





BS 2081 .F96 1834 c.1  
Fulke. William, 1538-1589.  
Confutation of the Rhemish  
Testament

502

11345

v



Great Society  
no  
188

1000

1000

1000





CONFUTATION  
OF THE  
RHEMISH TESTAMENT.

---

BY WILLIAM<sup>S</sup> FULKE, D. D.

---

WITH AN  
INTRODUCTORY ESSAY ;  
INCLUDING A  
BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE OF THE AUTHOR,  
AND A  
COMPLETE TOPICAL AND TEXTUAL INDEX.

---

NEW-YORK:  
LEAVITT, LORD AND CO.  
182 Broadway.  
BOSTON: CROCKER AND BREWSTER,  
47 Washington-street.

1834.

ENTERED according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1834, in the Clerk's office of the District Court of the Southern District of New-York.

---

JOHN H. TURNEY'S STEREO TYPE.

## P R E F A C E .

BY THE EDITOR.

AMONG "the signs of the times," few events more remarkable and impressive can be cited than the republication by American Protestants, of the original edition of the Rhemish Testament. When that volume was first issued in 1582, it excited in Britain indescribable alarm. "It was considered as a book of very dangerous tendency; being designed to promote the errors, superstitions, and impurities of Popery." In the preface to his "Defence of the English translations of the Bible, Fulke remarks—"The adversaries of our Lord who 'willett the holy scriptures to be searched,' perceiving that they cannot prevail to bring in that darkness and ignorance of God's most sacred word and will therein contained, whereby their blind devotion, the daughter of ignorance, as they themselves profess, was wont to make them rulers of the world, they also at last are become translators of the New Testament into English. In which, they leave the pure fountain of the original verity to follow the crooked stream of their barbarous Latin translation, and which beside other manifest corruptions, is pestered with many annotations both false and undutiful, by which they seek to infect the minds of credulous readers with heretical and superstitious opinions."

Not one permanent settlement of Europeans, except in Mexico, then existed on this Northern continent. Neither Popery nor Protestantism was known to the aboriginal Indians. Now, the emissaries of Rome are prowling about with all craftiness, and in all the agility and ferocity of the "*Beast*" to which the Dragon of Hell gave "his power, seat, and great authority." *Revelation* xiii. 2. That book which Protestants, two hundred and fifty years ago, dreaded as the pestilential "smoke of the bottomless pit," has been republished under the sanction of an efficient portion of Reformed Christians, expressly that it may TESTIFY OF ITSELF. No greater proof of the change which has taken place in reference to Popery, between the days when the impious tyranny of Pope Gregory XIII. raged, and the present era, when the no less insolent assumptions of Gregory XVI. are so openly avowed, can possibly be cited, than these two facts; that the commentary by which it was confidently hoped "the bright and blissful Reformation" would be obliterated, the modern Jesuits dare not print: and that Protestants have published that volume, confident that no reflecting citizen who reads the exhibition of the doctrines and practices of Romanism by the Jesuits of Rheims, will ever become a Papist.

Notwithstanding this conviction, it is a duty to avail ourselves of that wisdom and erudition and piety, which have effectually demonstrated the falsifications, ignorance, and wickedness of the Rhemists who so openly perverted the word of God. At the period when the New Testament, so called by the Jesuits of Rheims, appeared in 1582, "it was the opinions

of the learned, that both the translation and the notes ought to be answered by the ablest pen that could be procured; and no man in Britain was thought so well qualified for the undertaking, as Thomas Cartwright. Leicester, Queen Elizabeth's favourite, and Walsingham who was accounted the very mouth and hand of the queen, made particular application to him, and earnestly entreated him to engage in this important service for the church of God. The ministers and scholars of London, Suffolk, and Cambridge also combined their affectionate and pressing invitations. Thus encouraged, he laboured with all diligence during nearly four years, when Archbishop Whitgift, who was called *the Pope of Lambeth*, authoritatively forbade him to proceed any further in the work!

In consequence of this arbitrary display of antichristian intolerance and ecclesiastical despotism, Fulke, a very intimate friend of Cartwright, and a determined adversary to the modern Babylon, commenced the arduous task. He died almost immediately after he had completed his design; and although it was finished in 1589, yet twenty-eight years elapsed before the volume appeared from the press. Such was the manifest preference for Popery among those who directed the governmental affairs, during the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth, and the first years of James I., that a license for printing the confutations of the Rhemish Testament by Fulke and Cartwright, could not be obtained. To that noble friend of civil and religious liberty, Archbishop Abbot, are the world indebted for the dissemination of the two most instructive and convincing works which have ever been published in the English language respecting the Papal controversy.

Before we analyze the ensuing "Confutation of the Rhemish Testament," it may gratify the student to know something of the author. The following concise biographical narrative has been compiled "from Brook's Lives, Middleton's Biographia Evangelica, and Brook's History of Religious Liberty, which contain the most minute and authentic account extant.

William Fulke was born in London, but in what year is not known. He was chosen fellow of John's college, Cambridge, in 1564; and as he was so resolute and daring a Protestant, he must have been too young to have attracted notice during the reign of Queen Mary, a "woman literally drunk with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." *Revelation* xvii. 6. In compliance with paternal desire, he dedicated some time to the acquisition of jurisprudence. But disgusted with that profession, he resumed studies more congenial to his own inclination; upon which his father was so offended, that he withdrew from him necessary support. Fulke, however, persevered; and became so celebrated in the university for his mental endowments and superior scholarship in the various departments of learning, that he attained his fellowship without any adventitious patronage, by the mere force of his eminent claims in literature.

As a preacher, he became extensively known in the year 1565, in consequence of his uncompromising and bold remonstrances against the Popish habits and ceremonies incorporated with the ecclesiastical establishment. For this dislike and contempt of the Babylonish vestments which the priests wore, "Romish rags," as they were then disdainfully denominated, he



suffered considerable persecution, and finally was expelled from his college. He continued however to reside in Cambridge, and supported himself by the delivery of public lectures. *Strype's Parker*. 197, 280. *Middleton's Biographia*. Vol. 2. page 262.

Notwithstanding this ungodly oppression exercised toward him, he speedily obtained a reputation so distinguished and honourable, that in 1569, he would have been elected master of the college in which he held his fellowship, had not Archbishop Parker directly interposed his authority, and hindered the election. As a compensation for this obstruction to his usefulness, the Earl of Leicester, who with all his faults was the inflexible friend of those ministers who were staunch Protestants, and inclined to Puritanism, received him into his house, and appointed Fulke his domestic chaplain. But in consequence of the persecutions which he was called to endure, and some odious charges which were alleged against him by his malignant competitors, he resigned his fellowship. The inquiry into the truth of the imputations cast upon him having proved that the whole tale was merely a groundless calumny, fabricated through envy, his college, immediately re-elected him to his former endowment.

In the year 1573, Fulke was chosen master of Pembroke Hall, and Margaret Professor of Divinity, in the University of Cambridge; from which latter office, his friend Thomas Cartwright had been ejected by the wicked artifices and oppression of the semi-Popish prelates, who dreaded his influence and unbounded popularity. Notwithstanding Cartwright's illegal expulsion from his lecture and fellowship, the sameness of their duties, with their congeniality of character, temper, theological opinions, and detestation of the Romish idolatry, cemented Fulke and Cartwright in the most harmonious intimacy and brotherhood. Fulke was greatly instrumental in persuading Cartwright to accede to the solicitations which were made to him for his answer to the Rhemish Testaments: "but when he found that by the tyrannical prohibition of Archbishop Whitgift, Cartwright was forbidden to proceed, he undertook to answer it himself. This work was entitled "*A Confutation of the Rhemish Testament*;" in which he gave notice that the reader might some time be favoured with a more complete answer from Cartwright. That which occasioned the publication of the Rhemish Testament was as follows.—"The English Papists in the seminary at Rheims perceiving, as Fuller quaintly observes, that they could no longer *blindfold the laity from the scriptures, resolved to fit them with false spectacles*; and set forth the Rhemish translation in opposition to the Protestant versions." *Pierce's Vindication*. Page 103. "Fulke undertook, and successfully accomplished an entire refutation of the Popish version and commentary. The late James Hervey passed a very just encomium on this noble performance. He styles it, "a valuable piece of ancient controversy and criticism, full of sound divinity, weighty arguments, and important observations. Would the young student be taught to discover the very sinews of Popery, and be enabled to give an effectual blow to that complication of error; I know scarcely a treatise better calculated for that purpose." *Toplady's Historic Proof*. Vol. 2. Pages 196, 197.

In the year 1582, Fulke, Goad, and several other ministers were engaged

in a public disputation with some Papists, among whom was that Master-Jesuit Campion. This emissary of Rome, with others, was appointed by the Pope, expressly to murder Queen Elizabeth, and to subvert the Protestant government. They were eventually apprehended, and besides the gross idolatries and other corruptions of Romanism, they maintained that the Pope possessed authority over the queen, and as she was lawfully deposed by the Pope, they were justified in endeavouring to excite rebellion. For this treason, Campion and his traitorous associates were condemned to death. *Du Moulin's Vindication of Protestantism.* Page 198.

Although Fulke held a prominent station in the university of Cambridge, and among the theologians of that spirit-stirring age of profound inquiry, yet his opinions of the ecclesiastical state establishment, and of the necessity of conforming to its claims, were very puritanical. In his "*Petition of Prelates examined,*" page 15, he thus delivers his judgment, which proves that in his views of the evangelical ceremonies and discipline, he was substantially consonant with Cartwright. "In the scripture a bishop and elder is of one order and authority. There ought to be in every church or congregation an eldership, which ought to have the hearing, examination, and determination of all matters pertaining to the discipline and government of that congregation. Many speak of the sign of the cross, but they speak beside the book of God; and therefore their reasons should be rejected. For men must not compare or join the cross with the king's stamp; for he appointed no such thing whereby his servants might be known, but only baptism." *Zion's Plea.* Page 99.

After a life of great usefulness and labour in the church of God, this eminent servant of Christ was released from his warfare, August, 1589. He was interred in the church at Kedington, of which he was minister. The religious character of Fulke may easily be ascertained from the first clause of his last will and testament. "I commend my soul into the hands of Almighty God my Saviour and Redeemer, yielding most humble and hearty thanks unto his majesty for all his mercies bestowed upon me, most vile and unworthy wretch, but especially for his mercy showed unto me in Jesus Christ, in whom I believe to have remission of my sins, and to be justified by his blood. My body I commit to the earth, whence it was taken, in steadfast hope of a glorious resurrection unto life everlasting, through the mercy and merits of the same Lord Jesus Christ."

The greater part of Fulke's writings are volumes against the Papists. Some of them were only of temporary reference. But his, "*Defence of the translation of the Holy Scriptures in English,*" should be republished. It contains not only the marrow of the Popish controversy, and a vast fund of profound biblical criticism, but it is replete with the most important literary and historical intelligence respecting the period of the Reformation. "The Confutation of the Rhemish Testament" richly deserves all the eulogy appended to it by Hervey, the celebrated author of the meditations. It is full of critical erudition, sound theology, historical facts, and irresistible arguments.

In modern times, and according to the aspect of the present controversy

with the Romanists; the grand points which the Jesuits urge in defence of Popery are connected with the antiquity of the Papal claims, the uniform consent of all ages to those assumptions, and the universal testimony of the early fathers in corroboration of the more recent assertions of the unchangeableness and infallibility which they say ever have characterized the dogmas, rites, and practices enforced by the triple crowned Pontiff of Rome. No one of all the "strong delusions" with which the "all deceivableness of unrighteousness" is maintained, is more imposing in its lofty pretensions, more bewildering to those who are not versed in "the working of Satan," and whose opportunities of research have not been sufficient to draw truth from the fountains of knowledge, and more pernicious as it regards the direful bondage in which it chains those deluded votaries who become entangled in the net and labyrinth of this "mystery of iniquity," than the Roman claim of priority, antiquity, and universality.

The boasted principle of antiquity among the Romanists is the grand incentive to all their indignation, whenever their ungodly system is assailed. During a recent public disputation, the Papists became so audaciously obstreperous, that all the order and comfort of the meeting were destroyed. Inquiry was afterward made of an avowed Romanist in a respectable condition of life; "what is the reason of the different behaviour among the Protestants and Papists at religious discussions when the relative authority of their respective systems is canvassed? We sit as quiet as children when your priests pour forth their malignity, falsehoods, and calumny respecting the Reformers or the modern champions of our faith; but whenever a Protestant stands up to portray the character and acts of '*the Man of Sin*, and *the Mother of Harlots*;' instantly the Papists are in a commotion and uproar as if Bedlam at once had let loose all its pitiable tenants in the midst of the Assembly. What is the cause of this astonishing contradiction?" The Papist very candidly replied—"You Protestants have no right to say a word against our church. We are the ancient and the only true religion, and you upstart heretics ought to be hindered from slandering our holy religion; and if we had it in our power, we would soon silence you!" This was as honest and true an avowal, as it was malignant and characteristic of the Popish temper and desires.

One of the most insidious wiles of the annotations to the Rhemish Testament is this: they constantly and chiefly aim to convince the reader that Romanism in all its parts is derived from the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles. To sustain this position, there is a continual parade of pretended citations from the writings of the primitive authors in the Christian church; all of whom are adduced as witnesses to demonstrate, that in every age from the apostolic era, the cardinal doctrines, rites, and practices of the Papacy were the general and authoritative opposition of Christianity: that the Lord himself conferred upon Peter alone, as his earthly vicegerent, the uncontrolled supremacy of the church militant, and also invested him with the godlike attribute of infallibility; and that the apostle Peter was directed by Christ to delegate the same mysterious power and jurisdiction to his successors, the Popes of Rome throughout all ages. To corroborate this usurped claim, a large number of the most ingenious and corrupt partizans

of the Papacy were long and successively employed to forge public treaties, and acts of councils, and decretal epistles, with similar records. From these they pretended to demonstrate that in the apostolic age, and from that period during ten centuries, without interruption, the Popes had always been clothed with the same supreme spiritual majesty, as that in which they were decorated during the dark ages. With most ostentatious triumph, these fictitious writings were adduced; and especially the fabricated proceedings and decisions and canons of a supposititious council which never existed, but which was reported to have been held during the fourth century, tended in a high degree to enrich and aggrandize the Papal Hierarchy. *Fulke on Revelation*, xvii. 4. Indescribable mischiefs have resulted from the deceptions thus practised by the Papal writers, and from this system of turpitude which they had consecrated. They not only forged legendary tales and constitutions, laws and canons, in the name of the apostles, disciples, martyrs, and their immediate successors of the earliest Christian antiquity; but as far as was necessary to sanction their traditions, idolatrous rites, and impure and dissolute lives; they also cancelled, mutilated, altered and vitiated the various works of the earlier Christian writers, the copies of which they pretended to issue from the dark recesses of their monasteries. Hence, one of the most evil effects of their treachery is this; it is often extremely difficult, and sometimes totally impossible to decide what is genuine unadulterated truth, and to distinguish it from the spurious Monkish fables.

Conscious of the facility with which the unlettered portion of the people may be puzzled by a parade of quotations from a century of authors, and by references to half a thousand more; the Roman controvertists have always resorted to this subterfuge to ensnare their victims. Not less convinced of the fruitless toil in exploring the antiquated and musty volumes which have experienced the metamorphosis wrought by those forgers and counterfeiters in the literary productions of them who published their writings, fifteen, sixteen, and seventeen hundreds of years ago; their works are glutted with simulated extracts from the most renowned and estimated champions of the gospel; especially those who lived prior to the days of the Emperor Theodosius; expressly to turn off Protestants from the real topics in controversy. Nothing is more easy to a book compiler than this summary method of enforcing conviction, not by the power of argument or an array of facts, but by a deceitful reference to non-existent authorities, to which an opponent may not have access, and the search after which, he is previously apprized will repay him neither for his labour nor time.

None of the Papists or of their allies scarcely ever resort to the gospel for a sanction to their doctrines—and for a plain reason—neither Popery in its unrestricted demands, nor any modification of it however attenuated, derives any sanction from the oracles of God. Consequently, while it is factitiously based upon that foundation, it is discovered that the airy edifice rocks to its centre; and the dissembling castle-builders are obliged to support their tottering superstructure, by collecting every species of materials out of which they may be able to raise a buttress to prop up the falling

Babylon. They abandon therefore, Peter, Paul, James, John, Matthew, Jude, Mark, and Luke; and summon as witnesses, Tertullian, Cyprian, Eusebius, Jerome, Chrysostom, Augustin, Nazianzen, Ambrose, &c.; all of whom in different proportions were muddled in their judgments, and infected with the tendency to that grand apostacy of which Paul had prophesied, *2 Thessalonians 2*; and which by the concussion of the Roman empire was rapidly attaining its full evolution.

The translation and notes by the Jesuits of Rheims, commonly called the Rhemish Testament, are a perfect specimen of the diversified corruptions and falsifications with which the Roman controvertists attempt to perplex and confound the weak and the uninformed. Probably one half of the annotations are quotations from nearly two hundred different authors; whose works are extremely rare, and of course totally inaccessible to the incalculable majority of readers—and even could they be examined, the time necessary for an accurate research would preclude nine students out of ten, from such a laborious and unprofitable investigation. Nevertheless if the factors of the man of sin promulge “lying wonders,” and if “that wicked” disseminate “the lie,” Christians must in duty publish the truth, as an antidote to their soul destroying fallacies. Fulke and Cartwright in their confutations of the Rhemish Testament have executed in this respect a most noble and essential duty. Exclusive of all the overpowering arguments with which they have demolished the modern Babylon the Great at the bar of reason—and setting aside the numerous facts from ecclesiastical annals which are incorporated in their volumes—their works are invaluable to every person who is desirous to understand the genuine opinions of the most renowned writers of antiquity, upon all the prominent doctrines and duties revealed in the gospel of Christ. These volumes comprise an authentic and an extensive selection of the most interesting passages from the ancient authors upon the various topics discussed; and of their value and importance, all persons can judge merely by a reference to the index. They include almost every prominent controversy which has ever disturbed the nominal church; and especially all those which advert to Popery in its paramount characters and influence. These confutations completely exhibit the principles which were held by those men of whom the Papists so tauntingly boast: and from the survey, it is evident, that all the Fathers, as they are called, either doubted, disapproved, or denied every peculiarly distinctive attribute and observance of Popery. Thus, as the title to Cartwright’s refutation justly apprises us, the “*manifest impieties, heresies, idolatries, superstitions, profaneness, treasons, slanders, absurdities, falsehoods and other evils, by occasion whereof the true sense, scope, and doctrine of the scripture and human authors were abused*” “by the Jesuits of Rheims, are exposed in a masterly manner. Both the Protestants unfold a controversial dexterity and a fund of erudition not less admirable than instructive.

The false quotations of the ancient writers announced by the Jesuits; their deceitful contrivances to make the original authors sustain the Papal corrupt traditions; their impudent perversions of the plain meaning of the early ecclesiastical historians and theologians; and their wicked contra-

dictions of the most easily comprehended passages of scripture, expressly that the truth may be concealed, and the most antichristian heresies may be sanctioned, are illustrated on every page. Of the numerous examples which might be specified, three instances are singularly remarkable.

1. The apostle Paul, in *1 Timothy 2: 5*, proclaims that Christ Jesus is the "one Mediator between God and man;" and the apostle John, *1 Epistle 2: 1*, asserts, that "Jesus Christ the righteous" is our "Advocate with the Father;" and from the strict and only correct interpretation of the language, it is directly implied that Jesus Christ is the sole Mediator and Advocate. If a controvertist wished in the most comprehensive form to terminate all debate upon the subject of the exclusive mediation and advocacy of Immanuel; he could not possibly select from the sacred canon, two passages more brief and decisive. Yet these same texts, as if in the very spirit of perverse contradiction, the Jesuits have selected on which to append not only their own lengthened and contradictory notes, but also references to Augustin and Cyril; thereby to induce the unwary reader to suppose that these writers supported their senseless idolatry of praying to the saints; when it is demonstrable, that Cyril and Augustin both repudiated that pagan superstition. The acumen and erudition and sound didactic theology of Fulke and Cartwright most lucidly appear in their replies to the Rhemish annotations upon those verses.

2. Excepting the first and second commandments, probably, a more terse and authoritative mandate against all the forms of image-worship cannot be quoted from the holy scriptures, especially when we consider the then existing state of the world, than the injunction of the beloved Disciple, *1 John 5: 21*, "keep yourselves from idols." Notwithstanding, the Jesuits have annotated upon this prohibition in such a manner, that it is transformed into a direct sanction of idolatry—and Eusebius, Augustin, and Gregory are introduced as testimonies in behalf of this strange perversion of the fundamental article in all rational religion. The second Nicene council is also cited—and persons who know nothing of the Nicene council but as they have indistinctly heard of them as being mentioned at the head of the confession of faith, bearing the title of "the Nicene creed," may thereby suppose that the council of Nice whose creed is adopted by so many Protestants, and found in their standard books, were supporters of that gross form of idolatry, the worship of statues, images, crucifixes, &c. This wickedness and Jesuitism are portrayed in all their hideousness by the defenders of the Protestant faith; and the iniquitous dissimulation which impelled and directed all the course of the Rhemists in their blind translation, is justly exposed to merited execration.

3. The apostle Paul, *1 Timothy 3: 2*. *Titus 1: 6*, describing the qualifications of a minister, pronounces that he must be "*the husband of one wife*," which every person of common judgment rightly understands. At that period, bigamy, polygamy, and promiscuous concubinage were not only tolerated, but in many particulars were essentially combined with the prevalent idolatry, and consequently the whole multitude of the people were contaminated with the most loathsome pollution. Paul therefore enjoined that a Christian minister should have *one wife*, and but one;

according to the original divine appointment in Paradise. The Jesuits however have inculcated in their note upon those words, that the marriage of priests is ungodly and unlawful, and have introduced a great show of the early ecclesiastical writers to justify their abhorrent celibacy, which is not less impure than it is unnatural. The replies by Fulke and Cartwright upon this topic, probably equal in value any disquisitions in their whole volumes. They lay the axe to the root of the corrupt tree; and if piety, learning, argument and gospel truth could have prostrated the system of monkery! that direful source of uncleanness, infanticide, and all their concomitant crimes, would long since have been banished to "the bottomless pit," in which they originated. *McGavin's Protestant*, volume II. pages 80, and 85. Hartford edition.

It will consequently be perceived that the volumes of Fulke and Cartwright are an extensive spiritual armoury, in which are deposited a great variety of weapons for the use of those assailants who are desirous to overturn that "habitation of devils, the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird, Babylon the great." *Revelation 18: 2*. To contrast the various excellencies or deficiencies of those two anti-Popish warriors would be equally useless and absurd. "*They rest from their labours and their works do follow them.*" Their immortal volumes in defence of our common Christianity survive them; and are now faithfully presented to all American Protestants.

We do not approve of every sentiment contained in these *confutations of the Rhemish Testament*; and if Fulke and Cartwright could now revise their volumes, doubtless, they would erase some passages; but we did not feel disposed to reject "a measure of wheat" because a grain of cockle is mixed with it. The most unsatisfactory part of these works is their attempted illustrations of the Apocalypse. The evolution of the grand predictions respecting the remarkable period of 1260 years was at too great a distance in futurity to be accurately discerned. Even at this period, after 250 years have elapsed, many passages in the prophecies of Daniel and John are profoundly inexplicable. But this unavoidable defect is amply compensated by their other pre-eminent recommendations; for in addition to an invaluable and triumphant refutation of Popery, and a condensed summary of the works of the primitive Christians, these volumes by Fulke and Cartwright contain a rich treasury of pure didactic theology, blended with a deep mine of spirituality, devotional fervour, and practical piety; so that by the attentive perusal of them, the conscience and heart experience as much benefit, as the understanding realizes light and expansion.

As a specimen and proof of the qualifications of those renowned collegians to accomplish the arduous labour assigned them; the letter, written it is said by Fulke, to incite his "most celebrated" brother to the magnificent work of silencing the Jesuits of Rheims, is here subjoined.

#### LETTER TO THOMAS CARTWRIGHT.

NUNQUAM à te, venerande CARTWRIGHTE, plus opera exigeremus, quam quod in ministerio publico consumitur; nisi Ecclesiæ nostræ rationes et frequentes hostium incurSIONES vehementer flagitarent. Cum vero templum Domini extruere iam nobis satis non

sit, sed altera etiam pugnandum manu contra frequentes hæreticorum exercitus, non ægrè ferēs, si te Ecclesiæ nostræ alumnus ad certaminis hujus societatem provocemus. Non te fugit quanto cum impetu, et quàm furenter Papistarum cohortes, et Jesuitarum examina involarint in nostras Ecclesias. Quicquid apertæ impressiones, occultæ insidiæ, clandestina consilia efficere potuerunt, experti sumus: nullum defuit acerbis viris, quo vel religionis dignitas obscurari poterat, vel optimi ejusque fama violari. Atque cum hæc semper in religionis certamine illorum vires acriter satis repulerimus, verbi divini presidii communiti: novam illi nuper rationem iniverunt, quo à suis partibus stare divinas voces, et cælestia oracula, hominibus imperitis persuaderent. Quid enim aliud student novi fæderis translatione, et putidis, quas adjunxerunt, annotatiunculis, quibus quasi circumforanei præstigiatores rebus clarissimis tenebras offundunt, quàm ut hominum mentibus opinio inhereat, sacras scripturas turpiter à nobis contaminari, et quicquid est in eis verè solideque expressum, id illorum sententias firmissimè corroborare, nostras penitus convellere? Quanta hinc malorum nascatur Ilias, tibi facile est conjecturâ assequi. Nam licet pauci quidam è doctioribus videant, omnia cæcis tenebris et densa caligine ab eis obrui; tamen infirmorum mentibus multiplices intenduntur insidiæ, et hominum in religione nutantium animi variis dubitationum fluctibus concutiuntur. A te igitur contendimus, venerande CARTWRIGHTE, ut sceleratorum hominum impuris his conatibus velis obsistere, vel integrum librum refutando, vel ejus partem aliquam. Non ejusvis est è vulgo artificis affabrè conficere Tabernaculum Dei, sed *Bezabelis et Aholiabi*. Nec quisvis in bella Domini temerè intrudendus, fed è fortibus *Davidis* diligendi duces. Qualem cum te agnosceinus ex superioribus præliis pro civitatis nostræ, id est, Ecclesiæ muris susceptis; non dubitamus, si hoc certamen inire velis, debes certè pro ea, qua es in patriam et religionem pietate, quin pro aris, et focis, pro ipso Templi intimo sacrario dimicaturus, Jebusæorum vires, qui in arcem *Davidis* convolare student, possis pessundare. Accedit hinc, quod mirificè facit ad animum exacuendum, quòd non tibi jam cum fratre aliquo et ejusdem religionis socio dinnicandum sit, quod languidius solet certamen efficere, sed cum Ecclesiæ Christi insensissimis hostibus, Philistæis quibusque, et Ammonitis, multò dirioribus. Non dubitamus quin Madianitarum instar tandem se mutuis perfodiant vulneribus: cum nostræ *πανοπλιᾶς* vel strepitum inaudiverint. Vides ad quam honorificam te invitamus contentionem, Christi negotium suscipietur, contra Satanæ satellites. Excitamus ad bella Domini, ubi certa victoria, quam triumphus et applausus Angelorum consequetur. Nostræ preces tibi nunquam deerunt: aderit, procul dubio, Christus, ejus causa defenditur. Dominus Jesus tibi animum et vires adaugeat, et incolumem ad Ecclesiæ bonum diutissimè custodiat. Vale.

Tui in Christo amantissimi fratres.

ROGERUS GOADE.  
GULIELMUS WHITAKER.  
THOMAS CROCUS.  
JOHANNES FRETONUS.  
GULIELMUS FULCO.

JO. FIELDUS.  
NICHOLAUS CRANUS.  
EGIDIUS SEINTLER.  
R. GARDINER.  
GULL. CHARCUS.

#### TRANSLATION.

"WE never would require of you, highly revered Cartwright, any further endeavour than that which is spent in the public ministry, did not the respects of our church state, and the oft incursions of our enemies, vehemently urge us. But since it is not now sufficient for us to build up the temple of the Lord: but we must also with the other hand fight against the frequent armies of heretics: you will not take it ill that we provoke you as a fosterchild of our church unto the fellowship of this conflict. You are not ignorant with how great force and fury the bands of papists and swarms of Jesuits have flown upon our churches. We have felt whatsoever open hostility, secret stratagems, and privy plottings could effect. There hath wanted no poison of bitterness, whereby the dignity of religion might have been darkened, or the character of every excellent person debased. And whereas hitherto, being every way fortified by the power of the divine Word, in the conflicts for religion, we have always boldly repelled their forces; they have of late entered a new course, by which they might persuade unskilful men, that the divine scrip-



tures and heavenly oracles stand on their side. For what else do they project by the translation of the New Testament, and their adjoined unsavoury silly annotations, whereby, like runagate jugglers, they cast mists on most clear things, than that a conceit might stick in men's minds, that the holy scriptures are by us basely contaminated, and that whatsoever is in them truly and soundly expressed, the same most firmly strengtheneth their opinions and utterly eradicates our interpretation. It is easy for you to conjecture what a mass of evils thence may flow. For though a few of the learner sort see that all things are by them overwhelmed with blind darkness and thick mists: yet there are manifold snares laid for weak minds, and the wavering in religion are beaten upon by divers waves of doubt. With you therefore are we earnest, most revered Cartwright, that you would set yourself against the unhallowed endeavours of mischievous men, either by refuting the whole book, or at least some part thereof. It is not for every man, workman-like to frame God's tabernacle, but for Bezaleel and Aholiab: neither is every one to be rashly thrust forth into the Lord's battles; but the captains are to be chosen from among David's worthies; of which we acknowledge you to be, by your former battles undergone for the walls of our city, the church. We doubt not, if you will enter into this war, which truly you ought according to the zeal and piety you bear to your country and religion, but that fighting for your conscience and your country, yea even for the very inmost holy place of the temple, you will be able to tread under foot the forces of the Jebusites, who set themselves to assault the tower of David. Moreover, and it marvellously serveth to the sharpening of your courage, you are not now to fight with any brother or fellow of the same religion, which would make the conflict more faint, but with the most inveterate enemies of the church of Christ, far more cruel than ever was any Philistine or Ammonite. We doubt not but Midianite like they will at length deadly wound each other, so soon as they hear but the rattling of your complete armour. You see to what an honourable fight we invite you. Christ's business shall be undertaken against Satan's champions. We stir you up to fight the battles of our Lord, where the victory is certain, and to which the triumph and applause of angels will ensue. Our prayers shall never be wanting to you. Christ, without doubt, whose cause is defended, will be present with you. The Lord Jesus increase your courage and strength, and keep you very long in safety for the good of his church! Farewell.

Your most loving brethren in Christ.

ROGER GOAD.	JOHN FIELD.
WILLIAM WHITAKER.	NICHOLAS CRANE.
THOMAS CROOKE.	GILES SEINTLER.
JOHN IRETON.	RICHARD GARDINER.
WILLIAM FULKE.	WILLIAM CHARKE.

Notwithstanding this peerless testimony; such was the dread of ecclesiastical malignity in Britain in the year 1618, when Cartwright's volume was first published, and when the pioneer congregation of Puritans were preparing to migrate from Europe to the American wilds, that the names of the other ministers who had subscribed the preceding document were concealed from the public, because they were then living, and therefore exposed to Laud's persecution; merely for having persuaded the Master Theologian of his age and country to compose an efficient antidote to that destructive "working of Satan," artfully disseminated by the Jesuits under the name of the New Testament. Thanks be to God! that intolerance and despotism over the press have been banished from America and Britain; and the "*Confutations of the Rhemish Testament*" by Fulke and Cartwright shall yet expose the devices and ungodliness of Popery, to all who are willing to comprehend its "*damnable heresies!*" which bring upon men "*swift destruction!*" 2 Peter 2: 1. The volume by Cartwright will also speedily be printed: and as it may be said of him and

of Fulke, in the language of the gracious Redeemer concerning his forerunner John :—They were burning and shining lights : O that all American citizens may rejoice in their light ! *John* 5 : 35. When these replies to the Jesuits of Rheims shall have been completed, the Churches of Christ in the United States may be thankful and rejoice, that the Lord has graciously permitted them to obtain at such a low price, this edifying and unanswerable refutation of Romanism.

If the doctrine of our immortal Poet be true, and who can doubt it? in an inconceivably more seraphic sense than mortal strains can chant :—

“ The Saints on earth and all the dead  
But one communion make ;  
All join in Christ, their living head,  
And of his grace partake.”

Then the spirits of those “ just men made perfect,” Fulke and Cartwright, must exult in Paradise at the grateful intelligence wafted there by some ministering angel ; that being dead, by their “ Confutation of the Rhemish Testament,” they yet speak—and speak to whom? To a people, to churches, and to Christians residing in a country, which, when they were pilgrims on earth, was one vast unexplored continuity of wilderness, and by civilized beings uninhabited.

From this ancient solitary place, now blossoming as the rose ; to the New Jerusalem, those who have been chiefly instrumental in procuring the republication of this series of volumes to counteract the progress of Popery in this republic, would themselves not only aspire, but they pray that all their Christian Brethren also would soar to that amplitude of knowledge and sanctity, which by divine grace shall enable them to contend earnestly “ for the faith which was once delivered to the saints,” and qualify them eventually to participate in the beatitudes of those exalted champions of gospel truth, whose “ memory is blessed ;” so that when the time of their departure is at hand, they may exult with the conviction and fervour of our apostolic exemplar, Paul : “ I have fought a good fight—I have finished my course—I have kept the faith—Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me at his appearing ?”

New-York, April, 1834.

# CONFUTATION

OF

## THE RHEMISTS' PREFACE.

1. If the whole Bible had been translated by you, and that long since, into the English tongue, it is marvel, that it has lain so long by you, for lack of good means to publish it. You have published books of as great charge, and much less importance, within these eight and twenty years; but such, indeed, by which you had more hope to win unto your credit and cause, than you have by the holy Bible, though you perverted it with never so partial translation, and poisoned it with never so heretical and blasphemous annotations, as you have done your edition of the New Testament. You were wont to boast of the zeal of popes, cardinals, and other great prelates of the Romish sect, for the conversion of our nation unto their obedience. Were they also so straight laced, that none of them can find in their purses, to bear the charges of printing a work so necessary, or at leastwise profitable, as you hold the translation of the scriptures to be, for the maintenance of the Catholic religion? Or do you not rather, as the family of love used to do, for their works, craftily beg of your favourers in England, larger exhibition, upon colour of printing your translation of the Bible? when it is not hard to gather, that if you were purposed indeed to set it forth, and would use such means as you may, in those parts, the forbearing of the money, though your printer took it upon interest, might be paid for in the sale of one impression, although it so might happen, that a number of them were confiscated, or miscarried in the ways, as chanced to some of these your books. But who so seeth what unnecessary charge you have put yourselves unto, in printing this your translation of so large a volume: may easily perceive you set it not forth for poor men's profit, and that by so excessive price, of so small a part of the whole Bible, you mean to discourage your friends from waiting for all the rest: what advantage you have in this part, for deciding the doubts of these days, we shall examine in the several places, where you pretend to take it.

2. You are afraid, to give your old impudent proposition, that ignorance of the Scriptures, is the mother of Popish devotion. And therefore you hold it an erroneous opinion, "That the holy Scriptures should be always in our mother tongue, or that they ought, or

were ordained by God, to be read indifferently of all. Whereas it is certain, that the holy Scripture of the Old Testament was by God's ordinance first written in the mother-tongue of the Jews, and the New Testament in the Greek tongue, which was the mother-tongue to a great part of the world, and that language, which was most generally understood among the Gentiles, unto whom the Gospel was preached. Our Saviour Christ commandeth, not only a reading, as you yourselves confess, but also a deep search of the Scriptures, unto all the Jews indifferently. Paul commendeth the education of Timothy, in knowledge of the Scriptures from his infancy. Which authorities prove, that the holy Scriptures were ordained by God, to be read and known indifferently of all, and therefore ought to be translated into the mother tongues of all nations, that all may read and know them. Another erroneous opinion they account it, to think, that the Scriptures can be easily understood of every one that readeth or heareth them in a known language, which if it were admitted, yet it followeth not, that the Scriptures ought not to be in a known language, because they cannot be easily understood of every one that readeth or heareth them, but rather, that every one that readeth or heareth them, ought more diligently to study and exercise himself in them, more often hear and read them, and more fervently pray to God for aid of his Spirit, that he may understand them. And yet it is certain, that albeit some places of the Scripture are not easy to be understood of all men, yet there are many parts of them, and so many, as are able to instruct us unto salvation, so plain and easy, as they may be understood of every one that readeth or heareth them. And of this judgment is Augustine, answering this objection of the obscurity of the Scriptures: "Therefore hath the Holy Ghost magnificently and wholesomely so tempered the holy Scriptures, that by plain and open places, he might prevail against famine: by dark places, he might wipe away loathsomeness. For nothing almost, is gathered out of those obscurities, which is not found most plainly uttered in some other place."—*De doct. Christ. lib. 2, cap. 6.* And in the chapter immediately before, he showeth, that by reason of the diversity of languages, the same sound of

words, not serving all nations, the Scriptures were translated into divers tongues, that they might be generally known. "Whicreof it is come to pass, that even the holy Scriptures, by which so great diseases of men's wits are helped, being proceeded from one tongue, which might conveniently spread over all the world, through divers languages of the interpreters, being dispersed far and wide, might become known of the nations to their salvation." By both of which places, it is evident that Augustine deemed it more convenient in itself, and more agreeable to God's word, honour, and edification of the faithful, to have the Scripture turned into vulgar tongues, than to be kept and studied in any learned language whatsoever. Now why you should account any one tongue, more than other, to be ecclesiastical, you are able to give no sound reason, seeing God hath called his Church of all tongues and nations, and sanctified them all, to the preaching of the Gospel, and praise of his name. As for the Latin tongue, which you would most willingly have to be counted an ecclesiastical tongue, it was for many hundred years after Christ, the common vulgar and popular tongue, in most part of the west Churches, of those nations that were subject to the Roman empire. And why it is now ecclesiastical, that then was vulgar, I know no cause, but that Antichrist, whose tongue it is, blasphemously challenging to be the head of the Church hath chosen and authorized it to be ecclesiastical, in contumely of all other languages, which the Holy Ghost, descending upon the Apostles, in cloven tongues, hath consecrated to the preaching of Christ Jesus, and to the magnifying and setting forth of the great praises of God. That through man's malice, or infirmity, the Scriptures are often made pernicious and hurtful to many, it is no greater reason to keep them from the knowledge of most men, than it were to deprive all men from meat and drink, because many do abuse them, to the destruction of both their bodies and souls. As for the special consideration, that procured this edition, when you express it, we may better judge of it. In the meantime, we can conceive none others, but that which is the practice of many heretics, when you could not altogether suppress the knowledge of the holy Scriptures, whereby your errors are discovered; you thought it the next way for your purpose, by your partial translations, as much as you could, to obscure them; and by your heretical annotations, to pervert them; that the one should make them unprofitable, and the other hurtful.

