talia audivit?* and this is the crime which Socrates reprehends in Arius, that he began to move points *προτέρον ἄνοιξα*., formerly not question'd, but receiv'd with an uniform consent and credulity. As for Alexander's praising, somtimes one, somtimes the other party, it proves no more than that he was a prudent man: though Rufinus seems to tax him of oversoftness. But, because few falsities can be void of all truth, and few truths (at least before much discussion) totally free from all mixture of circumstantial error; therefore it could not be otherwise then well, to praise both sides ingenuously, according as they spake truth and reason, and
and discommend them, when they fell into falsities.

As for Constantine's flighting the Question at first, it shews no more but that, then, he did not penetrate the consequence of it; or rather, was not well enformed concerning it. For, ordinarily, the craftiest and most active party are they who make the first report; and if themselves be in the wrong, (as many times such are more eager and diligent than those that hold the right) their remonstrance is accordingly. And so it was: for Constantine receiv'd his first information at Nicomedia; very probably too, from Eusebius, Bishop of that City, a most perverse adherent to Arius: nor did Constantine himself know wherein the question consisted; as appears by this, that in his whol Letter there is not one word of explanation of the point, but only in common; that it was of slight questions, not belonging to the substance of Faith; the Arians still craftily endeavouring to diminish the importance of the controversy. Besides, we have good ground to believe, that some learned men in Court were prevented by Arius, and solicited into a secret favour of this error; from whom, 'tis likely, proceeded that motion of Constantine to the Council, for determining the point out of Scrip-
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Scripture. Nor imports it, that the Bishops contradicted not this proposition of the Emperour in words; because they had reason to follow it, (though not to that end to which the Emperour propos'd it, *viz.* the solution of the question, but) to the conviction of the Arians, and satisfaction of the world.

For, to speak to the reality of the business, there was no doubt among the Fathers about the truth or falsity of the main matter, (being fully satisfied concerning that, by Tradition, even from their childhood:) but the question was about the answer to their enemies' proofs, and to consult what arguments and reasons should be alleged against them; for the satisfaction of the Church, and the world without the Church, and for the expression of the Catholick doctrine, in such words as the Arians could not equivocally interpret to their own perverse meaning: especially, finding they had so puzzled the world with the dust they had rais'd in men's eyes, that even some good Catholicks could scarce see their way, but were in danger of stumbling against the blocks those Hereticks maliciously cast before their feet. *Eusebius Cæsariensis* testifies of himself, that He thought Alexander's party had held the *Son* of God to be divided from
from the Father, as one part is cut from another in Bodies; which would have made God a body, and truly two Gods.

For these reasons was their magna conquiritio, their turning of Scriptures, and their meeting in Council, as St. Athanasius witnesses, speaking in the name of the very Council itself, in his Epistle de Synodis: We met here (says he) not because we wanted a Faith, (that is, because we were uncertain what to hold) but, to confound those who contradict the truth and go about novelties.

Neither can any argument be made out of Ensebius's Epistle to some Arians, in which he says, The Bishops of the Council approved the word homousion, because they found it in some illustrious Fathers: for, though the inward sense of that term was perfectly traditional, yet was it not till then precisely fixt to that particular expression. But the same Bishops consented to the Excommunication of the Contradictors, to hinder men from using unwritten words: and was not that a proper and prudent remedy to prevent the inconveniences that easily arise from confusion and uncertainty of language; when every one phrases the mystery, according to his private fancy, and governs not his terms by some constant and steady rule,
as the writings of the Apostles or ancient Fathers: which interpretation exactly agrees with the Greek of Eusebius, "εὐαγγέλιον," that literally and truly signifies. Words written neither in Scripture nor anywhere else, as the word "ομιλούσιν" was in the Fathers. And so, I need not alledge He was a secret Arian; though, if he were, his testimony, as far as it reaches, would be so much the more efficacious against them, as Theodoret imploys it.

Now, by all this may be seen, why in Councils there are engaged so many disputations: for no calumny can be so impudent as to deny, the Fathers know their Faith before they meet there; which is plainly implied by the Heretics ordinary protesting against them, as unfit Judges because they are parties, and therefore refusing to come to the Council; besides, the possession of the old Religion being as publick and notorious, at such times, as the Sun itself at noon: wherfore, to say they come to seek out or dispute their Religion, by those long conferences, is a pure folly. They then hold their Religion upon Tradition or possession: but dispute things, either for regulating the Churches' language, that all Catholicks may keep a set form of explication of their Faith; or else to convince their
Adversaries out of such grounds as themselves admit.

To dispute, whether a Council, not confirm'd by the Pope, makes an Article de fide, or no? concerns not the difficulty now before us; and engages Catholick against Catholick, which is not our present work. In the mean while, out of all which has been said, we may gather, that there is no appearance the Catholick Doctrine, concerning the Trinity, was diversly taught before the Council of Nice, and, then first, establish'd out of the Scriptures: but, that it was the known and confessed faith of all the Ages before, as St. Athanasius expressly teaches; avowing confidently he had demonstrated it, supplicating the Emperour to permit the Catholicks to live in the belief of their Forefathers, and upbraiding his adversaries that they could not shew their progenitors. And to say the truth, unless a man be so perverse as to affirm Christians did not use the form of Baptism prescrib'd by Christ, there can be no doubt of the Tradition of the blessed Trinity: the very words of Baptism carrying the Tradition in themselves.

Lastly, 'tis objected, there was no reason for the Council of Nice, in this quarrel, to look into Tradition, since they had such abundance of Scripture. But we must put
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put out our eyes, if we do not see that even at this day the Arians are so cunning as to avoid the strongest Texts of Scripture, and explicate them by other places; and that 'tis impossible to convince, in this manner, any Heretick, as long as one place can explicate a hundred opposed. The Council therefore, at last, (though favour'd with as much advantage as Scripture could give over its adversaries,) was forc'd to conclude out of Tradition: as Theodoretus, St. John Damascen, and chiefly St. Athanasius himself confesses: a necessity which the Rules of St. Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Basil, and Vincentius Lyrinensis,(who teach, it is to no purpose to dispute with Hereticks out of Scripture,) and our own experience of above a hundred years, plainly convince and fully justify to any rational man, whose humour or interest is not to have all Religion obscure and doubtful.
That the necessity of Communicating Infants is no Tradition; But Prayer to Saints is.

There are yet two instances urged against Tradition. One that, for six hundred years, 'twas believ'd necessary to give the holy Eucharist to children; which custom has now been a long time disused. The proof, as far as I know of the necessity, is drawn only out of St. Austin and St. Innocentius, and some words of St. Cyprian: The former of which Fathers are cited to make this argument against the Pelagians. The Eucharist cannot be given, unless to those who are baptized: But the Eucharist is necessary for Children: Therefore Baptism is necessary for them. To which I answer with a formal denial, that any such argument is made by those holy Fathers: For their discourse runs thus, It is necessary for Children to be incorporated into Christ's mystical body; but this cannot be done without Baptism: therefore Baptism is necessary.
cessary for Children. Whether of us take the right sense of these Fathers, let the Books judge; I will only add, 'tis a great shallowness to think the Pelagians (who deny'd the necessity of Baptism) should admit the necessity of the Eucharist, or that it was easier for those Fathers to prove the necessity of the Eucharist, then of Baptism; So that, their argument must be suppos'd, by the objector, to be drawn ex magis obscuris ad minus obscuro.

Yet, because, especially, St. Austin's words seem equivocal, I will briefly set down the state of the question. St. Dennis tells us, no Priestly function was compleat without the administration of the blessed Sacrament: Thence came a custom to communicate those who were baptiz'd. This custom reached even to Infants, but neither universally, that is, in all Churches nor indispensably: For, it was only then used, when Bishops were present at Baptism; as is apparent, both because Communion was never administered, anciently, but after Confirmation; and because it was always held for the complemenent of all Priestly Benedictions, as is before declared: Besides, in some Churches, there is not the least sign that ever it was given to Infants.

Another thing to be understood is, that St.
Austin uses to explicate the Communion to be an incorporation into Christ's mystical Body; of which no doubt but the Sacramental body is both a figure and cause. This St. Austin himself, upon the sixth of St. John, plainly delivers, and, in his phrase, takes the eating and drinking of Christ's Body to be Faith or Baptism: So do Orosius, Prosper, Fulgentius and Facundus, either explicating or following him. This equivocal manner of speaking makes those, who are either not attentive enough, or not willing to have him speak orthodoxly, construe his words Grammatically, that are spoken Allegorically; which left his best Interpreters, and most expert in his works, account to be his opinion.

But to conclude this History, After their loud and full cry, as if the prey were in their sight, which I believe will never come within their reach, (for a deep mouth is a sign of slow heels;) let us see how necessary the African Church (an objection more strongly urged) thought Baptism itself was to Infants, that is, in how perpetual use. And presently Tertullian (the mainly cited and glorify'd for St. Cyprians Master) tells us lib. de Bap. c. 18. Itaque pro cujusque persona conditione ac dispositione, etiam etate, cumulatio Baptismi utilior est. St. Austin (Disciple
to the other two) reports what hapned to himself, having ask’d Baptism in his Childhood, by reason of a sudden danger of death: which being passed, his Baptism was defer’d by his Mother; Quia viz. post lavacrum illud, major et periculosior in jordibus dilectorum eatus foret; and adds, ita jam credebam, et ulla, et omnis domus, nisi solus pater. And that this was not the Faith of that house only, but of the whole Country, is evident from these words; unde ergo, etiam nunc, de alijs atque alijs, sonat undique in auribus nostris: Sine illum, faciat quod vult, nondum enim Baptizatus est. If then Baptism itself was not perpetually administr’d to Infants, can we think the Eucharist was? or is here any probability it was so us’d to children, as not to be also often omitted, and that lawfully?