3. The wisdom of the Popish Synagogue, and the governors thereof, is the wisdom of the old serpent, and of the children of this world, who are often wiser in their kind than the children of light, with whom it is a high point of prudence to provide for themselves, by any unjust means whatsoever. So have the Popish Clergy always endeavoured, by depriving the common people of the reading of holy Scriptures, and following their predecessors the

Jewish lawyers, have taken away the key of knowledge, of the same policy, that they did, lest their wickedness being commonly discovered by the light, they should lose that estimation, which through blind ignorance they have commonly obtained. They who have made claim for the common people in this case, whom, of your charity, you call the populace and their seditious leaders, of godly zeal and true simplicity, not of curiosity, pride and disobedience, have both made it, and justified it, with better reasons than all the proud Papists in the world are able to avoid. For what greater reasons can be alleged, than the authority of God in the Old Testament, and of Christ, our Saviour and his Apostles in the New, and the practice of the primitive church, and the consent of the most ancient and approved Fathers of the same, which have been brought to prove that the holy Scriptures ought to be known of all Christians? But the Governors of the Popish Antichristian Church, arrogating to themselves the name and dignity of the dispensing of God's mysteries and treasures, among which, as you confess, the holy Scriptures are no small store; by maintaining that ignorance is the mother of devotion, declare, if they could, that they would willingly abolish all knowledge of the holy Scriptures from the common people's hearts. And whereas you say, "that of old, they have not ever condemned all vulgar versions of the Scripture, nor generally forbidden the faithful to read them;" let the registers of Bishops be searched, where it will appear, that many have been accused and condemned as heretics, for having, reading, or hearing the holy Scriptures in the English tongue, without any exception taken against the truth of the translation. And that the Governors of the Popish Church "have not by public authority prescribed, commanded, or authentically ever recommended any interpretation of Scripture into the vulgar tongue to be indifferently used of all men;" they have declared sufficiently thereby, that they were not the ministers of God and Christ, nor successors of his Apostles, nor of the ancient fathers of the primitive church; all of whom, by public and lawful authority, always prescribed, commanded, and authentically recommended, as the holy Bible and the writings of the Fathers are most plentiful witnesses, the holy Scriptures of God, to be known, read and understood of all Christians indifferently, and without exception of any; which of necessity implieth the translation of the same, into all vulgar languages, without which, it is not possible for all sorts of Christians to read them, know them, and understand them.

4. Seeing the Armenians were converted to the faith, long before Chrysostom went among them; it is not to be doubted, but that they had the whole scriptures in their vulgar tongue long before this time. And their confession lately set forth, doth plainly argue, that they have the whole Bible in their own language at this day. To justify that the Slavonians

say of Hieronym's translation into their tongue, his own words are these: "I say not this that I would bite my predecessors, or think that any thing is to be detracted from them, whose translation being most diligently corrected, I have given long ago to the men of my language." Now the Slavonians were the men of Hieronym's language, or mother-tongue, as he testifieth himself of the place of his nativity, in *catalogo*; for whose use he might translate the vulgar Latin Bible, which was according to the Septuagint, after he had most diligently corrected it. But if this place prove it not sufficiently, at least he saith plainly, that the Scriptures were translated into the tongues of many nations. *Prefat. ad Damasum in evangelia*. Besides these, the Syrians, Arabians, and Ethiopians, had of ancient time the holy Scriptures in their several languages. The Spaniards of ancient time had the Old Testament translated into their mother tongue. Walafridus testifieth, that the Dutch tongue is the same, which was the language of the Goths and Gethes, into which, since the days of Ulphilas, by whom they were first converted, some wise man of that nation translated the holy Scripture. *De reb. ecclies. cap. 7* In our own country, not only the Saxon translations of divers parts of the holy Scriptures, but the testimony of Bede, whom you quote and cite most impudently, doth prove that vulgar translations of the holy Scriptures in his time were commonly used and occupied by the multitude. His words are these: "This island at this present, according to the number of books in which the law of God is written, doth search out and confess, one and the self-same knowledge of the highest truth, and of the true height in five tongues; namely, of the Angles, Britons, Scots, Picts, and Latins, which in meditation of the Scripture is made common to all the rest." He meaneth that men of all the four nations, studied the Scriptures by help of the Latin tongue, and such commentaries and treatises of the elder Fathers as were written therein. But he saith expressly, that the knowledge of the highest truth, which is not to be found but in the holy Scriptures, and according therunto was both searched out, and confessed in the mother tongue of the other four nations, by whom he meaneth the Christians unlearned in the Latin tongue.

That the Scriptures were current in English, both before and after Wicliff's time, and not of his translation, beside your conjecture out of Lynwood, is manifestly proved, by many ancient written copies of the English Bible, differing in translation, yet to be showed, of which Wicliff's translation could be but one. Notwithstanding that the Pharisaical clergy condemned the reading of them for heresy, let the acts of public writings remaining in the Registers testify. And of what devilish policy, they kept the laws of God in secrecy and silence, which he commanded to be uttered in all places and times, to the edifying of all sorts of Christians, how-

soever you seek to smooth and cover it, God's children do plainly espy it.

5. How pernicious heretical translations of the Scriptures are, which poison the people under colour of divine authority: if we had not learned sufficiently by the corruptions of old heretics, this translation of yours doth give plentiful testimony, which being helped forward with heretical annotations, as it were with stings, to make way for the poison to enter, hath no small force to deceive the simple. But the best is, we are assured that they shall not prevail finally, but in them whom the Lord acknowledgeth not for his. In the meantime, not only the remedy of true and sincere translation, out of the fountain and original text, is to be opposed, but also the fraud of the adversary, as occasion serveth, to be discovered and laid open.

6. The Popish Church arrogating to herself divine wisdom, in restraining that which God hath left to be most free and general, declareth that she is the Babylonical harlot, the spouse of Antichrist, who exalteth himself above all divine authority, and controlleth the wisdom of God in every thing, that is contrary to his devilish presumption: as in the use of images, of the cup in the Lord's Supper, of marriage in the Church Ministers, of meats in times made by him more religious, and such other. The true Church of God teacheth the true use of the Scriptures, even out of the Scriptures themselves, and discourageth not men from reading of them, as it were from a dangerous discourse, whereby they are like to take harm, knowing that none but spiders can suck poison out of wholesome flowers, which poison yet is not in the good flowers, but in the evil nature of the spider. The holy Scriptures, learned even from a man's infancy, are able to make him wise unto salvation, and being well studied of the man of God, are able to make him perfect and ready unto all good works, and to execute every part of his office.—2 *Tim.* 3. 15. &c.

7. That the Governors of the Popish Church have taken straighter order for readers and translators of the Scriptures, than the Fathers of the Primitive Church of Christ did: it is not to preserve the word of God from profanation, or to bridle the proud curiosity of the contentions, as it is pretended, but to suppress the light of truth, which displayeth their gross and palpable abuses, both in doctrine and conversation.

But where you say, that the holy Scriptures were never read of all persons indifferently, it is a most impudent assertion, set down without any show of proof, and contrary to most manifest arguments of antiquity. We acknowledge, the Fathers of the ancient Church were careful to keep the holy treasure of God's word from abuses: but that they did not, by prohibiting or restraining the reading of it, but by diligent teaching and exhorting of men to the right use of it. Therefore where you say, "We must not imagine, that in the

Primitive Church, every one who understood the Scriptures in the learned tongues, wherein they were written, or in other languages, into which they were translated, might without reprehension, read, reason, dispute, turn, and toss the Scriptures :” it is utterly false : for with reverence of God’s mysteries, and to the end they were given, every man might not only, without reprehension, but with good liking and commendation of the godly Fathers, read, reason, dispute, and search, which is to turn and toss the books of the Scriptures. It is recorded generally of all the faithful in Beroa, that they daily searched the Scriptures, even to examine the doctrines of the Apostles, by them, *Acts 17. 11.* Ireneus saith, *Lib. 2. cap. 35.* “That all the Scriptures, both of the Prophets, and of the Gospels, may be alike heard of all men.” Chrysostom exhorteth all men indifferently to read the Scriptures, “and to call their neighbours to the hearing of them.” *Gen. Hom. 7.* Also he taketh away the vain excuses of them, which alleged, that they were worldly men, had wife, children, and household to look unto, and prayeth, that they would not deceive themselves, saying, “That they which are entangled with such cares, have more need to seek remedy, by reading of the holy Scriptures.” *Gen. Hom. 21.* And *Hom. 2. Comment. in Matt.* he saith, “The reading of the Scriptures is more necessary for laymen, than for the monks.” And *Hom. 5.* he saith, “The people ought as soon as they come at home from the Church, to turn over the holy books, and to call their wives and children together to the conference of those things which are said. It is no excuse to say, I have not read what Paul saith, but a fault.” *Epist. ad Heb. Hom. 17.* Further, where you say, we must not imagine, that our forefathers suffered every school-master, scholar, or grammarian, that had a little Greek or Latin, straight to take in hand the holy Testament, Augustin is plainly against you, for he saith, “That they which turned the Scriptures out of the Hebrew tongue, into the Greek tongue, may be numbered, but the Latin interpreters cannot be numbered. For in those first times of the faith, as the Greek book came into any man’s hands, which seemed to himself to have some skill in both the tongues, he was bold to translate it.” *De Doctrin. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 11.* That the translated Bibles were in the hands and godly use of all sorts of men, women, children, how base soever their degree and calling was, is partly showed already : and more particularly Hieronym saith, that in the country of Bethelam, the husbandman, the ploughman, the shepherd, the reaper, the vine-dresser, did sing the Psalms of David, and made none other noise. *Paul and Eustoch. ad Marcel.* Chrysostom saith, the knowledge of the Scripture is most necessary for children, *Pueris*, boys and girls, because you so term them, and exhorteth their parents to cause them from their tender years to be ex-

ercised in the reading of the holy Scriptures. *Epist. ad Ephes. Hom. 20.* ‘That the Scriptures may be read at the table, he showeth. *Gen. Hom. 10.* And that players, rhymers, and jesters, instead of their lewd practices, should be commanded, in recompense of their entertainment, to read the holy Scriptures, whereby the servants, apprentices, slaves, and drudges of the house may be made equal with Angels. *Com. in Matt. Hom. 49.* Augustin also exhorteth the people to read the Scripture at the table, and meats. *De Temp. 56.* As for boats and barges, which serve for men’s travel, seeing God commanded his laws to be spoken of in journeys, and Christ himself preached out of boats and barges, there is no cause why his holy Scriptures may not be read in them also. Neither did the ancient Fathers account any true Christian, or company of Christians, to be a profane person, or company, but rather a company of profane persons, by diligent reading of the Scriptures, to be made a holy Church of God. *Chrysostom in Matt. Hom. 49.* And although there was not so easy means, before printing was invented, to disperse the copies of the Bible into every man’s hand, yet by the continual labour of the stationers, notaries, or book-writers, which in those times supplied the want of printers, there was a sufficient number of copies for every man that would buy them : or else Chrysostom should in vain have exhorted all the laymen of his time to buy them Bibles, or at least the New Testament. “Hear, I pray you, all ye laymen. Provide you Bibles, which are the medicine of the soul : if you will nothing else, at least get the New Testament, the Apostles, the Acts, the Gospels, continual and diligent teachers.” *Epist. ad Coloss. Hom. 9.* It is a frivolous pretence therefore, of the scarcity of copies : for whatsoever will be commonly sold, and well paid for, by diligence of workmen will soon be made plentiful.

8. They were in all men’s hands that were desirous to read them, and were to be bought of common stationers, or booksellers, as appeareth by the saying of Chrysostom, cited before : not only in libraries, monasteries, &c., and some devout principal laymen’s houses and hands. And as devout laymen did use them well then, so do such men use them well now, learning out of them such things as be necessary and profitable for them to know, and leaving higher mysteries and hard places to the discussing of the learned. That the husbandmen of whom Hieronym speaketh, sang the Psalms in an unknown tongue, which they could neither read nor know the sense, meaning, or mysteries of them, is boldly affirmed, and impossible to be proved. Such singing of Psalms with the lips, not understood with the heart, no godly wise man would have allowed, much less commended, as he doth, calling them their songs of love, the shepherds’ whistles, the instruments of tillage. And as those holy persons of both sexes, to whom Hieronym

commendeth the reading and meditation of the Scripture, used them to the glory of God, and the building up of their souls in faith and godliness. So God be thanked, at these days, many thousands of faithful Christians, with like zeal, reverence, humility, and all other virtues requisite, do read the holy Scriptures in their mother tongue, and by daily reading, do greatly profit in piety and charity, as well virgins as married folk, parents and children, princes and subjects, pastors and people.

9 There were in those times some arrogant and presumptuous abusers of the holy Scriptures, and will be in all times, as of all other good gifts of God: whose misbehaviour, as it was sharply and justly reprehended by the godly Fathers, so was it not thought any cause to restrain the multitude from the lawful and necessary use of God's books, as it is now pretended by the Papists. For that as some swelled in pride, and vanished in curiosity, so many profited in humility, and all other virtues necessary unto true Christianity. And even so the case standeth at this time: some, unlearned and ungodly, pervert the Scriptures to their own condemnation, yet many use them wholesomely, to their comfort and edification.

10. Every word of this section being granted to be as true as the Gospel, it cannot be inferred that therefore it is not convenient, that the holy Scriptures should be in the mother tongue, that they may be read of all sorts of Christians, without exception of any. For the holy Scriptures teach that moderation which Nazianzen requireth, that measure and discretion which Augustin commendeth, and reprehend that arrogance reproved by Gregory, and the rashness and intemperance detested by Augustin. So that by diligent reading of the holy Scriptures, the Christian may learn to embrace the virtues, and to abhor the vices.

11. Although there be many things in the Scriptures unmeet for all men's capacities, because of the difficulty of them, yet is there nothing unmeet to be read of any man, neither are there any mysteries of holy writ unmeet for Christian men to know and understand, as you seem to insinuate. The eunuch did read the prophecy of Esay, which he did not understand, yet was he not in danger to take any hurt by it; and God sending him an interpreter, showed, as Chrysostom saith, "That it is impossible, that he which with great study and fervent desire is occupied in the holy Scriptures, should always be neglected, but although the instruction of man be wanting unto us, the Lord himself entering into our hearts from above, doth lighten our mind, spreadeth his beams into our reason, openeth things hidden, and becometh teacher of those things which we know not, &c. *Gen. Hom. 35. and Luc. cap. 16.* After most vehement exhortation unto the people, to read the Scriptures, which if they neglect, he saith, it is not possible for them to attain to salvation, he addeth, "Yea, specially, although thou dost not understand such things as are

hidden in them, yet of the very reading much holiness groweth." Therefore Gregory Nazianzen wisheth not to have the Jews' tradition, for not reading of the Scriptures or any part thereof; but a like order, to restrain young men from being too bold in exposition, and contentions in disputing of the mysteries of the holy Scriptures. Nevertheless David, wiser than all the authors of that tradition, asking whereby a young man shall cleanse his ways, answereth, by study, meditation, and keeping of the law of God. *Psal. 119.* Neither doth Hieronym commend the tradition of the Jews, which permitteth not the beginning of Genesis, the Canticles of Solomon, and the beginning and end of the Prophet Ezechiel, to be read of young men, being under thirty years of age, but only saith, that the difficulty of the prophecy of Ezechiel is proved by that tradition.

12. No true Christian will be loth to be ordered by the pastors, doctors, prophets, expounders, teachers, and the preachers of the Church, which Christ hath given unto us, that we should take the law and instruction of faith at their mouths. And although faith come not principally by only reading of the Scriptures, but by hearing of the preachers lawfully sent, yet you must give them leave, to search the Scriptures daily, as the Bereans did, to see whether those things which their pastors, preachers and teachers do deliver, be even so. *Acts 17. 11.* Seeing also you confess, that reading in order and humility, doth much confirm and advance our faith. That the book of Scripture, is called of Ambrose *Liber Sacerdotalis*, you must give us a better quotation than *Lib. 2. ad Grat.* not so much for the term, but for that you infer thereof, that we must take and use it at the hands and disposition of priests. Ambrose wrote five books *de fide, ad Gratianum*, and three *de spiritu sancto*. Your note book deceived you.

13. That the Scriptures were made for all Christian men's instruction, when you have wrangled as much as can, you are driven in the end to confess. That Popish priests, not only of envy, but also of devilish policy, lest their false doctrine and wicked life might be reproved, have kept that holy book from the people, though you will not acknowledge; yet the children of God, whose eyes he hath opened, do plainly see and perceive. Your comparison unto the devil's suggestion, will then seem to be like, when you can show God's prohibition from reading the Scripture, as our parents could, for eating of the tree of knowledge. But when Christ saith expressly to all Christians, search the Scriptures, your cavilling is like the serpent's suggestion, which contrary to the express word of God, said, you shall not die, but God knoweth, &c. So you would bear men in hand, that albeit God command them to search the Scriptures, yet there is great danger in reading of them, and therefore they were better not to read them. Yea, your predecessors have condemned for heretics, such

as did read them, though now you go about to excuse the matter, and say that you meant nothing, but that the people should beware of blind presumption, and learn to be wise unto sobriety: as though these lessons are not better learned by reading them in the book of God, than by your restraining them from reading them at all, or not but at your pleasure. But let us consider, why the Popish Church permitteth not every one at their pleasure, to read the Scripture. She knoweth, saith you, the "Scriptures be ordained for every state, as meat, elements, fire, water, candle, knives, sword and the like." We know by the Scriptures the word of God to be ordained, as meat and other things most necessary and comfortable, but not as fire, water, candles, knives, swords, and like matters of danger, whereof men should be rather afraid to meddle with them, except it were for necessity. And yet there is as great necessity of the holy Scriptures, as of any thing you have named, and in them, as Chrysostom saith, *Gen. Hom. 9*, we may not suspect any danger to be, as in fire, water, candles, knives, swords and such like. All the danger is in the affection of him that abuseth them to his own condemnation; whereas, fire, water, sword, knives, cannot always be so governed by the wisest, but that they prove hurtful sometimes to the occupiers of them.

Whereas, you say, the Popish Church forbiddeth not the reading of the holy Scriptures in any language, it is false. For whatsoever she doth now, certain it is that her ministers have forbidden it in times past, and immediately before, you show reasons, why she doth not permit every one to read the Scriptures, so soon you have forgot yourself. Except perhaps you will say, she forbiddeth not such as understand them in Latin, to read them also in English, which is a poor permission: but if she envieth no man's commodity, why doth she not permit all men, to take that commodity which they may receive by reading of them? You answer, "She giveth order how to do it to edification, and not to destruction." It were well if she did so, for that care were seemly for the spouse of Christ. But as you affirm before in the sixth section, she hath taken order, "That the holy Scripture though truly translated into vulgar tongues, yet may not be indifferently read of all men, nor of any other than such as have express license thereunto, of their lawful ordinaries, with good testimony from their curates or confessors, that they be humble, discreet, and devout persons, and like to take much good and no harm thereby." By which order it appeareth, that they which have most need to read the Scriptures, are utterly debarred: many other by the difficulty of obtaining license discouraged, and especially, none but rank and obstinate Papists, may be allowed, for those only of the Popish curates, confessors and ordinaries, shall be couned humble, discreet, and devout persons. Let all godly wise men judge, therefore, whether the Popish Church, although you profess that she

envieth no man's commodity, yet by this order, hindereth not as much as in her lieth the profit of all men. But you answer, that carnal men and heretics, be hogs and dogs, to whom pearls and holy things, such as the Scriptures be, are not to be cast; which if it were a right interpretation of our Saviour's commandment, it were not lawful to attempt the conversion of heretics, by preaching the truth, nor to procure the repentance of carnal men, by exhorting them to the love of heavenly things. But as by preaching and exhortation, so by diligent reading and meditation of the holy Scriptures, many heretics are made catholics, many carnal men are made spiritual. Therefore not all that be carnally minded or infected with error, but only desperate, profane and malicious contemners of the truth, are those hogs and dogs, to whom the precious holy mysteries of the Gospel are not to be any more offered, when they have plainly declared themselves to be such. Chrysostom, whom you cite, speaketh expressly of such, and not of all carnal men. For in the next section, you describe the people of Constantinople, whom he exhorted to the reading of the Scriptures, to be very carnal men, and so they were indeed, yet he judgeth the reading of the Scripture, most necessary for them. And *Hom. ex. Luc. cap. 16*, after a most vehement exhortation to read the Scriptures, he addeth, "The reading of the Scripture, is a great defence against sin, the ignorance of the Scriptures is a great downfall and a deep dungeon, it is a great loss of salvation, to know nothing of God's laws, this thing hath both bred heresies, and brought in corrupt life, this hath turned all things out of order upside down." But even that ignorance, which he so detesteth, is of you Papists, counted good Catholic devotion, or the mother thereof. And what other was the state of the most, in the blind days of Popery, but even a gross ignorance of all the holy Scriptures? Where the people might not know what they believed, what they prayed, what God commanded, or any thing pertaining to Christian religion, but either of dumb images, or of dumb priests, except once in seven years, perhaps, of some prating friar or other Popish preacher, which rather turned them from Christ, than showed the right way to God by him.

You add further, that you would have heretics quite discharged, from all occupying and possession of the holy Testament. It must first be proved who be heretics, and which be the true Church that hath right and interest in the Scriptures: for neither your challenging of the name of the Church, will be sufficient to prove you so indeed, nor the terming of any other to be heretics, except you be able out of the word of God, to convince them to be such.

Finally, for the right use of the holy Scriptures, the pastors of the true Church of Christ, do diligently instruct their sheep, out of the holy Scriptures, with what moderation, humility reverence, desire to profit by



them, and invocation of God's spirit, they ought to read them, how carefully they must avoid all presumption, curiosity, rashness, profaneness, and such like vices, which may not only hinder their profit in the Scriptures, but also cause all their travel in them to turn to their utter destruction. These things the true pastors and governors of the Church can teach, without arrogating unto themselves any presumptuous authority, to restrain or permit according to their judgment, that which our Saviour Christ hath left generally to all the members of his mystical body, which is his holy Church, and to every one of them.

14. Chrysostom not in respect of such variety of circumstances, as you speak of, but absolutely, and most vehemently, commendeth, not only the lawfulness, but also the necessity of reading the holy Scriptures by the laymen, as appeareth in many places out of his homilies, and many other, which are omitted, seeing the matter by you is partly confessed. Yet one or two, shall not be amiss. First, he doth not only exhort the people of Constantinople, which were so worldly-minded, as you write, but also the people of Antioch, whom he greatly commended for their virtue and godliness, he calleth upon very earnestly to be diligent in reading of the holy Scriptures; *ad Pop. Antioch. Hom. 22, 42, &c.* Again, for the necessity of studying the Scriptures, he saith, "They that will attain to salvation, let them exercise themselves in the Scriptures." *Epist. ad I Cor. Hom. 6.* Where you think it requisite in these times, for a popish Catholic to be skilful in the Scriptures, I would many of them were of your mind, for then I would not doubt but some of them, by God's grace, would become Christian Catholics.

15. All that Chrysostom saith, to this purpose, is wiped away with this reproachful gloss, that he spake, "Not as a teacher in school, making exact and general rules to be observed in all places and times, but as a pulpit man agreeable to that audience and his people's default." Belike, pulpit men, with you, do more regard their creed before a few captious scholars in their school, than they do reverence the presence of Christ, before whom they should prepare to speak, when they preach in the Church of God. And therefore, albeit in figures, and phrases, and manner of handling, there is some difference, between a preacher before the people, and a reader before the learned, yet no learned godly man, such as Chrysostom, will so advisedly, so vehemently, so oftentimes as he did, utter any thing in the pulpit, before the ignorant, the truth whereof he is not able to justify in the schools before the best learned. Beside that your restriction of his rules unto his audience, and people's default of Constantinople, is before proved to be both frivolous and false, seeing he commendeth the study and reading of the holy Scriptures, no less generally to the people of Antioch, which were not a little

more spiritually affected, than they of Constantinople. And to that you say, "He maketh it not a thing absolutely needful, for every poor artificer to read or study Scripture, as some perversely gather of his words;" let his own words testify for him. *Epist. ad Col. Hom. 9.* "Hear all ye that be secular or laymen, and have the government of wives and children, how the apostle commandeth you specially, to read the Scriptures, and that not simply, nor as it were by occasion, but with great diligence." Doth not omnes mundani, all secular men, include as well every poor artificer, as every merchant, or gentleman? Or is it not a thing absolutely needful, which the Holy Ghost commandeth all men to do? I might add hereunto, that he saith in another place, *Luke 2. 16.* "It cannot possibly be, that any man can attain to salvation, except he be continually conversant in spiritual reading." But here you would quarrel, that he maketh no exact rule, because many men attain to salvation, which cannot read at all. Yet his meaning is plain, and his words agreeable, that none can be saved, but by that knowledge which is gotten by continual reading of the Scriptures, whether a man read them himself, or hear others. That he favoureth not presumptuous, curious and contentious jangling, and searching of God's secrets, it is true, no more do we, and much less the pride and madness of them, that will be teachers, controllers and judges of doctors, church, Scriptures and all.

Cæsius Arelatensis, *Hom. 13.* exhorting the ignorant people to repeat among themselves what they have learned in the sermon, saith, "Qui novit literas, Scripturam Divinam student legere: qui vero non novit, quærat sibi et roget qui illi debeat præcepta relegere, ut quod legerit, possit Deo adjurante complere."

Neither are you ever able to prove, that every artificer among us, readeth the deepest and hardest questions of holy Scripture, rather than the moral part, albeit that seeing whatsoever is written, is written for our learning, that through patience and comfort of the holy Scriptures, we might have hope: no simple artificer among us, is forbidden reverently to read any question of the Scriptures, which is either necessary, or profitable for him to know. If there were not in the Apostles' time, vain minded men that languished about questions, and perverted the Scriptures to their own destruction, it is no marvel though there be some such in these days. But as the Apostles never restrained or forbade the reading of the holy Scriptures, for the misbehaviour of such as abused the same, no more do we. And surely this argument of yours, although it came from Rheims, taken of men's abuse, will carry less weight in the schools, against the general liberty for all men to read the Scriptures, than the authority of Chrysostom, though he in your judgment were but a pulpit man, for the contrary.

Where you account only faith, and fidence

to be new phrases and figures, the one faith only, may be showed by twenty authorities, to have been used, more than twelve hundred years ago, by writers of the Church, both Greeks and Latins: the other, fidence, is a new phrase of your own framing: as for the Latin word *fiducia*, and that which it signifyeth, trust and confidence, I doubt not, but they which are meanly read in the Scriptures do know them to be both ancient and usual.

16. There hath been ever some schismatical heads, which have fantasied, that they could interpret the Scriptures by their own wits, without other ordinary means of learning, or the grace of God's Holy Spirit: against whom this same may be applied which you write. But that every artifice among us, that readeth the holy Scriptures, is thus presumptuously affected, it is a most impudent slander. For many thousands, with due reverence of the word of God and true humility of heart, do read to their infinite commodity, comfort, and increase of godliness. Where you say, they delight in none more, than in the Epistle to the *Romans*; I marvel why you should mislike them that do so, seeing that the true faith of the church of *Rome*, whereof you would seem to be so great maintainers, in no part of Scripture, is more plainly set forth, than in that Epistle, which the Doctor and Apostle of the Gentiles, did write unto the *Romans* to be read, heard and understood, of every simple artificer among them, as well as of the rich and learned, even all that were in *Rome*, beloved of God and called to be Saints.

As for the *Cantica Canticorum*, I think all the brazen faces, that conspired to write this preface, cannot name three simple artificers in England, that delight more in that book, than any other of the Scriptures. Neither is there any treatise of the holy Scripture, which is generally less studied, either of the learned, or unlearned. But because it is a continual allegory, the difficulties thereof served well, to make a show of your slander, before them whom you have enchanted to believe every lie, that your impudent mouth is not ashamed to pronounce. The *Apocalypse* also, though it be hard to understand, and be full of mysteries, yet may it be read as other parts of holy Scriptures, and there are many things in it, that are plain and easy to be understood of every artificer. But perhaps you are more unwilling, they should read the *Apocalypse*, because it doth describe the whore of Babylon, the city of *Rome*, so plainly, and the Epistle to the *Romans* liketh you not, because it is so plain for justification by faith without works. The rest that you say, of the difficulty of some part of the Scriptures, the simple and godly artificers among us, do acknowledge and either seek the interpretation of them at the mouth of their learned pastor, or else are content to be ignorant in the exposition of them, knowing as they are taught by *Augustin*, that in those places which are plainly set down in the Scripture, are found all those things which concern faith and good

living. *De. doct. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 9.* which is as much as is necessary, for every Christian man to learn for his salvation.

The example of Basil and Gregory, in studying the Scriptures thirteen years, before they expounded them, pertaineth not to every simple artificer, but to the pastors and teachers of the church. And God be thanked, our church hath many godly learned teachers, that have studied more than fourteen years before they have openly expounded the Scriptures, and which follow the understanding of them, not out of their own presumption, but out of the writings and authority of the ancients or elders; which are the words of *Ruffinus*, whom you quote, who speaketh not one word of uniform consent or Apostolic tradition. If you allege, that all our preachers, are not of so many years' study, I answer, their example maketh no law, especially where the necessity of the Church requireth men of less time, yet sufficient to teach the truth. Neither are the most of your Seminary Priests, whom you send over to disturb the government, as well as the peace of our Church, of thirteen years study in the Scripture, seeing we know some of them, but the other day, runagate unlearned boys from our Universities; but being come to you, they are suddenly become great clerks, and profound teachers; whose impudence serving them instead of all learning.

17. God's name be praised, a great number of our ministers, have had as good cogitation and care as is meet for that calling, and thereby have brought our country into that flourishing state in religion, that virtue and good life in them that diligently read the holy Scriptures translated into the mother tongue, never more shined in any age, than it hath done since the light of the gospel hath driven away the clouds of Popish ignorance, as all that be indifferent, and know the experience of both times, cannot but confess. Think you, the manners of the most perfect in the Popish times, are so forgotten, that you may with honesty, abide the comparison, with the common sort of Christians in this time? But your drift is to deceive young heads, of whom through your traitorous conspiracies you have sent a great number to London Bridge, that never knew the former days and manners, and see indeed much wickedness in this time, yet punished where it is detested, in all sorts of men, and not openly permitted, as Stews be in Popery.

18. We yield humble thanks unto God, that although the fruits of the gospel, be not so plentiful, as it were meet after so long teaching: yet the word of God hath not been preached and read in vain, but that great and notable effects thereof do appear, in the life and conversation of the faithful. And that all sorts and degrees of men, women, and children, which be diligent in reading, and hearing the word of God, be reformed in all virtue and godly behaviour. And that there is more religion, fear of God, faith, and conscience, in all such persons, than was in any

superstitious hypocrite, that lived in the dark days of Popistry. Neither do women teach their husbands, children their parents, young men the old, scholars their master, and sheep their shepherd, except perhaps, where there is greater knowledge in the woman than in the man, in the child than in the parent, in the young than in the old, in the scholar than in the master, in the people than in him that occupieth the place of the pastor; in which case, it is not against God's ordinance, that the inferior should instruct the superior. David saith, that he had more understanding than his elders, because he studied the law of God, that he became wiser than all his teachers, because his meditation was in the Lord's testimonies. But where the husbands, parents, old men, masters, and pastors, as they ought to be, are better learned in the holy scriptures than their inferiors, there is no such disorder among us, as you speak of. Neither are the sentences of God's holy word, by any of us, abused into mirth, and mockery, and such other wickedness, but either by Papists, or profane unreligious persons, which have brought that horrible profanation of the Scriptures, from the common practice in Popery. Neither make we or allow we any such rhymes, tunes, or translations, as may give just occasion to increase such impiety.

19. These Papists, are able to follow no argument against us, with any appearance of truth, but that which is grounded on petition or begging of principles. For who will grant them, the fall of good life and profaning the divine mysteries, in and by them, which use to read the holy Scriptures among us, as they are taught by us to read them! yet they say, *every body seeth*. And as for that which they call the great corruption and decay of faith, indeed, is the true instruction, confirmation, and increase of faith. That heretics which seek nothing in the Scriptures, but the confirmation of their error, must needs abuse them to their damnation, is confessed on our part. But both heretics and evil men, seeking to know the will of God in the Scriptures, by the promise of Christ, are assured to find it. And the sense of the Church and of the Doctors, if it be the true sense of the Scriptures, is taken out of the Scriptures themselves. Therefore even in the Scriptures with the assistance of God's Spirit, may be found that true sense of the holy Church, and the Doctors thereof. But that the ignorant and unlearned, which know and follow nothing but their private fantasy, may easily be seduced, and that heretics, wolves, and the devils themselves, pretend the holy Scriptures, it needed not so many authorities to prove, because it is acknowledged of all men that have but mean knowledge. Yet it followeth not which you conclude, that the vulgar or common people, in these days of general disputes, cannot but be in extreme danger of error, by reading the Scriptures truly translated, but rather by reading of them, may be preserved from dangers of error, if in humbleness of heart, and desire to know the truth, they seek, knock and

pray to him which hath promised that they shall find enter, and receive.

20. You slander the Protestants, in saying they walk in deceitfulness, and abuse men by false translations, corrupting, adding, detracting, &c. the particulars whereof, as they occur in these annotations, shall receive their answer to your shame. And as for that book wherein they are set forth more at large, by which you mean, Martin's Discovery, the author did well to term it a handmaid to this great gentlewoman, the gloss of your annotations, specially in respect of her modesty, that being once rebuked of her sauciness, she holdeth her peace, and doth not reply. So that these five or six years having none among you, that dare set pen to paper, to defend her after the death of her father, she hath kept silence to the shame of all Papists. Therefore for a large and particular confutation of all those slanders, I refer the reader to a book set forth in confutation of that discovery, called "A defence of the sincere and true translation of the holy Scriptures into the English tongue, &c." And that which you write specially against Beza, is confuted in the answer to Martin's Preface, Section 18, 19, 20, 21, 22.

The last quarrel against our translation, is, for adding whole sentences to the Psalms in metre, and even to the Creed in rhyme. By as good reason you might have brought out all books that we write in English, to prove that our translations of the Bible are faulty. For all reasonable men know, that the turning of the Psalms into metre, is no translation, neither is the Creed any part of the text of the holy Scripture, although good regard should be had as well in the one, as in the other, that nothing be added to the sense. Where you say the poor deceived people say and sing those metres, as though they were God's own word, you measure their understanding by the blindness of your ignorant Papists. But assure yourself, our people are not so ignorant, but they can distinguish the very text of the Scripture translated into English, from the paraphrase of the Psalms brought into metre, knowing that this latter must be consonant in sense unto the former, or else it is not the divine Scripture, no not although it be agreeable unto it. That our translation maketh of God's word the Devil's word, it is a railing sentence grounded upon no truth, nor argument sounding like truth.

21. All these quarrels and false accusations, are answered sufficiently in the book before remembered, and as they are touched in these annotations they shall here also be confuted.

That Calvin, the Church of Zurich, and other, complain of the translation of Castalio, showeth indeed, that we approve none, but that is sincere and true, although without proof you accuse ours to be as bad or worse. If Luther misliked the Tigrine translation, it is not sufficient to discredit it, seeing truth, and not the opinion or authority of men, is to be followed in such matters.