Maldonatus (a grave man, otherwise) exceeded, and I wonder he is tolerated, speaking so directly against the Council of Trent, after the publishing of it. But his assertion is manifestly fall’n: Since, ’tis known Communion was not used to be given but after Confirmation; and Baptism, without Confirmation, was held sufficient for salvation; as is beyond cavil, expressed by St. Hierrom, in Dialog. cont. Lucifer. about the middle.
The last instance is of *Prayer to Saints*, which is proved not to have proceeded by Tradition from the Apostles time; by four arguments. First, because divers Fathers held that the souls of Saints were not receiv'd into Heaven, till the day of Judgment; therefore certainly they would teach no prayer to Saints. The Antecedent I will not dispute; not that I believe it, but that I know not what it is to our question: For, suppose they are not; may they not nevertheless pray for us? we Catholicks think that Jeremy the Prophet was not in the Macchabees days admitted into Heaven, yet we make no difficulty to believe that he did *multum orare pro populo & sana civitate*. Those Fathers that are cited for the Receptacles, are acknowledg'd to place the Saints in *Sinu Abrahae*; and our Saviour teaches us, that *Dives prayed to Abraham*. The Protestants, as well as we, allow prayer to living Saints: wherever then the dead Saints are, are they worse then when they were living, that they may not be prayed to? But the principal answer to destroy utterly this objection, is, that those who say we learn by Tradition, that *Saints are to be prayed to*, say likewise we have learn'd by Tradition that Saints go to heaven, that is, are admitted to the fight of God, before the day of Judgment.
The next proof is, that prayer to Saints began with a doubting preface of τις οὐδένα, to which I find my self no ways engaged to frame a particular answer, having no farther ground from my Adversary (who cites not any Author) to explicate the meaning of this objection. I remember, Cardinal Richelieu, at his death, is reported to have taken his kinsman, Marshal de Meilleray, by the hand, and told him that, if the next world were such as was figured to us here, (I deliver what I conceive to be the sense, not the words) he would not fail to pray for him: Now some, who had a hard opinion of that great Person, would press out of this speech, that he believ'd not the Immortality of the Soul. Whether this also be pretended to be the meaning of that Optative term, τις οὐδένα, I cannot judge; for then I should easily admit it has some force against the Tradition of praying to Saints: But, if it be but an Oratorial expression and obtention, such as is in St. Paul, when he presses men to good works, by the like phrase; I know not how it reaches any way to his intent, and much less against the receiving of this use by Tradition: except the objector suppose that, truly, the first Prayer he finds in writing was the first that ever was made, which is neither proved nor probable.
The third opposition is out of Nicephorus Calixtus, who reports, that Prayers to the Virgin Mary were first brought into the publick Liturgie, by Petrus Gnaphem, a Heretick. The consequence I should make out of this antecedent is, that, seeing the Author's being a Heretik (a condemn'd and hated Person) could not hinder this institution to take root and be approved, 'tis a sign it had a deeper foundation then of his beginning: not that it was before in the Liturgie, but that it was an ordinary practice among Christians; which use, because we know no origin it has in Scripture, must have been out of Tradition, and not of a short time: how our Adversary will prove the contrary, I am not able to make any likely conjecture.

The last argument is drawn out of the confession of our own Doctours, who affirm, there is no Precept for praying to Saints in the Church of God (for so much is meant by those words, sub Evangelio;) and yeild the reason, that Pagans might not think themselves brought again to the worship of men. Which Antecedent having two parts, the non-precept, and the reason thereof: out of the first part nothing can be deduced; out of the second this consequence is inferred, Pagans would be equally scandaliz'd by
by the Permission, as by the Precept. Therefore, if it be commanded, neither certainly ought it be permitted.

Although no law oblige one Divine to maintain the reasons of another, yet I see no such evidence in this consequence, as, for it, to renounce the reason: for, me thinks, if those we call Saints, were meant to be Gods, we should of necessity be bound to worship them; whence it follows, if it be not necessary to worship them, neither are they Gods, nor the worship exhibited to them, such as is due to God; but only of that degree which we give excellent creatures: a position so conformable to Nature, that it can scandalize none but the enemies of Perfection; who, under pretence of avoiding Idolatry, take away the due honour and excitation to Vertue. But, which way, out of a non-Precept, can be infer'd the non-Teaching of the Doctrine, I cannot imagine; since what those Doctors hold, continues true at this day, when it cannot be denied that Praying to Saints is both taught and practiced: For though, in our prayers, there be some directions to Saints; yet, generally, Christians are not bound to such devotions, and they that are, 'tis but their own voluntary acceptance of the obligation to which such prayers are annexed.
THE
THIRTEENTH ENCOUNTER

Reflecting on certain considerations: and shewing that there is nothing able to disprove the Church of Rome's Communion to be the signe of the true Church.

Although, out of the whole preceding discourse it be evident that this way I defend, makes the Churches Definition depend upon the Tradition of the point defined, and not Tradition upon them; as if, because by Tradition, we know the Churches Definitions to be true, thencefore we know the truth deliver'd by Tradition: Nevertheless, since there may be some truth in this reflexion, That Tradition is known sometimes by Definition, let us see what can be said against it: Tis first, therefore, put into consideration, whether since four Disciples of Christ have written Gospels, or the Gospel, that is, as much as they preach'd (for they preach'd nothing but the Gospel:) if God would have us trust the Church, he was
was not both to specify so much, very plainly, in them, and farther deliver such signs as were necessary ever to know Her by.

For answer, I ask a cross question, Whether, if God Almighty would have all men see by the Sun, he was first to tell them which it is, and paint *its picture on every wall, that so we might know which is the Sun? And because my question may seem rather offensive than deserving any answer I proceed to the application; and ask, Whether any of those Christians, of whom Saint John says, *exierunt ex nobis, could doubt which was the Church, wherof he had been a part and left it? And, since you cannot answer otherwise then affirmatively, I think I need not repeat the same question, of Arius and Pelagius, and Luther. If then God has provided for all these, that they were taught to yield obedience to the definitions of this Church, so clearly, that they could neither doubt which Church was their teacher, nor of what Church he spake; how dare they presume to accuse him of deficiency in his providence? The same Authority that gave you the Scripture, and told you it was the Word of God, said likewise, that what she taught was no lesse the Word of God. If you believe her report for the Book, why refuse you it for the Doctrin? If her recom-
hends be not security enough for the one; they will certainly prove far less for the other; since, unless I am strangely mistaken, the doctrine of the Catholick Church is not so hard to believe, as the story of the fable: let any Atheist or discreet Moore or agan be judge.

Oh, but since the Evangelists wrote Gospels, they wrote all they preach'd; for they preach'd nothing but the Gospel. The Gospel is known to be the same with the Greek Evangelium, that is, the Good-spel, or happy tidings of Christ's coming: so that the Book or Preaching which tells us Christ is come, is a Gospel, be there! never so much, more or less, in the Book or Sermon: how then it can be inferred out of the name Gospel, that the Apostles wrote as much as they preach'd (for it is not credible they preach'd all they wrote) I am not able to comprehend.

The second consideration is, how we know when the Church has defined? To which I answer, In the practice of sixteen ages it has no more been doubted, when the Church had defined, then when a Parliament had enacted: Why then is there required more information? But, some Divines say more, some less to be enough. Let them be doing in the Schools, as long as the practice
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A dice goes on sufficiently for the Church government.

Thirdly, we are to consider, Whether sufficient notes be left to know the Church by? But who shall use these notes? Catholics? They are in the Church. Heretics? They know what Church they forsook. Pagans? They look not into the Scriptures to finde the Churches mark. Peradventure those Heretics whose separation is so long since, that they remember not out of what Church they went. But none are grown so aged yet. However the marks of the Church are apparent enough in Scripture, if there want not wil in the seeker to acknowledg them.

The fourth consideration is, Whether points of Faith, or to be of Faith, be infinite (new ones continually springing) or finite? If finite, why are they not all delivered at once, to make an end of incertitude and defining? The answer is, they are both finite and infinite: finite, in gross, and wholly delivered by the Apostles, wholly believed and practiced by this present Church; but infinite, in the detail, by which mans wit can parcel out this general flock of Faith. For, as soon as any sharp and crafty Heretick has varied some proposition, necessary to the explication of a fore-believed Doctrin, there may be occasion of settling some new propo-
propojition, which shall be no other than a part of what was formerly believ'd in Substance, though not so explicitly deciphred. As he that professes Christ is a Man, implies he has a man's Nature, a man's Understanding, and Will, and Action; though this word Man distinguishes not precisely these faculties: nor does he that repeats all these qualities in particular, say any more then he that said in general he was a Man. Now then I answer the objection, as Aesop's Master did those who would have bound him to drink up the Sea: stop the Rivers (said he) and I will performe my bargain: So say I, hinder impertinent curiosities from importuning the Church, and her Truths will be undoubtedly seen in her belief and practice, without making new Definitions.

The last objection; that it will appear a shift to say the Churches definitions are certain, and yet not let it be known when he has defin'd, of it self falls flat to the ground: both because I take not that way; and, if I did, since we are not troubled about knowing our Churches Definitions, who have the burthen of obeying and do it in practice, the Objectors are confuted as Diogenes did Zeno, (when he disputed against motion,) by walking before him.

For all this, the Church of Rome must not escape
escape yet: And so, we are told that, if he were design'd for the Pharos to know the rest of the Church by, somewhat had been advan'd; for, otherwise (say they) we can assign no mark of the true Church, the Roman being deny'd to be such as we make her. First, I answer, we have no need of recourse to the Church of Rome; it being the infallible distinctive sign of the Church, to lay claim to the handed Doctrin, or, Tradition, which evidently appears cannot be claim'd by two: For, if two agree in a point to day, and one dissent to morrow, it were madness to say the disagreeer can lay claim to yesterdays opinion.

Secondly, we say, if we would fly to the Roman Church, the oppositions force us not from it: For, why is not Cardinal Perron answer to Plefsis invincible, that the whole Church condemn'd St. Cyprians proceedings? Likewise the Asian Bishops were condemn'd in the Council of Nice. The African Bishops question was about the enacting a Law, which nevertheless, was carried for the Bishop of Rome.

If the Fathers remit us to the Apostolical Churches, whose successions were, then, visible and evident; what's that to us, now, when all successions are interrupted, save only that of the Roman Church? The definition o
of the Council of Calcedon is known to be only the conspiracy of a Cabal, never approved as legitimate; but reversed afterwards: So that all these angry darts turn their points against their Authors; the judgment in every instance having past in favour of the Church they oppose. But this question, concerning the Church of Rome, is of greater extent and importance than to be huddled up in one sheet of Paper: Therefore, let us leave Her to the acknowledged Majesty the possessor in the Christian world; and not, by slight objections and answers, rather seem to undervalue her Dignity, then either oppose or defend her Authority.