The glosses, prayers, and confessions, though they be printed, and bound in the same volume with the Bible, yet they be not privileged and authorized to be so joined with the Bible, as part of it, or yet so wholly consonant unto it, but that they are to be examined according to the text of the Scripture, and not otherwise to be received, than so far forth as they are agreeable therunto. Unless perhaps you think, that we usurp such lordship over men's faith, as you do practise, which require all these your slanders, contained in your preface, and all other errors comprehended in your annotations, to be taken for articles of faith, wholly consonant to the Catholic religion. The contradiction that you note in the fourth article of the Creed in metre, with the confession of our faith denying *Limbus patrum*, if you were not malicious enemies, might be avoided, by acknowledging that the author of that metre is to be understood so, as his words may agree with the article of the confession.

22. These forty or fifty years being void of compassion, you have suffered the people to be without a Popish translation, while you had any hope to persuade the world, that ignorance of the holy Scriptures is more mete for them, than knowledge in the same. But being beaten from that most impudent assertion by shame, and the conscience of all Papists that are of any equity or indifferent judgment crying out against it, and seeing that you laboured in vain to bring in blind ignorance: you have yielded by obscure translation, partly to dim the light of the Scripture, and by heretical annotations, to pervert the sense of the Holy Ghost, to the upholding of the kingdom of Antichrist. That our true and sincere translations, out of the original tongues, being laid aside, your mists of dark speeches, and wicked observations might come in place. What you profess and protest of your care and sincerity, may be credited of them that be devote unto you; but all reasonable men may take a taste of your credit by this. In the answer to *Martin's* book called the *Discovery*, &c., you were admonished of manifest corruptions, and false translations, even of your vulgar Latin text, but where is the promise of reformation these five or six years? Your like fidelity in citing and applying the savings of the ancient Fathers, shall God willing be laid open in this answer to your annotations: but as for the humble acknowledging of your errors, and the corrections of the same, we have small hope to see. For so long as your heads be occupied in contriving most horrible conspiracies, treason and murder of your sovereign, and the overthrow of your own country, we cannot be persuaded that any heavenly wisdom can enter into so malicious souls, or that there is any fear of God, regard, honour, or love of his truth, that moveth you to any thing, whatsoever you pretend. But even as the book you lately wrote against the murdering of princes, had no other purpose of the setters forth, but to make our Queen and her

counsel secure of your devilish practices, while you intended nothing so carefully, as the most cruel and unnatural slaughter of her person, and of all her faithful counsellors and trusty subjects, by that hellish and satanical conspiracy of Savage, Ballard, Babington, and the rest, by Gifford and Allen, principal pillars of your Seminary of Rheims, enchanted and confirmed thereunto, openly testified by their own confessions, at their arraignment. That in translation of the Scriptures, the very words must be kept, as near as it is possible, and the phrase of the tongue into which we translate will bear, we do acknowledge with *Hier. ad Pammach.* That which you cite out of Augustin, is not to be found in the place by you quoted; but wheresoever it is written, it seemeth to be intended of terms usual in the Church, against heretics, rather than of translation. That the ancient doctors refused not the barbarisms and solecisms of the vulgar Latin translation, which they then had, was because they did write in Latin, to be understood of the common people, to whom the Latin tongue was vulgar, and that translation familiar: not that those barbarisms and solecisms by long use became venerable, or that it is any example for you, to bring in Latin and Greek words into the English text, neither used before, nor understood now of the English people. Although the place you cite out of Ambrose, is by him defended to be a commendable phrase, by authority of those which made choice of words and eloquent speeches, of which one said, *Loco editiore quam victoribus decebat.* Neither doth Hierom in the epistle to Damasus say, that he keepeth religiously these and such like barbarous speeches, although he use some of them in his commentaries, for the cause before alleged, but rather he sheweth, that recourse must be had to the original truth of the Greek text. Nevertheless he saith, he hath so tempered his pen, that those things only being corrected that might seem to change the sense, he suffered the rest to remain as they were.

Neither had Augustin any religion in false or barbarous Latin, although he did bear with it, and was willing to use it where it was best understood, or did best express the original Greek. For in the first place by you quoted, he would have the original tongues, out of which the interpretation is made, to be looked unto, and that which is barbarous and obscure, to be corrected by it, as instead of *vitulamina*, he would have *plantaciones*: that which is commonly understood to be borne with, if it cannot be amended, and giveth an example of. "That which now we cannot take away from the mouth of the people that sing, upon him shall my sanctification flourish, where the barbarous word *floriet*, doth nothing hinder the sense: yet a cunning hearer had rather have it corrected, that it might be said, not *floriet*, but *floribit*. And nothing doth hinder the correction, but the custom of the singers. But these things

may be easily contemned." In this is the most religious care, that he hath to keep barbarisms and solecisms, this is the special pride and infirmity that he counteth in them that would have them corrected.

In the second place by you noted, for avoiding of ambiguity, he saith, he had rather speak barbarously than purely: as where the text is, *Non est absconditum a te os meum*, because *os* signifieth a mouth and a bone, the certainty must be learned out of the Greek tongue, "Wherefore many times, the vulgar custom of speaking is more profitable for signification of things, than the learned purity. For I had rather it be said with barbarism, *Non est absconditum a te ossum meum*, than that it should be therefore less plain, because it is more Latin like." His meaning is, he had rather have a barbarous word used, that is understood of the common people, than a pure Latin word, either not understood, or uncertain how it should be understood.

In the third place, he saith, that *sanguines* in the plural, is no good Latin word, yet because it is the plural number in the Greek, the interpreter did choose rather to express the truth according to the sound of words, though he spake not so pure Latin, according to the grammarians, for if he had spoken in the singular number, he had not expressed the Apostle's meaning, "Therefore let us speak, and not be afraid of the grammarian's palmer, so that we may come to the sound and more certain truth."

These things I have examined particularly, though the matter be not weighty, that the reader may see how soundly and sincerely, you gather out of the Fathers, where no great need enforceth you, that he may the rather suspect your dealing with them in matters of great importance.

23. Although the text be not truly translated by you, yet ye are not able by it to disprove the truth of our doctrine, nor to defend your own heresies. Whatsoever in your annotations, you have observed to charge us with heretical corruptions of false deductions, hath been sufficiently confuted already. As for the old brag of Apostolic tradition, exposition of Fathers, decrees of Church and Councils, shall now be declared to be as vain as ever it was. And whosoever, with diligence, sincerity, and indifference will vouchsafe to read, as well your annotations, as our answer to the same, I doubt not but they shall acknowledge more to be performed concerning this matter in the end, than we promise in the beginning. As for the wilful blind, that will be led by none other, but by your blind Pharisaical guides, we must let them alone, to fall together with you, into the pit of everlasting destruction.

24. We may see, there is no small account made of these your annotations, that you promise the reader such satisfaction and contentment in them, as he could not find in all the Popish treatises, that have been set forth these thirty years. Well, the trial is all. For my part, by the assistance of God's

grace, I nothing doubt, but as I have in twenty other of your treatises, laid open the weakness of your part, with the lewd means you use to uphold it, in such sort you have no list to reply: so in this work, I shall perform the like, that the saying of Augustin, by you set down, shall be found most true. "That the contradiction of Papists, as of all other like heretics, is the occasion, that the true meaning of the Scripture by diligent search is better understood, than it were like to have been, if no such heresy had arisen, and that the true Catholics be better discerned from the arrogant heretics, according to the saying of the Apostle. There must be heresies, that they which are approved may be made manifest." So the malice of Satan, the father of lies, is by the invincible power of God, converted to the avouching of the truth, and to the benefit of the Church, which by heresies the Devil seeketh to overthrow.

25. Your application of Augustin's place, is as true as your quotation: for you quote *cap. 13*, instead of the *33 cap.* And he speaketh not of points of doctrine, that indeed are not decided by Scripture, for of the point of doctrine in controversy between him and the Donatists, that such as were baptized by heretics, might not be rebaptized, he saith in the chapter going before, "Truly we follow in this thing also, the most certain authority of the canonical Scriptures." And a little before, he had alleged for the same question among other authorities of Scriptures, the saying of our Saviour Christ to Peter. He that is once washed, need not to be washed again. But the matter that was not to be found in the Scripture, was an example of one baptized by heretics, received by the Church without rebaptism. For he had also before alleged the same example of the Samaritans, who being circumcised in schism and heresy, were not circumcised again, when they were converted to the true religion of the Jews: which proveth the point of doctrine invincibly. But the contentious heretic would still urge the like example to be showed of baptism, whereupon Augustin saith, "Therefore, although indeed, an example be not brought forth of this thing, out of the canonical Scriptures, yet in the same things also the truth of the same Scriptures is holden of us, when we do that which hath now pleased the whole Church, whom the authorities of the Scriptures themselves doth commend, that for as much as the holy Scripture cannot deceive, whosoever feareth to be deceived with the obscurity of this question, let him ask counsel of the same Church, which the holy Scriptures without all ambiguity, doth demonstrate or set out." The obscurity of this question grew by the contrary judgment and practice of Cyprian's time, which the whole Church, by the authority of the Scriptures, had reformed in Augustin's time. He saith not therefore, "that of points not decided by Scriptures, the Church must be consulted," but where ques-

tion of contrary judgment and practice doth arise, the judgment of the whole Church must be inquired, what is agreeable to the holy Scriptures, and preferred before the particular opinions and practices of any other, though otherwise godly and learned, as Cyprian was.

The Church therefore hath wisdom to decide questions by Scripture, not authority to determine of points of doctrine, not decided by the Scriptures, for there are not such necessary for God's people, to know or practise.

26. You translate the vulgar Latin text, and not the original Greek text, for ten causes. The first is the antiquity, that it was in use in the Church of God, above 1,300 years ago. This is more boldly affirmed, than can be soundly proved: for it appeareth not by the Fathers of those times, that any one translation was generally used. Augustin saith, "There was an infinite variety of Latin translations." Hieronym in effect saith as much. *Prefat. ad Damasum in 4. Evang.* Yea, it will be hard for you to name any one Father of the Latin Church, that used it more than 1,300 years ago.

Tertullian used it not, as appeareth by a hundred texts that he citeth, differing from it: for example. Your vulgar Latin hath *Alter alterius onera portate*. Tertullian citeth it, *Onera vestra invicem sustinete*. Your text hath, *prudenter prudentium reprobo*. Tertullian's text was, *irritam facium*. Your text hath, *Non enim erubescio Evangelium*. Tertullian's text was, *Non enim me pudet Evangelii*.

Cyprian used it not, as appeareth by infinite texts, which he citeth in his books of testimonies *ad Quirinum*, and throughout his works, whereof I will show a few examples, Your text hath Matt. 3, *Non sum dignus calcamenta portare*. Cyprian's text had, *Non sum doneus, ad Quirinum, lib. 1, num. 12, Luke 1. Your text hath, Quia visitavit et fecit redemptionem plebis sue*. Cyprian's text was, *Quia prospexit redemptionem populo suo, lib. 2, num. 7. Your text John 1, hath, in principio erat verbum*. Cyprian's text had, *In principio erat Sermo, lib. 2, num. 6. Your text Rom. 2, hath, An divitius bonitatis ejus et patientia, et longanimitatis contemnis?* Cyprian's translation had, *An nunquid opulentiam bonitatis ejus et sustententiam et patientiam contemnis?* lib. 3, num. 35. The Clergy of Rome in Cyprian's time used not your vulgar Latin text as appeareth by divers texts cited in their Epistles. As for example, your text hath, Mat. 18, *Omne debitum dimisi tibi quoniam rogasti me*. The Romans' text had, *Donavi tibi omne debitum quia me rogasti. Cler. Rom. Epist. 31. Your text hath, Rom. 1, Quia fides vestra annunciat in universo mundo*. Their text had, *Quia fides vestra predicatur in toto mundo*.

Ireneus, or he that translated him into Latin, which is very ancient, followed another translation than your vulgar Latin. I forbear examples, which are many, because it is not certain of what time the translator of Ireneus lived, who is thought to have written in Greek.

Arnobius, an ancient writer, used not your text, as appeareth by divers places which he citeth. For example, your text hath, 1 John 2, *Filioli novissima hora est*. Arnobius read, *Pueri novissima hora, &c.* Your text, Luke 22, hath, *Satanas expetivit vos ut cribraret*. Arnobius did read, *veitlet*. Your text saith, *Ego autem rogavi*. Arnobius saith, *Ego autem intercessi*.

Hilary used not your vulgar Latin text, as appeareth through all his commentary upon Matthew, whereof take these examples. Your text hath, Matt. 7, *In quo enim judicio judicaveritis indicabimini*. Hilary saith, *Judicabitur de vobis*.

Cap. 15, your text hath, *Arundinem vento agitatam*. Hilary readeth, *vento moveri*. Your Latin text hath, Matt. 26, *Extendens manum excutit gladium suum et percussit servum principis sacerdotum amputavit auriculum ejus*. Hilary saith, *gladium exercens sermo principis sacerdotum aurum abscedit*.

Ambrose, you confessed before, used a more ancient translation than your vulgar Latin, and lest the unlearned reader should think it were in that one only place, I will give a few examples, whereby it may appear that he used not your vulgar Latin in his whole commentary upon Luke. In the Angel's salutation, Luke 1, your text hath, *In mulieribus*. Ambrose saith, *inter mulieres*. In the answer of Mary, your text hath *fiat mihi*. Ambrose saith, *contingat mihi*. In the 12th chapter, where your text hath *ager*, Ambrose hath *possessio*. Yours hath *quid induamini*, Ambrose hath, *quid vestiamini*.

Pacianus used it not, as Ep. 1. Luk. *Dignus est mercenarius*. Your text is, *Operarius. 2 Cor. 2. Non enim cersutias ejus ignoramus*. Yours, *Non enim ignoramus cogitationes ejus*. Julius Firmicus, tra. 1. *Qui aufert*. Vulg. *Qui tollit*. Apo. 5. *Prostraverunt se*. Vulg. *Ceciderunt*.

Victorinus Col. 1. *sedes*, Vulg. *throni*. *Condit*, Vulg. *creata*. 1 Tim. 3. *mysterium*, Vulg. *sacramentum*. *Receptum*, Vulg. *assumptum*.

Gaudentius Erixianus used it not, as it appeareth *Ep. ad Germinium*, where he reheareth the whole parable of the unjust steward out of another translation.

Seeing none of the Fathers of those times, used your vulgar Latin text, I pray you tell us in good earnest, what Fathers you mean? for these are the chief, and almost all those works remain of those times. Again, where you say it is most ancient, you forget what you said before, that Ambrose followed an older translation than the vulgar Latin translation.

The places by you quoted, do show, that Hieronym did correct a vulgar Latin text, that was much used before his time, at the request of Damasus, but the common received opinion of Papists, which call it Hieronym's translation, is no good argument to prove it to be the ancient vulgar text of his correction. All probability, is but your own authority. For it is against all probability, that Hieronym who corrected it, according to the Greek,

as he professeth, would have left so many places that are not warranted by any Greek copy.

Again, there are in it, some of those faults which Hieronym did correct, as in Mark the first, the name of Esay, which he thinketh to be the fault of the writers. *Com. in Matt. ap. 3.* The like is in some copies of the vulgar Latin, *Judva Jude.* Matt. 2, and cap. 6 he correcteth the word *externant*, which remaineth in your vulgar Latin text.

Also c. 16. 4. it appeareth that Hieronym's text was *vade retro me*, yours is *vade post me*.

In the Epistle to the Galat. c. 1. where your vulgar Latin hath *expugnabam illam*, Hieronym in his commentary, rehearseth the text, *et devastabam illam*. Likewise for *acquiri* in the same chapter, he correcteth *contuli* according to the Greeks. Again, upon the third chapter he saith expressly: *In some books it is read, who hath bewitched you not to believe the truth? but because it is not found in the copies of Origen, we have omitted it.* But those words which he saith he hath omitted, your vulgar text hath. Therefore with greater probability, may I say, that your vulgar text is not that which Hieronym corrected, but rather the same text uncorrected, than you can affirm, that by all probability, it is that which he corrected.

The antecedent being proved false, the consequent cannot be true. Augustin commendeth Hieronym's labour and diligence in that correction of the vulgar Latin, but we have declared before, this is not that which he corrected, therefore it is not the same which Augustin so commendeth. Neither doth Augustin use your vulgar Latin text, as I might show by five hundred examples, but a few shall suffice.

In the ninth of John, your vulgar latin text hath, *fecit latum ex sputo, et linxit latum super oculos ejus.* Augustin's translation was *de saliva sua lutum fecit et injunxit oculos cæci.* Tract. in Joan. 41. Also John 13, your vulgar Latin hath *post buccellam.* Augustin's book had, *post panem, or post panem intinctum.* In the first chapter of John's first Epistle, your vulgar Latin text hath, *et testatur et annunciamus vobis vitam æternam, quæ erat apud patrem et apparuit nobis.* Augustin's text had, *et testes sumus, et annunciamus vobis vitam æternam, quæ erat apud patrem, et manifesta est in nobis.* Also in the second chapter, to the fifth verse he addeth these words, *si in illo perfecti fuerimus, which are not in your vulgar Latin text.* In the same place, he readeth *dilectio Dei*, where your text hath *charitas.* In the fourth chapter of the same Epistle, your text hath *omnis spiritus qui solvit Jesum.* Augustin's text had *omnis spiritus, qui non confitetur Jesum in carne venisse, &c.* By these it is manifest that Augustin followed not your vulgar Latin text, which it is like he would have done, if it had been the same which Hieronym corrected, and which he so commended and allowed.

You are not able to prove your Church service to be so ancient as Augustin's time,

for many of your Church lessons are taken out of Beda, and other writers, who lived many hundred years after Augustin's age. And such parts of the Scripture, as seem to have been of most ancient time used in the Church of Rome, are not taken out of your vulgar Latin text. In the Lord's prayer, it is *panem nostrum quotidianum*, in your vulgar Latin text *supersubstantialem*, likewise for *gloriam in excelsis*, your vulgar Latin hath *gloria in altissimis.* So out of Matthew 21, your Church service hath *Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini, hosanna in excelsis*, your vulgar Latin hath in *altissimis.*

That it hath not been ever since Hieronym's time alleged, and interpreted in the writings and commentaries of the ancient Fathers of the Latin Church shall appear by these testimonies following. Your text hath Matt. 16, *porte inferi non prevalebunt. Optatus Milevitanus, allegeth porte inferorum non vincunt.* Matt. 7, your vulgar Latin hath *conversi dirumpant vos. Optatus read, conversi elidunt vos.* Luke 13, in your vulgar Latin it is thus written, *dicit autem et ad quosdam qui in se confidebant tanquam justi, et aspernabantur cæteros.* Optatus saith it is written, *Dicebat Jesus hanc similitudinem propter eos qui se sanctos putant, et contemnunt cæteros.*

Fulgentius, another ancient father of the Latin Church, alleged not always your Latin text, as appeareth, *Ad Trasimundum lib. 1. c. 5. Omnis spiritus qui non confitetur Jesum Christum in carne venisse, ex Deo non est.* Your text hath, *qui solvit Jesum.* 1 John 4. lib. 2. c. 18, his text had *conforme corpori*, where your text hath *configuratum.* Phil. 3.

Primasius, an old father of the Latin Church, in his Commentary upon the Epistle to the Hebrews cap. 1. hath *Oleo latitæ præ consortibus*, where your text hath, *oleo exultationis præ participibus.* Cap. 3. ad Gal. in his exposition he followeth that, which he saith was the Latin text, *Quibus ad horam cessimus:* whereas the Latin now is negatively *neque ad horam.* And although the writers or printers have prefixed the vulgar Latin before his commentaries, yet it appeareth by many places of his commentaries, that he followed another text.

Prosper Aquitanicus somewhat elder than he, allegeth Scripture, out of another translation, than your vulgar Latin: as of *promissis, part 3. pro. 1.* out of John 1. *dic, ut habeamus renunciare his,* your text is, *ut responsum demus.* In the same place, *vox clamantis in eremo, parate viam, &c.* your text is, *in deserto, dirigite.* Out of the Acts 13, he citeth this text, *Cum impletur cursus Joannes, dixit, quem ne suspiciamini esse, non sum ego, sed ecce venit post me, de cujus pedibus non sum dignus solvere corrigiam calcamentorum ejus.* Your text is, *cum impleti autem Joannes cursum suum dicebat, quem me arbitramini esse non sum ego, ecce venit post me cujus non sum dignus calcamenta pedum solvere.* It were folly to add more examples, in a case so manifest.

Leo, Bishop of Rome, expounded not your vulgar Latin text, and therefore it is not like

to be that which Hieronym corrected: for in his Hom. in *fest. omni. sanctorum*, interpreting the beginning of Matthew's Gospel: next after *Beati pauperes*, he placeth *Beati qui lugent*, as it is in the Greek. "After the commendation of this most happy poverty, our Lord added, saying, blessed are they that mourn. Your vulgar text placeth, *beati mites, quoniam ipsi possidebunt terram*. And Leo, when he cometh to that third beatitude, readeth *hereditate possidebunt terram*, more expressing the Greek word. Gregory indeed, who was three hundred years after the time by you before named used your vulgar Latin text, and that so precisely, that where there is a manifest corruption, not of the translator, but of the writers, Luke 15, *everit domum*, for *everit*, he nevertheless expoundeth the text according to that corruption, although he confesseth that in another translation it was *emundat*, which is more agreeable to the Greek. But this error of Gregory, you are content to give over, for in your translation you say, *she doth sweep the house*, according to the truth of the original Greek, being ashamed to follow the gross error of the best Bishop of Rome, of all the number that followed him.

Vigilius, an ancient Father, used not your translation, as appeareth in many places: Lib. 2. he citeth the text thus, Luk. 2. *Puer autem crescebat et confortabatur, repletus sapientia, et gratia Dei super eum*. Your text hath, *plenus sapientia, et gratia Dei erat in illo*. Again this text Heb. 2, he citeth, *nam paulo minus minoratur vidimus Jesum, &c.* Your text is, *eum autem qui modice quam angeli minoratus est*. In the same place after some Greek copies, Vigilius readeth, *sine Deo*, where your text is, *gratia Dei*.

Gildas, our countryman, Matt. 5. 16. *magnificet patrem vestrum*. Vulg. *glorificent*. Matt. 7. 3. *trabem in oculo tuo non consideras*. Vulg. *non vides*. 1 Tim. 3. *si quis episcopatum cupit, bonum opus cupit*. Vulg. *desiderat*.

The profane particular chapter of Trent, hath no authority to prefer any translation, much less one so corrupt and depraved as that is, before the original text of the Apostles' and Evangelists' own inditing; nor to forbid any man to reject that which is found disagreeing from the original verity. No council although it were general, which your good lords and masters of the Popish French Church, will not acknowledge the Tridentine to be, have any authority against the truth, but only for it, as Paul saith of himself, and other Apostles.

In gravity, sincerity, and majesty, it is not to be compared with the authentical Greek text, beside that in many places it is ridiculous, insincere, untrue, and consequently of no authority, much less majesty. And although the translator was not partial in respect of the controversies of our time, yet this unapt translation sometime is abused of you, to the maintenance of your errors, as in answering your annotations will appear.

The translator indeed according to his knowledge, did purpose to translate exactly,

both words and phrases: but being neither very good Grecian nor good Latinist, beside that he erred in many places from the true sense, he hath translated many places barbarously, as is confessed by Lindanus, Isidorus, Clarius, and others of judgment among you. What hurt is it then, if by learned men of these times, which have exact judgment in both the tongues, that rudeness be amended. Is the Scripture of more credit in false Latin or in barbarous Latin, than in true and clean Latin? No, verily, but that you prefer old errors, before old truth newly restored. If that vulgar translation follow the truth more exactly than ours, I would wish ours were reformed according to the Greek. Concerning the examples you bring, I answer your *præesse* doth not follow the Greek more exactly, than our words, to maintain, or to show forth. For *προστασθαι* doth signify as well that which we translate, as that which your vulgar text hath. We translate it also to excel, as Beza doth say, *Præstantes esse*: and the Greek signifieth all three indifferently, as every man that is learned therein will confess, and the Lexicons bear witness. The word dedicated, as Beza translateth it, had been more proper, than prepared: yet, because the word signifieth, to renew, and mention is made before of the new way, it is no hurt to the sense, to say, He prepared a new way. As for the words, *Justificationes, Traditiones, Idola*, we expound truly according to the Greek, as is declared at large, in the book of the defence of our translations, unto which I refer the reader.

Beza preferred it before the translations of Castalion, Illyricus, and such like; and it is not to be denied, that the old interpreter of the New Testament, according to his knowledge, and after that copy which he followed, translated religiously: yet partly for want of knowledge, partly for lack of conference of other copies, or judgment to discern them, he hath translated many things obscurely, many things untruly, some things ambiguously, and oftentimes barbarously.

The dissension of interpreters must be decided by the original Greek, as Augustine showeth, and Hieronym thinketh as much. Neither is there greater dissension of our interpreters, than is of the copies of your vulgar Latin text: neither is it like, neither is there any cause why Luther should so say, as you report out of his adversary *Cocleus*. For so long as the Greek text remaineth, the diversity of translations cannot bring the truth in uncertainty, but they that be learners and lovers of truth, may plainly see it. Nor yet is Beza's translation so wide from the Greek, that it is forsaken of us: but we use our judgment freely in those points, and are not tied to his authority. *The Son of Caiman*, though it be a superfluous and false addition, yet because it is in most of the Greek copies, we are content to let it stand, as the name of Jeremy, in Matt. Gospel, which yet we doubt not to be a corruption instead of Za-



chary, or else that there should be neither named. Yet Beza, by authority of Moses, and of a very ancient Greek copy, now remaining in the library of the University of Cambridge, doth leave it out in his translation.

The other example, *Cum uxoribus*, with their wives, is nothing wide from the Greek text, but very aptly agreeth therewith, yet because the word signifieth also women generally, and because it might be, that there were other godly women, besides the wives of the Apostles, our translator thought good to translate it by the word women, which comprehendeth as well wives, as other women.

This only argument, if it were well proved, might justify your translation out of the vulgar Latin text. The other nine reasons, if they were all granted, as there is not one of them all true and good, are not sufficient to prove, that you ought to translate out of the Latin, rather than out of the Greek. Seeing the water is most pure out of the spring, and not out of ponds and ditches that are derived from it.

27. The proof is like your accustomed proofs, where you heap on words to deceive the ignorant, which being rightly weighed, have no substance at all of truth in them. Your first argument is, that most of the ancient heretics were Grecians, which did corrupt the Scriptures in Greek. A feeble reason, as though the providence of God, which caused the New Testament to be written in Greek, either could not, or would not, preserve it from the corruption of the heretics, in Greek as well as in Latin. But some of these corruptions, you say, remain in the Greek books unto this day: it may be in some copies they do, which yet are convinced by other copies. But that you deny: and for example you say, Tertullian affirmeth the Greek text, which is at this day, *1 Cor. 15, 47*, to be an old corruption of Marcion the heretic, and the truth to be as your vulgar Latin hath: but Lindanus whom you follow, mistook Tertullian greatly, and so doth Beza. For Tertullian layeth not Marcion's corruption in that verse, but in the 46th verse, and by the authority of the Apostle in the 47th verse, discovereth his corruption. For after he hath proved out of the Apostle against Marcion, that the resurrection pertaineth unto the body, and not unto the soul only: he declareth that the Apostle confirmeth the same of Christ himself, where he saith, "The first Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam a quickening spirit, although the most foolish heretic would not have it to be so: for he hath placed the last lord, instead of the last Adam, fearing indeed, lest if he shall have the Lord to be the last Adam, we also might defend Christ in the last Adam, to be of the same nature whereof the first Adam was. But the falsehood doth plainly appear: for why is the first Adam, but because there is the last Adam? There is no order of things one to another, except they be equal, and be

either of the same name, or substance, or author. For although in divers things also, there may be one thing first, and another last, yet they must be of one author. But if the author be another, he also may be called the last: yet that which he hath brought in, is first, but last, if it be equal to the first: but equal to the first it is not, because it is of the same author; after the same manner, he shall be convinced in the name of man. The first man, saith the Apostle, is of the earth earthly, the second is the Lord from Heaven. Why is he called the second, if he be not a man as the first? Or is the first the Lord if the second be? But it sufficeth, if in the Gospel he taketh Christ the Son of Man, as man; and in the man Adam, cannot deny him. The words following also do press him together; for when the Apostle saith, such as he is, which is of the earth, namely the man, such are the men earthly: therefore, such as the man is, that is from Heaven, such are the men who are from Heaven." This place of Tertullian being rightly understood, doth not charge the Greek with any corruption, but rather reproveh the corruption of Marcion in verse 45; and is a good testimony for the antiquity of that reading, which is now of verse 47 in the Greek text. And whereas in his book, *De carnis resurrectione*, it is now read, *Secundus homo de celo*; it seemeth that *Dominus* is left out, through fault of the writers, seeing he addeth immediately, *Id est, Sermo Dei, id est Christus*; which agreeth properly to *Dominus*, and addeth not *celestis*, as it is in the vulgar Latin. And although some ancient Fathers of the Latin Church, as Ambrose and Hieronym, do read so, and Calvin misliketh not the sense, which is true; yet all the Greek copies and ancient Fathers of the Greek Church, as Athanasius alleging it against Marcion himself, *Euthy. Pan. par. 1. tit. 9*; Chrysostom, Damascen, and Occumenius, holding the Greek text, and the sense thereof, being good and godly, there is no reason why it should be counted a corruption. Another corruption of the Greek text, you say is noted by *Hierom. in 1 Cor. 7. 33. Adv. Jovinian, lib. 1*; where indeed he saith that "the Latin books of his time were as the Greek is now, and that the Apostolic truth is as your vulgate text is, and as he in that place translateth:" yet he confesseth that he had cited it otherwise, and so he doth in his book against Helvidius, and it *Ep. ad Eustochi. de Virgin. custodia*. But seeing Basil, who was of the Greek Church, and older than he, doth often cite the text as we read it now, and so doth Chrysostom likewise read and expound it Occumenius also and Theophylact. Almost all the old Greek copies do agree in this reading, with that which was the ancient Latin text in Hieronym's time: therefore it is rather like that Hieronym's Greek book was faulty, and lacked the conjunction, than that all the Greek Church was deceived in it. The third corruption you say is noted by the Tripartite history, *lib. 12. cap. 4. in 1 Jchu 4. 3*:

and the true reading to be *omnis spiritus qui solvit Jesum*; as also Socrates contendeth, affirming that text which we now read, is a corruption of the Nestorians, as Beza confessed. But Beza telleth you also, that Cyprian, *lib. 2. adv. Judæos, cap. 8*; citeth it in Latin, according to that we now read in the Greek, who seeing he lived certain hundred years before Nestorius, Soerates, or Cassiodorus, do unjustly charge him with corruption, although some old copies in their time, whom your Vulgate interpreter followed, might have *ο λυει τον Ιησου*, as Socrates saith. Yet all the Fathers of the Greek church, as appeareth by Oecumenius, retaining the Greek text as it is now, and all the ancient copies thereunto agreeing, and the Syrian translation confirming it, the testimony of one no very ancient historian, Socrates, and that manifestly false, is not sufficient to convince the Greek Testament of corruption, especially seeing not only Cyprian, and long before him, Tertullian, *De prescript. adv. Heret.*, and after them Augustin, and other ancient Fathers of the Latin church, do acknowledge this reading to be the true text and word of God.

23. It is a shameless cavillation to say, we acknowledge the Greek text to be corrupt, because in some few places, where the Greek copies do vary, through the default of the writers, being deceived by similitude of letters or otherwise, we choose that reading, which being most agreeable to the circumstance of the text is confirmed also by authority of the vulgar Latin translation; as in the first example you bring out of Heb. 9: 1. Some Greek copies now extant, leave out the word *tabernacle*, and so the circumstance of the place requireth. The same is the judgment of Photius, and Oecumenius, and before them of Chrysostom, in whose copy it was left out. The Syrian translation also omitteth it, as well as the vulgar Latin. Is the Greek text then corrupted, when we have so good testimony of the true reading thereof, both out of some ancient Greek copies yet extant, out of the ancient Fathers of the Greek text, and also out of the ancient translations into other languages?

The second. Rom. 12, likewise, hath most of the ancient Greek copies to warrant it, beside the authority of Clemens, Alexandrinus, Basil, Chrysostom, Photius, Oecumenius, Theophylact, old writers of the Greek church, the Syrian translation, and the Vulgate interpreter of the Latin; yet forsooth, we forsake the Greek text as corrupted, when in diversity of Greek readings, we follow that which is so substantially avouched.

The third example, Apocalypse 11, beside the Complutensian edition, which doubtless followed some ancient Greek copies, hath the authority of Aretas, and those ancients of the Greek church, out of whom he gathered his commentaries, which is sufficient to judge of that diversity, which is in mistaking of one only letter in the Greek word.

The fourth, 2 Tim. 1. 14. is no departing or

forsaking of any Greek text, but only a necessary explication of that Greek according to our English phrase. In so great a number of places, as you speak of, in this section, you had small wit to bring this for one, but that you were come to the end of your quarrels, though you place another after it for a fashion. You yourselves have other manner of additions than this is, in your translation, whereof some are necessary and some needless. Yet you would not be charged to forsake the Latin text as corrupt, although sometimes you do, and cleave to the Greek, wherein no wise man will blame you.

The last example, James 5. 12, hath also ancient Greek copies, the Syrian translation, and the judgment of Oecumenius, with such ancient Fathers as he doth follow, together with the vulgar Latin.

We forsake not the Greek text as corrupted, when we forsake the fault of the printer or of the writer, and follow the Greek text, which is warranted by ancient copies written or printed, and by the authority of ancient Fathers, the sense of the Holy Ghost, and the circumstances of the places agreeing that to be the very true reading of the Greek text and the right Scripture of God, no more than you forsake the vulgar Latin text as corrupted, when you leave the common reading, and follow that which is placed in the margin. You yourselves acknowledge at the end of this preface, that sometimes you translate the word in the Latin margin, and not that in the text, "when by the Greek or the Fathers, we see it is a manifest fault of the writer thereof, who mistook one word for another." And may we not do the same in the Greek, which you do in the Latin, without forsaking the Latin as corrupted? O conscience of Papists!

29. It is not vain trifles, whatsoever Erasmus, or any other man, shall reject out of the Greek text under that name; and yet you do him wrong, to say he calleth the conclusion of the Lord's prayer trifles, absolutely; but upon condition, if it be no part of the ancient text: for confirmation whereof, beside the most part of ancient Greek copies, Chrysostom in his commentary upon Matthew's gospel, Hom. 20, without any controversy doth read it and expound it. Therefore it may well be thought, that the Homily upon the Lord's prayer in the fifth tome, where it is omitted, was written by some Father of the Latin Church, rather than by Chrysostom. So the style in my opinion doth argue with the mention of *sursum corda*, brought in also by Cyprian. Euthymius who gathered his exposition out of many ancient Fathers of the Greek Church, doth in like manner read it, and expound it. The Syrian interpretation also which is very ancient doth acknowledge it: so doth the Hebrew text, which if it be not the authenticall of Matthew, yet is very ancient.

The Latin Church indeed hath not used it in the form of prayer, because it is not a petition, but acknowledging of the power and glory of God, to whom the petitions are di-

rected. Yet it seemeth, that Tertullian did read it: for although in his book, *De oratione*, where he handleth only the petitions, he makes no mention of it, yet, *Lib. 4. adv. Mar.* it is very like, he hath respect unto it, when after a short conviction of the Heretic out of every petition of the Lord's prayer, he addeth—"Therefore of whom shall I ask, that I may receive? At whom shall I seek, that I may find? At whom shall I knock, that it may be opened unto me? Who hath to give to him that asketh? He whose are all things, whose also I am, who do ask." And whereas some ancient Greek copies, which it seems that the Vulgate Latin interpreter did follow, do back this conclusion, yet it followeth not, that it is rashly added in all the rest, and so rashly received of the Greek Church, but rather it is most like, that the writers of those copies omitted it, as a thing commonly known, and daily rehearsed of every man: by which means also, it is like, the omission of certain petitions in Luke's Gospel came.

Concerning the second example of superfluity noted by Erasmus, Rom. 11. 6, seeing all the Greek copies except one, that we can hear of extant in these days, do agree in this text; and Chrysostom in his commentary upon this place, likewise Ptolemy, Occumenius and Theophylact do read it, and the text requireth it to make a perfect anthesis, we must rather think it a defect in your Vulgate Latin text, than a superfluity in the Greek. For the third superfluity of the word *wife*, Mark 10. 29, Erasmus hath nothing but his bare conjecture; all the Greek copies being against him. But it is a device that you have found out, to make the Greek text condemn itself of superfluity, and to justify exceedingly the vulgar Latin. Because the printers Stephen and Crispin do set a mark at those words or sentences which are found in most of the written copies, yet not in all; that the readers may know, that such words or sentences are not found in every written copy; which, by no logic in the world, argueth the one of superfluity more than the other of defect, but leave it to the judgment and discerning of the learned, which is most agreeable to the truth. Your own Vulgate Latin text, printed by Plantin and corrected by Hentenius, hath more than two hundred places in the New Testament marked more than are found in divers ancient copies. Wherefore, if Popish logic be as good against Latin, as it is against Greek, I may conclude, that the Vulgate Latin text in these superfluities condemneth itself, and justifieth the Greek text exceedingly, as being marked in a number of places, that such words and sentences are superfluous, in which our Greek text hath no such thing. For example, Acts 5. 8, the word, *mulier*, woman, hath a mark of superfluity: and in the same chapter, verse 15, this sentence, "and might be all delivered from their infirmities." And Acts 15. 41, this sentence is noted with a mark of superfluity: "Commauding them to keep the precepts of the Apostles and Elders;" none of which is

in our Greek text; and therefore it proves the Greek to be more sincere and true than the Latin. This is your own argument, therefore you must not deny it.

30. If you would conclude rightly, you should say, that it is no derogation to the vulgar Latin text, to disagree from every Greek copy, so it agree with the most and the best. But to disagree from all, as it doth some times, or often from the most and the best, must needs be a great derogation unto it. The testimony of Beza which you cite, is nothing against himself; neither doth it justify your vulgate Latin text in all places, but only where it followed the best and truest copies of the Greek text, as sometimes it doth: unto which you do well to confess with Augustin, that "the Latin translations that fail in any thing must needs yield." But the chief matter is to prove, that it was translated out of the more learned and diligent Greek copies: and that it hath continued ever since without alteration or corruption. The first you take upon you to prove by eight reasons, all which shall be examined.

If it agree with the true and uncorrupted Greek text, we will not complain, but you must remember that every Greek copy, extant or not extant, is not sufficient to excuse it: neither can you prove that it agrees with the true and uncorrupted text in all places, as where it is not only against all old copies extant, but also against the reading and interpretation of all the Fathers of the Greek church. Where you doubt, lest we shall forsake the Greek, it is needless. Beza, in James 4: 2, with Erasmus, supposeth a letter might be changed through default of the writers, in a matter of no controversy or advantage against you. In the other place he maketh no question, but showeth how the Greek word is taken, even in the same sense, that your vulgate translator doth.

Sometimes it doth agree with other Greek copies set in the margin, but not always; and therefore this is no good argument to justify it to agree with the Greek in all places. If it did always agree with the margin, it were not enough to warrant it; except you can prove all that is in the margin to be always the true and uncorrupted, the more learned and diligent Greek copy.

You make very good conclusions of particulars. We sometimes follow the marginal copies, as the true text, and leave the common reading; *ergo*, the marginal copies are always the true text. In the examples by you noted, I have showed what reasons we have to prefer the marginal copies. Bring you the like for those which agree with your Vulgate Latin, dissenting from the common Greek reading, and then your argument will be of some force, otherwise you may be ashamed to use it.

This argument in effect is the same as the former. Therefore except you prove that which any copy of Erasmus, Beza, Gagnais, or any other man, hath agreeable to your vulgar Latin to be a true, uncorrupted, and

more learned and diligent copy than the common Greek text, you say nothing to the purpose. For the Latin text, as you said before, must yield and be corrected according to the Fathers' meaning, by the true and uncorrupted Greek text, and by Augustin's judgment, by the more learned and diligent copies; and therefore cannot be justified by following any Greek copy, though it be false, corrupted, lesser learned, and more negligent. As for some Greek copies, it is not unlike, but they have by some perverse writers been altered according to the Latin, or negligently been written or copied out of truer copies.

This reason hath more pith than all that went before, therefore whereas your vulgar Latin hath the consent of the ancient Fathers of the Greek Church, although there be no Greek copy extant at this day to warrant it, yet will we not condemn it, as disagreeing from the Greek text. As in the first example you bring, 1 Tim. 6. 20. Although Occumenius doth read, as the common reading is now, yet he telleth you that Chrysostom did read as your vulgar Latin hath. Beza addeth Basil, and of the Latin Fathers, Ambrose and Augustin, and confesseth that it hath a very good sense, yet he preferred the other, peradventure being moved by the authority of the Syrian interpreter, who translateth it vanities and novelties. But in your second example of John 10. 29, you were foully beguiled to say, so readeth Cyril and expoundeth it, lib. 7. in John c. 10. For that seventh book, as the fifth, the sixth, the eighth, are none of Cyril's books, nor of any ancient Fathers, but were added by Jodocus Clichtovins, a very late writer, because these four books of Cyril are lost, and are nowhere extant at this day. You show yourselves to be diligent readers of antiquity, by this example. And yet you might have been admonished to beware of this ridiculous error at this time, if you would have vouchsafed to peruse my rejoinder to Bristow, sometime one of your crew, who made sport with this authority of Cyril, to defend the vulgar Latin before, and was well laughed at for his labour, as you are much more, among all the learned, who by his stumbling in the dark, could not beware of falling in the broad day light.

Your third example is of 1 John 3. *omnis spiritus qui solvit Jesum*, which Ireneus readeth so, but of Ireneus there may be a doubt, because he did write in Greek, and is translated into Latin by one that followed the vulgar Latin text very much, and was not so precise in expressing the words of Ireneus, as may appear by that parcel of Ireneus in Greek, which is reserved in Epiphanius. Augustin, in tract. 6. in John, readeth this text, according to the Greek text that now is, and afterward discourseth at large upon it. But towards the end, he repeateth the text according to the vulgar Latin, and briefly expounds it, whereby it seemeth, that his book had both the texts. Except we should suspect, that those few lines which concern the vulgar Latin, were interlaced by some that

would show what sense the words of the vulgar Latin might have. Indeed the words in the conclusion, *quid nos docet, nisi ut facta interrogemus, verba non credamus*, do very aptly agree with the end of the sentence immediately before those lines, *adeo ut noveritis, quia ad facta retulit*. Lodovicus Vives noteth divers lines inserted in his book *De Civitate Dei*, which in other ancient copies were not to be found.

Leo indeed, who lived after Augustin, and was a Bishop of Rome, followed herein the vulgar Latin text. Socrates and the Tripartite story, I have answered before. So that except you had Ireneus in Greek, you have gained little certainty out of the ancient Fathers. Tertullian and Cyprian being for the Greek reading that now is, with all the Greek Church.

'Touching your fourth example, John 5. 2, if you let *Piscina* be the nominative case, and by *probatica* understand a gate of Jerusalem near to the Temple so called, your vulgar Latin text is agreeable to the Greek text, and need not to be altered. And this is Beza's judgment for the name of that gate, citing *Nehem. 3. 1. &c.* And although Chrysostom and Cyril, and Theophilact deceived by them, read otherwise, yet Enthyimius, who followed other ancient Fathers of the Greek Church, readeth agreeable to the Greek text that now is, and to the vulgar Latin.

Concerning your fifth example, Theodoret, as Beza telleth you, readeth the copulative conjunction *καί* between the two nouns, signifying gift and justice, but it appeareth not so by his commentary. And his reading is not sufficient to control all the copies, and all other the Fathers of the Greek Church, as Chrys. Phot. Occum. Theophil. Last of all, *Luke 2. 14*, the vulgar Latin is maintained not only by Origen and Chrysostom, but also by a most ancient copy which Beza had, now kept in the Library of the University of Cambridge, and is not misliked of Beza, although he follow the common reading warranted by all the rest of his Greek copies, and many other of the ancient Fathers. To conclude, if all the varieties of the vulgar Latin, had some ancient Greek Father, or some old copy to avouch them, as a great number have not; yet were not that sufficient to justify them, if the better learned and more diligent copies be against them, and the sense of the place do plainly require another reading.

We think verily, that the old interpreter did follow some Greek copy which he had, in places where he hath not been depraved. But whether it was always a true and uncorrupted copy which he followed, we must examine by other copies, by consent of the Greek Fathers, by diligent marking the scope of the text, and by the ancient translations, which seeing they are often against your vulgar Latin text, although the interpreter followed some Greek copy, whether extant or not extant, he is not altogether to be excused, nor his translation, according to some corrupt copy to be embraced as authentical

Beside this, it is oftentimes manifest, that when his reading was the same that ours is, yet sometimes because he understood not the property of the Greek word or phrase, sometime because he was not able to express it aptly in the Latin tongue, he hath committed many errors meet to be amended, as in the annotations of Beza, Erasmus and others, a great number may be seen. This reason therefore is of no force, to make it better than the Greek generally, though the truth of *ποικιλια* for *πυγμα* were granted unto you: no more than a beggar's cloak with a hundred patches in it, is better than a fair gown of velvet, that hath but one such amiss in it. As for the word in question if it signify up to the elbow, as Theophylact and Euthymius take it, I see no absurdity, although the Popish Priest at Mass washeth only his fingers' ends, as superstition is sometimes nice, sometimes insatiable, if we think that the Pharisees washed their hands to the elbow. And peradventure it is more probable that they washed to the elbow, than that they washed oftentimes before every meal. But seeing the word cometh of *πυγος*, which signifieth a fist, the meaning may be, they washed diligently, as they do who oftentimes rub one fist in another: and so it may be taken for often washing, as the interpreter of Euthymius saith it is taken of all the interpreters.

The consent of the Latin Fathers who followed the vulgar text, which Hieronym in his time confessed to be corrupted, will not justify the vulgar translation against all the Greek copies, all the Fathers, all old translations, all circumstances of the text, and that which you add, all such conjectures. The former example is not agreeable to the rule, for as you say it hath a Greek copy in the Vatican, it hath the Syriac translation, and a Greek author to warrant it, beside the authority of Augustin and Leo, Fathers of the Latin Church. And yet two make not so great a consent, to carry the matter from all copies, Fathers, translations, circumstances and conjectures. But in truth, your vulgar text, in some copies, hath according to the Greek, *spiritus sanctus*, and leaveth out *datus*, yet indeed, this is not to be accounted a fault or variety, though it be not precisely according to the word, which expresseth the true meaning of the text, as all men, except Macedonian heretics, which deny the divinity of the Holy Ghost, will confess.

In your second example, you have small consent seeing Erasmus telleth you, that Augustin is corrupted and Hieronym, as you confess in the next section, is against you, and so are some copies of your vulgar translation. Then have you no more but Ambrose: for venerable Beda had, according to the Greek, *si cum volo manere*, by whom the corruption of Augustin is plainly discovered, seeing he hath nothing in a manner of his own, but the very words of Augustin upon that place.

I perceive you will have your vulgar Latin text to stand, though it have neither Greek copies, nor Greek Fathers, nor good rea-

son, which you call conjectures, nor the consent of the Latin Fathers, to maintain it. For the divers reading of the Latin Fathers, maketh no more for the Greek, than for the vulgar Latin, you say, differing oftentimes from both. Admit it be so, when they differ from both, yet when they agree with the Greek, as you cannot deny, but oftentimes they do, they make more for the Greek, than for the vulgar Latin. And where you say they differ often from both, that one example that you bring, argueth that you have no great store of examples, where they differ from both. For the place of Hieronym agreeth fully with the sense of the Greek, although he add the word *sic*, which is not in the Greek, yet maketh no alteration in the sentence, which is conditional, whereas your vulgar Latin is absolute, without condition. But to put the matter out of doubt, that no readings of some Latin or Greek Fathers, differing from the vulgar Latin, are a check or condemnation to the same; Beza's authority is cited, saying, "That whosoever shall take upon him to correct the vulgar Latin translation, out of the ancient Fathers' writings, Greek or Latin, unless he do it very circumspectly and advisedly, he shall rather mar than mend." This is your usual kind of reasoning, of a particular to infer an universal. But what if he do it circumspectly and advisedly? what if he have not only some Fathers' writing, but also some Greek copies, or all or most that are extant? what if he have good reasons taken of the scope of the text, and circumstances thereof? may he not then be bold to correct something in the vulgar Latin translation? As whensoever Beza, or any other learned man proveth the vulgar Latin interpreter, he doth it upon the only writing of some Father, who had not always the book by him, when he cited places of the Scripture, but either all or some of those proofs, leading him to approve the writing of that Father, to be the true text, and specially some Greek copy to warrant it.

31. They have very dim eyes, that through these gross paralogisms, can see the vulgar Latin translation, in all points approved good, yea better than the true text itself of the Greek, so that it may not give place to any other text, copies, or readings, except it be in such faults evidently crept in by the negligence of the writers, which you affirm to be very rare. If you would correct your books, but according to some ancient readings and copies observed in Plantin's bible, which you speak of, you should reform many hundred places even in the New Testament, and make them to be more agreeable to the Greek text, than that you take to be your vulgar Latin translation. But except it be gross corruptions, that may be felt with the hand, you will not bend one joint to the Greek text, such malice you bear against the truth. Nevertheless you translate that text, you say, which in your opinion is uncorrupt, we translate the Greek, which we confess to be cor-

rupt, as you have declared. What you have declared, we have sufficiently confuted: it is now time to see what you have more to charge us, with confession of corruption in the Greek text.

32. The Calvinists, you say, confess the Greek text to be most corrupt, and yet translate it only: yes forsooth, they have translated the Syriac, and some parts of the Arabic, as they could get the copies. But who are they, that confess the Greek text to be most corrupt? You answer, Beza, bringing in his suspicion only, in four places. But a suspicion or opinion, is neither an affirmation, nor a confession. Yet let us severally examine them. In the first place, he doth not suspect the matter, but only maketh an objection, and answereth it, approving with the ancient Fathers, the primacy of Peter, the primacy of order, not of dignity. Yea he is so far from suspicion of this matter, that Mark 3. 16, he readeth *Simon, the first*, where neither your vulgar Latin readeth so, nor the common printed Greek text hath it so.

In the second place, Luke 22. 20, he saith it may be, that it came out of the margin into the text, but he doth not affirm it. He saith further that Basil readeth the participle, with his article in the dative case, which taketh away all difficulty, yet, because all the copies extant have it in the nominative, he concludeth in the end, that the solecism may be excused by the property of the Hebrew tongue, expressed sometimes in the Greek, as I have showed at large in mine answer to Gregory Martin, *cap. 1, sect. 37, 38, 39.*

In the third place, he hath some light suspicion, that the words, *to adore them*, might be removed out of the margin into the text, as in all written books, many such like words have been. The ground of this suspicion, is the authority of Justin Martyr, who citing this place against Triphon the Jew, leaveth out those words, *to adore them*, yet he showeth how it may stand with the sense of the Hebrew text, of the Prophet Amos: and speaketh never a word of corruption.

In the fourth place, he noteth the grounds of his suspicion, to be the Greek text of Hosea, and the authority of Augustin, in *Joan. tract. 12*, who readeth, *Ubi est mors contentio tua?* whereby it appeareth that the translation which he followed, did read *reikos*, and not *vicos*. So readeth Cyprian ad *Quirinum. lib. 3, cap. 58*, and Tertullian *De resur. carn.* yet because of the general consent of all copies, and other writers, Beza retaineth the usual reading.

Now come we to those places which are past suspicion, as being manifestly affirmed to be corruptions. Of the first, you say, he calleth it a manifest error, that in the Greek it is 400 years for 300 years, Acts 13. But that is not so: for rehearsing many accounts, of Beroaldus, and Junius, and others, he suspecteth only with Luther, that error to be in the number, he doth not affirm it to be manifest.

The next place is, Acts 7. 15, where he

thinketh the name of Abraham, by some unskilful person to be added as the name of Jeremy, Mat. 27, and of Esay, Mark 1, and Mat. 13, as Hieronym confesseth instead of Asaph, where neither of both is read at this day. And certain it is, that Abraham bought his field of Ephron, not of the sons of Emor. And Jacob it was that purchased the field of Emor, the father of Sichein, as Hierom saith. Now if you can give the true sense, not leaving out the name of Abraham, you shall deserve great commendation. In the mean time, Beza telleth you, it maketh no uncertainty or corruption in the Scripture, if a name or two, by errors of some bold writers, not of the author, be placed amiss, which by conference of other places, may easily be espied and reformed. The place, Mark 12. 42, though he was long troubled, as he confesseth, about the reckoning of it, yet in the end he findeth out the true account, how two mites make a quadrans, and suspecteth no manner of corruption at all.

Neither in the last place, doth he so much as suspect any corruption or addition, but only referreth the word *Desert*, to the way, and not to the city, although the city of Gaza at that time was not inhabited. This section therefore proveth not that the Calvinists, as you term them, confess the Greek to be most corrupt. For here is only one name certainly judged to be very untruly added, as all men confess, the name of Jeremy, Mat. 27, to be, and two or three light or uncertain suspicions, about matters of small weight, and such as can make no alteration of doctrine, the rest are false and unjust accusations.

33. Heshoweth out of Hieronym, that the Greek of the *Septuaginta*, in his time, agreed with the original of the Hebrew in the number of 70, and therefore he thinketh *πεντε* is put instead of *πεντες*. But all men be not of the same opinion, therefore although the matter be not great, it is no reason, that the whole Church, for that they mean by the Calvinists, should be charged for one man's opinion, and that but in one matter of no moment, to change the doctrine, to confess the Greek text to be most corrupt.

In the place, Luke 3. 30, he judgeth *rov kaivav* to be falsely added to Luke, not only by authority of Moses, which were sufficient but also by testimony of an ancient Greek copy, which now is at Cambridge. But all your quarrels, touching *Qui fuit Cainan*, I have confuted in my defence against Gregory Martin; Preface, *Sect. 18, 20.*

34. The Greek text of the New Testament needeth no patronage of men, as that which is the very word and truth of God. The sincerity of our translations, against all your frivolous cavillations, hath hitherto, thanks be to God, been so strongly defended, as you have no list any more to assail it. And as touching your easy answer that you can make, why you translate not the Greek, *forsooth because it is so infinitely corrupted*, all men of reasonable understanding may conceive, how well you have proved this infinite cor-

ruption. The sum of all your reasons being drawn together, your argument is this. One man suspecteth here and there, in three or four places, some depravation, or else in a name and a number, thinketh there is some corruption, *ergo* by confession of all the Calvinists, the Greek text is infinitely corrupted. But you tell us, you will not grant the Greek to be so corrupt, as we say, though you know it less sincere, and uncorrupt than the Latin, and therefore you prefer it, and have translated it. Well, if you know the Greek text that now is, to be sincere, where any of us hath but suspected or judged it to be corrupt; and we have proved it to be sincere where you have slandered it to be corrupt: there is no reason, why you should not acknowledge it to be very perfect, and therefore have translated it, rather than the vulgar Latin: which your own Bibles of Plantin's edition, whereunto you refer us, do convince of infinite variety, which as Hieronym saith, is a manifest argument of falsehood, and as yet is not decided among you, in that variety, which reading is to be followed, as true and authentical.

35. A great token of your true meaning, that you prefer not the vulgar Latin, as making more for you, in which respect in these annotations it shall appear, that you have more advantage in the Greek, than in the Latin, being assured that we have not one, and you many advantages in the Greek. These Popish brags, all that read your writings, are so well acquainted with them, that we need not stand in doubt of them: having tried by often experience, that when the matter cometh to approvement, your arguments are no better than a false and feeble cause can afford you, as in answer to the annotations, by God's help, will be made manifest. In the mean space, you note unto us certain places, where you have more advantage in the Greek than in the Latin. First, in such places where we dare not translate the Greek, because it maketh for you, against us. Secondly, where the Greek hath some words making for you, which the Latin hath not. Of the first sort, is the word *Justificationes*, Luke 1, which we call ordinances of purpose, as Beza confesseth. And why should we not of purpose avoid that term, which may be cause of ambiguity and error, when the word in that place signifieth another thing? as I have showed in my defence against Martin, *Cap. 1, Sect. 50, and Cap. 8, Sect. 1, and the Sections following.*

For the word *Traditiones*, mine answer is, cap. 2, in all the sections: for the words, Elders, Priests, cap. 6, for Images and idols, cap. 3, for the place of Luke 22, 20, cap. 1, sect. 37, 38, 39.

But to come to the latter sort. First you bring two texts, 1 Cor 7, and Acts 16, 30, where fasting is mentioned in the Greek text, which is not in the vulgar Latin. O impudent slanderers! do we deny fasting, because we deny your antichristian prohibition and abstinence from meats, to be Christian fast-

ing? God be praised, our doctrine is sound for fasting, would God our practice were as often, as our judgment is pure and agreeable to the holy Scriptures, in a hundred places almost, that commend fasting.

Your next advantage is for free will, if not flat Pelaginisism, but caterconism with it, that man's will being holpen with God's grace, is free: and we hold, that it is free from constraint, but not from bondage of sin, Rom. 7. And what other thing can you prove out of that text, 1 John 5. 18, "he that is born of God, preserveth himself:" dare you say by force of free will, and not by the strength of God's grace? make your syllogism, and give us a plain conclusion, and we shall see what advantage the Greek text giveth you.

Another giveth you advantage against only faith. What is that I pray you; Apoc. 22. 14. Blessed are they that do his commandments: a goodly advantage, I promise you. They that are justified by faith only in his merits do his commandments, and none other. Against special assurance of salvation, you have Rom. 8. 38. Paul saith not as it is in the Latin, *certus sum*, I am sure, but *μετισταμαι*, I am probably persuaded. Verily, either the Greek word signifieth I am sure, so as I cannot be deceived, or else your vulgar translation is false. And where he saith, I am persuaded, he noteth the certainty of the word and Spirit of God, whereby he hath this assurance.

Your last advantage is about the sacrifice of the Sacrament, where the Greek text useth the present tense, referring that breaking of his body, and shedding of his blood, to the present sacrificing of it sacramentally, and mystically: but I would advise you to beware, lest while you seek advantage for a Sacrifice, you lose your best argument for the real presence, as you term it. For you are wont to reason thus: He gave that which should be crucified, but his natural body was crucified, therefore he gave his natural body: and so he did, to be received spiritually, as in a Sacrament or mystery. But to shut you from your sacrifice, the word shedding, so often repeated, will be sufficient, except you have forgotten your old distinction of his unbloody sacrifice from his bloody sacrifice. If his blood be shed in the Sacrament, then is the Sacrament also a bloody sacrifice. So that you see, it is small gain that you gather by this advantage, that you need not cry out and say, "*Lo these and the like our advantages in the Greek more than in the Latin.*" Nay rather these be your fantasies of the Greek, and of the Latin.

36. There is none of us, that calleth the vulgar translation of the New Testament papistical, as though it were translated by Papists, or else made so greatly for Papists, when it is rightly understood: but because it is so magnified by the Papists, that it is preferred before the Greek; which is the original tongue in which the New Testament was written, and commanded by the *Tridentine* Papists, to be counted the only authent-

cal text. And he that said, the vulgar translation is worst of all, spake of the vulgar translation of the whole Bible, in comparison of the Hebrew of the old Testament, and of the Greek of the New Testament, and of the *septuaginta* in Greek, and the Latin thereof. Your fond conclusions, "*the Greek is more Papistical, and Papistry is very ancient, if the vulgar translation be papistical,*" be as good as your antecedent, *Some of them call it so,* which I am sure, no man of learning hath done, otherwise than I have before declared, except it be for that it is abused of Papists, to maintain Popery, when indeed the translator had no such meaning, as in the three first examples it is manifest: for by *pœnitentiam agite*, he meant not popish doing of penance, but true and Christian repentance: yet you will not give over the show of popish penance and satisfaction, that you have by that translation. Likewise, by *sacramentum*, *Eph. 5. 32*, he meant nothing but a mystery generally, as the truth of the Greek is, and as you do well prove out of his translations of the same word, *Apoc. 17*. Nevertheless, if you give over the hold, you would seem to have of that translation, to make matrimony a Sacrament of the New Testament, in that sense that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are called Sacraments: you shall have no show in the Scriptures to dazzle the eyes of the ignorant. For *Gratia Plena*, I think, if he had understood the force of the Greek word rightly, he would have translated it otherwise. That he translated the very like word, *plenus ulceribus*, which we also translate, *full of sores*, it may excuse him of partial affection, but cannot defend his translation, to express the sense of the Greek word. For the very like word he translated *justificati*, being justified or made just, not full of justice, *Rom. 3. 14*, and *1 Cor. 4. 4*, *justificatus sum*, I am justified. But concerning the last phrase, *Heb. 13*, because he could not express his own mind in Latin, I know not what his meaning was, but leave it to God and himself. Nevertheless it is certain, that it is not only barbarous, but also false and blasphemous to say, that by good works God's favour is deserved.

The active of this verb, *Heb. 11. 5*, and *6*, he translated *placuisse* and *placere*, to please and to have pleased: what else can the passive then signify, but to be pleased? which perhaps he meant, if he had known any Latin word of the passive voice that had signified so much, for lack of which, he used the term, which was of the common people used in that sense.

Now where he useth the word *mereri*, *Heb. 10. 29*, you say we like it well enough: but how know you our liking so well? we may allow the sense of the translation as good, because wicked men are thought worthy of punishment according to their deserts: but we do not allow the translation, to be agreeable to the sense of the Greek word *αξιωθησεται*, and therefore he could not have said truly, according to the same Greek verb, *watch*

*that you may deserve to escape all these things, and to stand before the Son of Man*, and so of the rest: for not only his translation had been untrue, but the sentences through his untrue translation had been false: for though men deserve, and are accounted worthy of punishment and damnation by sin, yet they deserve not God's grace and his kingdom, by their works, but are accounted worthy of his blessing and eternal felicity, for Christ's sake of God's mere mercy. But you ask whether *Primasius*, Augustin's scholar, were a Papist for using this text, and all the rest that have done the like? I answer no. For *Primasius* meant nothing else, but that God is pleased, as the Greek word signifieth, to accept such sacrifices. "With such sacrifices and gifts God is pleased to receive them: wherefore he saith by the Prophet, I will mercy and not sacrifice. The poor man is not to be considered, which seemeth to receive, but rather he which commanded to give: for the alms which is given to the poor man upon earth, is received of God in heaven. And think not that he will render unto thee that which he hath received: for thou hast given earthly things, but thou shalt purchase eternal things." These be the words of *Primasius*, which declare, that *promerco* was vulgarly taken for *dilector*, to be pleased or delighted. Neither doth he mean any meriting by the term of purchasing, which he useth: for he was an utter enemy to the *Pelagians*, as his master Augustin was, but only, that God of his mercy doth crown and reward his own gifts, not our merits, as Augustin saith. And when he useth the name of merits, he meant simply, works, as many of the old writers did in that time: for otherwise there is no Father so clear for justification by faith only, as *Primasius* is, *Rom. 3*, upon these words, *being justified freely*: Hear this word freely, and hold thy peace of merits. Likewise upon *Rom. 4*, and many other places: and who so used this text according to this meaning, we take them not for Papists.

But further you demand, whether Cyprian was a Papist, for using so often this speech, *promereri*, &c. I answer: The using of the words maketh not a Papist, but the Popish meaning, which Cyprian hath not; but that God is pleased with just works and obedience, repentance and humility, not merited or deserved: for he citeth the Scripture plentifully, that we ought to glory in nothing, seeing nothing is ours. *Test. ad Quirin. cap. 4*. And that we must put our trust only in God, and glory in him. *Cap. 10*. Your last question, was it papistry to say *Senior* for *Presbiter*, &c. is foolish trifling. We accuse not your translator of papistry, though you abuse his untrue or unperfect translations to the defence of papistry.

We have answered before of the words: and for the sentences we say, they are no papistical translations, neither do they any thing in the world favour Papistry: for they are well translated, and the very words of the Holy Ghost: when you can conclude any Pa-



pistry out of these sentences in good and lawful form of arguments, we will yield to your Papistry. Finally, the ancient Fathers, general Councils, and Churches of the west part, that used these speeches before Papistry was hatched and fully shapen, were not all Papists, but most of them professed enemies to the usurped tyranny of the Pope, to the pride of his Clergy, to merit of works and free will: and were maintainers of justification by faith only, of the marriage of them that were not able to keep the vow of continence, as in answer to these annotations it shall more fully appear; and by their own words not mangled, gelded, and falsified, as they are in your annotations, but truly set down as their books shall testify, whereby it shall be evident, that you believe not as they believed, nor interpret as they interpret, as you use not the translation that many of them used, nor speak as they spake.

37. Not the desire of sincerity, but rather of obscurity, hath made you thrust in a great number of words, not only Hebrew or Syriac, which are found in the Greek text, but also Greek and Latin words, leaving the English words of the same, which by long use, are well known and familiar in the English tongue. And as for Hebrew and Syriac words, which are found in the Greek text, it is not to be misliked that they should be brought also into the English tongue: because the Spirit of God, not without cause, writing Greek, did think it meet to receive them. And therefore in our translations, we retain them all, except a few that are usually expressed in English: as Amen, Amen, in the beginning of a sentence, which might well have been used, but that the translator studied to be more plain, and to express the meaning of that asseveration. *Alleluiah* we use in the New Testament, because we find it in the Greek Testament: but when we translate the Old Testament, there is no reason why we should not translate it into English, as well as other words of the text. We say also *Hosanna*, *Raca*, *Belial*, yea, and *Corbana*, because we find them in the original text. But as for Greek terms, which may well enough be expressed in the English tongue, we see no cause why we should retain them, as *Parasceve*, *Azymes*, *Neophyte*. And if you had so religious a care to use all the Greek words in your English translation, which you find in your vulgar Latin text, then you would as well have translated these and such like Greek words as your Latin text hath, *Magi*, *Ecclesia*, *Architriclinus*, *Encania*, *Dyscolis*, *Pura*, *Nauclerus*, *Typhoniscus*, *Bolis*, *Artemon*, *Dithalassus*. *Mages*, *Ecclese*, *Architricline*, *Encenes*, *Discoles*, *Pyre*, *Nauclere*, *Typhonike*, *Bole*, *Artemon*, *Dithalasse*, and not as you have done, *Sages*, *Church*, *Chief Steward*, *Dedication*, *Wayward*, *Fire*, *Master of the ship*, *Tempestuous*, *Sound*, *Mainsail*, a place between the two seas, where if we should pick quarrels as you do against us, we should make ourselves to all wise people ridiculous, as you are.

You neither like that our translation calleth *Parasceve*, the day of preparing, nor the preparation of the Sabbath, and yet both are true, according as the word is taken in that place. You say it is a solemn word for the Sabbath eve; but you are short of the sense, for it is taken for a whole day before the evening, and for the day of preparing: neither of which are contained in your Popish term, *eve*. Where you say, it is taken for Good Friday only, Ignatius is against you, *Epi. 5*, using it for every Friday. We translate *Pascha*, Easter, or Passover, the one being the usual English term for that feast, the other expressing the meaning of the Hebrew word. And what signifieth *Azyma* but sweet bread, and unleavened bread, as we translate it, and *Panes propositionis* but the show-bread, or the bread that is showed? yet, you say, that the one is false, the other ridiculous and strange: nevertheless some of the best learned among you, have used those terms, as *Heshius*, *lib. 1, cap. 15*, and *22*, *Stapleton* translation of *Beda*, *lib. 5, cap. 22*. You mislike that *Neophytus* is translated a young scholar, and will have it restrained to those that are newly baptized, though they be old scholars. We know, that *Neophytus* doth signify one lately planted, and so were they called, that were lately baptized, in as much as by the visible sign of baptism they were newly ingrafted into the faith: but if any such were well learned, he was not excluded from the office of a Bishop, from which Paul excludeth *Neophytum*, as appeareth by the story of *Ambrose*, who was chosen Bishop before he was baptized, and ordained Bishop the eighth day after he was baptized. Neither doth *Catechumenus* signify always him that is not baptized, for Paul useth it, *Galat. 6, 6*, for every one that is instructed. If *Phylacteria* could as well be Englished either for sense or term, as *Didragma*, *Paracletus*, and such like, I think the translators would not have feigned a term of the Greek word: although the word *Phylacteries* was usual in the English tongue, before our late translations, as appeareth in the Homil. of *Wicliff* upon the Tuesday in the second week of Lent. Where he also showeth what they were. *Concision* we use also, to express the allusion unto circumcision: but there is no such like reason, for *Prepuce*, *depositum*, *gratis*, and such like Latin words as you use. *Evangelium* signifieth the glad tidings of the Gospel, and so we translate *Luke 2. Evangelizo* I bring you glad tidings. And yet *Iodochus* *Loricinus* a Popish doctor, in his Gospel, contendeth that *Evangelium* signifieth properly *Bonum nuntium*, good tidings rather than glad tidings. So that by his judgment, that which you reprove is the better translation. But why do you not call *Evangelium* the *Evangelin*, as the Scots do? as well as *Evangelizare* to *Evangelize*, but that you affect novelty of words, to obscure the Gospel, as much as you can. In the rest, which you call Catholic terms, you are glad to have a sound of words out of the Scripture for a

show, seeing you have no matter at all to justify your Popish Advent, penance, traditions, and such like.

33. By all means you labour to suppress the light of truth, under one pretence or another. For what prejudice had it been to the sense, if you had translated *spirituales nequitie*, spiritual wickedness, as you do *desideris carnis luxuria*, the desires of fleshly righteousness, 2 Peter 2, 13? Your second example, John 2, is no hard phrase in Greek, but very vulgar and common, signifying as we have translated, "What have I to do with thee, woman?" but that you are angry with Christ for reprehending his mother, when she was in fault: whom you hold to be void of all sin, even original, contrary to the Scriptures. Otherwise you are not so precise in the same phrase: For Matt. 8, 29, *Quid nobis et tibi*, you translate, "What is between us and thee?"

In the third example, some of your old copies agreeing with the truth of the Greek, why do you follow the error of the rest of your copies, but that you love darkness rather than light? In the fourth example, the words of the text following, "Thou hearest the sound thereof," do plainly argue, that *spiritus* in that place signifieth the wind, and not the Holy Ghost. For the sound or noise of the Holy Ghost is not heard. Neither do the ancient Fathers otherwise translate it, though by that text, as they may well, they prove the free working of God's spirit.

In the fifth it is plain both out of the text, and out of Matthew 8, 24, that the vessel was filled with the waves of water. In the sixth example, Luke 22, 5, Paul, 1 Cor. 11, doth warrant us that this is Luke's meaning, "This cup is the New Testament." But you know why you would have hidden it as much as is possible, because it is direct against Transubstantiation. In the seventh, our translation is according to the meaning, as appeareth, Matt. 24, 21, though yours be more precise to the word of Mark.

In the eighth place, you say, that we boldly and presumptuously add the word Scripture, James 4, 6, saying, "The Scripture giveth greater grace," whereas you leave it indifferent to the Scripture, and the Holy Ghost both going before. By which reprehension you verify the saying of the Apostle, "The spirit that dwelleth in you lusteth to envy." For except envy of our well doing had blinded your eyes, you would never have said, that the Holy Ghost is that spirit that lusteth unto envy, as both your vulgar translation, and you yourselves do render the text.

In the ninth, you seek a knot in a rush, Heb. 12, 21, for whether this word, *that*, be added or omitted, the sense is all one. And you yourselves add many other words for explication, as it is necessary for every translator.

Men and brethren, is our English phrase, as masters and friends, of the same persons. And what difference is there between a

widow woman, and a woman that was a widow? A woman, a sister, the original text saith not, 1 Cor. 9, but a sister to wife: for it were absurd to say, a sister a woman. But where you say, the hell of fire, seeing your Latin is *gehenna ignis*, why say you not the *gehenna* of fire, as you say, *Pasch*, and not *Passover*. *Amen, Amen*, and not verily, verily? If you may express not only the phrase, but also the Hebrew word in English, without offence against the majesty of that speech, we may be bold to bring the Hebrew phrase into the English tongue, so as it may be understood of Englishmen.

39. Seeing you confess, that the Latin being a translation, cannot always attain to the full sense of the principal tongue, why did you not translate out of the Greek which is the principal tongue? And why doth the Tridentine assembly authorize that translation for only authentical, which neither doth nor can attain to the full sense of the principal tongue, before the text of the principal tongue itself? As for the advantage of your cause whereof you speak, that hath been exactly examined already, and more shall be in the proper places.

If you added the Latin word every time, that you give not the precise signification thereof, you should make yourselves and your vulgar Latin translation ridiculous even to children that are young grammarians, as when you translate *fenenerator*, a creditor, Luke 7, *stabulum* an inn, Luke 10, *navis* a boat, Mark 8, *navicula* a ship, Luke 5, *Non quia de egenis pertinebat ad eum*. Not because he cared for the poor, and such like.

How precise you are, let those few examples last before remembered testify. And for adding, let your own confession bear witness. *Curaverunt Stephanum*. "They took order for Stephen's funeral:" where a plain dressing of his battered body unto burial is signified, and no pompous funeral. And if I should follow such small quarrels as you do, I might bring plenty of examples, as 2 Cor. 8, *Qui multum*, he that had much, and *Qui medicum non minoravit*, he that had little, wanted not. 2 Cor. 1, *Supra virtutem*, above our power. 1 Cor. 13, *Evacuavi quae erant parvuli*, I did away the things that belonged to a little one.

For diminishing, take these examples. 1 Cor. 14. *But if they learn any thing*, will or desire left out. Acts 25. But Festus answered that Paul is in Cesarea, this word kept, being omitted. But Acts 10, 41, in a place of great importance, and a matter of some controversy, the text is diminished of a whole clause *testibus praedictis a Deo*, for which you give us no English at all. Likewise Heb. 7, 28, in a matter of controversy, where the Latin is, *Lex enim homines constituit sacerdotes*, you translate for the Law appointeth Priests them that have infirmity, leaving out *Homines*, where the *antithesis* is between the Priesthood of men, and of the Son of God.