You present us therefore next, with what is kept for the closing of our Tomacks; and they are two dishes: One, that at last we Catholicks resolve into Reason, as well as protestants. To this I answer, if you mean we must see Reason why we give credit to Authority, I agree with you: But then, since Reason is on both sides, Why (say you) must it be a Wall to us, and a Bulrush to others? Ie tell you. Reason has two parts, demonstration and Sophistry; and, in Demonstrations, that evidence which governs our lives, is the most familiar to us, and consequently, besides its firmness, 'tis the most rare and least denyable: Now, this proposition,
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Motion, that we ought to believe a knowing person, in that wherein our selves are ignorant, is, of this nature, a Maxime that governs all our life, publick and private: wherfore our ground or Reason, is a wall, a rock, or if any thing be yet more solid. On the other side, of all parts of Sophistry, that which is built on broken ends of obscure sentences of dead men, who cannot declare themselves, is the most weak and contemptible: and this being that you rely on, Reason therefore to you is weaker and more deceitful than any Bulrush.

The second dish is, that whatever is deliver'd in defence of the Church of Rome, only proves that, as yet, she is the true Church, not that she cannot leave the way she is in and fall to reform (as her adversaries call it;) or that there may not happen some Shism among the Churches now adhering to her, where both parts may claim Tradition and then where is the guide? To this I answer, I will not weigh the proofs of other for the eternity of the particular Church of Rome: since there is no contest betwixt us here, about that: but those who are acquainted with controversies, cannot be ignorant, that our writers intend to prove He indefectibility. All I'le say is, did you but agree with us, that she is at present the true Church,
Church, it would be argument enough for you to submit, till the cases happen which you suppose possible; and I should think my self too grating and severe towards a Person, in other respects extremely recommendable, if I should press harder, then upon him, nor could I desire a repast more delightful to my soul, then to have seen that in practice concerning him, which is now too late to be hoped.

---

THE FOURTEENTH ENCOUNTER.

Four other Arguments reversed.

Such is the condition of Religion; when the liberty of choosing is permitted to all that have the boldness to challenge it; who having no other Scales, to poise any arguments propos'd them, then the affection to their own wils or prejudice against others reasons, suffer every light objection to overballance the most weighty and solid Demonstration. Therefore am I forc'd to follow certain other Adversaries (my chase not being confin'd only to the noble game) to every by-turn and beat every little

12 bush;
bush, where either the necessity of a desperate cause, the fables of some wild Reporter, or the craft of any jugling Hypocrit can drive them to hide their weak heads in.

As for reason, in our present business they tel you, every one is born in liberty to Religion, and, till it be demonstrated he is bound to acknowledge some Teacher, the presumption stands for liberty, and 'tis merely of courtesy and graciousness, they take the pains to bring arguments for the Negativ. This I shal answer as the Caprich of some pragmatical Chaplain; not having incivility enough to entertain the least suspicion; that so great a Wit, flored with Art, in a busy time about questions of government should bring forth so misshappen a Monste.

But alas! what cannot an unruly fancy that bites the bridle of reason? Say the my young Divines, of Politick, of Patern government, what you say of Religion: not the absurdity so palpable, it wil ma you ashamed? That no child is bound to honour Father and Mother, till it be demonstrated to him he ought to do so? Not Subject to obey the Magistrate, till, after long dispute his power be evidently proved legitimate? Pas from these to Arts, and every one may play the Physitian, the Pil the Judg, (for Doctor of Divinity, you fr
Tradition.

... give your licence to all the world) without having any Master or Teacher, what a goodly Common-wealth you will make?

But 'tis reply'd, *Nullum tempus occurs vitati*, no more than *Regi*; since *veritas fortior est Rege*. I, Sir, but in your *major* you put *veritas*, and in your *minor*, *fulsit*is. For, what is your truth, when you come to declare your self, but probable arguments, of which nothing is more certain, then that they have no truth in them? a proof, as such, still carrying its truth in its force of concluding; but probable arguments have no force to conclude, and consequently, no truth. For, the truth of a saying is different from that of an argument: a true argument being that which proves the thing to be; a true saying which only affirms it to be.

And, if we look into it, we see, what I say is but the Law of Nature, and natural constancy: for as, to *not act*, 'tis enough to have no reason; but, *to act*, we ought to have a positive cause: so, to *remain* in the Religion of our Birth and Education, there is no other reason requir'd, then because we are in it; whereas, to *change*, we must have efficacious motives to perswade us.

Here, my Adversary will exult, and think, at least, Protestants cannot become Catho-
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likes, without evidence, which he conceives impossible. And, I grant his consequence, if he can prove his supposition. For, to my sight, nothing is more clear then, that Protestants changed their Religion from being Catholiks, and that upon but probable grounds: whence it is evident, no Protestant, who is formally such, (that is, holds his Religion on probable arguments, against the Catholik Church) but stands in a continual formal rebellion against Her, who by his own acknowledgment was once his Magistrate, and against whom himself confesses he has no more then probable exception.

Therefore, whoever, of a Protestant becomes Catholik, goes so far with evidence, that he reconciles himself to a government under which he once was, and had no just reason to depart from it, (none being sufficient to excuse so great a disorder) and so, ought, under peril of eternal damnation, return to his first obedience. For, where he is, he is certain to find, no security; since, his relyance, by his own verdict, is at most but upon plausible arguments: whereas, under the other government, there may be certainty, for ought he knows; of which there is this fair motive, that they all profess it, which is more forcible for the credit of
it, then whatever he can say in abetment of the contrary. Rashly, therefore, he opposes himself to follow a false way, a way that assuredly leads to unavoydable precipices.

They reply, the Turks also agree in the Law of Mahomet, and yet that brings no evidence their Law is true. But alas! they observe not that, in saying so, they unawarely call themselves no Christians: For, to us, this consent is no argument Mahometanism is true, because it carries no farther than that the Law is Mahomet's; And so far is manifest out of their common agreement: therefore, in parity, 'tis evident, out of the consent of Christians, that the doctrine handed down from the Apostles, is Christ's; and the doubt may perhaps remain with the Objectors, but not with us, whether Christ's doctrine be true? as neither we nor they doubt that Mahomet's preaching was fall.

And seeing the case is common to all Christians, against the Roman Catholik, he only relying on Tradition, they all renouncing it, he only can run his Religion up to the Person of Christ, and there leave it securely establish'd, upon the infallible credit of his word. And as no other sort of Christian society can pretend to this priviledge, so neither can they with any colour of justice, exempt
exempt themselves from the Authority of that Church that enjoys it: an Authority, which, if ever she had, and such as she claims it, is of so unchangeable a nature, being constituted by God, being the rock on which the salvation of mankind is built, and the fundamental stone of the Church, no time nor variation of material accidents can prejudice or prescribe against it. Wherfore, if Protestants at first departed unjustifiably, they remain for ever guilty of the same crime, till they restore themselves to the Primitive union.

Again, who, unless he had renounced all morality, ever called it liberty, not to know, or not be bound to the rules and principles of good life? Sure these objectors either think religion concerns not good life, but is a vain and empty Idea in the air, little important whether it be known or no: or forget themselves so far, as to fall into the sequel of this gross absurdity. Besides, who can be so desperately passionate, as to term it liberty, to have no good government; and relaps again to the rude state of barbarousnes, where murder, rapes, & a thousand intolerable insolencies are publikly permitted? For, if we cast our eyes on the End of Religion, we shall see, that to want the due Rules, is as inconvenient towards the direction of mankind to final beatitude.
beatitude, as the Laws of Canibals are destructive to all civil and friendly society. So that 'tis to be ignorant of all reason, to cry up a liberty to have no Religion, or to chuse one indifferently, as unconcern'd whether it be right or wrong. Were it not better plainly to avow the preferrence of the pleasures and profits of this world, before hopes so far off as the future life; then, with these ambushes, to ensnare unwary souls into the same inconveniencies, under title of a probable Religion?

And truly, if we look upon their lives, we shall find that hoc Janus summus ab imo Personat. I intend not by this any waies to derogate from the old Roman vertues, in this sort of people, as if there may not be found Regulus's, or Cato's, or Seneca's among them: for, I doubt not but the very vapour of Christianity has this wholesome effect among whom it passes, to breed in them as Heroick spirits as ancient Rome ever saw, and more too, if the like occasions presented themselves: But Nature, and Generosity, and Opinion, too often challenge their shares, or rather mastery, in such actions; and how little can justly be ascribed to the hope of heaven, I rather suspect then declare.

To return therefore to our discourse. The Jew, the Turke, the Heathen, can pretend a pro-
profession of his Religion; for all these stick to such conclusions as their principles afford them: But the Christian, who calls Christ's doctrine his, and confesses that he or his Sect has deserted those who alone pretend to the successive livery and seisin of it, can no way presume to the possession, till he plainly demonstrate the clearness of his title. Wherfore, it avails not any drowsie, rather then quiet, nature, to say his Father, (and peradventure Grandfather) was Protestant before him, and therefore he is Possessed for bona fidei, whilst he pretends only probable arguments: for so long he implies the possession to be unjustly detain'd from the advers party, who has the actual receit by succession; especially when this so unparalleled a Riot is committed without sufficient evidence, by the very Actors confession. A Protestant then, has no better claim to possession of Christ's Doctrine, by his so long continuance in Heresie, then the Paricide in Aristotle, who, having beaten his Father pleaded that his Father had beat his Grandfather, and his Grandfather his great Grandfather: as though such a graceless entail could prejudice the law of Nature.

Though not so absurd, yet as weak is another Objection taken from the Jewish Cabala: however, it seems worthy of thanks to
to the Suggestor. What it was, is not hard to guess, our Saviour himself having given us the hint of it, when he reproach'd the Jews for following the Traditions of their Fathers or Elders, to the ruin of God's commands. But to decipher it better, I ought to divide it into matter and form. The form I call the Rules: the matter, what was deliver'd or found out by these Rules. As for the matter, it seems in some way proportion'd to the proceedings of certain of our Divines, who pretend to be mysticall; and their imployment is, in the sublimer mysteries of our Faith, to invent or imagin what they think congruous circumstances, to move the affections to petty devotion: which imaginations, as they are fram'd out of good intentions, so have they many weaknesses, and little or no doctrin in them. Conformable to this we may conceive that, after there were no more Prophets among the Jews, (who fail'd them, not long after the second building of their Temple) the Rabbins began to frame explications on their Books of holy Scripture, and the mysteries learn'd from the Prophets. These interpretations, according to the degree of their skil and prudence, some perform'd better, some worse. But, as the Jews were a superstitious and ignorant Nation, not having principles of
of true knowledge naked before their Eys; but wrapt up in Metaphors and Allegories; all together went among them for sound Law. Til, after our Saviours time, and the dispersion of that generation, some foolish knave, to give authority to this mess of good and bad jumbled together, invented the story how Moses had deliver'd this doctrine to the Sanhedrin, and they had conserv'd it, by traditional conveyances from Father to Son. A story as impossible and incredible, to one who penetrates into the carriage of that Nation, as the Fables of Jeoffrey of Monmouth, and King Arthur's conquering Hierusalem.