These be diminishings of your Latin text,

which otherwise is defective from the Greek in a hundred places, yet you make a great matter, that the name of Paul is left out in the title of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the name of Catholic in the title of the Epistle of James. But the titles are no part of the word of God. One ancient Greek copy leaveth out the name of Paul. Again, those other five Epistles are called Catholic or general, not as though the doctrine of them, were more sound and Catholic than the doctrine of Paul's Epistles, but because they are directed to no special city or country, but either universal to all Christians, or to all Jews, inhabiting many nations.

40. You take enough unto you, to use your judgment in pointing, which may alter the whole sense, and sometimes give a contrary meaning. And as you are bold sometimes to

prefer the margin reading, before the text, when by the Greek or the Fathers, you see it is a manifest fault of the writer, so might you have done in many more places, and made your translation more agreeable to the truth of the Greek text: if you had not rather fly from the truth, than come no nearer than you be enforced.

Now I also let the reader understand my purpose in answer to the Annotations. I mean not to strive for every word in the margin, as the name of the Popish feasts, and such like, neither to meddle with those Annotations, which although they be not rightly gathered out of the text, yet contain no impiety, or slander of the Church, or the true members thereof. But only with such as are framed against the truth, and the maintainers of it.

## REPLY TO THE INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

THE truth and sense of the Scripture cometh not only by the credit we give unto the Church, but also by the spirit of God which giveth witness to his word, as the Prophet saith, "My spirit which is within thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, and the mouth of thy seed, shall not fail for ever." And therefore you falsify Augustin's authority in translating *commoveret*, moved. For he saith as there were many things, which held him in the Catholic faith, so, if he were not an infidel, he would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Church, for the most part, do first move the outward man, to know and reverence the Scriptures: yet afterward, by the spirit and the word, he is confirmed in the faith of them, so that now he believeth, not only for the authority of the Church, which consisteth of men, but by the assurance of the word of God, and the authority of the word itself, expressed in the Scriptures. And therefore Augustin in the 14th chapter of the same book, saith of the Maniches, as we may say of the Papists, "what have we to do but to forsake them, that invite us to know certain, and afterward command us to believe uncertain things: and to follow them which invite us first to believe, that which we are not yet able to behold, that being made stronger through faith itself, we may attain to understand that we believe, now not men, but God himself, confirming and lighting our mind inwardly." The other two sentences of Augustin, although they be not truly and wholly cited, yet they contain nothing for the Popish Church which is not Catholic, but particular, heretical, antichristian, and hath no succession in doctrine from the Apostles and the Bishops of the primitive Church whose doctrine it hateth and perse-

cuteth. For it is continuance in the same doctrine that Augustin commendeth, and not sitting in the same place, where the Apostles and ancient Bishops sat.

Luther, Zuinglius and Calvin, who received and believed all the Scriptures of God, and always gave sovereign authority only unto them, are unfitly compared with such heretics, as Tertullian named, who refused what Scriptures they would, and corrupted the rest at their pleasure. Therefore although all their heresies are condemned by the Scriptures, which is sufficient to establish the faithful, yet it was in vain, to encounter with them, by authority of Scriptures, which they did not admit; whereas by the argument of prescription, they were plainly convinced. For as Tertullian saith, *that is true which is first, and that is false which is latter*, which is the meaning of Tertullian, and his scope in that book of prescription against heretics.

The Papists in this point of vaunting, are not behind, as appeareth in the preface. And wherefore serve these Annotations, but to vaunt themselves of the Scriptures? But they are never the more to be trusted for that, but the Scriptures more diligently to be searched, and studied, that their falsehood in perverting them, may the better be espied and discovered.

Calvin and Jewel have their pages garnished not only with authorities of Scriptures, but also the sentences of the ancient Fathers of the primitive Church, which by the judgment of Vincentius, are means to bring them to the true understanding of the Scriptures, and are testimonies, that they teach not their own new inventions, as Samosatenus, Priscillian, Eunomius, Jovinian, &c. but the ancient faith of the Church, planted by the

Apostles, and continued by the ancient fathers for many hundred years after Christ, even until the Apostacy was made by Antichrist.

While you hold tradition beside the Scripture to be necessary, you cannot defend the Scripture to be perfect and sufficient by itself, unto all points of faith, as Vincentius saith: whom you falsify in translating *ad omnia* in all points; and leaving out that he saith before, of the means to defend faith, which are the authority of God's law, and the tradition of the Catholic Church, which tradition bringeth in nothing that is left out of the Scriptures, as yours do, but containeth the sum of Catholic doctrine grounded in the Scriptures. As appeareth plainly by the words of the same Father, abridging his former sentence. "We have said before, that this hath always been, and is also at this day, the custom of the Catholics, to approve the true faith, by these two means. First: by the authority of the divine canon, afterward by tradition or delivery of the Catholic Church, not because the canon alone, is not by itself sufficient unto all things: but because many interpreting the words of God after their own pleasure, do conceive divers opinions and errors. And therefore it is necessary that the understanding of the heavenly Scripture be directed to one rule of ecclesiastical sense, only in those questions chiefly, on which the foundations of the whole Catholic doctrine do lean."

By which saying it is plain, that Vincentius allowed another manner of perfection and sufficiency of the Holy Scripture, than you do acknowledge, which teach, that there be articles of faith necessary to be believed, which are not to be proved out of the Scripture, but stand only upon credit of tradition, as prayer for the dead, invocation of Saints, &c. whereas Vincentius speaketh of no tradition but that which is grounded upon the canon of the Scriptures.

In the second testimony of Basil also, you falsify his meaning, translating *dogmata*, arti-

cles of religion, whereby you would have it thought, that he speaketh of articles of faith and doctrine, preached in the Church, which have no warrant of the Scriptures, whereas he speaketh only of forms of speech, by which the articles of faith taught in the Scripture, are expressed, and of rites or ceremonies used in the Church in his time. As that they used to sing in the Church: glory be to the Father, and to the Son, with the Holy Ghost. The heretics objected, that this form of speech, *with the Holy Ghost*, was not found in the Scriptures. Basil proveth by the Scripture, that equal glory is due to the Holy Ghost, with the Father, and the Son. But touching the use of the preposition *συν*, in that form of glorifying the Holy Trinity, which of ancient time had been used in the Church, he referreth it to the Apostolic tradition, as he doth a number of ceremonies beside, and forms of public service then used in the Church: which he called *δευματα*, that are not spoken of in the Scriptures, at least not plainly and expressly, for he defendeth some of them to have their reason out of the Scriptures: counting among them the form of this confession: to believe in the Father, in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, which form of words in so many syllables, is not found in all the Scriptures, yet the truth and substance of this confession is most plainly and perfectly contained in the Holy Scriptures. Basil therefore is no patron of traditions that bring in articles of faith or religion not contained in the Scriptures, as is evident by other places of his writings, as in his moral *Reg.* 26. "Every word and deed ought to be warranted by the testimony of the Scriptures inspired of God. And *Reg.* 8. If whatsoever is not of faith is sin, as the Apostle saith, and faith is of hearing, and hearing by the word of God, whatsoever is without the Holy Scripture, seeing it is not of faith, is sin." The same judgment he showeth in many other parts of his works, *tract. de vera et pia fide, in re ul. brev. inter 1. et 95. et 98. Epist. 80*

## THE ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

### CHAPTER I.

1. You must understand this note, where there is a Priest or Deacon, that can chant it lustily, as in Cathedral Churches, or other great choirs: as for poor country Churches, where there is none but one hedge Priest that can neither well sing nor say, it is mumbled up as the rest of the morrow mass, unless we shall think that poor Churches and Chapels be no part of the Pope's holy Church. To the feasts of the conception and nativity of our lady, which is a very idol, you might have added the visitation of Mary, of the common people called the new-found lady-day. But the true histories of the Gospel have not so great honour with you as the idolatrous and blasphemous inventions of your own brain. For therefore you have appointed those solemn feasts of the conception and nativity, because you teach contrary to the Scriptures, that the blessed Virgin Mary was conceived and born without spot of original sin. *Rom.* 5, 12, and 16, *Rom.* 3, 9, *Gal.* 3, 22. And therefore, instead of honouring her with the singular privilege of Christ the Saviour and Redeemer of both her and us, you honour an idol, and not her: for an idol is nothing in the world. And so is that man or woman who is conceived without original sin, except our Saviour Christ, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, as none other ever was or shall be. Likewise when you call the blessed Virgin our Lady, as you call God and Christ our Lord, what do you but make her equal with God and Christ, in power and redemption? In which respect God is called our Lord. For it is no term of civil and temporal dignity and authority, as when we say, our sovereign lady the Queen, but a religious and divine honour that you ascribe unto her, calling her absolutely, our lady, as blasphemously as the Frenchmen do ridiculously call other saints, *Monsieur S. Pierre*. *M. S. Peter*, or my Lord *S. Peter*, and *Madam S. Genesefa*, *Mistress S. Genesefa*, or, my lady *S. Genesefa*, &c. In which appellation, as in offering of candles, and other things unto her image, and worshipping thereof, you resemble the old *Collyridian* heretics, against whom, and generally against the worshipping of images, *Epiphanius*, writeth, *Heres.* 79 and 78, calling the making of images to be worshipped, a devilish intent, and the worshipping of them and of the Virgin Mary, to be a deifying of her, and a blasphemous and wicked work. What would he have written if he had seen the horrible idolatry committed by the Papiets in the pilgrimages to the images of the blessed Virgin, where you called, and yet call stocks and stones your lady, as our Lady of Walsingham, Ipswich, Paris, Antwerp? What else were they but dead

images at those places? If he had heard your blasphemies uttered in the solemn festivities that you hold in her honour, contained in hymns, anthems, and especially in that execrable Psalter of Bonaventure, who perverteth whatsoever the Holy Ghost hath uttered in praise of God, abusing it to magnify the Virgin Mary. *Roga Patrem, Jube natum* Entreat the Father, command the Son. *Coge Deum*, compel God. *Vita salus*, our life and salvation, &c.

20. *Augustin* in the place quoted, by the word Sacrament, meaneth the holy mystery that is in marriage, of the inseparable conjunction of Christ with his Church, therefore he saith *Sacramentum, quia nullum, dicortium*, Sacrament because there was no divorce. Not that matrimony is a Sacrament of the New Testament, seeing it was instituted in Paradise before the fall of man, as baptism and the Lord's Supper are called Sacraments, which he saith, are fewest in number, and findeth no more in the Canonical Scriptures. *Epist. ad Januar.* 118. But as he calleth generally every sacrifice of the Old Testament, a Sacrament, that is, a holy sign of the invisible sacrifice. *De civ. Dei. lib.* 10, c. 5. And as he calleth that bread, which in that time was given to young novices in Christian religion before they were baptized, a holy Sacrament, though it was not the body of Christ. *De pec. mer. and remiss. lib.* 2, c. 26. Likewise in Psalm 44, he so calleth all the mysteries of Christian doctrine uttered in divers tongues, *Sacramenta doctrina*, Sacraments of doctrine.

23. We teach even as Paul doth, *1 Cor.* 7, although we teach that marriage is better than single life, where virginity or chastity are not kept, but counterfeited. And so held *Epiphanius*, and the Church in his time. *Cont. Apost. her.* 61. *Hierom and Demet.*

25. You do most impudently allege *Augustin*, to testify that *Helvidius* was condemned for a heretic by tradition only, for *Augustin* hath no word sounding to that purpose. And *Epiphanius*, whom he supposeth to have understood *Helvidians* by *Anticomarianites*, laboureth to convince that error by Scriptures. And *Hierom*, in his book against *Helvidius*, showeth that he was condemned for affirming that of the Virgin Mary, which is not read in the Scriptures, in these words, "But as we deny not these things that are written, so we reject those things that are not written. That God was born of a virgin we believe, because we read it: that Mary had matrimonial company with her husband after her delivery, we do not believe, because we read it not." Behold what a friend *Hierom* was to unwritten tradition!

## CHAPTER 2.

2. This coming was a divine inspiration, and oracle: for the star only could not tell them that Christ was born in Jewry. "Their coming," saith Hierom, "was to the confusion of the Jews, that they might learn the birth of Christ by the Gentiles." *Chrysostom. Hom. 6. in Matt.* Because Christ was come to make an end of the old Testament, and to call the whole world to adore Him, who was to be worshipped by sea and land, from the very beginning of his nativity, he openeth the door to the Gentiles, and so instructeth his domestical, that he also inviteth strangers; and, therefore, had no resembling to Popish pilgrimage, which is idolatry. Neither doth their example of coming to Christ, warrant the faithful in the like kind of external worship, done to holy persons, places, and things. For what faithful Christian will grant, that whatsoever may be done to Christ's own person, their King, the same or the like may be done to any of his subjects? much less to any places, or other dead things. Such shameless collections as this, may warrant all idolatry and heresy.

4. Not the privilege of their unction forceth the priests sometimes to say the truth, for then they should never lie, because that privilege remaineth still with them; but the will of God sometimes expresseth the confession of truth, even out of his adversaries. *Chrysost. in Matt. Hom. 7.* The very enemies of the truth are forced for the truth to read the Scriptures, and to interpret the prophecy of Christ to them that were ignorant, although they would not publish the whole truth.

11. Chrysostom speaketh not of adoration of the Sacrament, but of the reverent coming to the participation of the Lord's table, that they receive it not unworthily, as the words going before and after do plainly declare: Immediately before, he saith, "How much the greater the benefit is which we receive, so much the more we shall be punished, when we appear unworthy of it." And, after he had set forth the example of the wise men, with many amplifications, he concludeth in these words: "Let us be stirred up, therefore, and be afraid, and show forth greater piety, that coming neither negligently, nor coldly, we offer our head to a more vehement fire. This I say not, that we should not come at all, but that we should not come rashly." It is reverence of the holy mysteries that he requireth, not worshipping of the outward elements, as his own words declare. "Thou seest him," &c., not with the bodily eyes, but with the eyes of faith, as thou seest the Holy Ghost poured forth, whose nature to the bodily eye is altogether invisible; yet with the eyes of faith is seen, that is, certainly known to work, in the divine mysteries, not transubstantiation, whereof he never heard or thought, but the spiritual feeding of the faithful, with the body and blood of Christ. "Wherefore, ascend to the gates of heaven and hark diligently, yea

rather not of heaven but of the heaven of heavens, and then thou shalt behold that we say: for that which is worthy of highest honour, I will show thee in earth:" meaning the body of Christ, "which thou dost not only see, but also handle and eat," &c. All which speeches must be, of necessity, understood of a spiritual manner of seeing, handling, and eating by faith of the inward man whereof he saith, "Wipe thy soul, therefore, from all filthiness, and prepare thy mind to the receiving of these mysteries."

Likewise Hom. 7. in Matthew, he saith, they are like Herod, that abuse unworthily the communion of the mystery of the body and blood of Christ, and rebuketh them, which refuse to visit Christ in his poor members, as the wise men did in the crib: likewise them that leave Christ, in the spiritual crib; that is, that forsake the communion of the Lord's table, and run to filthy plays, unto the theatre.

Hom. de Philogonia, he useth the like exhortation by example of the wise men, to the worthy receiving of the Lord's Supper, not to the adoring of the Sacrament, after the Popish manner: "For if we shall come with faith, out of doubt, we shall see him lying in the crib: for this table supplieth the place of the crib: for here, also, the Lord's body is laid, not wrapped in swaddling clothes, as then, but on every side clothed with the Holy Ghost: they which are admitted to these mysteries, know what is said. And the wise men truly did nothing but worship, but thee we will suffer, if thou shalt come with a pure conscience to receive it, and to depart after thou hast received it." Here is no word of worshipping of that which we see with our bodily eyes, but to receive him reverently, whom we may see by faith: so that none of these places favour the kneeling and knocking, that is, the gross idolatry, maintained by the Papists, unto the sacramental bread and cup.

11. It is a mere fable, without ground of antiquity, or any probability, that these philosophers were kings, which being much for the honour of Christ, as you say, the Evangelist would not have omitted. Chrysostom saith, that the Jews ought to have perceived, how great dignity was added unto them, by the nativity of so great a king, which, by his triumphant birth, had drawn the king of Persia unto him, and under whom they might subdue all people. But it is against reason, that the king of Persia, who was, at that time, a great monarch, came to Jerusalem.

And Chrysostom, speaking of the Magi, never giveth them any honourable title meet for kings, but speaketh more contemptibly of them than he should, for he saith they were ungodly and barbarous men, *1 Cor. Hom. 24.* Therefore, he meaneth not, that the king of Persia came in person, but that by preaching of the wise men, when they returned into their country, the king of Persia might be brought to the knowledge of his nativity.

Theophylact, a more late writer, saith, the Jews should have rejoiced, that they should

have such a king, as should be worshipped of the Persian kings. Where, if he mean that these *magi* were kings, he goeth against all stories, which tell that there was but one king of the Persians at once. And, for the number of them, the author of the imperfect work, that goeth under the name of Chrysostom, being as ancient as he, out of an old story, saith, they were twelve in number, philosophers and wise men, not kings. Gaudentius Epistol. ad Paulum, *Legati universarum gentium Magi*. Synesius, Hym. 7. *Magorum sapiens ars, ex stellâ ortu obstupuit dubia*. Cosmas Hieros. calleth them Astrologians, Hym. 1. Beda in Matt. *Magi non propter Magicam artem sic nominantur, sed propter aliquam Philosophiam in qua Balaam successores creduntur*. But they that feigned the names, might feign the number, and the deportation of their bodies from the East, where they slept many hundred years, to Colen. Saying, that it is too impudent a fiction, to place them in two cities at once, for Milan maketh as great claim, and showeth as good evidence for their bodies, as Colen. But the monsters of Popish relics pass all Ovid's metamorphoses.

16. Neither Origen, nor Augustin, nor any ancient writer affirmeth, that every one of those children was a holy martyr; neither are you able to prove it. Macrobius writeth, that one of the sons of Herod himself, that was nursed in those parts, was slain among the rest. I suppose it is not necessary to believe that Herod's child was a Saint. Neither do I think, that they which instituted that feast, meant to canonize him for a Saint, or every Pagan's son, if any such were amongst them. As for them that were not circumcised, because they were not eight days old, there is no cause, why we should think them to be damned, seeing the Sacrament of Circumcision could not be ministered before the eighth day. Before which age, it is not to be doubted, but that many thousands of the Jews' infants died. Where you say, their holyday hath been kept ever since the Apostle's time, you are bold to affirm that you are not able to prove. Augustin speaketh but of his own time. The homilies in *diversos*, which go under Origen's name, as Erasmus telleth you, be not all his, but written by some Latin author, and those that were his, are corrupted by Rufinus. So that you come not clearly to the time of Origen, and though you did, you were short of the Apostle's time. And the author of that homily in *diversos*, allegeth the Holy Fathers, not the Apostles, for commanding the celebration of their memory. And certain it is, that before the time of Constantine the great, that gave peace to the Church, there were not many festival days observed. Inasmuch, that the feasts of the nativity of Christ, Easter, and Pentecost, were not uniformly observed in all places for many years after, as appeareth by Conc. Aurel. 4. cap. 1. Tolet. 10. cap. 1. Brac. 2. cap. 9. Beda, *De temporis ratione*, &c. What judgment soever the Church in old time, had in canonizing of

Saints, as you term it, or in defining who aro holy, nothing pertaineth to the Pope's manner of canonization; which is a curious, costly, and theatrical pomp, unmeet for the simplicity of the Church of Christ, and meet for the bravery of the whore of Babylon. Where nevertheless for the credit of his canonization, you may see a protestation that the Pope maketh, if it happen he be deceived, in the person to be canonized. And the author of the book saith upon good testimony, that the Pope was once compelled to canonize one against his opinion. What sure credit can there be of the Pope's canonization, when every Pope hath authority to annul and inhibit all the acts of his predecessor, as the famous tragedy of Fornosus, and his acts, so often confirmed and disannulled, his dead body mangled, and then revered as a Saint, by the images in Peter's Church, if your stories do not lie, doth abundantly testify. Herm. Shedel, Platina, &c. *Pontif. Mar. ad Corey. Arch.*

## CHAPTER 3.

I Your Popish Hermits, as the places of their Hermitage yet remaining in England do declare, dwelt not in desert or solitary places, but for the most part, near great cities and populous towns, and in austerity of life, were not so much as shadows of the old Hermits, of whom there is mention in the ancient Fathers' writings. Of whose profession yet John the Baptist was not author, because his office was singular, neither doth any of the old Fathers so call him, although some say, he was the chiefest of them, that led a solitary life in the wilderness. The Centuriasts indeed say, that Chrysostom spake somewhat rashly, and against the truth of the thing, where he maketh John Baptist, prince of all monks, Hom. 1 in Mark, and Hom. 69. in 21. Matt. not content to say, "they lead an Angel's life, and talk freely with God," but also, "that their soul is without all griefs and passion, and their body such as Adam's was, before his sin," which is contrary to the doctrine of original sin. Now whether these things were written by Chrysostom advisedly and truly, I appeal to your own judgments, which I know to be very corrupt, yet I think none of you have the face to defend all those words, as they lie, without any cavillation to be true and Catholic doctrine. All the Protestants do grant the austerity of John's life, in the place of his abode, in his apparel, and in his diet: yet they do not place it only in these. And although they say, the desert had towns and villages not far off, as the truth is, yet they acknowledge it was a solitary place. They that say his garment was chamblet, speak not of fine chamblet, but of a rough and coarse cloth, made of the great and hard hairs of camels, not of the fine and soft hairs, called camel's wool, whereof our chamblet and grograine are made; for his meat, they say, it was Locusts, which are usual to be eaten in that country, and wild honey, or dew honey, which there also is common.

Not thereby making him a common man, or a delicate person, but a man of straight life, and austere conversation.

2. When you understand by penance, satisfaction for sin, do penance, is not the English for the Latin, *agite penitentiam*, neither in word, nor sense. And that your interpreter meant no more in *agite penitentiam* than repentance, his own translation of the same Greek word Mark 1. 15. is manifest, where you are content to say, be penitent. *Agere penitentiam nihil aliud est, quam profiteri et affirmare se ulterius non peccaturum. Lact. de vero cult. lib. 6. c. 13. Perfecta est autem, penitentia, praterita desistere et futura non admittente. Isid. orig. lib. 6. c. de. officis.* To require satisfaction in them that are to be baptized, is against your own Popish learning: for many of you hold, that there is free remission of all sins without any satisfaction in baptism. As for the painful satisfaction, that Cyprian speaketh of, is meant of satisfaction unto the Church, that is offended, to be made by them, that had fallen unto denial of Christ, or idolatry, through terror of persecution, by such means to give outward testimony of the inward sorrow of their hearts, for so grievous offences, not to make amends to the justice of God for their sin. Neither was that public satisfaction required of every one that sinned, but only of those that had fallen openly and grievously into some heinous crime. And Beza doth justly mislike your translation, because in show of words, though not in the meaning of the translator, it favoureth that blasphemous doctrine of satisfaction for sin unto the righteousness of God, which was thoroughly performed by the sacrifice of Christ's death. But that the Greek word significeth satisfactory penance, you send us first to Matt. 11. 21, where our Saviour saith, Tyre and Sidon would have repented in sackcloth and ashes, but never a word of satisfaction: for sitting in sackcloth and ashes is no satisfaction for sin, but an outward sign of true sorrow for sin, and humbling of the soul to desire forgiveness of sins. Neither is there one word more, Luke 10. 13, whither you send us next. In the third place, 2 Cor. 7. 9, Paul saith, he is glad that they sorrowed unto repentance, for the sorrow that is after God worketh repentance unto salvation, not to be repented of. What word is here sounding for satisfaction? As for godly sorrow and grief of mind, to be necessary unto true repentance, we never will deny: but that sorrow is any satisfaction to God's justice, as a horrible blasphemy, we utterly abhor to hear of it. But where Scripture helpeth you not, you tell us, that Basil calleth the Ninevites' repentance, with fasting, hair-cloth, and ashes, by the same Greek word *μετανοια*, and we acknowledge as much, because our Saviour Christ calleth their repentance by the same word *μετρησσαν*, Matt. 12. 41. But where is satisfaction? Basil in the place by you noted, plainly showeth the use of sackcloth and ashes, and such like outward forms, "sackcloth," saith he, "is a helper unto repentance

being a sign of humiliation; he saith not it is a part of repentance, as you say satisfaction is. *Euchinus, Disput. Joha. cop. 7. Lactant. de vero cult. lib. 6. cap. 24.*

6. If general confession was not sufficient, but every man must utter all his sins in particular, John had shriving work enough, for seven years, to hear the confessions of Jerusalem, and all Jewry, and all the country about Jordan, of whom never a man was ever shriven before, and therefore every man's confession must be very long. O Papists blush you not at this impudent collection?

8. Fruits worthy of repentance are no satisfaction for sin, but arguments of true repentance, effects of repentance, and not part of it. Neither doth Hierom say that fasting, prayers, &c., are satisfaction for sin, but tokens of repentance. "Be ye converted to me with all your heart. And declare the repentance of your mind, with fasting, and weeping, and mourning. Despair not of pardon, through the greatness of your wickedness, for great mercy shall wipe away great sins." Hierom knew no satisfaction for sins, to the justice of God, but the death of Christ.

10. They that hear us preach, can testify that you lie: although we exhort not men to do good only, or chiefly in hope of reward, nor to avoid sin only for fear of hell, but rather in duty and thankfulness to God, that God may be glorified by their good conversation, and not dishonoured by their wickedness, which profess his name, and despise his laws.

11. Remission of sins is proper unto God, as well in John's baptism, as in the baptism of Christ. John here compareth the ministry of man with the authority and power of God. The outward baptism with the spiritual baptism: whereof the first is done by the hand of man, the other is peculiar only unto our Saviour Christ. And though some of the ancient Fathers were of another opinion, yet Mark saith expressly, that John preached the baptism of repentance, unto forgiveness of sins. And who can separate remission of sins from true repentance? when the Lord promiseth, at what time soever the sinner repenteth, to pardon his sin. The seal of baptism also, added to the doctrine of repentance, must needs testify remission of sins; namely, the soul to be washed by mercy, as the body is with water. Neither doth this doctrine derogate any thing from the baptism of Christ, seeing it is Christ that forgiveth sins, and giveth grace in the baptism ministered by John, and ministered by his Apostles. For John's baptism was of God's institution, and not of John's devising. Gaudentius, Bishop of Brixia. *Resp. ad Paul. Diac.* saith, "That Christ came to John's baptism as a sinner to wash away our sins in his body," which could not be, if John's baptism did not wash away sins at all. And touching the manifold heresies that you charge us with, I answer, that God by baptism assureth his children of the remission of their sins, not that the act of baptism, is



your heresy maintaineth, of the work wrought, taketh away sin, though a man were baptized being asleep. To the second I answer, that a true Christian is assured by the Sacrament of Baptism, of salvation, and therefore to be cleansed and justified from his sins, not only that he committed before baptism, but that of frailty he committeth to the end of his life. Which your heresy will not allow, extending the effect and virtue of baptism only to the time before the Sacrament received, which in them that are baptized being infants, is but short, and for little more than original sin. For the third we answer, that the salvation of children dependeth not upon the outward sign, and yet it is necessary, that the children of Christian parents be baptized, if they may attain to the Sacrament, according to Christ's institution. For the contempt, and not the want of baptism, where there is no default in the party, is damnable.

12. We abhor the heresy of them that hold the Church visible or militant in earth, to consist only of the good. But the heavenly Jerusalem, which is the mother of us all, the universal Church and body of Christ, consisteth only of God's elect, and members of Christ, ordained to eternal salvation.

16. Christ was the first that ascended in body unto heaven, as he was the first fruits of the dead: the first that rose again to live forever. But seeing the virtue of his death and resurrection were as available to the Fathers under the law, as unto us: to satisfy for their sins, and to make them righteous, as it is to us: we doubt not but the souls of the Fathers were in heaven, paradise, or Abraham's bosom, even where the souls of the faithful departed are now. For the Apostle, Heb. 9, 8, meaneth, that the way to heaven was not opened by the priesthood and sacrifices of the law, but by the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ. And Heb. 11, 40, where he saith, the Fathers received not the promises, it is plain, he speaketh of the full consummation of them, which none shall receive until the end of the world, when they with us, and we with them, shall be made perfect together.

#### CHAPTER 4.

1. Christ went into the wilderness, neither for penance, nor contemplation, but as the text saith, that he might be tempted of the devil. Which no Christian ought to do, to offer himself to temptation, therefore his going is no warrant, nor example unto Hermits. Secondly, he went by special instinct, and leading of the spirit, which warranteth not men that are led by their own will and affection. Thirdly, Christ remained in the wilderness, for a short season. Therefore is no example for them that spend their life in the wilderness. Fourthly, he fasted forty days, which no man can do of his own strength. As for your Popish Hermits in England, they never came in the wilderness, but oftentimes in the cities and towns: sometime, in the stews. As Stephen Gardiner, if he were

living, could testify of one brought before him.

2. Montanus the heretic, as Eusebius testifieth out of Appollonius, was the first that prescribed laws of fasting. *Eccles. Hist. lib. 5. c. 18.* And Ireneus saith in his epistle to Victor, that as there was in his time variety in observing the feast of Christ's resurrection, so in keeping the fast that went before it. "For some thought they ought to fast one day, some two days, some more, some forty hours day and night, which diversity of fasting commendeth the unity of faith and religion." Euseb. lib. 5. c. 25. Ireneus therefore dischargeth your forty day's Lent of the Apostles' institution. Dionys. Alexand. Ep. ad Ba. showeth, that some fasted six days before Easter, some two days, some three, some four, some none. Now let us examine, what you bring out of later writers, among whom I account Ignatius, though his Epistle have the name of a more ancient writer. But Jerome in Cat. knew no epistle of his to the Philippians. And the authentic testimony of Ireneus cited by Eusebius, of the diversity of fasting, manifestly declareth, that there was no such Lent, as that epistle nameth, in the days of Ignatius, who was an immediate successor of the Apostles. And albeit there was an ancient fast of forty days before Easter, yet was not that your Popish Lent, where flesh is prohibited, and fish permitted, but a time of abstinence indeed. The testimony of Hierom, which you expound for Lent, hath never a word of Lent, nor for Lent. For there were other solemn days of fasting in the Church, than Lent. Augustine indeed saith, that the forty days' fast, hath the authority of the example of Moses, Elias, and Christ, and that the consent of the Church hath established the same forty days to be kept before Easter, not as a thing necessary, but as other rites, which he nameth, not now observed of the Papists themselves. And further, the abstinence from fish as unclean, he condemneth as heresy. Hierom against Montanus, although he ascribe the forty day's fast to Apostolical tradition, because it hath no ground in the scripture, yet he showeth plainly, that it was of good will, and not of necessity. Whereas the heretics had three Lents in the year, which they commanded to be kept of necessity, "but it is one thing," says Hierom, to do a thing of necessity, another thing to offer a gift of good will." And lest his ascription of the forty days' fast, unto the Apostles' tradition, should move us; in the same place he saith, It was not lawful for Christians to fast in the Pentecost, that is, from Easter to Whitsuntide, and this prohibition of fasting, is also by the ancient Fathers, affirmed to be an Apostolical tradition. Yet the counterfeit Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Philippians, exhorteth them, after Passion week, not to omit fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays. But if any man shall fast, saith he, on Sunday or Saturday, except one, he is a murderer of Christ. Behold how hot this counterfeit Father is about his counter-

feit traditions. You see what credit is to be given to such things as are ascribed to tradition of the Apostles, without warrant of their own writings. Epiphanius affirmeth it to be an Apostolic tradition, that men should fast Wednesdays and Fridays throughout the year, except in the Pentecost, that is, from Easter to Whitsuntide: and in the six days of Easter, to receive nothing but bread, and salt, and water, Haeres. 75. And this he saith was the observation of the whole Church in his time. Yet the Papists fast Fridays between Easter and Whitsuntide, beside the Rogation week, and fast not Wednesdays commonly, neither observe the feast of the six days of Easter, with bread, and salt, and water. Yet have these as good testimony of antiquity, as the Lent-fast to be Apostolical tradition. The sermons of Ambrose, that are alleged, as Erasmus testifieth, and the style doth evidently declare, were none of Ambrose: but of some later writer, which counterfeited the sermons *Ad fratres in Ereno*, and some *De tempore* under Augustin's name, among which are found many that are intitled to Ambrose. To the authority of Leo, Bishop of Rome, calling Lent the Apostles' ordinance, I oppose the authority of Damasus, likewise a Bishop of Rome in his Pontifical, affirming that Telesphorus, Bishop of Rome, did institute it. And Telesphorus himself in his Decretal Epistle, saith, That he and his fellow Bishops, gathered together in council at Rome, did ordain this forty days' fast only for clerks; and contendeth in many words, that there must be a difference between clerks and laymen, as well in fast, as in other things. If you say this Epistle of Telesphorus is counterfeit, yet is it good authority against you, that urge it, with the rest of the dunghill of Decretals, against us. But the undoubted authority of Ireneus, cited by Eusebius, is sufficient to prove, that the Apostles left no such certain constitution, whatsoever the later Fathers affirm of Apostolic tradition, as they do of other things, which neither Papists nor Protestants count necessary to be observed. The last authority, cited out of Augustin, proveth, that in his time, that did write that Homily, there was no necessary enforcement to keep Lent, but every man did as he liked. But in all your citations of authors, true and feigned, there is no word of abstinence from flesh, which is the chiefest part of your Popish Lent, but of fasting once in every day, and that from dinner. *Ambrose ser. 34 and 36.* Barn. is a late writer, and therefore in opinion of Apostolic tradition, he might easily be deceived, as the elder Fathers were.

10. Augustin speaketh of the civil adoration or reverence in bodily gesture, done by Abraham unto the people of He'h. But by this text, all religious service is due only to God. Justinus Martyr proveth out of this text, *ως δε και του Θεου*, &c. that we ought to adore God only. Thus he hath persuaded us saying, "This is the greatest commandment," Thou shalt adore the Lord thy God, and him only

shalt thou serve, Apol. 2. And although Augustin being a mean Grecian, imagined a distinction between Latraria and Dulia, whereof the Papists take hold, to maintain their religious service unto creatures: yet they that are skillful in the Greek tongue, do know, that these two words do signify all one and the self same thing, saving that *δουλευειν* rather signifieth a more base kind of service or bondage, which were absurd to give to creatures, in religion. And the Hebrew word that Moses useth, out of whom this scripture is cited, signifieth the same that it doth, without any difference of God, or creatures. The distinction therefore is not in the signification of the Greek verbs, but in the subject of religion, or civil adoration or service.

The place of Eusebius whereunto you send us, is of the body of Polycarp, which the Christians were desirous to have been given them, to burial, but the malicious Jews persuaded the governor that he should not grant it, lest the Christians leaving Christ, should begin to worship Polycarp. And therefore say the faithful of Smyrna, in their Epistle, "They watched us lest we should have taken him out of the fire, being ignorant that neither we can ever leave Christ, which hath suffered for all that are saved in the world, neither worship any other. For him we adore, as being the Son of God, but the Martyrs, as Disciples and followers of our Lord, we love worthily, for their exceeding great good will unto their King and Master, of whom God grant we may be partakers and scholars. Therefore when the Centurion saw the contentment of the Jews, setting him in the midst, as their manner is, they burnt him. And so we at length having gotten his bones, more precious than precious stones, and better tried than gold, we laid them up where it was meet, where, as we may, the Lord shall grant unto us, being gathered together with joy and gladness, to celebrate the birth day of his martyrdom, both in remembrance of them that have sought before, and for exercise and preparation of them that are to follow."

This worthy testimony of the people of Smyrna, showeth how far their reverent love and regard of the bodies and relics of the Martyrs, differeth from your popish idolatry and superstition. So that I would marvel, why you quoted this place: but that I consider, you read it not in Eusebius himself, but in the old and corrupt translation of Rufinus, whereunto the word *diligimus* is added, and *reveremur* which is not in the epistle rehearsed by Eusebius. Hierom indeed, against Vigilantius, is more ready to maintain the immoderate estimation of relics, than of right he should have been. Yet is he also far from your idolatrous worshipping of them, as his own words declare. "But we do not worship and adore relics of martyrs, nor the Sun, nor the Moon, nor Angels, nor Archangels, nor Cherubim, nor Seraphim, nor any name that is named in this world, or in the world to come, lest we should serve the creature more than the Creator, which is to be blessed for ever

But we honour the relics of martyrs, that we might worship him whose martyrs they are." And in his book against Vigilantius he noteth "the ignorance and simplicity of certain laymen, or devout women, which having a zeal of God without knowledge, lighted wax candles in honour of martyrs," which in popery is a great part of commendable religion, even in the honour of their images, which were not in the Church in Hierom's time. Augustin, *de Civit. lib. 10. c. 1.* saith indeed, that by them which have interpreted the scripture, *Latria* is taken for that service which always or almost always, pertaineth to the religion of God. But Lodovicus Vives in his notes upon that chapter, telleth you otherwise; he bringeth examples out of the Greek text of the Septuagint as well as out of profane authors, where *Latria* is taken for service due to men. And in the same chapter Augustin saith, "that to consecrate ourselves, or any thing of ours in rites of religion to Angels, and consequently to any creatures, is the worship due unto the divinity or deity itself, and that which in Greek is called *Latria*. Therefore by Augustin's judgment, all your consecrating of yourself, or any thing of yours, to creatures, is idolatry: and so the greatest part of popish religion, even retaining your pretended distinction of *Latria* and *Dulia*, is manifest idolatry.