Now, if we look into the form, we shall find it more ridiculous then any Gypses canti
ting, or the jugling of Hocus Pocus, and as pernicious to true Doctrine, as any Pseudo-
mancy. To make good this censure, I shall in short describe their form: it consists in inventing the sense of Scripture by three abuses of the Letter, which (as far as my memory serves me, for I have not the books necessary) are these. One, by taking every letter of a word, for a whole word beginning with that letter: Another, by changing letters, according to certain rules fram'd by themselves: The third, to find numbers of years or other things, by the numbers which
the letters of the word compound, in such Languages where their letters are used for cyphers. So much being deliver'd in short, I cannot conceive any indifferent judgment so blunt, that he sees not how far these ridling ways of explication are from the natural intention of a Writer; and how destructive to all truth, if used otherwise then for pleasure and as a disport of chance and encounter. Our Country man, Doctor Alablaster, invented a far more convenient trick, by purely dividing words and joining the ends of the former to the beginnings of the following: as we also do, sometimes in English, to disguise common words; and the Hebrew is far more apt for such tricks. But he found this age too subtle, to cozen any considerable number with such trivial bables: Wheras the Cabala gain'd upon the Valentinians and Gnosticks, to build prodigious errors, in very good earnest, upon their more ridiculous invention. I am not ignorant some eminent persons have been pleased sometime, to give way to such toyes, through luxury of wit and gaiety of humour: But it is one thing to play for recreation, and a far different to establish a Basis of Faith and doctrin, which is abominable, on such Chimerical dreams. And yet, this it is our Opposer would Fa-
An Apologie

ther, upon no less then Moses and the Sanhedrin and all the sacred Magistracy of the old Law.

Let us give a step farther and see, if it were true, how like it were to our case. The Tradition we speak of, is the publick preaching and teaching and practice exercised in the Church, settled by the Apostles thorrow the World: This Cabala, a doctrin pretended, as deliver'd to few, with strict charge to keep it from publicity, and so communicate it again successively to a select Committee of a few; wherein you may see as fair an opportunity for jugling and cozenage, as, in our case there is impossibility. The Moderns thherefore, who profess Cabala, may say they receiv'd it from their predecessors: but they can yeild no account why any Age may not have chang'd that which was in the breasts of few shut up together in a chamber; and so ther's no possibility of farther assurance, then the vote of a Council of State, for its being deriv'd any higher.

But the Arguer demands, whether they cannot ask me, In what age or year their doctrin was corrupted? And I answer, they may very boldly: But, if I assign an age or year, can they acquit themselves in point of proof? clearly they cannot: for, since there was
was no Register nor visible effects of this doctrin (it being forbidden to be divulg'd) 'tis evident, that cannot convince it was not corrupted in that year or age. He urges farther, the notoriousness of the ly, so impudent as few would venture on: not reflecting that he speaks of a secret, altogether incapable of notoriousness. May not they add, says he, the dispersion of their Churches through so many Countries and Languages? I yeild they may, but to no purpose, unless they continue Sanhedrins in every Country: For otherwise, this dispersion will prove but the derivation from their Council of Tiberias, or such like time, which is nothing to the succession from Moses. Add to this, that the Nation since Christ's time, is infamous for falsifying doctrins and corrupting Scriptures: and, even in our Saviours time and long before, their Rabbins were justly branded with the foul imputation of frequent forgery; their Sects and heresies being grown up to that desperate height, as to deny there were any spirits, or shall be any Resurrection, which is the very top of impiety.

But (what is no less to be consider'd, then any thing yet offer'd) the very subject of the question is different. The Church, we speak of, is a vast and numerous body, spread...
o're the world; and he must be a mad man that would go about to deny this Body has remain'd perpetually visible, from Christ's time to ours: however some Heretick may pretend the invisible part, viz. that the Faith has been interrupted. But, for the Sanhedrin, what assurance, nay what probability is there of deriving its pedigree, from Moses to the daies of our Saviour? In all their oppressions during the time of the Judges, in the division of the Tribes, in the raign of their Kings, in the captivity, first of the ten, then of the two other Tribes, very little mention of any such Magistrate, much less evidence of a perfect continuance. How far then, are we from having any certainty of a doctrin's succession, by them, of whom 'tis very obscure, whither any such persons were or no?

A third objection is collected, from the natural proneness in Mankind to conserve Tradition; by which they intend to shew Religion is corrupted: Wherin you may note the force of wit and Logick, to draw arguments against a truth, even out of these very causes, which are made to conserve the truth impugned. The arguments are three. First, that divers Fathers, for zeal to the received doctrin, were very earnest against the belief of the Antipodes, which, now, is an ocular
ocular certainty. That divers Fathers did oppose that doctrin, I willingly grant: but that it was for zeal to Religion, and not through the opinion of absurdity in Philosophy, I am not satisfy'd, nor does the Author bring any proof. I remember they object, as absurd, that men should stand feet to feet; I remember they conceit those under us would fall into heaven; for the rest, some places of Scripture are allledged; so that, not out of zeal to Tradition, but through misunderstanding the Scripture, they fell into this error. Yet I deny not there may, perhaps, be some argument out of Religion; as men confirm their opinions from all they can.

The second proof, I imagin touches the History of Virgilius; who, for a like opinion, is reported to have lost his Bishoprick. But 'tis a mistake; for that holy man was no Bishop when he was charg'd with this error, That he held there was another Sun and Moon, belonging to the hemisphere opposite to us, and a new world: nor is it certain, whether truly he thought so, or recanted, or was falsely accus'd; but well known he was afterward made Bishop, and lived and dyed with opinion of sanctity.

But though the two first proofs are slender, the third will require more strength to resist.
resift it; and thencefore 'tis especially recommended to the Reader, to look on the place: it being in a Council and our own proper confession, and so apparently strong, and altogether insoluble; if the Author be inexpugnabilis Dialecticus, as well as St. Augustine, in his Burlesque phrase.

Thus then begins this Onset, which our Adversary manages with as much civility as strength. I will also desire you (says he) to look into the 584. Page of the Florentine Council, set out by Binius: and there you will find, that the Latins confess they added to the Creed, the procession of the holy Ghost from the Son, because the contrary opinion seem'd to them, by consequence, opposite to a confessed Tradition of Christ's eternal Divinity: which yet appears by what Cardinal Perron has excellently shown, not to be contradictory to Faith, but that this consequence was ill drawn: which may have been in other points too, and so have brought in no small number of errors; since neither was their Logick certain to conclude better, nor were they less apt to add to their Creeds accordingly, at any other times, then they were at that. Thus far the charge: And I have been obsequious to so ingenious a request; as wil, I hope, appear by my answer, if I first wash my hands from Cardinal Per-
for Tradition.

... with whom I do not engage: nor need, since the Council has age and can speak for itself. As also, by the way, note that, since the addition of Filiöque, (which was about the year 440, in St. Leo's time) there has not any tittle been added to the Churches' Creed; though very many Heresies have been condemn'd. So that the Ob- ector is forward in his assertions, without seconding them with solid proofs.

To come now to the Combat, I doubt much he, who was so solicitous to have me look into the Council, was not so careful as to cast an eye upon it himself: Else he would have found, the question had not been of adding the words Filiöque, or ex tur, but of the using them; the adding having been for the controversy with Photius, the using for the expression of our belief, which the Council says, consists in two points; First, that the Divinity is the same in all the three Persons, that is, there is not three Divinities in three Persons, nor yet one Divinity from which the Persons or Personalities be resolute different, and not, δύο μισθοε χαρισ. The Second, that none should have any cause to suspect the holy Ghost to be ἐκ τοιούτων. Wherefore, the insufficiency of the consequence, which (he says) Cardinal Ron demonstrates, is not to our purpose.
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no such inference appearing in the Council: the Latins or Roman Church only professing that, if the holy Ghost did not proceed out of the Father and the Son, as one principium or cauē, then the Divinity were divided in the Father and Son, and, by consequence, in the Holy Ghost too, and so τετραγωνικαςι as the Council speaks.

Whence, we may see, the Opponent mistook the whole case, there being no question of the cause of adding, but of what was express'd; nor any dispute of Christ's Divinity, but of the Unity of the Divinity with the Persons and in itself; Nor any drawing of consequences, but an expression of Catholic doctrin; nor any supposed error: but a truth confess'd both by Protestants and us: and finally, the words are said to be used, to express this point, that He proceeds from the Son; and not question'd why the opinion is held, that He proceeds from the Son, which is far different from what we now contend about.

There is another objection, and Cardinal Perron made the Author, as having reported, out of Isidore, that the Jews conspired together to abolish the book of Wisdom, because it spake too plainly of Christ. The story the Objector himself will not avouch, because it would rank the Book (by him
him pretended to be *Apocryphal*) too high: yet, though it be acknowledg'd fall, he con-
ceives it strong enough against us, because it shews such a thing might be done. Let us poize a little the weight of this Argument: It might have been done; therefore your Trad-
tion may fail you. First I demand, how you prove it might have been done; because Isidore said it was done. The Spanish Conquerors, when first they enter'd the miracles of the Western World, reported, They climb'd up great hills in the Sea: Therfore was it possible? They talk'd much of waters which restor'd Youth: Therefore is it credible? But Isi-
dore's authority convinces this: If it were Isidore, the holy Bishop of Sevil, somthing were said: But 'tis Isidore, surnamed Mercator, one that collects and patches together truths and falsities, almost indifferently; at least our men spare not to reject him in mat-
ters of great moment. Thus the bare possibility, that it might have been done, is not, it self, yet, sufficiently prov'd.