Likewise *de Treuit. lib. 1. ca. 6.* where he hath the same distinction of *Latria* and *Dulia*, he saith, it is idolatry to consecrate a temple to any creature, and thereby proveth, the divinity of the Holy Ghost, because our bodies are his temple. For to whom a temple belongeth, to him also the service which he calleth *Latria*. The Papists therefore, building and dedicating temples to the Angels and Saints, by Augustin's judgment, give them the honour proper to God, and so commit horrible sacrilege, and idolatry. Bede, in 4 Luke, distinguishing *Latria* from *Dulia*, referreth *Dulia* to the service of charity that one Christian oweth to another, not to the worshipping of relics, and saith, "they are called Idolaters, which bestow upon Idols, Vows, Prayers, and sacrifices, which they owe only to God." Seeing therefore, all that is made an idol, which is worshipped, with the service proper to God: and prayers, vows, sacrifices, by Bede's judgment, are due only to God, it followeth that prayers, vows, and sacrifices, bestowed not only upon images, but upon Saints, and their relics, are the service of idols, or idolatry. As for the authority of the 2. Council of Nice, that decreed the adoration of images, and Damascen, that followeth that idolatrous determination, ought not to move Christian men, contrary to the express commandment of God, Exod. 20, and against this Council, I oppose *Conc. Eliber. Can. 26.* that was ancienter. and the Councils of Constantinople under Leo, and of Ephesus, that were of later time, condemning the worshipping of images. The same Council of Nice was also condemned, by a Council holden by the commandment of

Charles the Great, and a book written against it, which is extant under the name of Charles the Great, but written as it seemeth, by Albinus, that was his instructor, for thus Mat. West. writeth. "The same year, Charles, King of France, sent a synodal book into Britain, in which were found many things contrary to the true faith: and therein especially that it was defined by the agreeable assertion, of almost all the learned men of the East, that we ought to worship images, which the Catholic Church doth altogether abhor. Against which, Albinus wrote an Epistle, by authority of the holy Scriptures, marvellously endited, and brought it to the French king, with the same synodal book, in the person of Bishops, and noble men."

The authority of Damascen, a Grecian, is countervailed and overmatched by the authority of Gregory the Bishop of Rome, who though he allow the use of images, yet he condemneth the worshipping of them, *Lib. 7. epist. 109. Seren. lib. 9. epist. 9.*

17. Satisfaction by your own doctrine, is not required of them that are baptized, therefore satisfaction is no part of repentance. Ambrose saith of Peter's repentance: I read of his tears, I read not of his satisfaction.

#### CHAPTER 5.

12. The reward is promised of the free mercy of God, of whose grace, cometh strength to endure persecution, and not of the merit of the work: "For whence should I have so great merit," saith Ambrose, "seeing mercy is my crown?" *ad. Virg. Ezhort.* "He crowneth thee," saith Augustin, "because he crowns his gifts, not the merits," in *Psalm 101.*

15. When Augustin saith the church cannot be hid, he meaneth from them that will diligently seek her in the Scriptures, where only the certain knowledge of her is to be found, *de Unitat. Eccles. ca. 2* and *3* and *16. de Past. Cap. 14.* Nevertheless he compareth her to the Moon, which is often hid, and so may the Church in divers respects be hidden. *Psalm 20.* Also he acknowledgeth, that the Church may be so secret, that the members know not one another, *de Bapt. cont. Don. lib. 6. ca. 4.* And the Catholic Church which is the whole mystical body of Christ, an article of faith, is always invisible, Eusebius Emiss. Hom. in Natal. Confess. *Apostoli et Episcopi supra montem, sicuti civitas supra montem. Non possunt abscondi, altius sedent, omnium oculi ad eos respiciunt.*

20. It is necessary for every Christian man, not only to believe, but to endeavour himself to keep even the least of God's commandments: yet is he justified, and hath remission of his sins and transgressions of God's commandments, only by faith in the mercy of God. *Rom. 3. 28. Galat. 2. 16.*

21. The virtue of justice, whereby we love and keep God's commandments, though no man doth either of both perfectly, is undoubtedly the gift of God, and is inherent in us, that are justified by the grace and mercy of God

through faith, and of this unperfect justice, we are truly, yet unperfectly, declared to be just, without the works whereof, no man of age can be saved. But yet for all this, we are justified, or made just in the sight of God, by faith only, through the imputation of Christ's justice, and not by the works of justice, which as Augustin saith, "do follow him that is justified, do not go before him that is to be justified," in Ps. 102. *de fid. and oper. cap. 14.*

23. The difference of sins proveth not that some are mortal, and some venial: for all of their own nature are mortal. The reward of sin, saith the Apostle, is death, *Rom. 6. 23.* and all sins to him that is truly penitent, are pardonable by God's mercy. He that sinneth against the Holy Ghost, is never truly penitent, nor his sin ever remitted, *Heb. 6. Matt. 12.*

26. This prison by Carpocrates, a very ancient heretic, was taken for the bodies, into which the soul was removed by the devil, until it was thoroughly purified, *Ireneus, lib. 1. c. 24.* But of Montanus, an old Heretic also, it was taken for a place in hell, where every small offence is punished in soul, although it shall be saved in the resurrection, as testifieth Tertullian *de animi cap. de infer.* By which it appeareth, that the opinion of Purgatory is very ancient. Nevertheless, it is not like that Cyprian, who was far from these Heresies, in the forenamed Epistle, speaketh of Purgatory: for he only alludeth to this text, and to the 1 Cor. 3. comparing the excellency of them that suffered martyrdom, above them that had fallen in time of persecution, and were received again into the Church, either by pardon of their exercises of repentance, that were prescribed unto them, or after they had thoroughly performed them: because Antonianus, to whom he did write, being somewhat inclining to the error of the Novatians, feared lest by the receiving of them that had fallen, and by remitting those exercises of repentance, virtue would be diminished, and martyrdom decay. But Cyprian answereth, that chastity and virginity had their due praise, though adulterers upon their repentance were received. "For it is one thing," saith he, "to stand at pardon, another thing to come to glory. It is one thing for him that is cast in prison, not to come out until he hath paid the uttermost farthing, another thing straightway to receive the reward of faith and virtue, &c." Augustin expoundeth the place clearly of hell and eternal pains, *Serm. dom. in monte, lib. 1.* So doth Hierom in *Lament. Lib. 1. cap. 1.* Euseb. *Eniss. Hom. in demi. 6. post Pent. Carcer iste infernus est.* Theoph. Antioch. *In carcere, id est, in Gehennam,* and Chromatius, in 5. *Matt.* and many other of the ancient fathers. And the text is plain, that he which is out of charity, hath deserved hell fire: and I suppose the Papists will not send him to Purgatory, that dieth out of charity.

33. Mark and Luke, understand the exception which they do not express, for they all

report one doctrine of our Saviour Christ: and the exception declareth, that not only divorcement, but also marriage after divorcement is free, as it was in the Law, where fornication is the cause of divorcement. Chromatius, in hunc locum, *Unde non ignorent quam græve apud Deum damnationis crimem incurraunt, qui per effrenatam libidinis voluptatem absque fornicationis causa dimissis uxoribus, in aliu volunt transire conjugia.* The Pope's canon law restraineth the liberty of marriage and divorcing, because he may take more money for bulls of license and dispensation to marry.

33. The knot of marriage is broken, through the wickedness of them that commit fornication, and therefore this is to be understood of such divorcees, as are not for the cause of fornication. Neither can marriage out of this place, be proved to be a sacrament, although Augustin call it by the name of a sacrament or mystery. But of marrying after divorce, Augustin, note, chap. 1. 20, is doubtful, although he incline to the negative, as in his book *de adulterinis Conjugiis ad Pollent,* where he professeth this question to be most obscure, and more than he dare determine: but Hilary maketh no question, but that through adultery the marriage ceaseth, and is dissolved.

39. This is a slander of Luther, he did write only, that Christians should not hope to have victory against the Turks, before the church was reformed, and the Pope's wickedness was bridled, and men's manners were amended.

#### CHAPTER 6.

1. Good works are the fruits of justification, proceeding from a justified man, and do justify, as James saith, that is, declare a man to be just, and so a man is justified by works, and not by faith only. But they do not justify a man in the sight of God, who requireth perfect justice, and not imperfect, such as good works of men are, which follow the justified man, as Augustin saith, *do not go before unto justification,* Ps. 102. *de fid. and oper. cap. 14.* Wherefore a man is justified in the sight of God, by imputation of the justice of Christ, which is most perfect, through the only grace and mercy of God, apprehended by faith only. *Rom. 3 and 4. Gal. 2.*

Neither is all the justice of a Christian man that is justified, comprised in alms, fasting, and prayers, but in obedience of all God's commandments, and yet all that is imperfect, as Augustin proveth, *de perfect. Just.* and saith not, that all justice is comprised in these three works. "This is our justice now," saith Augustin, "in which we come hungering and thirsting to the perfection and fullness of justice, that hereafter we may be filled therewith." Ps. 49, he saith, "Who are just? but they that live of faith, doing the works of mercy: for those works are the works of justice. Therefore by his judgment, the life of a just man is faith, the fruit, works of mercy and justice."

4. This repaying and rewarding proveth that the reward is due, but not that the works are meritorious. The reward is due by God's promise, his mere mercy moved him to promise. And we may be encouraged in respect of the reward to do good works, but not only nor chiefly in that respect, but especially to show ourselves thankful and dutiful, that God may be glorified by our good works, whose glory ought to move us more than the reward, if that we love God as we ought with all our hearts.

7. Long prayer is not forbidden, but Popish prayer in an unknown tongue is idle babbling, as ill as that which the heathen used. The Scripture testifieth, as Cyprian showeth, that the third hour of the day, the sixth, and the ninth, were used for prayer by Daniel, the three children, Paul, Peter, and John. Which proveth not your Popish canonical hours, that is a-kind of service which you call so, numbled up of your priests oftentimes in an hour or less, to be of such antiquity, or to be discharged from much babbling or lip-labour. Neither is it meant, that all those three hours were spent only in prayer, but at those three times of the day, the godly used to pray: namely, in the midst of the time, from the sunrising to noon, at noon, and in the midst of the time, between noon and the sunsetting; whereas all your Canonical hours in the Popish Church, are despatched before noon. Cyprian therefore speaketh not of any set forms of prayers, but of times meet for all Christians to pray in, not only at these three hours, but also at the sun rising, and at the sun setting, and in the night season, and generally at all hours, as our Saviour Christ teacheth. Not maintaining the heresy of the Euehites, which did nothing but pray with their lips: but requiring the heart to be always lifted up in affection of prayer, which is by faith to look for all good things of God only, and at certain times also, to use words of petition, to admonish us of our necessities, and to stir up our desire to be more fervent. "What other things is it," saith Augustin, "to pray without intermission, but without intermission to desire that blessed life, as none is but that which is eternal, of him who only can give it? Therefore let us desire this always of the Lord God, and let us pray always." *Epist. 12, l. c. 9.* The prayers of heretics, whether they be long or short, rude or rhetorical, please not God, neither yet of hypocrites. The short collects of the Church, are no prejudice to long prayers, where the form of words is not longer than the sincere affection of prayer continueth.

11. Luke is the best interpreter of the Greek word, who showeth, that it signifieth bread sufficient for every day. Comprehending all things necessary for this present life: whereof we may infer, that spiritual food is more necessary, which in the other petitions is asked rather than in this, if we respect either the words or the method of this form of prayer. Notwithstanding, upon the ambiguity of the Greek word, many of the Fathers refer this

petition to spiritual food especially, among which, the Lord's Supper, being a seal of our spiritual nourishment by the body and blood of Christ, unto eternal life, is a part, as the preaching of God's word is another part, noted also by the Fathers to be desired in this petition. *August. de serm. Dom. in mont. lib. 2.*

12. Augustin doth often teach the difference of sins, some great, some less, but never your Popish distinction of mortal and venial, as you do, and in the places quoted speaketh of small sins, but not of venial. In the former place he saith, a man may be *sine crimine*, that is, without heinous offence: but not, *sine peccato*, without sin. In the latter he nameth, *peccata parva*, small sins, distinguishing them from great and heinous wickedness.

13. Howsoever any man hath read, the text is plain, "Lead us not," whereby is proved, not only a permission, but an action of God, in them that are led into temptation. Therefore Augustin, after a long disputation against Julian the Pelagian, bringeth also this petition for an argument, to prove, that God as a righteous Judge, punisheth sin by sin, by delivering the reprobate unto the power of Satan. "What is that which we say daily, lead us not into temptation, but that we be not delivered unto our own concupiscences? Therefore God delivereth into ignominious passions, that those things may be done, which are not convenient, but he delivereth conveniently, and the same sins are made both punishments of sins past, and deserts of punishments to come. As he delivered Achab into the lie of the false Prophets, as he delivered Roboam into false counsel. These things he doth by marvellous and unspeakable means, who knoweth how to work his judgments, not only in men's bodies, but also in our very hearts." *Cont. Jul. lib. 5, cap. 3.* Neither doth Beza's exposition make God author of sin, but using the phrase of Augustine, he saith, "The Lord leadeth into temptation, whom as a just judge, not as an author of sins, he permitteth unto the will of Satan, that he may fill their heart, as Peter speaketh." *Acts 5.* And it is a most detestable slander that Calvin, or they that follow his judgment, make God the author of sin.

20. Treasures laid up in heaven in this place, properly signify neither faith nor works, much less meritorious works, but rather the reward of the heavenly life, which God of his mercy giveth to them that believe, according to their works, rewarding their plentiful sowing, with plentiful reaping. *Chrysost. Hom. 21, in Mat.* He showeth both that this early treasure lieth open to hurt: and also, that the heavenly treasure is clear from all spot, and most safe either in respect of the place, or of the excellency of those rewards.

24. No Christian man serveth Calvin as his master, but God only. Nevertheless, so long as Calvin teacheth that which he learned of Christ, Calvin may be embraced as a servant of Christ, neither doth he ever desire to

be taken otherwise. But when the Pope commandeth things contrary to God, as worshipping of images, communion under one kind, and such like, and will be honoured as a most holy Lord, that cannot err, it may be said most truly, no man can serve God and the Pope.

## CHAPTER 7.

6. So that by confession of mortal sins, you mean not auricular shrift, which the Scriptures doth not exact.

8. To ask in faith is necessary, and more than a due circumstance. James 1. 6.

15. This note is true of libertines, and such heretics of our time: but the true professors of the Gospel, whom you especially envy, shall be found in trial, always as honest as Papists.

16. All false doctrine, contrary to the Scriptures, is the proper fruit of heretics. For he is a heretic, which obstinately maintaineth an opinion, contrary to the Scriptures, as the Papists do many. And especially, those plain notes, which the spirit giveth of antichristian heretics, namely, the forbidding of marriage and meats, where are they to be found at this day but in Papists? *1 Tim. 4.* The rest of the notes you give, are not found in us, but rather in you. The marriage of vowed persons, that cannot contain, is allowed by Epiphanius and Hierom to be Catholic. And if it be incestuous, your Pope giveth license for incestuous marriages, as he doth for those marriages that are against the law of nature, which are incestuous indeed. We spoil no Churches, but destroy idolatry, as God commandeth. *Deut. 7. 6.*

21. These men say, Lord, Lord, without a true and a lively faith. For he that in true faith shall invoke or call upon the Lord, shall be saved. *Rom. 10.* We confess, it is not enough, to believe, neither doth Luther teach, that only infidelity is sin, but that it is the root of all sin. Neither do we hold, that by the faith of working miracles, which apprehendeth only the power of God, any man shall be justified, but by faith in God's promises, which layeth hold of the mercy which God offereth. Finally, he that is justified by faith only, doth the will of God his heavenly father, though not perfectly, yet gladly and cheerfully. God be thanked, we do not set little by good works, which we acknowledge to be the necessary effects of justifying faith, though we renounce our own justice, that we may be partakers of the justice of God in Christ. *Philip. 3. 9.*

## CHAPTER 8.

4. The words of Chrysostom are these: "The Priests of the Jews had authority to put away leprosy of the body; or rather not to put it away at all; but only to discern them who were rid of it, and thou knowest, how greatly their Priesthood was to be esteemed. But these have received authority, not to discern the leprosy of the body, being rid away, but altogether to put away the unclean-

ness of the soul. They therefore that despise them, are more wicked than Dauid, and worthy of great punishment." By which words, he meaneth not, that ministers of that Gospel, have absolute power to forgive sins, but authority to assure the penitent sinners of God's forgiveness, in which respect, they are to forgive in God's name. For Christ himself, did not forgive sins, but as he was God equal to his father. Chrysostom *Mat. Hom. 30.*

8. The body and blood of Christ, is to be received with all humility and reverence: yet not imagining transubstantiation. For that material part of the Sacrament which entereth into the mouth, Origen saith, it goeth the way of all meats, *Mat. cap. 15.* Chrysostom's liturgy was made long after Chrysostom's time, as appeareth by a prayer for the Emperor Alexius, in whose name it was made. Augustin ep. 118. useth the example of the Centurion, to show that neither they that receive the Sacrament daily, nor they that receive it seldom, dishonour the body of Christ, having either of them their several reasons, as Zaccheus, who received our Saviour Christ into his house joyfully, and the Centurion who acknowledged that he was unworthy to receive him under his roof.

14. Hierom against Jovinian, hath many feeble arguments, among which this is one, that the Apostles had no carnal copulation with their wives, because Christ saith, "he that hath left wife," &c. *Mat. 19. 29.* For our Saviour Christ speaketh of none other forsaking of wives, than is necessary for all married men, to leave their wives as well as their parents, children, brethren, houses, lands, namely in carnal affection, or worldly love not in lawful use. And Clemens Alexandrinus much ancienter than Hierom, and nearer the Apostles' times, saith, "that Peter and Philip begat sons, and Philip gave his daughters in marriage, *Stromat. lib. 3. Euseb. Emis. in nat. Joa. En. Petrus uxorem et prolem habuit.*" And by whom had Peter his daughter Petronilla, of whom the popish legends write much holiness, if not by companying with his own wife? and that since he was an Apostle, and had the surname of Peter. Which her age also doth argue: for she was so young in the time of the persecution of Domitian the Emperor, that Flaccus the count, desired to have her in marriage, whereas if she had been born before Peter's calling to the Apostleship, she should have been almost threescore years old at that time. In the Romish Church where Antichrist was to have his seat, the mystery of iniquity began to work, and show itself in prohibition of marriage somewhat timely: yet are you not able to prove, that none but such as professed continence, were in the Latin Church ever admitted to the ministry. Tertullian was a married man in the ministry, without any such profession of continence, as appeareth by his books written to his wife. Where, in the first he exhorteth her, after his departure.

not to marry again. In the second, that if the infirmity of her body was such, as she must needs marry, that she marry not an infidel. This exhortation had been needless, if she had already professed continence: neither needed Tertullian to have set before her the example of many other, that in marriage, by consent, took away the debt of marriage, to persuade her, that she might be able, if she would endeavour, to live unmarried. And if he, before he entered into ecclesiastical order, with her consent, had promised perpetual continence, she should have had experience in herself in her younger time, how able she was to live without the use of a husband. But Epiphanius, you say, telleth the Greek Priests, "that they do against the ancient canons, which keep company with their wives:" yet doth he confess immediately, that those canons were not kept in his time. But where you add, that Paphnutius in the first Council of Nice, doth plainly signify the same, it is false. For Socrates thus writeth of the matter. "It pleased the Bishops to bring in a new law into the Church, that those that were dedicated to the holy ministry, namely, Bishops, Priests, or Elders and Deacons, should not sleep with their wives which they had married when they were laymen: and after they had consulted of this matter, Paphnutius stood up in the midst of the company of Bishops, and cried out aloud, that they should not lay a heavy yoke upon the men dedicated to the holy ministry, saying, that the bed was honourable, and the matrimony unpolluted, lest with too much preciseness, they should rather hurt the Church: for all men could not bear the exercise of continence, and peradventure chastity should not be kept of every one's wife: and he called the company with a man's wife chastity. That it was sufficient, that they which had obtained clergy before marriage, should not come to marriage any more, according to the ancient tradition of the Church, but that no man should be separate from her, whom he had married being a layman." The very same reporteth Sozomen. And Clemens affirmeth, that the Apostle alloweth the husband of one wife, whether he be Priest, or Deacon, or Layman, *using matrimony without reprehension, Stromat. lib. 3. But there was never any example authenticall, you say, of any that married after holy orders.* Of examples, I suppose you doubt not but that there were many which took wives after they were made Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, because in the later Councils, there be so many canons to punish them that so married, and to prohibit them to marry. And certain it is by stories, and other monuments of antiquity, that in England Priests did marry commonly, even after the decree made against it, by Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury in a Synod holden at Winchester Anno. 1076. For Gerard, Archbishop, of York, writing to Anselmus Archbishop of Canterbury, certifieth him, that those whom he invited to take orders, would not

consent in their ordination, to profess chastity, that is, not to marry, as the decree of Lanfranc required. But these examples, you will say, were not authenticall, because they were against the ancient tradition of the Church, alleged even by Paphnutius, and against the canons of so many Councils: Whereunto I reply, that seeing they were to be warranted by the word of God, no tradition or decree of men, can make that lawful, which by God's word, is not only at liberty, but also commanded, namely, that "to avoid fornication let every man have his wife, and if they cannot contain let them marry," and of virginity and continence, there is no commandment of the Lord, but every man may use the liberty that God hath given, yea though he hath the gift of continence. And therefore, Paul being unmarried, affirmeth that it was lawful for him to lead about with him a sister to wife, as the rest of the Apostles did, even the Lord's brethren and Cephas: Ergo, it was lawful for him to have married, being an Apostle. The liberty therefore given by God to all, and the commandment of God, to them which have not the gift of continence, to marry, doth make the examples of them that married after holy orders taken, in the account of God, and all that be godly, to be authenticall. And although Paphnutius accounteth the tradition of the Church ancient, by which they were prohibited to marry, that were not married before they were ordained: yet it appeareth by Tertullian, that it was not so ancient as his time. For in his book of Monogamy against second marriages, written when he was a heretic, he derideth the Catholic Bishops, which thought it lawful for them to marry again, when their first wife was dead, perverting the meaning of Paul's words, which saith, "a Bishop must be the husband of one wife, to the maintenance of his heresy, as the Papists do." He saith, "the Holy Ghost foresaw there should come some, that would affirm all things to be lawful for Bishops: For how many are there among you that govern the Church, which have married the second time, insulting against the Apostle, and not blushing when these words are read under them." This place showeth, that that which was thought unlawful by the heretic, was counted lawful and authenticall by the Catholic Church. Long after Tertullian's time, was the Ancyrian Council, where the tenth canon decreeth thus. "That whosoever being ordained Deacons at the time of their ordination, do protest and say, that they must marry, because they cannot remain unmarried: if they marry afterward, let them continue in the ministry, because the Bishop hath granted them so to do." This canon testifieth of many authenticall examples of them that married and might marry, after holy orders taken. Moreover, in the days of Julian the Apostate we read, that Basilus a Priest or Elder of the Church of Ancyra, and Eupsychius of Cæsarea of Cappadocia, who had lately taken to wife a gentlewoman, and was but even a

bridegroom, ended their lives by martyrdom. Sozom. lib. 5. c. 11. and histo. tripartit. lib. 6. c. 14. Many hundred years after this, Balsamon maketh mention of a consutation of Leo the Emperor, by which it appeareth that there was a custom in his time, that those which had taken holy orders might marry lawful wives, within two years after their ordination, Bals. in Can. 10. Conc. Ancy. So long the authority of God's word in the Greek Church prevailed against the decrees of men, and in the Church of England much longer, until within these four or five hundred years at the most.

#### CHAPTER 9.

3. The ministers of the New Testament, have authority to forgive sins, and to retain them by declaring herein the will of God, as his ambassadors and messengers. The Jews charged our Saviour Christ with blasphemy, because they acknowledged not his divinity. For the Priests of the Law, were also ministers, not authors of forgiveness of sins, whereof they were not ignorant.

5. Chrysostom saith, "He did not refute their opinion which said it was proper only to God to forgive sins, but did approve it. For if he had not been equal with his father, he would have said: Surely you judge rightly, I am far from that so great power, but now he saith no such thing, but contrariwise affirmeth it by word and sign. So because it is wont to be unpleasant to the hearers, that any man should speak openly of himself: by the words of other men, and by a sign or miracle, he showeth that he is God equal to his Father." *Matt. Ho. 30.* Hilary is of the same judgment, saying, "It moveth the Scribes, that sin should be forgiven by a man: for they beheld in Jesus Christ only a man: and that to be forgiven by him, which the Law could not release. For faith only justifieth. Afterward the Lord looketh into their murmuring and saith: That it is easy for the Son of Man on earth to forgive sins. For it is true, no man can remit sins but God only, therefore he which remitteth sins is God, because no man forgiveth sins but God, *Matt. Can. 8.* Ambrose is worthy to be heard in the same case. "When the Jews affirm that sins can be forgiven by God only, verily they confess him to be God, and by their own judgment they bewray their falsehood, in that they affirm the work, and deny the person. Therefore even of themselves, the Son of God receiveth a testimony of his work, and requireth not the consent of their voice. For falsehood can confess, but cannot believe, therefore there wanted no testimony to his divinity: there wanteth faith to their own salvation." In *Lucam. cap. 5.* Behold, that which was Catholic doctrine in these ancient fathers, is counted heresy in us.

6. Christ had absolute power of himself, as very God, to forgive sins properly, and to preach the forgiveness of sins as Mediator. *Athan. contr. Arr. lib. 3. Euthym. pan. part. 1. tit. 2. ex epistola de gestis in concilio. Arim. and Seleus*

8. Let Hilary speak upon these words, "All things are concluded in their right order, and now the fear of desperation ceasing, honour is rendered to God, because he hath given so great power to men, but this was due only to Christ, it was familiar to him only, to do these things, by the communion or participation of his Father's substance. Therefore this is not to be marvelled, that he can do these things, for what shall not God be believed to be able to do? or else the praise should have been of one man, not of many, but hereof is the cause of the honour given to God, because power is given to men by this way, through his word, both of remission of sins, and of resurrection of the body and of returning into heaven." In these words Hilary showeth what is proper to Christ as God, and what is granted to his ministers, to preach and declare by his word. That which is proper to the Divinity, cannot be communicated to any creature. Such is the absolute power to forgive sins, which are committed against the Law of God, and therefore proper only to God. The authority, which God hath given to men, to assure the faithful penitent, of remission of sins, nothing derogateth from the glory of God, but greatly setteth forth the glory of his mercy.

8. Christ gave power to his Apostles, and the ministers of the Church to forgive sins, not absolutely and properly, as God forgiveth, but to be witnesses and ministers of God's forgiveness: whereof Ambrose saith, "Although it be a great matter to forgive sins unto men, for who can forgive sins but only God, who also forgiveth by them to whom he hath given the power of forgiving, yet it is a much more divine thing to give resurrection to the bodies." Thus you see this Father's judgment, that man when he forgiveth sins by power granted of God, doth not forgive properly, but God to whom it is proper to forgive sins, forgiveth by man.

15. Neither Epiphanius, nor Augustin, speak of popish fasting days, which consist in abstinence from flesh: But Epiphanius saith, the Apostles appointed the Wednesday and Friday, to be fasting days, how truly, let the Papists themselves judge, and that on those days, the fasting was appointed until the ninth hour of the day, which is three hours before night. Augustin *Epi. 86.* acknowledgeth fasting, but no certain fasting days, otherwise than the custom of every Church required, according to the answer of Ambrose made unto him concerning fasting on Saturday, which was observed at Rome, but not at Milan.

21. Christ by his word, and without his word, by outward signs, and without any at all, did only work miracles, and the force or virtue did not proceed into his garment, but immediately from himself: Therefore Christ said not, there is virtue proceeded from my garments, but there is virtue proceeded from me. *Luke 8. 48.* There was no virtue in his garments, when the soldiers had parted them among them: nor while he wore them, for



the people that thronged him, received no benefit by them, but she only, and they that touched him by faith. Now concerning the image that this woman is said to have set up: *Eusebius* reporteth the story, not of his own knowledge, but of hearsay, That in *Cesarea Philippi*, where this woman dwelled, over against her door, upon a high stone, was a brazen image of a woman kneeling, and holding up her hands, as though she made an humble suit; over against which there was another brazen image of a man, which was said to be of Christ, reaching his hand to the woman, at whose feet upon the same pillar, a strange kind of herb did spring, which when it came up to the hem of his brazen garment, it was a medicine for all diseases. This image *Eusebius* confesseth to have remained unto this time, as was testified by them that travelled to that city, and saw it. But of the miraculous herb, how true it was, he saith not. Now what his judgment was of them that did set up this image, he declared in these words; "And it is not to be marvelled, that those of the Gentiles, which received benefits of our Saviour of old time, did these things, seeing we have seen the images of his Apostles Paul and Peter, yea and of Christ himself preserved, being painted in colours, as it is like, ancient men of a heathenish custom, which they had without alteration, after this manner, were wont to honour them whom they took for saviours." *Eusebius* accounting this setting up of images in the honour of Christ and his Apostles to be a heathenish custom, gave small credit to the miracle of the strange herb: of whose virtue he could allege no example, of any that was cured, as he doth the testimony of them that saw the image.

Where you allege out of *Sozomen*, that the Christians afterward placed the image in the Church, as though they set it up to be worshipped; the truth is, they laid up the pieces of the image, after it was broken, which they gathered together, and kept them in the Church, which is all that can be gathered of the story. Wherein, as they showed some zeal of Christian religion, in seeking to preserve that which was defaced by the infidels, so they cannot be excused from superstition, if they kept the pieces in the Church, as any relic of holiness. *Epiphanius* finding an image of Christ in a chapel contrary to the scriptures, and as he saith, rent it in pieces. *Epiph. Epist. ad Joan. Hierosol.*

22. She had no devotion to the hem of his garment, but because she was kept off by the press, so that she could not come near to desire his aid, as others did, she said within herself: If I shall but only touch the hem of his garment, &c. But the popish touching of relics, which neither have any virtue in them, nor any promise of God annexed to the touching of them, for health, either of body or soul, cannot be excused from superstition. And this is a very blunt comparison of relics of dead men, with the presence of the Son of God, who was willing to show his divine

power by his word only, or by outward signs of touching with his hand, or touching his garment, or anointing with oil, or making of clay with his spittle, and such like; as it pleased him in healing men's bodies. By what word of God are we certified that he will do the like, yea grant spiritual holiness, by touching of relics? If we have not God's word, what faith can we have, but a superstitious credulity?

28. No wise or learned man allegeth this place, for justification by faith only, this is therefore a peevish slander. In the place noted you shall see more.

34. The miracles said to be done in the popish Church, are counterfeit fables rather than illusions of devils, as hath been proved by many experiences, and yet are they false or lying signs of Antichrist. The divine power of Christ, was manifest, in casting out of devils.

38. Christ biddeth not his disciples pray and fast in the Ember days, but to pray continually, not that hedge Priests should be sent forth to say Mass, but that learned pastors might be raised up of God, to gather in his harvest by preaching the gospel. And at the ordination of ministers of the Church, what time soever it be, the Church assembled prayeth to God for them that are called, that they may be faithful and diligent in their calling.

#### CHAPTER 10.

2. *Ambrose* acknowledgeth the Primacy, but not the pre-eminence of Peter above the other apostles. For in the place quoted, he saith, "that Paul was not inferior to the other Apostles that went before him, among which Peter was one, in dignity, but in time." And in his Book *de Incarnat. Domini cap. 4.* he acknowledgeth the Primacy of Peter. "The Primacy of confession verily, not of honour or pre-eminence, the Primacy of faith, not of degree." Likewise *De sp. Sanct. lib. 2. cap. 2.* he saith, Paul was not inferior to Peter. And, *In Ep. ad Gal. cap. 2.* he declareth, that Paul had the Primacy over the Gentiles, as Peter over the Jews. The rest that you say of *Beza*, is an impudent slander.

11. We doubt not, but the blessing or godly prayers, as of the Apostles, so also of godly Bishops, and other Ministers of the Church, is greatly to be esteemed: but the Popish Bishop's blessing with his fingers, is not worth a straw, neither doth any ancient Father commend such a blessing. *Augustin* saith, that he and other departing from *Aurelius* a godly Bishop, received benediction of him, that is, a godly and Christian farewell. *In Socr. lib. 6. ca. 14.* is no mention of Bishop's blessing, but rather of banning. For *Socrates* reporteth, yet doubting whether it was true, that *Epiphanius* and *Chrysostom* being fallen out, *Chrysostom* should say, "I hope thou shalt never come to thy country," and *Epiphanius* answered, "I hope thou shalt not die Bishop." But whether they said so or no, *Epiphanius* died in the way homeward, and

Chrysostom was deposed from his bishopric. I suppose this story maketh little for the Bishop's blessing. But it taketh away venial sins, you say, by authority of Ambrose, in *Luke 9*. But in truth, there is never a word of the Bishop, or of his blessing, or of venial sins, but of the benefit which men receive by entertaining of preachers of the gospel. "We do not only give peace to them that entertain us, but, also, if any offences of earthly lightness do overshadow them, after the steps of the Apostolic preaching be received, they are taken away." His meaning is, they receive great benefit both by the prayers and by the doctrine of the preachers, if they entertain it as well as their persons. A poor place for the Popish bishop's blessing.

19. The story of the Church declareth this to be verified in the true martyrs thereof, but the best learned of the Papists are not able to defend their heresy, by the Scriptures, against the unlearned Christian Catholics, much less against the learned, as the writings of both parts make manifest.

25. He that calleth himself the vicar of Christ, and putteth himself in the stead of Christ, by the very signification of the word, is Antichrist. So doth the Pope: having no warrant out of the word of God, to be so much as a member of Christ; because his doctrine, decrees, and life, are contrary to Christ, as in the book called *Antithesis Christi et Papæ*, and many other godly treatises, is manifestly declared.

34. This is a mere slander against Beza: for our Gospel, which we preach, neither breedeth, nor alloweth any rebellions. But your hellish father, the Pope, raiseth rebellions, as it is most notorious, against our sovereign, of her subjects in the north, and sending both his legates, and his banner of rebellion, to raise rebellion in Ireland, hireth, blesseth, and pardoneth horrible traitors, to murder their most loving and natural prince, and you traitors of Rhemes, are joined with them in their most evilish conspiracies, procuring and comforting them, that enterprise such monstrous impiety; and shame you nothing, to charge Beza with maintaining of rebellion? As for the civil wars in France, let all the king's edicts of pacification, that hitherto have come forth, testify, that those of the reformed religion, in taking arms to defend the laws and liberties of their country, against private persons, have done nothing but in the king's service.

41. Our Saviour, Christ, promiseth a reward to them that entertain the godly, persecuted or not persecuted, but not out of the merit of him that is received, which is nothing unto salvation, but of his own abundant grace, by which the prophet and the righteous man receive their reward, and not of their own merits. *Leo. Pro calice aque frigidae præmium habet gratuita largitio.* Ser. 4. de quadrage. Provided, that Jesuits, Seminary priests, and such other that come to stir up rebellion, procure murder of their Prince, and invasion of their country by strangers, or

to infect the people with Popish heresies, be not accounted but as false prophets, hypocrites, traitors, and heretics, not popes, just men, or true Christian Catholics.

#### CHAPTER 11.

7. When men of rare holiness have been in the wilderness, which hath not been in all ages, men have resorted to them to be partakers of their prayers and ghostly counsel. But this pertaineth not to Popish hermits, which dwelled commonly scarce a quarter of a mile from cities and populous towns, nor to Popish anchorites, which dwelled even in cities and towns, having daily resort unto them although they came not abroad themselves.

14. The Greek participle being of the present imperfect tense, as well as of the present, the coming of Elias in person, cannot be proved out of the text, notwithstanding the opinion of Gregory, and other ancient writers, which Hierom upon this place noteth, but doth not allow. Origen seemeth to be against it in *Matt. tract. 3*, and *Pamphilus Apologia pro Origene*. The like use of this participle is in the same chapter, verse 3, where the sense must needs be, "Art thou he which was to come." So it ought to be here, "This is Elias which was to come." So doth Hentenius, a Papist, translate it, *Qui venturus erat*.

21. Sackcloth and ashes are signs of humiliation, as Basil saith, and so helping unto repentance, and thereto pertaineth all chastisement of the body, which the Scripture commendeth, and not to satisfaction for our sins. The Greek word signifieth, change of the mind, and therefore is well translated by us, repentance and amendment of life, and is not taken for pain or punishment, as you would import by your term of penance, which yet if it be rightly understood, is nothing but penitence. *Isidor. Origen. lib. 6. cap. 18*. And although Dionyse, or other ancient Fathers, have sometimes, and that seldom, used the word *μετανοια*, by a Metonymy, for the public exercises, that were appointed for the trial and testimony of repentance, in them that had openly fallen, yet it followeth not, that the word doth properly signify so: but as it is in the Scripture, and of the Greek Fathers also most commonly taken for true repentance, and conversion of the heart unto God. Neither is confession called *μετανοια* in the ecclesiastical writers, although they speak of priests or elders, that by hearing men's confessions, judged of their repentance, and therefore were called those that were appointed for repentance, *Socr. lib. 5. cap. 19*. Neither are they that confess called *μετανοετες* of their confession, but of their repentance, whereof the humble acknowledging, and confessing of their sins, was a testimony unto men, as their conscience was known to God.