But let us pass that, and, without much training our charity, grant among Jews it might have been done, as not a few think the very Law was lost in the times of their wicked Kings or other oppressions: what inference can they make against Christian Tradition? Of Books of Scripture, perad-
venture
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venture there was a time, when some one, or rather any one might have been lost; because it was in few hands: shall we therefore conclude the same possibility of suppression, when we treat of Doctrins universally profest by so many Millions? when we dispute of Practices every day frequented by the whole Church.

Still there's one jarring string, that grates my ears with its loud discord; though the stroke come not from the hand of these objectors, yet I will endeavour to put it in tune. Some sick heads roving up and down in their extravagant phantasies will needs entertain a wild conjecture, that at first our Saviour was indeed still'd God, and though the learned, who had the knack of distinguishing, knew well enough the inward meaning then signify'd only a most eminent and god-like person, yet the common People understanding their Preacher simply, as the letter sounded, came by degrees universally to believe his true and real divinity. But with what ingenuity can such rambling wits think the chief Principle of Christianity should be so negligently taught? or accuse so many holy Saints of those purest times to be such deceitful Teachers? Besides, did not their rashness blind them, they would easily see the raising the Person of Christ,
from humane to divine, would necessarily infer a notorious change in the solemn Prayers of the Church and daily devotion of the People, which certainly would give so great a shock to both, it could not possibly be attempted, either undiscern'd or unrefiited. Lastly the Christian Faith being delivered not in a set form of words, but in sense a thousand ways explicated & enforced according to the variety of occasions and capacity of the learners: how can any ambiguity of phrase endanger them into a mistake, who attend not so much to the dead letter, as the quickening sense, so variously express'd, so often inculcated to them by their masters?

THE FIFTEENTH ENCOUNTER,

Declaring the state of this question, Whether the Scripture can decide controversies?

There remains yet a second part of our Apology; for, as this is the Catholicks principle to adhere to the authority of the Church, that is, to the living word written in their breasts, which governs all their actions relating to religion: so on the other side,
side, whoever have at any time, (under the pretence of reformation) oppos'd her Authority, such have constantly rais'd up their Altar against Tradition, upon the dead letter of the Scriptures: Which, as the Catholick Church highly reverences, when they are animated by the interpretation of Tradition; so, by too much experience, she knows they become a killing letter, when abus'd, against the Catholick sense, in the mouths of the Devil and his Ministers.

But, before we set our feet within the lists, I am bound to take notice of an opposition, no less common then flight and absurd: and this it is. When we retire to Tradition, after both parties have lost their breath in beating the aerial out of Scripture, they presently cry out, Cannot Aristotle, cannot Plato make themselves be understood? why then should not the Bible, as well determine Controversies? If this were not after sixteen hundred years of experience, after so much pains of our own, since Luther's time, idly cast away, in tossing the windy balls of empty words, without coming to resolution of any one point, peradventure it were pardonable: but now, alas, what can it be, but an obstinate desire of darkness and a contempt of God's Law and truth, by a bold and irrational assertion and loud clamours
flamours to beat down the Catholick Church; like Dametas in the Poem, striking with both hands and his whole strength, but winking all the while?

Let us, therefore open our Eys and look thorow this objection; Cannot Plato and Aristotle make themselves be understood? Yes; but what then? Ergo the Scripture can determine controversys? The supposition wherein all venom ly's is conceal'd; which thus I display: As Aristotle wrote of Physticks and Metaphysticks, so the Scripture was written of those controversies which since are risen among Christians: But Plato and Aristotle can make themselves be understood concerning those Sciences: therfore the Scripture can do as much concerning these Controversies. This ought to be the discourse. But had it been cloth'd in so thin and transparent a dress, the Authors would have blusht to thrust it into light: For, tis a most shameless Proposition, to say the Scriptures were written of the Controversys, long after their date, sprung up in the Christian world.

Beginning from Genesis to the Apocalyps, let them name one Book, whose theme is any, now-controverted, Point betwixt Protestants and Catholiks. Tis true, the intent and extrinsical end of writing St.
Johns Gospel was, to shew the Godhead of Christ, which the Arians afterward deny'd, but that is not so directly his theme, as the miraculous life of our Saviour, from whence the Divinity of his Person was to be deduc'd: and yet the design so unsuccessful, that never any Heresy was more powerful, than that which oppos'd the truth intended by His Book.

But, I suppose, their reply will be, they purpose not to say the Scripture was written of our present controversies, but of the precepts of good life and Articles of Faith necessary to them, about which our controversies arise. If this be their meaning, their Assumption is as ridiculous, as, in the other, their Major or chief Proposition. For, their argument must be framed thus. As Scripture was written of the necessaries to good life; so Aristotle and Plato, of Physicks and Metaphysicks: But Aristotle and Plato write so plainly, that all questions rising about their doctrin, can be declared out of their words: therefore all questions relating to good life, may also be cleared out of Scriptures. Wherein the Minor is so ridiculous to any that have but open'd a Book of Philosophy, that 'tis enough, not only to disanul the proof, but discredit the Author.
And yet were it true, the consequence would not hold: For whoever considers what belongs to the explication of Authors, knows, there is a great advantage to discern the sense of those who proceed scientifically, above the means to understand one that writes loose Sentences. An Archimedes, an Euclid, a Vitruvius will be of far easier interpretation, where the Subject is of equal facility, then a Theognis, Phocylides, or Antoninus, because the antecedents and consequents do, for the most part, force a sense on the middle propositions, of themselves ambiguous. Now, the works of Plato and Aristotle are generally penn'd, though not always so rigorously, yet still with an approach to the Mathematical way: The Scripture uses a quite different method, delivering its precepts without connexion betwixt one another. And though I deny not but, peradventure, the Articles of our belief have, in themselves as much connexion, as the severest discourses of those Philosophers: yet the style, wherein they are couch'd in the Bible, is accommodated to vulgar capacities, and the delivery by way of plain and direct affirmation, without attending to the artificial rules of demonstration.

But, because no controversy can be clear and fit for decision, unless it be prepar'd by an
An exact and rigorous stating the Question:
I first intend to set down my own sentiment, which I conceive is also that of the Catholick Church: and afterward what I collect to be the opinion of my Adversaries; leaving them this free and just liberty, to correct me if I mistake their mind.

First then, we Catholicks no way doubt, but the Scripture is the word of God, and of infallible truth, if rightly understood: and that whoever, being out of the Church, receives the Scripture in that quality; the ground of such reception (if rational) can be no other, then because we taught him so, and deliver'd it to him, as such. For I do not intend to dispute against those Spiritati, who, by an Enthusiastical light, can judge of Scripture without sense and reason: And, to those, who pretend either Fathers or other Christians out of our Church, I answer, my meaning is to comprehend in our Church the Fathers; for so goes our position; and consequently all Sæts either receiv'd the Scripture immediately from us, or from those who received it from us.

Secondly, we doubt not but the Scripture is highly profitable, for the enablement of Preachers to teach, reprove, confirm; in all points of Catholick doctrin, both concerning Speculation and Practice: and by con-
Tradition.

Sequence that the Church were not so thoroughly furnish'd for all kind of exigences without it; for which reason it is of particular usefulness, and indeed necessity to the Church.

Thirdly, we confess the Bible contains all parts of Catholik Doctrine, in this sense, that all Catholik doctrine may be found there, by places and arguments be deduced thence, nay more, be topically or Oratorially proved out of it: so that, if an able Preacher be in a Pulpit, where he speaks without contradiction, with a full and free scope; he may, merely discoursing out of Scripture, carry any point of Catholik doctrine before the generality of his Audience, and convince at the present such a part of them, as either are but indifferently speculative, or have not taken pains in the question.

Fourthly, I affirm, that if any point be brought to an eristicall decision before Judges, where the parties on both sides are obstinately bent to defend their own position, by all the art they can imagin; so the question be not, which part is true, but only which is more or less conformable to Scripture; the Catholik position may be victoriously evidenced, by arguments purely drawn from thence, compared and valued according to true
true Criticism; without ayd of Fathers, explications, or any other extrinsical helps. Thus far I esteem all good Catholiks ought to hold; and believe that all, καὶ πᾶντος, ὑποθεσμόνος, doc, de facto, hold.

Now then, to come to the true difference betwixt our Adversaries and us: I understand it consists in this, That having stated a material point, (as whether that which we see and touch in the Eucharist be truly Christ's body, or only a figure of it, it self remaining substantially Bread) and that this question be to be handled contentiously before Judges, each party pretending to convince and demonstrate, by quotation of places critically exalted to their highest force: whether the Scripture (I lay) be a sufficient Storehouse to furnish either side with Texts, unavoidable and convincing beyond any shadow of reply; in the judgement of sworn and expert judges, who are well practis'd what convincing signifies, and how much the various acceptions of words and mutability of meanings import in the construction of sentences. This is that wherein I engage the Catholik Negative; and suppose all Adversaries must hold the Affirmative.

And the first reason of my supposition is, because I never see them attempt any other way
way of disputing, but out of Scripture: nor yet, in that, do they use fair play, as to put the places which favour them on the page of receipts, and those which Catho-
liks bring to the contrary upon that of ex-
pences; and then having by rules of good Criticism examined the qualities of both, prefer that party which is more de-
erving.

Next, I know not how that man dare hew his face before any person of common sense, who shall first acknowledge he goes a-
against the opinion of the whole present Age wherein he lives, against the undoubted testi-
mony of a thousand years before him, against the known laws both spiritual and tempo-
ral, publiquely renouncing all obedience to all kinds of Magistrate, empower'd by God and Man with just authority to conserve those laws; that shall accuse all his kindred, Ancestors, and whole Country of blindness and ignorance, and pretend all the world is bound to desert them and follow him: and this in a matter, concerning no less an inter-
est than Eternity: and after all this so ar-
rrogant bawling and high demands, being ask'd what evidence, what proof he can bring to introduce so great a mutation in the world, shall be forc'd to confess, he can put play at cross and pile with them, to know
know which of the two sentences is true, which falls. For, setting aside real and irre-fragable conviction, what is there left in speculation, but meer contingency?

Now this strange boldness, this incredibl preemption was undeniably Luthers case and if his, then certainly all his followers. For, neither is the weight and authority of so many ages become less pressing and efficacious against his adherents, nor their first plea improved or amended, but rather weaken'd: if by his and all his fellows la- bours, as yet no evidence is produced (a infallible sign none is likely ever to be made:) Nor is the change of temporal law and Princes any motive, to him that goes upon pure reason, and seriously ays at the good of his soul.

Again, he whose discourse is not convincing, and yet will be medling with truths of highest importance, is either ignorant of that defect, and then he deserves the name of a rash temerarious fellow that dares, in matter of such consequence advance Propo-sitions (by passion or precipitation) who quality himself understands not: or else knows he does not convince; then let him at the beginning of his Sermon express much, and tell his Auditors, he is come to speak to them concerning their salvation. an
and propose new Tenets about it; but, in very deed, he can neither prove the old Tenets are false, nor those which he shall propose, to be true: Can any one think, if the Auditory have either wit enough to discover so grosse an Impostor, or never so little honesty to care what becomes of their souls, or love to Christianity; they will not with great indignation pull his jump o' re his eares, and tumble him out of his Pulpit? Now what difference is there (so the mischief be done) whether it be foretold the people or no; saving that, to conceal the wrong, is a more wicked and destructive piece of cunning?

Another consideration is, that in practical things, more probability approaches to certainty, and, by multiplication, contingency at last begets perfect Necessity; but, in speculation, not so. For, as there is more probability to throw seven upon two dice, in forty trials then in four: so, in five hundred, most certainly that cannot fail to be the cast: the reason is, because the number of casting so exceeds the variety of chances, that it makes first a difficulty, and after an impossibility of missing. Now, in speculation, if no particular cause precisely compel, and determine the effect, variety can prevail nothing; so that, rigorously spea-
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king a conclusion is no nearer being true, for a hundred unconvincing Arguments, then for one: whence it follows, where there is no demonstration, neither Opinion is securely the better. He therefore that pretends the introduction of a change in a speculative point, ought either to promise evidence and conviction, or else content himself with silence: for 'tis absurd to move any one to change his assent (I speak not here of a practical resolution) without promising him some abetterment.

Lastly, as far as I can penetrate, he that has a changeable and uncertain Religion, has none at all. For, I conceive a Religion (as we now discourse of it) is the knowledge by which we are to guide our selves in our way and progress towards eternal felicity: so that, if the Religion any one professes be not the true, he cannot by its principles perform what is requisite to the gaining of that end: Neither is any knowledge which such a Probabilist has, the right and proper means of cultivating his soul in order to future happiness; and therefore it is as impossible an untrue Religion should lead to Heaven, as a fall way, to London. Now, if a Religion that is not true, be no Religion, he that doubts whether he has the true, is in doubt whether he has any Religion or none; and
and he that pretends no farther then to doubt about Religion, pretends not to know he has any: but, the act of knowing cannot be had, if he that has it, does not know he has it; thencefore he that pretends not to know he has a Religion, confesses himself to have none.

The same is clear in practice. For suppose an Apothecary had compos'd a drug for his Patient; but being uncertain whether to administer it like a potion or a glister, should sometimes give it one way, sometimes the other: or a Guide, having undertaken to conduct a Stranger thorough some untroden Wildernes, & for want of assurance which way to take, should lead him up and down as in a Maze, first to the left hand, then to the right: were not these excellent Masters in their crafts, and worthy of continual imployment; but with this condition, that they practised their Arts upon none but one another? Then, if Religion be the knowledge of conducting our souls to heaven; is not he like to make good speed, that acknowledges himself uncertain of the way? who to day marches forwards, and to morrow goes as much backward; to day confesses and adores Christ in the Eucharist, to morrow blasphemes him, and damn's all that adore him; to day prays to Sotes.
Saints, bears respect to a Crucifix, and a compassion to the dead, to morrow cries out against all, as Idolatry, Superstition, and meer inventions of lucre?

Still there remains with me one other scruple about this point. Divers great Brains have undertaken the commendations of things, which mankind, is so far from delighting in, that very few can endure them; this aversion rising out of a judgement, not taken up by humour, but taught by nature, which justly abhors all that diminishes or destroys its being, as Blindness, Folly, Sickness, and the like: and contrived many perswasive forms and witty inducements, to invegle their Auditory into an evident absurdity. Others we find, who, by whole Sects, maintain'd that all propositions were indifferent; and their practice was, of every subject to speak copiously and plausibly on both sides: and this in good earnest, out of a settled belief that they could make which side they please the more probable. I ask then, whether the probability either of these two sorts of wits bring for their paradoxes, be sufficient to chuse a point in Religion? If you say, If What imports it in any point which part you take, that is, whether you have any Religion or none? If you say, no; what
means do you prescribe us to know when a probability is great enough; or, who's he that is able to judge the degrees of probability, when they are sufficient, and when not?

Peradventure you may say, In the first case, the evidence of nature shews their probability to be clearly absurd: and I could answer, why may not Nature sometimes be deceiv'd, as Anaxagoras would persuade us, when he maintain'd Snow was black? but I need not; 'Tis enough to remember, The questions of Religion are concerning actions whose effects appear not to us; and yet, ordinarily the effects are the chief means to frame arguments, and produce certainty, in practice, that the cause is right. 'Tis enough to remember eternall bliss belongs to the next world; and the Mysteries we dispute, are such as the Son of God only has seen and brought us tydings of. But what wil you say to the second sort of disputers, who equall all probabilities; and are men, against whose eloquence, erudition, and prudence in other things, you cannot except? To all this I can yet add one plain but very considerable reflexion; that certainly, to prove any position, those wild capricious Brains cannot find weaker places for their arguments, then a mute, ambiguous, dead writing, not quickned with reason and discourse:
course: which yet, is the boasted ground of all that renounce the infallibility of the Church, in matters of supernaturall belief.

THE SIXTEENTH ENCOUNTER.

Examining five Texts brought for the sufficiency of scripture.

The case thus stated, we have won the field: If I have err’d in framing the question, let them correct it, with these two conditions, that they propose it so, as to leave themselves a Religion, and different from ours: for unless both these sublitt, the quarrel betwixt us is at an end. But if I have rightly express the point in controversy, let them bring one place of Scripture that comes home to the question, and carry the Bays. Their position must include these two branches: That Scripture is intended for a ground to decide Controversies in such a contentious way as I have set down: and sufficient to perform this charge. For the former I dare confidently affirm, there is not in the whole Bible an expression so much as glances towards it. And though the
the second includes the first, and can have no verity nor subsistence without it; yet since there are some who discovering not the first, can persuade themselves they find the second, we will try how solidly they proceed.

First then, they cite certain Texts in which they say, the Scripture gives us salvation: But there is a wide difference betwixt giving salvation, and being the whole means or adequate cause of it, which is the point to be maintained, if they will prove the Scripture sufficient; else all Faith, Sacraments, good works, preaching, &c. must be absolutely excluded as unnecessary, since of, every one of them may be said, it gives salvation. Whence in common already appears these arguments are so weak and defective, they carry not half way home to our question: Yet let's see at least how far they reach.

In the fifth of St. John, Christ bids the Jews search the Scriptures; because you think (faith he) you have eternal life in them. Our Saviour was discoursing there of such as bore witness to him: and having nam'd his Father and St. John, at last he descends to the Scripture and tells them to this purpose, You think to have life in the Scriptures; though you deceive yourselvs in that
that opinion; for you have only the killing letter, and not the verifying spirit: Nevertheless search them, for they bear witness that I am the true life, to whom you will not through want of charity and love of God have recourse to seek it. Therefore you refuse me, who come in the name of my Father, a sign of Truth, because I seek not mine own interest: But you will receive Antichrist or some other who shall come in his own name, which is a mark of deceit and falsehood, so perversely are you. This is our Saviour's discourse: of all which to this argument belong only these words, You think you have life in the Scriptures, that is, (if I understand the Text) you deceive yourselvs, if you think you have life in them; which surely must needs be a very strong reason to prove, Scriptures give salvation: though if the question were not of the Text, I should make no difficulty of the conclusion. And it may be noted that our Saviour descends to the proof of Scripture, in the last place: putting Miracles the first, as motives able to convert Sodom and Gomorrah: in the second Preaching, specially they shewing some good affection to their Preacher St. John: Lastly, the mute words of Scripture. And as for St. John, our Saviour expressly
for Tradition.
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Bresly says he cites him, in condescendence to them, that they might be the rather moved to embrace the truth, by that esteem they had already entertain'd of their Preacher. Whereas for Scripture there was only their own conceit, which our Saviour seems to reprove as an humourous and froward obstinacy, that they would not be convinc'd by the palpable demonstration of his Miracles (the easiest and surest way) nor rest upon the preaching of his Precursor, whom themselves confess to be a Prophet; nor lastly make a diligent search without prejudice, into Scripture, which, if interpreted with charity and humility, might have led them to him and salvation.

The next place is John 20. These things are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Son of God; and believing may have life in his name. 'Tis true both Scripture and Faith give life; but not the least mention made here of any such quality in either of them. This only is declar'd that the end of St. John's writing the Gospel was not to make a compleat History either of our Saviour's Acts or doctrin; but only to specify such particulars as prove that Christ was the true consubstantial Son of God: to keep them out of the Heresly then beginning to rise, that they might continue true believers.
vers in the Church of God, live according to its Rules and be saved by so living, that is, by being true Christians or Jesuits; which is certainly the sense of these words, in his name, or, in the name of Jesus, as to be baptiz'd in the name of Jesus, signify's to be enroll'd among the company known to be his.

Now from this Text we may clearly collect that St. John's Gospel was not written by the Authors intention for any such end as the argument urges: Nor, that it gives life, more then this one Article does, that Jesus is the true Son of God; Nor yet that this Article gives life, but that life is to be had in the name of Christ, whatever these words signify: Only it may be infer'd that life cannot be had without this Article; but not that this alone is able to give life, or that it cannot be believ'd without St. John's Gospel, or that St. John's Gospel, of itself is sufficient to give life without the concurrence of Tradition. So that there is no appearance from this proposition that life either can be attain'd by Scripture alone, or cannot be had without it.