25. The godly, whether they be learned or unlearned, do not vaunt of their knowledge, and spirit of understanding, above all ancient Fathers, and the whole Church. But where they have the plain testimony of God's word

on their side, they may safely be preferred before the authority of all men of the world, that hold the contrary. By that which hath been observed in part, and more shall be, God willing, before we come to the end of these annotations, it shall appear, that the Papists which brag so much of the ancient Fathers, and of the Church, do much more decline from the judgment of the ancient Fathers, and primitive Church, than we, which may not yield to any man's opinion, that is contrary to the plain sense of the holy Scriptures and word of God.

30. The law of God is impossible to be kept, in such perfection as God requireth, and therefore no man can be justified by the works of the law. *Gala. 2, 16, c. 3, 11.* And yet the yoke of Christ is sweet, and his burden light, to them whom he easeth and refresheth from the burden of sin, and his commandments are not heavy to them, whose faith overcome the world. *1 John 5. Fulg. de remiss. pecc. lib. 6, c. 4. Prosp. sen. 222. Paulinus ep. 20.* But if any man can keep God's commandments, he needeth not to come to Christ to be refreshed, he overcome by justice of works, and not by faith, he need not say the Lord's prayer; yea Christ died not for such a one.

#### CHAPTER 12.

24. Those miracles that are said to be done by Saints, and are alleged to maintain any doctrine contrary to the truth taught in the Holy Scriptures, Augustin is bold to call them "either the fictions of lying men, or else the works of deceiving spirits: for either those things are not true which are said of those miracles, or else if heretics have any miracles, we must the rather beware of them." This writeth Augustin against the Donatists, which were full of lying miracles, but come short by a thousand degrees of the Papists, the monsters of whose lying miracles are much more than all the poetical fables, which all modest Papists will be ashamed to hear of; but these traitors of Rhemes, barking against the truth, are ashamed of nothing.

30. He speaketh of his own doctrine, by which we must make trial, who gathereth with him, and who not. We may safely gather with all our governors, or equals, that gather with Christ, and with none other. Neither doth Hierom warrant us, that whosoever gathereth with the Bishop of Rome, gathereth with Christ. For that he said to Damasus, was in that respect, that Damasus gathered with Christ, that is, acknowledged the Godhead of Christ, against the Arians. In this article of faith, he that gathereth not with Damasus, scattereth with the heretics, and with Antichrist. Not that Damasus succeeded Peter in the government of the whole Church, and in that he is Bishop of Rome, is a rule to be always followed. For the same Hierom that gathered with Damasus, affirming the divinity of Christ, would not have gathered with Liberius, whom he testified to have subscribed with the Arians, against

the divinity of Christ, *in Catolo. Num. 107. Fortunatianus.* And touching the Bishop of Rome's government over the whole, in his Epistle to Evagrius, he saith, that *all Bishops be the successors of the Apostles:* and that the poor Bishop of Eugubium is not inferior to the rich Bishop of Rome, &c. Cyprian saith, that *all the Apostles were equal with Peter in honour and authority. De simplicitate prolatorum.*

31. That God will not forgive the sin against the Holy Ghost, the text is more plain, than that with any glosses of man's inventions, it can be obscured. That there is a sin, which he that hath committed, cannot be renewed by repentance, the Apostle speaketh as plainly *Heb. 6. 4, 5, 6.* They that have sinned against the Holy Ghost are never renewed by repentance, nor come to true repentance and change of mind, though as Judas, they be sorry, not for their sin, but for the punishment, which they have deserved by their sin. Hierom upon the text saith: That the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall at no time be forgiven: and asketh how Bishops and Priests that have blasphemed the Holy Ghost were in his time received to their degree. *Hesych. lib. 2. c. 10.* What this sin is, and that it shall never be remitted, Pacianus showeth against the Novatians, *Fulg. de remiss. pecc. lib. 1. c. 24.* And although final unrepentance be never forgiven, because God forgiveth only the penitent: yet it is manifest, that our Saviour Christ speaketh not in this place of final repentance, but of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which he may commit that obstinately and contumeliously rejecteth the grace of God offered him, for remission of sins, as Augustin saith; but of despising the Sacrament of Popish penance, he speaketh not one word. For there was no such Sacrament acknowledged in his time, although according to the discipline of the Church, they that had openly and grievously fallen, so that they were excommunicated, had time and exercises appointed them to show their repentance, that they might be again received into the Church: which discipline, also, whosoever contemneth, so long as he remaineth in that contempt, by our Saviour Christ's own saying, is to be taken for a Heathen and Publican; and if he die in that contempt without repentance, he dieth as a Heathen or Publican. But of the necessity of auricular confession, of satisfaction in work to the justice of God for sins committed, of the form of words of absolution, mumbled over man's head by a Popish Priest, Augustin knew nothing in his time.

32. Not the Jews generally are charged, nor their posterity are punished for the sin against the Holy Ghost, but some of them which were the Pharisees and Scribes, that came from Jerusalem, of whose posterity its possible there is few or none remaining at this day.

32. Mark is a sure interpreter of these words. For he, saith Mark, that blasphemeth the Holy Ghost, never hath forgiveness, but is guilty of eternal condemnation. The error of Purgatory, in Augustin's time, be-

gan to peer up, from which, as Augustin was not altogether clear, so doth he not affirm any thing certainly of it. For in his treatise *De octo Dulcitiu quest. Quest. 1.* thus he writeth of it, "Such a thing, as saving by fire, is not incredible to be even after this life, and whether it be so or no, it may be inquired, and either be found, or be hid, that some faithful men are saved later, or sooner, by a certain purging fire, by how much more or lesser they have loved corruptible goods, yet not such of whom it is said that they shall not possess the kingdom of God, &c. except after they have duly repented, those crimes be remitted unto them."

But *Hypognost. cont. Pelag. lib. 5.* acknowledgeth heaven and hell out of the Scriptures, but of the third place he saith "The third place we are utterly ignorant of, yea we find that it is not in the Scriptures." This is the variable opinion of Augustin, sometime doubting and thinking it not incredible, sometime denying that any such thing is found in the Scriptures. And although he spake against the Pelagians and Papists, which feigned a third place, where infants unbaptized should remain after this life, yet his words are general, and his reason is as good against Purgatory, as against *Limbis infantum*.

In Gregory's time, which was almost two hundred years after, the error of Purgatory had gathered more strength, and yet is holden by Gregory, but for the *least and lightest offences, as idle talk, immoderate laughter, or household care, which is scarce occupied without offence*. It is sufficient for us, that neither the Scripture teacheth Purgatory, neither the primitive Church did admit of it, for many hundred years after Christ, although by the *Carpocratians, Montanists, and Origenists*, the foundations of that error were laid of ancient time.

33. Augustin defendeth freewill against the heresy of the Manichees, which held that men were made evil by nature, and creation of the evil god, and not of their own will. The freedom therefore against such enforcement as the Manichees taught, is not contrary to the thralldom of man's will, since the fall of Adam who fell of his freewill. And therefore, Augustin in his retraction of the same book, sayeth, "In the second of these books we disputed of the free choice of will, either to the doing of evil or good. But of grace, whereby they are truly free, of whom it is said, if the son shall make you free, then shall you be truly free, we were not compelled by any necessity to dispute more diligently, because the adversary was such a one, as he was, with whom we had to do." And the very same collection out of this text, he retracteth lib. 1. c. 32. and sheweth how it must be understood, that he said of freewill, or else it is erroneous: "In another place I said, except a man shall change his will, he can work no good," which in another place he teacheth to be placed in our power, where he saith: "Either make the tree good, and his fruit good, or make the tree evil, and his fruit evil, which is not against the grace of

God, which we preach now. For it is in the power of man to change his will into better, but this power is none at all, except it be given of God, of whom it is said, he gave them power to be made the sons of God: for seeing that it is in our power which we do, when we are willing, nothing is so much in our power as our will itself, but our will is prepared of the Lord, by that means therefore he giveth power. So is it to be understood which I said afterward: That it is in our power, that we may obtain, either to be engrossed into the goodness of God, or to be cut off by his severity: because it is not in our power, but that it followeth our will, which when it is prepared of the Lord to be strong and able, that work of piety is easily done, which otherwise was hard, yea impossible." Thus the simple may see, how you go about to delude them, alleging the words of Augustin, against his own judgment and meaning.

36. Every idle word is worthy of condemnation, if God should deal with us according to his justice; as it is plain in the next verse: for our tongue is given us to speak always that which is to the glory of God, and to the profit of the hearers. Nevertheless, he that pardoneth all the gracious sins of the faithful that are truly penitent, whereof they must also make account in judgment, forgiveth also the sin of idle words. Therefore this is a brutish collection, as all the rest of your Popish notes are: we must give an account and not be damned, ergo, there must needs be some temporal punishment in the next life.

#### CHAPTER 13.

8. Of them that hear the word of God, some bring forth fruit more plentifully than others, according to the measure of God's grace, given to every man: who, in rewarding every man according to his works, *crowneth his own gifts, and not men's merits*, as Augustin testifieth, *In Ps. 70. Conc. 1. in Ps. 101.* For, if any thing be rendered to merits, saith he, it is hire or wages, not grace, or a free gift, in *Psal. 144.* Neither doth Augustin speak of the merit of virginity, as you understand that word of merit, for desert, but of the dignity or excellency thereof before the state of the married. Neither doth he allow, that distribution of a hundred fold to virgins, threescore fold to widows, and thirty fold to married folks, because the martyrdom of a married person, is more excellent than the chastity of a virgin. *Cap. 44, 45, and 46.* In his catalogue of heresies, he noteth among the errors of Jovinian, that he counted the chastity of virgins equal unto the worthiness of chaste and faithful married folks. Where, though Augustin useth the term merits, yet he meaneth by it, dignity, excellency, or worthiness, not desert, as the places before noted do plainly testify. Hieron, though he doth condemn the errors of Jovinian, concerning the excellency of virginity, as we do also, yet he alloweth no merit, or desert of virginity before God, nor of any work of justice.

For thus he writeth against the Pelagians, *Lib. 1.* "Then are we just, when we confess ourselves to be sinners, and our justice doth not consist of our own merit, but of the mercy of God."

Ambrose, though he prefer the worthiness of continence before marriage, and useth the word *Meritum*, yet that the reward of eternal life is not given to men's merits or deservings, he writeth thus: *Ethort. ad virginas.* Whence should I have so great merit or deservings, seeing mercy is my crown? And even in the same *Epistle*, 82 *ad Verell.* he writeth of the reward of eternal life. *Faith, only shall go with you to the next life, and justice shall also accompany you, if faith go before.*

15. It is a shameless slander against Calvin, that he should teach God to be the author of sin, as whoso will read the place quoted of his institution, shall plainly see. For he holdeth, as Augustin saith, that God hardeneth the wicked, *not as an evil author, but as a righteous judge*, not by a bare permission, or suffering, but by withdrawing and withholding his grace, and delivering them into their own lust, or into the deceit of Satan, as a just punishment of their former sins, as Augustin teacheth at large, against Julian, the Pelagian, *lib. 5. cap. 3.* and Paul, of the idolatrous Gentiles, affirmeth, that *God delivered them into passions of ignominy*, as you, yourselves, translate. *Rom. 1.*

30. The reprobate are in the visible Church, but they are not of the Catholic Church, which is the mystical body of Christ. *They went out from us*, saith John, *but they were not of us.* *1 John, 2. 19.*

55. We call not the body of Christ, baker's bread, but that which the baker made, which is digested and cast out with other meats, as Origen saith, which, if it be not eaten, mouldeth, or is otherwise corrupted; these things it were blasphemy to affirm of the body of Christ. Therefore, it is baker's bread, that is subject to corruption. And whereas you say, faith telleth you the contrary, tell us upon what text of Scripture your faith is builded. The Scripture telleth us, that the Lord's sacraments bread, and bread that is broken, which cannot be verified of his natural body, which is no now broken, but is whole and incorruptible in heaven. Cyril saith, our Saviour, Christ, when he gave the Sacrament of his body, "*gave fragmenta panis, pieces of bread to his disciples which believed.*" *Joan. lib. 5. cap. 14.* Therefore, their faith and yours is not one.

#### CHAPTER 14.

12. There is no doubt but the dead bodies of the faithful are to be laid up in the hope of resurrection, but not to be abused unto idolatry: for John's disciples buried his body, they shrined it not to be worshipped. Concerning the story of the malice of the Pagans, you foist in many things that your author saith not: for Theodoret in the place noted, saith no more, but that they broke up the tomb of John Baptist, burnt his bones, and scattered abroad the ashes.

You say, that the Christians laid the body

of John the Baptist, with the relics of Elias and Abdias: this saith not Hierom, but "There lie Helizaus and Abdias, prophets, and John the Baptist, than the which there was none greater, among them that were born of a woman." Elias was taken up in a fiery chariot, therefore they had no relics of his body. But admit your memory failed you in naming Elias instead of Helizaus, not only here, but also in the table: what wonderful miracles were there wrought before Julian's time? Rufinus speaketh of none, before nor after. Hierom saith in his time, that Paula quaked at many marvels that she saw there: namely, "Devils roaring in divers torments, and before the sepulchres of those holy men, men howling like wolves, barking like dogs, rearing like lions, hissing like serpents, lowing like bulls. Some turn their heads about, and touch the earth with the crown of their head backward, women hanging by the feet, their garments abroad to fall upon their faces. She took pity of them all, weeping for every one, she prayed Christ to have mercy on them." But not of any that were cured of their madness there. Again ye may note how Hierom agreeth with Rufine when he saith, that John Baptist lay still in his time in Sebaste or Samaria: but let the history of Rufine be true. He saith, that certain from Jerusalem of the monastery of Philip, came to that place, where the Pagans raged against that body of John Baptist, to pray; you say they came thither on pilgrimage: but howsoever it was, they brought some relics away with them, the rest were burned. Yet Glaudentius of Brixia, and Paulinus of Nola, were persuaded that they had his relics in the great Church at Fundi in Italy. *Gaud. de delic. Basil. Paul. Epist. 12.* Now for any injury that is done by us unto the bodies of the Saints, it is a mere slander: but the counterfeit relics that you show, and worship as idols, we destroy and abolish. And to prove they are counterfeit, we need no other testimony, but of yourselves, which place one and the same relic in so many places at once. John Baptist's head, you say is at Amiens, other say, his face only. I will not inquire how it came thither from Constantinople, whither it was carried by Theodosius. *Hist. Trip. lib. 9. c. 12.* But the same part that is at Amiens, is at Jean Angely. The rest of his head, from the forehead to the neck, is in Malta: yet the hinder part of his skull is at Nemours, his brain at Novium Rastroviense, another part of his head at Jean Morien, his jawbone at Vesalium, another part at Paris, at John Laterane, a piece of his ear at Floride, his forehead and hairs in Spain, at Salvadore, another piece of his head is at Noyon, and another at Lucca, in Italy. And yet for all these pieces, his whole head is at Rome to be seen and worshipped. And many Churches in England had relics of his head. Is there not good cause think you, that we should honour these holy relics: if for nothing else, yet because they can multiply them-

selves, and be in so many places at once? O impudent brood of Antichrist.

13. A simple argument to justify the profession of Hermits. Yet that there were many good men that in times past led a contemplative life in desert places, I deny not: but I affirm, that their example is a shame to the mock monks and false Hermits of Popery, which live in cities, and in the frequency of people, that I speak nothing of their faith and life, far unlike. Neither doth Hierom or Sozomenus say, "they did penance for their own sins, and the sins of the world:" neither had they any such blasphemous opinion, that they could satisfy for their own sins, much less for the sins of the world. Anthony, who was counted the chief of those Hermits, confesseth that the wound of man's sins could not be healed by any means, but "by the only goodness of God, which gave his only begotten Son to suffer for our sins." *Ep. 2 and 4.*

26. Christ can dispose of his body above nature, but not to destroy the essential conditions of a body, for then he should cease to have a body, and overthrow the hope of our resurrection. *Euse. Emis. hom. in Sabb. post ciner.* And where you quote *John. 20.* to prove that his body did go through a door, your own translation is, that the doors were shut, not that he came through the door: for he made the door open, and give place to him, as the prison door did to the Apostles by the ministry of the Angels, *Acts 5.* which yet were shut again, so soon as they passed through, "for if the distance of place be taken from bodies, they shall be nowhere, and being nowhere, they shall not be at all," as Augustin teacheth. *Ep. 57. Dardan.* Where you quote Epiphanius to affirm, that the body of Christ can be in the compass of a little bread, it is a manifest abusing of the reader: for Epiphanius saith not so, but the clean contrary. For teaching that the sacramental bread, is an image of Christ; "And yet," saith he, "neither in greatness nor fashion, nor power, it is like either to his divinity, or to his humanity: for it is a long shapen roll in fashion, and void of sense as concerning power:" which testimony of Epiphanius clearly overthroweth your error of transubstantiation, and carnal manner of Christ's presence in the Sacrament, both together.

29. Bernard was but a late writer, and was deceived with the error of Peter's primacy, though not so grossly as the Papists hold it at this day: neither is his collection any better than his authority. Peter walked on the water as Christ did, *ergo* he was the only Vicar of Christ. While Bernard followed such arguments, no marvel it were said of him, he saw not all.

31. God useth not by heretics and antichristian tyrants, and masters of impiety, to uphold and preserve his Church, but by painful and faithful teachers, and wise and faithful governors, although they have infirmities.

## CHAPTER 15.

8. He that prayeth in a tongue which he understandeth not, cannot come near to God with his heart, seeing his heart cannot request that which is contained in the sound of words uttered with his lips. He may have a superstitious devotion or zeal of God, which being not according to knowledge, cannot bring him near to God. For he that will come near to God, must come by faith, without which it is impossible to please God, and faith cannot be of things unknown, but of things revealed to us by the word of God. Neither doth the Apostle say, that he who prayeth in a tongue which himself understandeth not, doth edify himself, but he that hath the gift to speak in an unknown tongue which he himself understandeth, but not the Church, may edify himself, but not profit the Church. As for profit in spirit, Paul nameth not, but he that prayeth in spirit, that is according to his spiritual gift of strange tongues: if he pray in the Church, he must pray with understanding of other, that his prayer be not unfruitful, or else hold his peace, if neither he, nor any other, can interpret his prayers. As for him that understandeth not what he requireth in an unknown tongue, prayeth not at all, but mocketh God and the Church, if he pray openly. And where you say such a one may have less distractions than other in his prayer, there is nothing else, but a distraction of his mind from his tongue, when his heart cannot think that which the words he pronounceth doth signify, which he knoweth not whether they be blessing or cursing, prayers or thanksgiving, for spiritual benefits or temporal, for himself or for other, for forgiveness of sins, or perseverance in virtue. Whereas true prayer, requireth a true sense of feeling our present need, and of the necessity of our brethren, yea of the whole Church of God. *Nilus de orat. c. 33.*

Prayer in an unknown tongue, was first brought in by Fixai, the horrible heretic among the Jews, who said unto his scholars, "Let no man seek the interpretation, but only in his prayers say these words," &c. *Epiph. Har. 19.* who doubteth not, that this testimony of Isaias may be rightly applied against him and his sect: and even by the same reason it may be applied against the Papists, who much more than the hypocritical Jews, honour God in vain with their lips, according to men's traditions, and therefore their heart is far from him.

9. Of Popish traditions, doctrines, and commandments, some be repugnant to God's laws, as worshipping of images, sacrifice of the Mass, communion in one kind, prohibiting of marriage and meats for religion's sake, and such like. Some are beside the laws of God, as idle and unprofitable ceremonies, whereof they have an infinite number, serving not to order, decency, and edification, but to idolatry and superstition: while they make them as a part of God's service and worship. In both sorts, being the doctrine of men, God is worshipped in vain, as our Saviour saith, out of

the Prophet Isaias. Now let us see, how you defend them: first you say, "Paul gave commandments both by his epistles and by word of mouth, even in such matters wherein Christ had prescribed nothing at all, and chargeth the faithful to observe them," for which you quote 2 *Thess.* 2. 15. and 1 *Corinth.* 11. 23. This is a detestable slander of the holy Apostle, who taught nothing as necessary to be observed, but that which he had received of the Lord, either in particular, as the observation of the Lord's Supper, 1 *Corinth.* 11. 23. or in general, as the comeliness to be observed in the holy meetings, according to the distinction of sexes, which God hath made. Out of which general doctrine, the Apostle inferreth his arguments, for the covering of women's heads in the congregation, and the not covering of men's heads. And yet in the outward ceremony of covering, or not covering, he prescribeth nothing as a part of religion or the service of God, but as a matter of comeliness and decency among men; which is varied according to times, persons, and places: and therefore concludeth, that it is not the custom of God's Church to contend for such matters. But for matters necessary to God's worship, the Church must strive even to the death of her children. As for ceremonies apt for decency, order, and edification, they are allowed by the word of God, and the Church hath liberty in the external forms of them, so those three conditions or ends be observed. But in the other place of Paul, how prove you that he speaketh of any thing not expressed in the Scriptures? For though he hath not comprehended all things in his Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, yet he taught no doctrine necessary to salvation, but that which Moses and the Prophets have said, and which was accomplished and taught by our Saviour Christ in the gospel. As for matters of external discipline, and form of administration of the Sacraments, public prayers, and such like, which are variable so the substance of doctrine be retained, and the general rules appointed for such matters be observed, he never required any perpetual observation.

But "the Apostle made laws of blood and strangled, necessary to be observed." Not as a part of God's worship, but as necessary for edifying of the Jews in love: which cause ceasing, those laws also cease of themselves, without any abrogation. For now when the infirmity of the Jews is no let, it is lawful to eat blood and strangled.

The observation of the Lord's day is not delivered by blind tradition, but hath testimony of the Holy Scriptures, 1 *Corinth.* 16. 2. and *Apoc.* 1. 10. *Acts.* 20. 7. and the observation thereof, is according to God's commandment, and no doctrine of men.

You say, "the Apostles prescribed the feasts of Easter and Whitsuntide, and other solemnities of Christ, and of his Saints, which the Protestants observe." *Epiph. hæc.* 75. Epiphanius ascribeth to tradition of the Apostles, the Wednesday fast, and many other

ceremonies which the Papists do not observe. Therefore the Papists must confess, either that such things were not prescribed by the Apostles or else that they were prescribed none otherwise, than indifferent ceremonies, which are subject to alteration, and in which the religion or worship of God doth not consist. And so the Protestants observe them, for order and edification of God's people, that use to assemble at such times: as the Apostles observed the Sabbath day, Pentecost, and other solemnities of the Jews, not as a portion of Christian religion, but taking occasion of the meeting of the Jews in those festival times.

You say, "the Apostles appointed the Lent and Ember fasts, as well to chastise men's concupiscences, as to please God thereby." For the appointing of Lent and Ember fasts, you quote *Hierom. ad Marcell. cont. Mont.* who indeed allegeth the tradition of the Apostles, for one forty days' fast in the year, but of Ember fasts, and such other, he speaketh never a word. And I have showed before out of *Euseb. lib. 5. c. 18.* that *Montanus* the heretic was the first that appointed laws of fasting. And *Ireneus*, cited by *Euseb. lib. 5. c. 26.* sheweth the diversity of fasting, as well as of observing the feast of Easter, which proveth, that neither the one, nor the other, had any certain prescription by the Apostles. That men by fasting serve and please God, you cite the examples of *Anna, Tobias, Judith, Hester*, who served and pleased God thereby, whereof we doubt nothing at all, while they used fasting to the right end allowed of God, that is, humbling of themselves, and chastising of the body, that it might be more obedient to the spirit, and fervent in prayer. For otherwise, fasting of itself, as *Hierom* saith, is no perfect virtue, but a foundation of other virtues. "Think not," saith he, "that thou art holy, when thou hast begun to fast and abstain, for this virtue is a help, not a perfection of sanctification." I conclude therefore, that Popish traditions, placing religion and holiness, in commandments and ceremonies of their own invention, are as ill as the Pharisæical traditions, and men seek in vain to worship God by them. For Christ hath given no warrant or authority to any man, to add any thing to the worship of God prescribed in his word. Neither hath he assured us, that whosoever heareth man, heareth him, but so long as man preacheth God's word, and not the visions of his own head. Judas was one of them, of whom it was said, *he that heareth you, heareth me*, but this was understood to be no longer than he preached the Gospel, else the high Priests might be excused for hearkening to him, when he said, *what will you give me, and I will betray him unto you.* The Holy Ghost joineh not with them that set up a new religion, or teach new doctrines, but with them that retain only the doctrine of Christ, as sufficient unto salvation. And that is the true Church which heareth the voice of the spouse and is content to be directed thereby in all things. That company of men which teach contrary to the Scripture, or beside the Scrip-

tures, to worship God not as the word hath prescribed, but according to the doctrines of men, is the synagogue of Sathan, and not the Church of Christ: Neither have they sending or commission from God. But they who sincerely, according to the Scriptures, do teach the gospel, have sending and commission from God, *Rom. 10.* and are to be heard even as Christ himself so long as they teach nothing but that Christ hath taught, as is to be proved out of the Holy Scriptures.

11. The Papists abstain not, as the Catholics did in Augustin's time, for chastisement of their concupiscence, but of hypocrisy, not for religion and holiness. For wine, spices, fruits, salad, and many fishes which they use, do much more nourish concupiscence, than usual flesh, from which they abstain. As Augustin showeth of the fasts of the Manichees. *De error. Man. lib. 2. cap. 12.*

18. The Spirit speaketh so evidently of your Popish prohibition of marriage and meats for religion and holiness, that all your lying words and shifts of hypocrisy, cannot excuse you from holding the doctrine of devils. If neither flesh nor fish defile a man as you say now, why do you prohibit flesh to some men at all times, and to all men at some times? The like I say of marriage, whereby Gregory Martin, a bird of your own nest, affirmeth, *that the sacred order of Priesthood is profaned. Discou. cap. 15.* And Durand can yield none other reason, why fish is eaten on fasting days, but because God hath not cursed the waters, "because remission of sins should be by the water of baptism. For this element is most worthy which washeth away filthiness, and upon which the Spirit of the Lord was born before the making of the world. But he cursed the earth in the works of man: hereof it is, that it is not lawful in fasting to eat any kind of flesh which liveth on the earth, as four-footed beasts," &c. *Lib. 6. cap. aliis jejuniis.* Let the reader now judge, whether you abstain not from flesh as from meat cursed of God. Whereas the faithful know, that all the creatures of God are good and sanctified unto them by his word and prayer.

28. Christ never commendeth a sole faith, which is void of good works, to be sufficient for justification, but a lively faith, which worketh by love, to justify alone, without respect had unto the merits of the works. This woman's faith was not solitary, or void of good works, but accompanied with patience, invocation, humility, charity, and other fruits of faith: yet was she justified before God, by faith only, and before men justified or declared to be just by the fruits of a living faith. *James 2.* "A godly faith," saith Augustin, "will not be without hope and charity." *Ep. 80.*

#### CHAPTER 16.

13. Peter by the grace of God, and not by the merit of his confession, is made not the rock, but a rock or foundation stone of the Church, and receiveth such ecclesiastical

power, as was common to him with all the Apostles.

13. All the logicians in the world, cannot conclude in lawful syllogism out of the words of this chapter, that any greater authority was granted to Peter, than to every one of the Apostles: who were every one foundation stones of the Church, had every one keys of the kingdom of heaven, had every one as large and ample power of binding and loosing as Peter had: and therefore this surmise of Christ intending to constitute Peter head of the Church is false and feigned.

14. If Peter were head of the fellowship before he confessed Christ, as the words of Chrysostom import, then he was not made head by these words that follow: "Thou art Peter," &c. But in truth Chrysostom never deferred any primacy to Peter of authority and dignity, but of order and promptness of faith. *Hom. 38.* He giveth the same title of headship to four Apostles at once. "For Philip," saith he, "and those two couple that held the headship of the Apostleship, were of Bethsaida." Of John he saith, *Evang. Joan. Prolog.* "The son of thunder is most beloved of Christ, the pillar of all the Churches that are in the world, which hath the keys of the kingdom of heaven." *1 Corinth. Hom. 39,* he saith, "The dignity of all the Apostles is equal." Therefore Chrysostom meaneth not any authority over the rest of the Apostles, or any other, than every one of the Apostles had: though they had not all equal gifts, but some excelled in gifts, as Peter, James, and John: nor the like dispensation in executing of their office, the primacy of the circumcision being appointed to Peter, and the primacy of the Gentiles to Paul.

17. Chrysostom indeed thinketh, that Nathaniel did not acknowledge Christ to be very God. But Hilary, whom you name first, *Can. 6, or 16,* hath never a word of Nathaniel. But *lib. 6, de Trinit.* he saith, "Nathaniel confessed Christ to be the son of God, as Moses and the Prophets had foreshowed," who doubtless foreshow his divinity. Cyril plainly affirmeth, that he knew him to be God, by knowing his heart. *In John. lib. 2, cap. 19.* Augustin also in *Joan. Tract. 7,* judgeth the confession of Nathaniel, "the same that Peter made afterward, when our Lord said unto him, blessed art thou Simon," &c. Bede also saith, "Nathaniel considering his divine majesty, confessed him to be the Son of God." *In Joan. cap. 1.* Primasius also saith, "Nathaniel hearing but ones entence answered, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel, which thing, when Peter so long after confessed, he obtained to hear, that he was happy, and that the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given to him." *Epist. ad Rom. cap. 10.* Thus five doctors against one, affirm that Nathaniel confessed as much of Christ's divinity as Peter. Therefore this is another vain surmise, why Peter should be made the head of the Church. For Christ had long before revealed his divinity unto his Apostles, and they all, except Judas,



did believe it, as well as Peter, who for them all, answereth and confesseth. *John*. 6, 69. "We have believed and known that thou art Christ, the son of the living God." Where Peter as in this place, *Matt*. 16, "had the primacy of confession, not of honour:" as Ambrose saith, *De Incarnat. Dom. cap.* 4. That Peter received the building of the Church committed unto him, we acknowledge, as all the rest of the Apostles did likewise, being the foundation of the Church, as well as he. *Ephes.* 2, 20.

13. No doubt, it was a great reward of Peter's confession, that the Church is built upon him: but this reward, even as the same faith and confession, was common to him with the rest of the Apostles. Neither doth Theophylact mean otherwise: therefore he saith within few words after, "Although it was said to Peter alone, I will give to thee: yet the keys were granted to all the Apostles."

14. We confess with Cyril, Hilary, and Basil, that Peter was a stone, designed for the foundation of the Church, but so, as all the rest of the Apostles are stones upon which the Church is built. *Apoc.* 21, 14. Neither do we wrangle, when we say that Christ is the only rock or foundation, upon which the Church is built, for the Apostle hath taught us so to say. *1 Cor.* 3, 11. Yet do we not exclude the ministry and labourers of his Apostles, whom also we acknowledge, to be stones and foundations of his Church: not in respect of their persons, but in regard of the heavenly doctrine, which being committed unto them, by diligent preaching and writing, they planted in the world: and so became with the Prophets, the foundation of the Church: Jesus Christ still retaining his place, to be the corner stone, in whom the whole building being coupled together, groweth up to a holy temple in the Lord. *Eph.* 2, 20, 21. "Therefore as Christ is the rock, foundation, or corner stone, neither Peter, nor all the Apostles, are the same." *Fulg. de remiss. pecc. lib.* 1, cap. 19. But your blasphemous advancing Peter's primacy, tendeth to make him a whole foundation of the whole Church, which none is but Christ. Neither hath he therein any Vicar or substitute, but by his divine power, sustaineth the whole building of the Church himself. So saith Chrysostom: "He himself sustaineth and beareth all things, in whom the whole building is coupled together. Whatsoever thou shalt name, either the roof, or the walls, or whatsoever it be, he beareth the whole himself." *Epist. et Ephes. Hom.* 6. Therefore that which is proper to the divine nature of Christ, cannot without blasphemy, be ascribed to the ministry of man.