The third Text is out of 2 Tim. chap. 3. That the Scriptures are able to make him wise to salvation through the faith of Jesus Christ. The paraphrase of the place, as I understand
it, is, O Timothy! be constant in the doctrine I have taught thee; and this for two reasons; One common to all converted by me, because thou knowest who I am that deliver'd it to thee; This is the first and principal reason, the authority of the Teacher: Another peculiar to thee, because from thy infancy, thou art vers'd in the holy Scriptures, which are proper to make thee wise and understanding in the law of Jesus Christ, or to promote and improve thy salvation, which is obtained by the faith of Jesus. So that, he speaks not of Timothy's becoming a Christian, but his becoming a through furnisht (or extraordinary) Christian, a Doctor and Preacher.

And the ground on which I build this explication is derived from the words following, where the Apostle expresses this vertue of the Scriptures being profitable to teach and reprove; as also from this consideration that the sequel, Be constant to my words or Doctrine, because the Scripture can teach thee the truth of Christ's doctrine, is not very exact, but rather opposite to the former, and plainly inducing the contrary; as if one should argue, Follow not my doctrine, because mine, but because the Scripture teaches thee it: which directly contradicts the intention of the Apostle, as appears in the verse immediately.
diatly precedent, Be stedfast in those things thou hast learnt, knowing by whom thou wert in-
structed; whereas this other discourse is per-
fectly consequential, Stand to my doctrin
because the Scripture confirms and seconds
it, making thee able to defend and, prove
by arguments, what I have simply taught
thee to be true, by the sole evidence of Mirac-
cles, which beget Faith, not Science.

But to grant our Adversary the less pro-
per sense and consequence, that the Scrip-
ture was to contribute to the salvation of
Timothy himself; still ther's an equivocation
in those words, through, or by the faith of Iesus
Christ: which may be refer'd to those, ( to
make thee understanding) Either so, that the
sense be, The Scriptures (in which thou hast
been vers'd since thy infancy) will contribute to
thy salvation, so that thou understand them ac-
cording to the Faith of Iesus Christ which I have
orally deliver'd to thee; and this is, in direct
terms, the Catholick Rule, that the inter-
pretation of Scripture is to be govern'd by
Tradition or by the faith and doctrin so re-
ceiv'd, and formally depends from the first
words, Remain constant to my doctrin: Or,
by another explication, which is more ma-
terial and flat and most incredible, That
the old Scripture (for of that only the A-
potstle speaks, no other being written while
Timothy
Timothy was a child) should be able, without relation to the knowledge of Christ by other means to make a man understanding enough to be saved by the Faith of Him; as may be seen by St. Peter's being sent to Cornelius.

So that, of these three senses, the first is nothing to our adversaries purpose, and nevertheless is the best; The second positively and highly against him: the third incoherent to the words precedent and following, and in itself, an incredible proposition. But give it the greatest force the words can, by any art, be heightened to, they come nothing near the state of the question proposed which concerns the decision of all quarrels carried on by litigious parties: Whereas this Text is content with any sufficiency at large to bring men to salvation: a point not precisely now controverted between us. Besides Timothy being already a Christian, 'tis a pure folly to think the Apostle sent him to the Scriptures to choose his Religion.

The words immediately following the place explicated are urged for a new Argument: They are these: All Scripture is inspired from God; and profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, (that is, good life) that the man of God become perfect, being furnished to every good work. The paraphrase, accor-
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according to my skill is thus, The holy Writ spake of, is any Book inspried from God, and profitable to teach things unknown, reprehend what is amiss, to set straight what is crooked, to instruct in good life; that the Church of God, or any member thereof, may become perfect, being, by instructions and reproofs applied out of Scripture, by such preachers as Timothy, fitted to any good work or all kinds of good works. This I conceive the natural meaning and most conformable to the Text, were we to seek the interpretation of it indifferently, without any eye to our present controversy. And in this sense, 'tis a clear case, the Apostle speaks of the benefit of Scripture, when explicated and apply'd by a Preacher, in order to the perfecting of those that hear him.

But if, by importunity the adversary will needs have it, that the Scripture should give the quality of being άνάφερω to the person himself that reads it; to content him, I shall not hinder him of his mind, but only prove it nothing to his purpose: For still this must be the sense, that it produces in the reader the excellencies required in a Preacher, namely to make him do all those good works which are expected of him; as teaching, reprehending, &c. So that one way or other, still the Scripture is apply'd to furnish...
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with him with Precepts, Arguments, Examples, and such like instruments of persuasion: but of giving the first Catechism, or binding oneself self Apprentice to the Bible, to learn the first rudiments of Christian profession, there's not the least word or syllable that colours for such a conceit: nor can it indeed consist with the direct meaning of the place; since the being already a Christian, is plainly supposed in Timothy, by St. Paul's institutions viva voce, before any exhortation to this use of Scripture. So that, here is no question concerning the first choice of Faith, but of perfection after Faith: much less any mention of convincing in foro contentioso, about which is all our controversy.

Another place is Acts 26. where St. Paul, defending himself before Agrippa and Festus, against the Jews' accusation, who calumniated him that he spake in derogation of the Law, and brought in a new doctrine to the disturbance of the people; made only this answer, that he preach'd nothing but what the Prophets had foretold. His words are these: The Jews for this (teaching Christ's doctrine) finding me in the Temple, would have kill'd me: But I having obtain'd succor from God until this very day have persisted testifying (or protesting) to great and little, that I spoke nothing
nothing but what the Prophets and Moses had foretold should come to pass; as, that Christ was to suffer, that he was to be the first should rise from death to life, and preach light both to Jews and Gentils. This is the true interpretation of the Greek Text, as far as I am able. In my power to explicate it, according to the intention of St. Paul. I deny not but the words singly taken may be interpreted, I have persisted in expounding to great and little, and in my Sermons saying nothing but what &c. But this explanation is neither so proper to his defence, nor at all advances the Adversaries cause: For since St. Paul tells us directly what the points are of which he spake; whatever can be gathered out of them, only this is said, that these three points were foretold by Moses and the Prophets: and on the other side, the discourse is imperfect, running thus: I preach'd indeed many other things; yet nothing but what was in Moses and the Prophets, to wit, that Christ was to suffer, &c. His meaning therefore is, that since he was in hold, his perpetual endeavours had been, to shew that these things he was accused to have preach'd against the law, were the very marrow of the Law and foretold by Moses and the Prophets: and that, wheras the Jew expected Christ to be a temporal King, who by force of Arms should restore the house
of Israel, to a great and flourishing estate, the truth was quite contrary; for, according to the doctrine of Moses and the Prophets, He was to be a passible man, to suffer death, afterwards to rise again triumphantly, as the first fruits of the Resurrection, and to send his Disciples both to Jews and Gentiles to spread the light of the Gospel throughout the world.

What advantage against the necessity of Tradition, can be drawn out of this place of Scripture, which doth not so much as talk of the extent of Catholic doctrine, much less come within kenning of our Controversy, is beyond my reach: This I know, that, so say all points of Catholic doctrine can be sufficiently prov'd out of Moses and the Prophets, is an assertion I believe our Adversaries themselves will deny; as being both ridiculous in itself and absolutely discrediting the necessity of the new Testament: and yet clearly, without maintaining so gross absurdities, they can make no advantage of this Text.
THE
SEVENTEENTH ENCOUNTER.

Examining such places as are brought against the admittance of any, but Scriptural proof in Religion.

We are at last come to those places in which they most glory, conceiting themselves able by them utterly to destroy all Traditions: These are such as forbid to add or detract from the holy Scriptures: which, though commonly so explicated by Protestants, yet certainly cannot but appear to every child altogether impertinent to our controversy. For, tis a far different question, Whether we were bound to put new or Apocryphal Books into the Canon (which our adversaries charge us to have done) or to take none out (which we charge them to do?) from that now in debate. Whether there be any other means of assuring matters of Faith, beside the Bible? or rather, Whether Scripture in an eristical and contentious way, be a Rule sufficient to decide all controversies in Religion? Nevertheless let us see the Texts they allege for their opinion: Deut. 4. 2. Isb. 1. and others.
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thers to the same effect.

My first answer is; suppose these places imported all the force our adversaries pretend, we are not in the least degree concern'd: since all that's said is clearly spoken of a certain Book or Law, properly and specially belonging to the Jews: and no more obliging Christians then the Book of Leviticus or the Law of Circumcision.

Secondly: since it is held as a main distinction and opposition betwixt the Laws of the Jew and of the Christian, that those of the Jew were to be written in Stone and Paper, and those of the Christian in the hearts of men by Tradition: it would rather follow (if such Analogy were to be made) that because nothing but Scripture is to be given to the Jew, only Tradition is to be pressed on the Christian.

Thirdly, to the end this place may have the effect endeavoured by the arguer, all the rest of the Bible, except Deuteronomy or such other Book, to which the Texts cited particularly relate, may be burnt, or at least cast out of the Canon; and not have any power to decide controversies, even in the Jews law. I know 'tis answer'd, that Protestants deny not such Books: Neither do we accuse them of it; only we conceive we may safely say, they contradict themselves,
in pressing these places to that effect of one side, and admitting the Books on the other.

My fourth Answer is, that the Law itself enjoyns in certain cases, other precepts to be added; remitting the people upon any doubt, first to Judges, and afterwards to the High Priest, and commanding their declarations to be obeyed, and under greatest penalties punctually observ’d: So that, the consequence drawn out of these places, is both weak in itself and prejudicial to them that use it.

Nor is the inference our adversaries wrest out of the last Chapter of the Apocalypse less unreasonable than the former: where, he that adds or detracts any thing from that Prophecy is accursed: whence pleasant discoursers will needs conclude, that Christian doctrine is no otherwise to be proved but by Scripture. Questionless, to speak more pertinently to the Text, they should have laid, it was to be prov’d out of nothing but the Apocalypse: but because that would appear too palpable and absurd, they included the rest of the Scripture violently against the express letter and meaning of the Text. This Argument seems to me, as if the fam’d Astrologer Mr. Lilly, had obtain’d a Protection from the State, that non should
should presume to abuse his Prognostications, by foysting in counterfeit ones, or blotting out any part of his; and thence, one should boldly infer that all our Courts of Justice were commanded to judge such cases as came before them, only out of Lilly's Almanack: with this sole difference, that the arguer here unjustly cogs in the whole Scripture, instead of the single Book of the Apocalyps, which makes his consequence far weaker and more unexcusable than the other; as I confess the similitude I use agreeable rather to the impertinency of the objection, then to the dignity of the subject.

To these two may be paralleled that Preface of St. Luke, so strongly urg'd by some. The words, as I understand them, are these. Seeing many have endeavoured to compile a history of the things in great abundance acted among us; according as they who were from the beginning eye-witnesses and instruments of the Gospel, have delivered to us: I also have thought fit (excellent Theophilus) since I was present at all, things almost from the beginning, to set them down to thee in order, that thou mayest know the certainty of the Reports which thou hast been taught. This is the Text, though others interpret it otherwise; who (if they will urge any thing out of their own explication) must first justify it against this.
But out of this, First St. Luke pretends no more then to tell our Saviour's life, like a good Historian; however some of his excellent sayings cannot be deny'd their place in his life, as is testify'd by the same St. Luke, in the first of the Acts: and therefore we ought not expect to know more from him, then was fit for an Historian to report; that is, the eminent deeds and sayings of our Saviour. Now, the end expres'd in the Text for the writing of this History may be understood two ways: One, that Theophilus might know which reports were true, which fall: The other, that Theophilus out of the recital of Christ's miracles and heroical actions might understand the greatness of his person, and by consequence the certainty of his holy doctrin, which depends from them; But whether one or the other, however there is not a word that this Book should serve for a Catechism, to teach him and all the world the entire body of Christian doctrin, which must be our Adversaries meaning.

There are yet two passages I must not omit, because our Adversaries make great account of them: one is the fourth Chapter of the first to the Corinthians, That you may learn in us, not to be wise beyond what is written. To understand this place, you must know
know there grew some emulation betwixt the disciples of the Apostles, (if I may guess) betwixt those of St. Peter and St. Paul. This St. Paul reprehends at large: but for fear of making the breach wider, instead of closing it, would not name St. Peter, choosing rather to put the case, as if it had pass'd betwixt himself and Apollo: and first uses this argument, that Paul and Apollo are but Ministers of Christ: therupon after some diversion, he comes to tell them, how all that any man has, is from God and for the people; and concludes, to have all esteem'd as the Ministers of Christ and dispensers of his Mysteries: And after he has express'd how little he concerns himself, whether he be wel or ill reputed by them, concludes, telling them he had taken those two names of Paul and Apollo, to teach them this point; and then brings in the words alleadg'd, which I may venture to paraphrase thus. I have disguis'd my discours concerning the esteem you ought to have of your Preachers, under the names of Apollo and my self; that, by what I teach you to be due to our persons, you may learn not to be affected to your Preachers, above what I have written to you about a dozen lines before: to wit, that they are all ordain'd for you Ministers of Christ and dispensers of his Mysteries; to the end one of you do not swell with pride
or choller against another in any mans behalf, and so breed Schisms and contentions among your selves.

This is the meaning of the Apostle; as will appear to any judicious understanding, that can be content to read and diligently weigh the whole composition of the discourse. And here we are unwillingly constrain'd to observe the desperate shifts of many of our adversaries, into which either the rashness of their passions or necessity of their caus engages them: for so, in the Text we now treat, they presently snapt at a piece of a sentence, where they found this charming word (written;) and that was enough for them, without ever troubling their heads to consider or sense or connexion in order to the framing a legitimate argument. For, had they but taken the immediately precedent line, These I have disguiz'd into Apollo and myself for you, and then brought in the words cited, That you may learn in us, not to be wise above what is written; the nonsense would have declar'd it self, and stumbled the Reader, who could not but presently have check'd at the inconsequence. And the verse following would be likewise incongruous to these, that you be not sweld one against another for any man: For, what connexion can either the words precedent, or sub-
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Subsequent have, with this, that, You are to learn your Faith out of the Scripture? and yet I have translated the Latin Sapere or Greek ἴς, against the true sense, for the objectours advantage; whereas the true meaning is not to esteem them higher, or bear themselves, as if their Masters were higher: and thus the very English Translation yields it.

The latter place is out of the first to the Galathians, where he warns them, that whoever comes to preach any doctrin, besides that which He had taught them, they should refuse him communion, or account him execrable. This passage I have always esteem'd very strong and pregnant for Tradition; and our Adversaries call it a most illustrious proof against it. I confess at first I was at a loss to imagine how they could frame an argument out of so unfavourable a Text: but at last, I perceiv'd it might perhaps be thus, St. Paul (said they) preach'd nothing but what was written, as he testify's to Agrippa; so then, all he preach'd was Scripture: But he commands them to receive no other doctrin, but what he deliver'd them: Therefore, he enjoynd them to make Scripture the Rule of their Faith. This is (as far as I can find) the full epitome of their discourse upon this Text.

But
But, considering that what is in Scripture may be deliver'd by preaching, without an mention of Scripture; me thinks though all St. Paul taught the Galathians had been written, yet it follows not He commandeth the Galathians to hold the doctrin from Scripture; For those two words, what ye Evangelized to you, and what you have receiv'd signify so plainly preaching, that I can collect nothing from this place, but that the were to hold their Faith because He hath preach'd it; then which 'tis impossible to imagine a more efficacious argument to demonstrate Tradition.

And, to this effect, he exaggerates his own quality; that he was one who had no receiv'd his doctrin from man nor 'by the empty of man, but immediately by revelation from Christ; and afterwards, (upbraiding the Galathians for their inconstancy ) ask them, whether they had receiv'd their Christianitie by the works of the Law, or ex audiitu fidei, by hearing of the Gospel? So that in effect, his command is to the Galathians to stand to his preaching, that is, to Tradition for their Faith: and this not only against all men but even Angels, should they come down from Heaven to preach any thing contrary. For, that the word praeter may signify contrary, is too well known to be
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be insisted on; But, that it signify's so here, the particular occasion of this discourse makes evident; St. Paul expressing that some intruded themselves seeking to overturn the Gospel of Christ: and charging upon them that, whereas they had begun in spirit, they ended in flesh, and the like; Wherfore it is plain, he spake of doctrin contrary to what he had preach'd. But if præter be taken for besides, it will signify besides Tradition, not besides Scripture: there being not the least mention of Scripture: Now, how soundly it is proved that St. Paul taught nothing but what was written, is before examin'd; which yet if admitted true, were nothing to the purpose. For, 'tis not the Catholik position, that all its docttrins are not contain'd in Scripture: but not held from thence nor to be convinced out of the naked letter, especially in a pertinacious dispute: A question certainly not so much as dream'd of in this place of St. Paul.

And now to close this whole discourse, I shall only add one short period: as a pru- lential reflection upon the different fitness and proportion these two methods have, in order to determine controversies. That, in case where any two parties disagree, Tradition is very seldom so much as pretended by both, and if at all, still in points of less im- portance:
portance: whereas Scripture is continually alledg'd by all sides, how numerous soever their factions be, and how fundamental soever their differences: An evident sign, the way of resolving by Tradition, is incomparably preferrable to that of judging by the bare letter of Scripture: especially if, still upon examination, one of the pretended opposite Traditions prove, indeed, either not sufficiently universal or not positively contrary to the other, but, perhaps a particular custom of some Province, as Rebaptization: or only a meer negative Tradition, as that of the Greeks concerning the Holy Ghost.
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THE EIGHTEENTH ENCOUNTER,

Declaring the reasons of the Authors concluding, without proceeding to the examination of the Fathers Testimonies.

I have omitted the petty quiblets of Criticism which our Adversaries use to press in divers of the places I explicated: not only because they are often fall, most commonly strain'd, and always such pigmy bulrushes, that they merit no admission into a grave discourse: but chiefly, because, considering largely the Antecedents and consequents to the Texts alleged, I found the substance of them wholly mistaken and nothing to our purpose: and that such arguments are the abortive issue of immature brains, not able to distinguish the force of Canon shot, from a Faery's squib or a boys pot-gun.

And I dare (had I good conditions) maintain that, in all the differences betwixt Protestants and us Catholicks, they cannot produce
produce one place of Scripture, in which the words can bear a sense that comes home to the state of the question. I know many urge those of the Decalogue against Images. To which I answer, with words analogica to those of St. Paul, Who (speaking to the Galathians) protested that whoever circumcis’d himself, as a thing necessary or because of the old Commandment, was bound to keep the whole Judaical law: So say I, whoever condemns Images, upon this prohibition of Moses, is bound to keep all the law of the Jews: For, if these words be a law to us, because they are written in theirs, all that’s written in their law must be so to us; since he that made one, made all; and, for whom he made one and deliver’d it to them, for them he made and deliver’d all the rest, as one entire body of law to be observ’d by them. He therefore that counts himself bound by this Law, must (if he have common sense) esteem himself equally obliged to all the rest.

Upon the same reason hangs the keeping of the Sabbath day; for, of all the Decalogue, these are the only two points unrepeated in the new Testament: so that, all the rest we are bound to accept in vertue of that, but these two we cannot. Wherfore, whoever holds, The Sabbath day is commanded by God, either
either does so because he finds it in the old Law: and to him I protest he ought (in consequence to this judgment) submit to all that law and become a Jew: or else, because he finds it in observation among Christians, that is, in Tradition: and to him I protest, he is bound to embrace all that comes down by Tradition, namely, the whole Roman Catholic Faith: Therefore, every rigorous observer of the Sabbath, is bound in common sense, either to be a Jew or a Catholic.

To make an end, I know our adversaries alleged many sentences of Fathers to prove the sufficiency of Scripture: wherof the most part I am sure are as far beside the state of the question, as those places of Scripture we come now from examining. However, finde myself, not concern'd to look into them: pretending no farther at this present, then to consider the ground upon which those I oppose rely, for their assurance, that Scripture is sufficient to decide controversies, according to the state of the question, as is proposed. Now, because they reject wholly the Authority of Fathers, from a definitive sentence in matter of Faith: it is impossible for them, (if they are not quite Bedams) to rely on their Authority for acceptance of Scripture; for what can be imagined
gin'd more palpably absurd then to receive upon their credit the whole Rule of Faith, and yet not take their words for any one Article of Faith? and consequently what can be imagin'd more vain and fruitless then for me to lose my labour in striving to shew that Protestants have no colour from Antiquity, to expect this al-deciding power in Scripture, whilst themselves aver the whole multitude of Fathers is not capable of giving a sufficient testimony for their reliance on Scripture: since therefore there is nothing like a ground in Scripture, and they scorn all ground except Scripture, I must leave them to the freedom of doing it without ground.

FINIS.