15. Many words to little purpose. We acknowledge that Peter was a stone, upon which stone the Church is builded, as the rest of the Apostles were stones, upon whom also the Church is builded. And we confess, that Cepha in the Syrian tongue, which language our Saviour used, signifieth a stone, not only a great main Rock, such as Christ is, being the

foundation of the whole Church, but also of every little stone. And in the Syriac translation, *1 Pet* 2, where the Apostle calleth all the faithful living stones builded upon the precious stone Christ, the same word is used. Therefore, if we would translate so precisely as you speak, out of the Syriac tongue, we should say, Thou art a stone, and upon this stone I will build my Church. But the Greek which we translated, making difference of the gender, we have done right in observing the same. And albeit *πετρος* and *πετρα* in Greek, do signify the same thing, yet is *πετρος* proper to the Attic dialect, when it signifieth a rock or stone. And because it is not like, that the Apostle, without cause, would in so few words vary the dialect, we must needs think, that *πετρος* in this place, is taken for the proper name of Peter, and *πετρα* for the common name of a stone, whereof Peter had that surname. Which, whether it be referred to Christ whom Peter confessed, or to Peter's faith, or confession of Christ, or to Peter himself in respect of his doctrine and Apostleship, as the ancient fathers have all these three relations, it cometh to one end: that Peter had none other authority than the rest of the Apostles, upon whom the Church was builded, no less than upon Peter, who also believed and confessed as Peter did, had the keys of the kingdom of heaven and power to bind and loose, as ample as he, *Matt.* 18, 18. *John.* 20, 13. But let us examine the authorities of the ancient fathers, that are quoted for this matter. Augustin understanding the rock to be Christ, is condemned of error, because he followed the Latin terminations of *Petrus* and *Petra*. But is not the same difference in the Greek? or think you the difference is made in vain? You say, notwithstanding that his error, he never denieth Peter to be the rock and head of the Church. But if this text by his last judgment in his retractions make not for it, how can he hold Peter to be the rock of the Church in your sense, or head of the same? You say, "he hath expounded it of Peter, in many places, and allegeth Ambrose in a hymn:" but in no place he concludeth thereof, the supremacy of Peter, or acknowledgeth Peter to be such a foundation stone, as none of the Apostles is but he, or that Peter was made head of the Church. Psalm 69, he saith, "Peter having confessed Christ to be the Son of God, in that confession, was called a stone, upon which the Church should be builded." These words set him not an inch above the rest of the Apostles. *De verb. Dom. sac.* 10, *serm.* 49, is no word of the rock, or building of the Church upon Peter. Except you mean these words, "He saith unto Peter in whom being but one, he informeth his Church, or maketh him an example for his Church to follow, Peter dost thou love me?" The context of that place is plain, that Augustin speaketh nothing of Peter, as the foundation of the Church. The other four places out of the sermons *De sanctis*, are none of Augustin's authority, no more than those sermons are. The very style of which argueth them to be

of another and a later writer: yet is one of the sermons which you quote, ascribed also to Ambrose. But admit they were Augustin's, yet they make little or nothing for Peter's supremacy, which is the matter in question, and not whether the Church was builded upon Peter, which we acknowledge. Ser. 15, he saith, "Peter was named the foundation of the Church." So doth he in the Ser. 16, with more ample words, but yet expounding himself, he saith, "In the same house Peter layeth the foundation, Peter planteth, the Lord giveth the increase, the Lord sendeth watering." In these words he showeth, how he is a foundation and unmoveable stone, containing the building and burden of the whole Christian work, namely, as he preacheth Christ the true rock, and layeth him for the foundation of the house, while he planteth the faith. In the Ser. 26, the author saith, Peter is a rock or stone upon which the Church is builded, "as he containeth the foundation of faith in the Church." And that is true of every one of the Apostles, to whom was committed the doctrine of the gospel which is the foundation of Christian faith. In the Ser. 29, the author according to the scripture, calleth Peter and Paul both, "Founders of the Christian name. Peter among the Jews, Paul among the Gentiles," and in many other words showeth that Paul was not less or inferior to Peter. *Annot. in Job. cap. 30*, there is nothing touching this matter. But beside these, you alleage many other authorities, of which not one, except Leo and Gregory of Rome, do favour the supremacy of Peter, nor they so absolutely, as now you hold it. To begin with the council of Chalcedon, the fathers in that council, did so acknowledge the Church to be founded upon Peter, that they decreed, the Bishop of Constantinople should have equal authority and dignity with the Bishop of Rome, except the primacy of seniority." *Action 16. and Can. 28*, although the Bishop of Rome's legates were present, and alleged what they could to hinder the decree. Tertullian saith, "Peter was called a stone or rock, for the building of the Church. All the Apostles were stones. *Cont. Marcio. lib. 4*. The Church was builded upon Peter, because it was builded by him, that he first occupied the key," &c. *De judicitiis prope finem*. By whom also it appeareth, that the Catholics in his time, challenged authority of binding and loosing, to pertain to the Church by that text. *Thou art Peter*, &c. where he like a heretic contendeth, that it was spoken personally to Peter, and that Montanus, the spiritual man, with his Church, is successor of that authority, and not that Church is a number of Bishops. Origen also, *Hom. 5. in Ecod.* calleth Peter a great foundation, and most strong rock, upon whom the Church is builded. But how that is to be understood, he showeth plainly in his commentary upon this text. "But if thou thinkest, that the universal Church is builded by God, upon this one Peter, what sayest thou of James and John, the children of thunder, or of every one of the

Apostles? Therefore it was truly said unto Peter, Thou art Peter, and upon this stone I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: Yet it seemeth to be said to all the Apostles, and to every perfect faithful man, because they all as Peter, be stones, and on them all the Church of Christ is builded, and the gates of hell shall prevail against none of them that are such." Those words of Origen, you see do plainly overthrow the supremacy of Peter, although he confess him to be a stone upon which the Church is builded. Cyprian, *De unitate Ecclesie*, was as great a friend to Peter's supremacy as Origen. For thus he writeth, "Although he gave equal authority to all his Apostles after his resurrection and said, As my Father sent me, so I send you, receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they shall be forgiven, and whose you shall retain, they be retained, yet to manifest unity, the beginning of that unity proceeding from one, he disposed by his authority. The same thing verily was all the Apostles that Peter was, endued with equal fellowship of honour and authority, but the beginning proceedeth from one, that the Church might be showed to be one." This writeth Cyprian, of the building of the Church upon one man Peter, showing that all the Apostles had the same honour and power that Peter had. And therefore Peter had no supremacy of authority over them, or over the whole Church, more than every one of the Apostles had. That which Hilary writeth upon this place, *Can. 16*, of the foundation of the Church, may well be understood of faith. As he doth most plainly express his mind, *De Trinit. lib. 2*. "This one foundation is unmoveable, this is that one happy rock of faith confessed by the mouth of Peter. Thou art the Son of the living God." And *lib. 6*, he saith: "All the Apostles, for the worthiness of their faith acknowledging his divinity, received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and authority of binding and loosing in heaven and earth." Wherefore Hilary, out of this text, never acknowledged the supremacy of Peter, or any greater authority granted unto Peter, than unto the rest of the Apostles. The next place, you quote, for Ambrose, *serm. 46*, is the very same which you quoted before, and ascribed to Augustin, *serm. 16. de sanct.* resembling indeed the style of neither. Likewise the *serm. 69*, is the very same that you cited before, as Augustin's *serm. 26. de sanct.* These places if you had viewed yourselves, you would not have cited for shame under the name of two several doctors, and yet they serve you to small purpose. But you know Papists are ready to take all draft that you will thrust into their mouths, and never examine whence it cometh. With whom so long as you may retain your credit, you esteem not what all the learned of the world may judge of your impudency. But lest you should seem to have nothing of Ambrose, but forged, you quote *lib. 6. cap. 9. Luke*, where he doth acknowledge Peter none otherwise to be the foundation of

the Church, than every faithful man may be. "For he that shall overcome the flesh is a foundation of the Church, and though he cannot be equal to Peter, yet he may follow him. He denied not to his disciple the grace of this name, that he should be called Peter, because he had solidity of constancy, and steadfastness of faith of the rock. Endeavour that thou also mayest be a rock. Therefore seek the rock, not without thee, but within thee. Thy act is thy rock, thy mind is thy rock. Let thy house be builded upon this rock, that it may not be beaten with any storms of spiritual wickedness. Faith is thy rock, faith is the foundation of the Church. If thou be a rock, thou shalt be in the Church, because the Church is upon a rock," &c. Here is all that can be gathered out of this place for Peter's supremacy. You were as well advised to quote Hierom, *lib. 1. in Joann.* whose words are these. "But thou sayest, the Church is founded upon Peter, although in another place, the very same thing is done upon all the Apostles, and they all receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the strength of the Church is established equally upon them all. Yet therefore, among twelve one is chosen, that the head being appointed, occasion of schism may be taken away." In these words Hierom acknowledgeth no greater authority of Peter, than of the rest of the Apostles, but only a primacy of order for avoiding of confusion and dissension, which in every company of them that be equal in degree, must be observed. Your second place out of Hierom, is in *cap. 2. Isa.* where he saith of the Church: "This house is builded upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, who also are mountains, as followers of Christ. Of this house and Jerusalem, the Psalmist saith aloud. They that put their trust in the Lord, shall be as the mount Zion, he shall not be moved forever which dwelleth in Jerusalem. The mountains are round about it, and the Lord is round about his people. Wherefore upon one of those mountains, Christ foundeth his Church, and saith unto him, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." By this testimony, Peter is one of the mountains, upon which the Church is founded: where is Peter's supremacy in these words? Last of all in *cap. 19. Hier.* where the text is *De cavernis Petrarum. Out of the holes of the rocks*, he interpreteth the rocks to be the Apostles, and Apostolic men. "For not only Christ was a rock, but it was granted also to Peter that he should be called a rock." Behold Peter is a rock, as every Apostle and Apostolic man is, by this place of Hierom, who also in *Matt. cap. 7.* saith, "Our Lord founded his Church upon that rock, whereon the wise man builded his house, of which rock, Peter the Apostle took his name." This being common to every wise builder, proveth no supremacy in Peter, and much less in any that shall claim it by succession from him, as the Romish prelate doth. And therefore, expounding this text, he find-

eth nothing proper to Peter and his successors, but common to all Bishops and Priests. Among whom some not understanding the place, took upon them a piece of Pharisaical pride, which he there confuteth. And most expressly defending the judgment of the Church in the whole world, against the practice of the Romish Church, he saith: "If authority be sought, the world is greater than a city. Wheresoever a Bishoppe, either at Rome or at Eugubium, either at Constantinople or at Rhegium, either at Alexandria or at Tunis, he is of the same worthiness, and of the same priestly office. Power of riches, and baseness of poverty, maketh not a bishop higher or lower. But they are all successors of the Apostles. But thou wilt say, how is the Priest at Rome, ordained at the testimony of a Deacon. What dost thou bring me the custom of one city?" The place of Chrysostom is answered before, *sect. 4.* And that Cyril meaneth Peter to be a rock, none otherwise than all the Apostles, his words are plain in *Isa. lib. 4. cap. 44. or 2.* "But why do we call them the foundation of the earth? For Christ is the foundation of all, and stay of all, keepeth and holdeth all things, to be sure and steadfast. In him we are all built, a spiritual house compacted by his Spirit, into a holy temple, and habitation of himself: For he dwelleth in our hearts by faith. The next and nearer foundation to us, may be understood, the Apostles and Evangelists, being eye witnesses, and made ministers of the Word for confirmation of faith. For when we know that their traditions are to be followed, we shall keep a right faith, and not strange or erring from Christ. For by him it was said to Peter, because he had confessed the faith in him right soundly, and had said, thou art Christ the Son of the living God, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, calling a rock, as I think, the unmovable faith of the disciple. It is also said by the Psalmist. Her foundations are upon the holy hills: The holy Apostles are rightly to be compared to holy hills, the knowledge of whom is established as a foundation to the posterity." To the same effect he writeth *lib. 5. cap. 54.* Epiphanius in Ancorato acknowledgeth Peter to be the first or chief of the Apostles, on whom the Church is builded, but he understandeth his confession, faith and doctrine, not his person. "For in him," saith he, "the faith was established by all means, and all questions of faith are decided in him." So likewise *hære. 59.* after he hath acknowledged him to be a rock, upon which the Church is builded, he addeth the reason, and expoundeth how he is a rock. "Because," saith he, "he confesseth Christ to be the Son of the living God, and here, upon this rock of steadfast faith, I will build my Church." Now seeing this rock of steadfast faith was in all the Apostles, it is certain that Epiphanius purposed not to make Peter a singular foundation stone by himself, but jointly with all his fellow Apostles.

Leo, Bishop of Rome, striving for the dig-

nity of his See, as his predecessors, Zosimus Boniface, and Celestine, had done before, and were discovered in the council of Africa, to have alleged a forged canon of the council of Nice, is no equal judge in this case. Neither could his allegations any thing prevail in the general council of Chalcedon, but that the bishop of Constantinople was made his equal. Gregory was almost immediately before that Boniface, that bought the title of supremacy of Phocas: Yet he prophesied, that John, bishop of Constantinople, which first challenged the title of Universal Bishop, was the forerunner of Antichrist. *Ep.* 78. 82. 194. Your last witness, Theodoret, calleth Peter a principal foundation of the Church that was shaken, and confirmed again by repentance. But the same Theodoret showeth, that he was a foundation, in respect of his faith and confession, in Cantic, saying, "He calleth the piety of faith, and profession of truth, a rock. For when our Lord inquired of his disciples, whom men said that he the Son of Man was, thou, saith blessed Peter, art Christ, the son of the living God. To whom the Lord answered, saying, verily, verily, I say to thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." And, lest you should think, that Peter, in respect of his faith and confession, was a singular foundation. Psalm 47, thus he writeth: "He hath builded the Church, as the holy Apostle saith, upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the corner stone thereof. And our Lord, himself saith, to blessed Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. Therefore, the Prophet hath put this word, well founded, for sound foundations, that she may remain unshaken and unmovable." These words declare evidently, that Peter is a rock and foundation of the Church, no otherwise than all the Apostles are, and hath no supremacy of authority over the rest, granted by this text. Thus have we answered to those fathers, that say the Church was founded upon Peter. But because you cannot deny, but that they say, also, that the Church is builded upon Peter's faith: you say, *they mean not faith separated from the man, or in any other man, as we unlearnedly take them.* What they meant by faith, and how we take them, I have showed by their own words, which are plain enough, and need no great learning to interpret them. They mean that faith that was in Peter, which he confessed at that time, which he held always after, and which he, with the rest of the Apostles, preached in the world, as they all held the same faith and confession, and, therefore, were all made foundation stones, in respect of the faith they taught, upon which the Church is builded, and received the keys, and authority of binding and loosing, in as ample manner as Peter did. But let us hear what high point of learning you will teach us. "They mean," say you, "upon faith, as in him, who here confessed that faith." That is, upon Peter's faith: Now, whether you mean that singular faith,

that was in Peter only, or the general faith of the Church, whereof Peter's faith was a singular *individuum*, it passeth my learning to discuss. If you mean that faith, which was a singular accident in Peter only, who here confesseth that faith: it is a strange paradox, to say, that the universal Church, and faith, should be grounded thereupon: Seeing the foundation and the Church should fail, as soon as Peter died. For that singular accident, could not descend to his successors any more than other accidents to his person. If you mean, that general faith, that was in all the Apostles, who all, by Peter's mouth, confessed the same, then are they all by Christ his answer, made foundation stones of the Church, as well as Peter. And this is the plain meaning, according to the evident words of the ancient fathers.

18. We deny not that Peter had these prerogatives, as a partaker of them together with the rest of the Apostles for the present, and for their successors, the pastors and governors of the Church to the benefit of the whole Church, in all times to come to the end of the world. The sayings of the doctors are plain, that the rest of the Apostles were made stones of foundation by Christ immediately, and not by Peter: received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and power to bind and loose, not at Peter's hands, but immediately from Christ himself, as also the texts are plain. *Matt.* 18 *John.* 20. But Hierom, you say, "taketh this rock not to be Peter's person only, but his successors, and his chair." *Ep. ad Damas.* The same Hierom as we heard before, saith, "The Church is builded upon all the Apostles, and all Bishops are their successors." In what Bishop's chair soever, the true doctrine is continued and kept, it is a rock of the Church, as well as that chair wherein Damasus sat. *Gildas lib.* 2. But if any Bishop of Rome hold not Peter's faith, he sitteth not in Peter's chair. And therefore he that joined with Damasus holding Peter's faith of the divinity of Christ, would not have joined with Liberius, subscribing against the divinity of Christ, who also sat at Rome, where Peter perhaps never came. But certain it is, he sat not in Peter's chair, no more than the Pharisees sat in Moses' chair, while they held and taught that which Moses did not teach. Hierom, therefore, following none as principal but Christ, joined in fellowship with Damasus, who, sitting in Peter's chair, taught as Peter did, that Christ is the Eternal Son of God. And Augustin in that Psalm against the Donatists, saith, that the continuance of the same doctrine and unity of the Church, even from Peter's seat, is the rock against which the proud gates of hell shall not prevail. Not that whosoever sitteth in Peter's seat, must have all authority that he will claim. For Augustin himself in the African council, with the rest of the fathers of Africa, decreed against the bishops of Rome usurped authority and forgery. And in the council of Chalcedon the Bishop of Constantinople was made equal to the Bishop of Rome, the legates

of Leo of Rome, setting themselves against it, but in vain. Leo therefore, is too partial for the prerogative of his own see, and therefore his testimony is no prejudice, against so many ancient fathers, as were of the contrary judgment before him.

18. Christ had his Church from the beginning of the world builded upon the foundation of the Prophets, himself being the head and corner stone thereof. He speaketh therefore now of the continuance and enlarging thereof among the Gentiles, by the ministry of his Apostles. And therefore, this is a mere fantasy that his Church was not builded until Christ restored Peter to his Apostleship, *John* 21. 15, or that it was not perfectly finished before Whitsunday. You may as well say, it was not distinguished from the Synagogue or Church of the Jews for many years after, seeing the great multitude of the Jews that believed were still observers of the ceremonies of the Law. *Acts* 21. 20.

18. So long as the Roman Church continued in Peter's faith and doctrine, it was founded upon Peter, and not only upon Peter, but also upon the prophets and apostles, yea and upon Christ himself: so long the gates of hell prevailed not against it. But none of the ancient fathers affirm, that the Roman Church should always continue in Peter's faith. Augustin, against the Donatists, affirmeth, that the continuance of the Church in the same religion, even from the seat of Peter, is the rock which the proud gates of hell do not overcome. Now this count of priests from the seat of Peter, might be made as well in the Church of Antioch, as in the Church of Rome, seeing Peter sat at Antioch, as well as he did at Rome, and the patriarch thereof, at this day, hath his succession of bishops from Peter's seat, as well as the bishop of Rome. The same count might be taken from other Churches where the Apostles sat, as Tertullian showeth, *de prescriptione*. "Go to, now, thou that wilt exercise curiosity better in the matter of thy salvation, go through the apostolic Churches, in which the governors sit, even still in the very chairs of the Apostles, in which their authenticall Epistles are rehearsed, sounding the voice, and representing the face of every one of them. If Achaia be near thee, thou hast Corinth. If thou be not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi, thou hast the Thessalonians. If thou canst go into Asia, thou hast Ephesus. If thou lie near Italy, thou hast Rome, from whence authority is at hand for us, also." These words of Tertullian, declared, that not the Church of Rome, only, but every apostolic Church, had a sure testimony of the truth. And that Africa had recourse to Rome, only for the nearness of it. In the second place, *De utilitate credendi*, cap. 17. Augustin nameth neither Peter's see, nor the Roman Church, but speaketh of the Catholic Church, "which, even by the confession of mankind, from Apostolic see, by succession of Bishops, heretics in vain barking about it, and partly by the judgment of the people

themselves, partly by the gravity of councils, partly, also, by majesty of miracles, condemning them, hath obtained the top of authority." He had spoken before of the providence of God, which had gathered, builded, and beautified the Church, by the foreshowings of the prophets, by the humanity and doctrine of Christ, by the travels of the Apostles, by the contumelies, crosses, death of the martyrs, by the commendable way of the Saints, and by convenient miracles in due time. Whereunto he addeth the testimony of mankind, in the history of the succession of bishops from the Apostle's time, judgment of the people, authority of Councils, and miracles confirming it, and condemning all heretics. This maketh nothing for the authority of the Roman Church, or See, above all other Sees and Churches. Augustin himself, with other Bishops of his province, decreed, that no man, under pain of excommunication, should appeal from the Church of Africa, to the Church of Rome, or any other place beyond the sea. *Concil. Afric. Can. 92*. As had been decreed before, *Concil. Milvit. c. 22*.

19. Cyprian in the place cited, writeth against the epistle of Stephanus Bishop of Rome, and therefore it carrieth no show or likelihood of truth, that he would write any thing, that might make the authority of Stephanus irrefragable, against himself. For you would have us to understand, Peter's and his successor's authority to be so great by this grant, as none of them can err. But by this place of Cyprian, it is manifest, that he acknowledgeth no more to be given to Peter, than to all the Apostles, namely, power to remit sins. "It is manifest where, and by whom remissions which is given to baptism, may be given. For first our Lord gave this power unto Peter, upon whom he built his Church, and from whence he instituted and showed the beginning of unity, that it should be loosed in heaven which he loosed in earth. And after his resurrection, he speaketh unto the Apostles also, saying, as my Father sent me, even so do I send you. When he had so said, he breathed and said unto them, receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins you shall remit, they shall be remitted unto him, and whose you shall retain, they shall be retained. Whereof we understand, that it is not lawful to baptize and to give remission of sins, but for the governors in the Church, and them that are established by the law of the Gospel, and our Lord's ordination: and that without the Church, nothing can be either bound or loosed, when there is not any man that can bind or loose anything." These be Cyprian's words, which prove that the Church was not built more upon Peter, than the rest. For if you urge, that he saith, the power was given first to Peter, and the Church was built upon him, at that time when these words were spoken, you confute your own note, *Sect. 10*, where you say, the Church was only promised to be built upon him in this place, which was fulfilled. *John* 21, 16. If the Church were not built upon Peter before that

time, all the Apostles received power of remitting and retaining sins, before the Church was built upon Peter. *John. 20, 22.* Cyprian therefore meaneth that Christ spake in the singular number, first to Peter, that which afterward he spake to all the Apostles, showing why he spoke in the singular number, not that the Church should be built on Peter's person, more than on the rest: but to show the unity of the Church beginning of one; as his very words are manifest, while he giveth equal authority to all governors of the Church, as successors of the Apostles, and maketh so little account of Peter's successor above the rest, that writing expressly against him, he proveth by this text, equal authority of all the governors of the Church. *Fulg. de rem. pecc. lib. 1, c. 24. De ecclesia catholica.*

That the Church is built upon Peter's confession, we have the ancient Fathers' testimony, to warrant us. *Hilary, De Trinit. lib. 6,* saith, "The building of the Church is upon this rock of confession. This faith is the foundation of the Church, by this faith the gates of hell are of no power against it. This faith hath the keys of the kingdom of heaven. What this faith shall loose or bind on earth, is bound and loosed in heaven." Angustin also *De verbis Dom. in Evang. Matt. Serm. 13.* "Thou art Peter," saith he, "and upon this rock which thou hast confessed, upon this rock which thou hast acknowledged, saying, thou art Christ the son of the living God, I will build my Church, that is upon myself the son of the living God I will build my Church. I will build thee upon me, not me upon thee." This like saying he hath in *John. Tract. 50, and 124. In Epist. John. Tract. 10.* Bede upon this place, saith, "It is said unto him by a metaphor; upon this rock, this is the Saviour whom thou hast confessed, the Church is built, which to his faithful confession, gave participation of his name." The authority of Gregory, which you quote, being a Bishop of Rome himself, and so near the time of the open revelation of Antichrist in the Romish See, is partial in this case, and therefore against all the Primitive Church, not to be heard. Yet in that place *lib. 4, epist. 33,* for in *epist. 32,* there is never a word of, he joineith with us, saying, the Church was built upon Peter's confession. "Continue in the true faith, and lead your life in the rock of the Church, which is grounded upon the confession of Peter, Prince of the Apostles."

19. We acknowledge the authority, or chair of doctrine, knowledge, judgment, and discretion, between true and false doctrine, to be granted to Peter, and to every one of the Apostles, to whom also the keys were granted, *Hilary de Trin. lib. 6, Hierom. cont. Jov. lib. 1, Gaudentius Brizianus tract. 16.* But the rest that followeth, height of government, power of making laws, of calling councils, of the principal voice in them, of confirming them, making and abrogating of Canons, ordaining and deposing of Bishops, power to dispense the goods of the Church, both spi-

ritual and temporal, especially to be appropriated to Peter, hath no ground in the text: neither was any such power permitted to the Bishop of Rome, as Peter's successor, for many hundred years after Christ. Polycarp would not yield to Anicetus, Bishop of Rome, in the celebration of Easter, as testifieth Ireneus. *Apud Euseb. lib. 5, cap. 26.* When Victor usurped authority over the Churches of Asia, he was countermanded by the Bishops there, *Euseb. lib. 5, cap. 25,* and sharply rebuked and withstood by Ireneus, and the Bishops in France, Polycrates, and the Bishops in Asia, and others. Not one of the first four general councils was called by the Bishop of Rome, neither had he principal voice of confirming or making Canons in them. But in the first of Nice, he was made equal with the Patriarch of Alexandria. *Can. 6.* In two other, namely Constantinople and Chalcedon, the Bishop of Constantinople was made equal in authority with him, and in all things, except in seniority. *Constant. 1, cap. 3, Chalced. can. 28.*

In the councils of Milevit, and Africane, appeals for any ecclesiastical cause, were denied unto the See of Rome. *Milev. can. 22, Afric. 92.* Yea, long after that Boniface had bought for money this supereminant authority, it was not acknowledged of many Churches, and even of the Church of Ravenna, in Italy, for many years after. That keys in the Scripture, do many times signify authority, especially when they are applied to our Saviour Christ, we confess: but that any such authority as is here expressed, of making laws, calling councils, &c., is meant by them, we utterly deny, but whith authority soever is understood by them, is common to all the Apostles, and to the whole Church after them, as witnesseth, *Tertull. Scorp. adv. Gnost. Hilar. Psal. 52. Aug. de Doct. Chri. lib. 1, cap. 18. Cont. Advers. leg. et Prophet. lib. 1, c. 17, in Evang. Joan. Tr. 5. Fulgent. de fide ad Petrum, cap. 3.*

19. Corporal punishment, either for heresy or rebellion against the Church, and the Pastors thereof, belongeth not to the ministry of the Church, but to the Christian Magistrate, who beareth the sword. *Rom. 13, 4.* Which Peter was commanded to put up. *Matt. 26, 52.* But under this binding, you would cloak, not only your cruelty practised against the true professors of the Gospel, but also your horrible treasons, rebellions, invasions, and conspiracies against your lawful Prince and country, under pretence of execution of the Pope's most slanderous and antichristian Bull of deprivation.

19. Every one of the Apostles had the same authority in loosing which Peter had. *Matt. 18, 18.* And the Church hath the same power after them. *Fulgent. de remiss. peccat. lib. 2, cap. 20.* But as touching satisfaction for sins due unto God, no man can make, but Christ only. And the ministry of the Church cannot pardon any debt due unto God, but assure the party penitent of God's forgiveness: and so saith Hierom, writing upon this very text. "Bishops and Priests not under

standing this place, take upon them somewhat of the pride of the Pharisees, that they think, they may either condemn innocents, or loose guilty persons, whereas before God, not the sentence of the Priests, but the life of the persons charged, is inquired of. We read in Leviticus of the lepers: where they are commanded to show themselves to the Priests, and if they have the leprosy, then they are made unclean by the Priest: not that the Priests do make men lepers, or unclean, but in that they have knowledge of him that is a leper, and him that is not a leper, and can discern who is clean, and who is unclean. Therefore as the Priest in that case maketh a man clean or unclean, so here the Bishop and Priest bindeth or looseth: not whether they be guilty or unguilty, but according to his office, when he hath heard the variety of sins, he knoweth who is to be bound, and who to be loosed." Bede upon this text writeth to the same effect. "This power without doubt is given to all the Apostles, to whom it is said by himself after his resurrection generally, receive the Holy Ghost, &c. Also to Bishops and Priests, and to the whole Church, the same office is committed: although some of them not understanding rightly, think they can condemn innocents, and absolve guilty persons, which they cannot do, but going about to deprive themselves of the power granted." Exercises of repentance prescribed by the Church for satisfaction thereof, or other censures of discipline, may be released by them by whom they are enjoined, and that kind of releasing was of ancient time called indulgence. But it was not allowed to the Bishop of Rome to admit or release, except in his own Church of Rome, those that were cast out or suspended by other Bishops and Churches: as appeareth by many places in Cyprian's epistles. *Ep. 55, ad Correl. and Ep. 68, ad Clerum et plebem Hispan.* Hilary and Epiphanius ascribe no greater authority to Peter than to the rest of the Apostles. But Leo being a Bishop of Rome, was too partial in extolling of Peter's prerogative, and the pre-eminence of his See of Rome. Therefore he was overruled by the general Council of Chalcedon. There is no godly temporal potestate, that challenged to be head of the whole Church, or of any particular Church, as Christ is head thereof, neither any of that authority which is here given to Peter, with the rest of the Apostles and their successors, the true ministers of the Church. But only they challenge, as the highest magistrates, to have sovereign authority within their dominions, to maintain true religion by law, to banish false religion and idolatry, and to punish all offenders, whether they be of the clergy or laity. Which authority, the godly kings of Judah, David, Solomon, Ezekias, Josias, &c., and the Christian Emperors, Constantine, Valentinian, Theodosius, and others, did exercise, to the glory of God, and to the benefit of his Church. You say, "Greatest sovereignty in God's Church, attributed to Christ,

*Apoc. 3,* is here communicated to Peter." This is such blasphemy, as Peter would have rent his clothes, if he had heard any man attribute so much unto him. For Christ hath the key of David, as the son of David and only true Messias, which openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth where no man openeth. This key Peter cannot have, except he were Christ, for it is proper only to Christ, but the keys of the kingdom of heaven, given to Peter and the Apostles, are keys of ministry in respect of Christ, whose stewards they are, to open and shut according to his word, and not at their own will and pleasure.

21. Christ affirmed not the like suffering to his passion to be necessary to salvation, in every one; but that every one in affection of denying himself, ought to be ready to suffer whatsoever is laid upon him, for the profession of the Gospel.

27. Every man's works be the fruits, either of his faith, or of his infidelity. Good works are done only by him that is justified by faith only. "For without the merits of good works," saith Augustin, "the ungodly man is justified by faith. Faith goeth before, that works may follow, neither are there any good works which do not follow, faith going before them." In Ps. 67. The free will that he speaketh of, in that treatise against the Manichees, he sheweth how it is to be understood in his *Retractions* lib. 1. cap. 22. and lib. 2. cap. 8. Man's will is not evil, by creation of the evil God, as those heretics blasphemed, yet hath man since his fall, no power to do any good, but of the grace of God. "For free will," saith he, "availeth not to any thing but to sin, if the way of truth be hidden or unknown." *De spir. et lit. cap. 3.*

#### CHAPTER 17.

2. Christ is almighty, and yet can do nothing against his own will, his word, or his glory. And therefore it is a brute conclusion, Christ could glorify his passible body, ergo he can dishonour his glorious impassible body, to bring it within the compass of a piece of bread, that it may be devoured by dogs, cats, mice, or, that is worse, to be eaten of wicked men, the members of the devil. Or Christ could add a glorious form unto his body, ergo he can take from it the essential properties of a body, and yet keep it a true body still. Although the question be not so much between us, what Christ is able to do of his absolute power, as what he will do according to his word.

3. If it please God by a special dispensation, they may: but the dead as Augustin saith, by their own nature, cannot be present at the affairs of the living. *De cura pro mat. cap. 16.* "There be the spirits of the dead, where they do not see whatsoever things are done, or come to pass in this life of men," *cap. 13.* "Therefore whensoever they are present, it is by special grant of God, far otherwise, than is the usual order, attributed to every kind of creature," *cap. 16.* Being a matter therefore so extraordinary, and having

no word to assure us of God's will, it is mere tempting of God to desire any help by their presence, as it is, to desire of God to work miracles, because God can and hath wrought them by his Saints. Moreover the comparison of Angels and Saints departed, is very absurd; for the Scripture testifieth, that God useth the ministry of his Angels, both extraordinarily and ordinarily, for the protecting of his children. But we have no testimony of the Scripture, that he useth the souls of the Saints departed, for any such purpose.

9. Peter called the mount Tabor the holy mount, and the place where God appeared to Moses was called holy ground, yet neither Peter nor Moses taught men to have any religion or devotion toward such places, nor did institute any pilgrimage unto the same: therefore the religion and devotion you speak of, is but voluntary religion or superstition. And though some good men and women in Hierom's time, had affection to see those places where Christ had been present, and wrought his miracles, yet did they not put any religion in such visiting, or if they did, it was superstition. Hierom himself being greatly commended by Paulinus, that he lived in those holy places, declareth how small religion he had in them: "It is not commendable to have been at Jerusalem, but to have lived well at Jerusalem." And after he hath set forth the praise of Anthony, and many swarms of solitary men that dwelled in the countries near unto Jewry, and yet never saw Jerusalem, and specially of Hilarion, which being a man of that country, and that lived in that country, yet saw Jerusalem but one day in all his life, "that neither he might seem to contemn the holy places for their nearness, nor again seem to shut up the Lord in a certain place. Thou wilt say, to what end are the matters fetched from so long a beginning. Verily, that thou shouldst not think any thing to be wanting to thy faith because thou hast not seen Jerusalem, neither that thou shouldst esteem us to be better, because we enjoy our dwelling in this place, but whether here or elsewhere, thou hast equal reward with the Lord according to thy works."

11. Divers of the ancient fathers are of opinion, that Elias shall come in person, immediately before the second coming of Christ, as the forerunner of his second coming, and to convert the remnant of the Jews. But these words of Christ, do not prove it. For he saith no more, but that the prophecy was, that Elias should come, and that he is already come, as he saith of John the Baptist, Matt. 11. 14, he is Elias that was to come. And Origen upon this place understandeth no more comings of Elias, but this one of John, that was come in the spirit of Elias.

19. If you mean of Popish Exorcists, neither have they authority of God, nor power to cast out devils. Neither is there any such ordinary function in the Church of God: that men should have power to cast out devils, more than to heal all manner of diseases, speak with strange tongue which they never

learned, or to work other miracles. Which spiritual gifts God gave in the beginning of the preaching of the gospel, to confirm the credit thereof among the Jews and the Gentiles, but of long time have ceased among Christians, who are to be directed by God's word, whereunto their profession bindeth them to give credit, without any further confirmation of miracles, than that which is testified in the Holy Scriptures. And where you say, that heretics can never cast out devils, or work any true miracles, it is false: for our Saviour Christ saith, that many shall allege in the last day, that they have prophesied in his name, cast out devils, and wrought many miracles. God, in the law, chargeth his people not to be carried away by false prophets, though they work miracles. *Deut. 13. 1.*

20. We are not bound to believe all that is reported of Gregory Thaumaturgus. Yet being testified by authors of good credit, and the miracles tending to the confirmation of true faith, we do not deride them, as we justly may the monstrous fables of your Popish legends, festivals, and other works of like credit. Where also the miracles are feigned most commonly, for the confirmation of false doctrine, and the maintenance of covetousness of Priests, as in the cases of purgatory, pilgrimage, and such like.

21. The Popish Church abuseth the ignorant, to make them believe they can cast out devils, whereas they have no such power, neither by all their prayers or fasting, can they conjure out one unclean spirit, unless they have first as sorcerers and witches conjured him in.

26. There is no reason by this text, why the clergy should be exempted from tributes, and obedience unto princes, more than all true Christians, who are the children of God, as well as they. Our Saviour Christ therefore, doth exempt himself only, as the Son of God, and King of Israel, not his Apostles and Ministers also. You most shamefully abuse the words of Hierom clean contrary to his meaning. For he speaketh not of the clergy only, but of all Christians: nor saith, they are free from tribute paying to earthly princes, but his meaning is, that they render not their tribute, that is, due obedience to Christ the king. His whole sentence is this. "Christ oweth no tributes, as the king's son, but he which had taken upon him the humility of the flesh, ought to fulfil all righteousness. And unhappy are we, which have our name of Christ, and do nothing worthy of so great majesty. He for us, both bare the cross, and paid tribute; we for his honour, pay no tribute, and as the king's sons are free from tasks." His meaning is, that we ought to yield all subjection, which is signified by tribute unto him who endured the cross for us, and became subject to worldly power for us. Chrysostom upon the 13. of the Romans saith that this commandment of subjection, extendeth to all men, both Priests and Monks, and not only to secular men. "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers: Although



thou be an Apostle, although thou be an evangelist, although thou be a prophet, or whatsoever thou art: for this subjection hindereth not piety." *Epist. ad Rom. Hom. 23.*

27. I marvel at your modesty, that you write so sparingly of Peter's prerogative wherein your author is so rank, but you know right well, that no man of mean judgment acknowledgeth that book of questions to be Augustin's, or any man's of like antiquity, learning, and judgment. The payment of tribute for Peter, is a sign of subjection, not of superiority. But he that boasteth himself to set in Peter's chair, will pay no tribute, but rather exact tribute of Kings and Princes.

## CHAPTER 18.

1. Chrysostom noteth it as their error and infirmity, that they imagined Peter to be preferred before them, as well in payment of the tribute, as in other matters. Hierom upon this place, saith: "By the equality of the price, they thought Peter was preferred before all the Apostles, which in payment of tribute, was matched with the Lord. Therefore they ask, who is the greater in the kingdom of heaven, and Jesus seeing their thoughts, and understanding the causes of their error, will heal the desire of glory, with the contention of humility." But by Mark it appeareth, that this contention began in the way, before they came into the house, where Christ appointed Peter to pay tribute for them both, therefore not upon that occasion. *Mark 9, 34.*

10. Calvin doubteth not of the protection of God's Angels, but whether every one hath a several Angel, appointed for his custody from his nativity, which no place of Scripture doth prove. But sometimes one Angel, hath the charge of a great many men, sometimes many Angels are ready for the defence of one man, and all the Angels with one consent, do wait for our preservation, as in the place noted, you may see the Scriptures cited. Neither doth Hierom mean, that every one hath his several Angel, for he allegeth for proof, the Angel of Ephesus, Thyatira, Philadelphia, and the rest: where if the word Angel were to be understood of heavenly spirits, yet it is one Angel for the Church of a whole city, not for every person.

18. Upon the 16th chap. verse 18, you said, the building was only promised, and consequently the power was not given, but only promised: yet here forgetting yourself, you say, "He gave before this power to Peter over the whole, and now to all their Apostles, and their successors," quoting Hierom and Cyprian, of which neither saith, that he gave Peter power over the whole, but equal power to all his Apostles, as is declared. *Lib. 1, cont. Jovin. Cypr. de unit. Eccl. c. 3.* Hierom, in *ep. ad Heliod.* saith no more, touching this matter, but that "all clergy succeeding the degree of the Apostles, have the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Of which I infer, that all the Apostles had the keys immediately from Christ, and not from Peter.

## CHAPTER 19.

6. Augustin useth the word *sacramentum* generally, for every holy mystery, and we confess there is a great mystery in marriage, yet is matrimony no sacrament of the New Testament, as baptism and the Lord's Supper are, being instituted in Paradise. Therefore in the second place by you quoted, he saith, "a certain holy mystery of marriage, is commended to the faithful." *Chap. 1, 20.*

9. The exception of fornication, leaveth marriage alter divorce, as free as it was under the law. And although Fabiola of her own accord did penance after the death of her second husband, yet was she not compelled to forsake her second husband, nor her marriage judged unlawful by the Church of Rome in that time. Hierom, although he confess it a fault that she married again, yet he excuseth it by necessity of her infirmity, which could not live unmarried, and therefore citeth the saying of the Apostle. *1 Cor. 7.* "It is better to marry than to burn." Neither doth the saying of Paul, *Rom. 7.* hinder the lawfulness of marriage after divorce: for he is no longer a husband who is lawfully divorced for adultery. *Matt. 5, 33.*

11. You pervert the words of Augustin, clean contrary to his meaning. "All men take not this saying, but they to whom it is given; for they to whom it is not granted, either will not, or else fulfil not that which they will, but they to whom it is given do so will it, that they do fulfil it." Augustin's meaning is, that both the will to be chaste, and the power to fulfil that will, is of the gift of God, and not in the power of man. Yet is not the will of man enforced, but either changed into better by God's grace, or else left subject to sinful concupiscence, where the grace of God maketh not free. This is the true meaning of Augustin, for as he saith in Psalm 147, "Virginity in the flesh is but of a few, but in the heart it ought to be of all men." But Origen saith, it is given to all who ask for it: indeed he seemeth to say so much, but yet in the end he addeth, "It is profitable to know what a man ought to ask, that he may be meet to receive." Signifying, that God giveth all things that we pray for, if they be expedient for his glory and our salvation. Hierom upon this place is very plain, although he acknowledgeth virginity to be the gift of God, in them that pray for it, that labour for it, yet he confesseth that it is not in every man's power, saying, "Christ addeth, he can take it, let him take it, that every man may consider his own strength, whether he be able to fulfil the precept of virginity and chastity; for chastity of herself is pleasant and alluring every man unto it, but our strength must be considered, that he may take it which can take it." Origen himself, *Tr. 25, in Matt.* inveigheth against them, which not having regard to men's strength, forbid them to marry. *Hesych. lib. 1, cap. 3.*

12. They that are assured of the gift of chastity unto their lives end, may lawfully

vow or determine of it: but without such assurance, no man can vow continence lawfully. But where the vow is lawful, it followeth not that it was meritorious, and more sure to obtain everlasting life, than the state of wedlock. For eternal life is the free gift of God in Jesus Christ, not the merit of works, whereof the married man by faith, may be as sure as the virgin.

12. In the fifth section you hold that virginity is possible for all men. Whereupon it should follow that this is an absolute precept to all men. For the word is not he that will, but he that can.

The law of God requireth us to love him with all our soul, all our strength, &c. Therefore whereinsoever we are able to show our love to God, we are commanded to do it. But where there is no general precept to all men, as to abstain from marriage, there is a special respect to be had, what every man by God's grace is able to do, and what is most for the glory of God, and that every man when he knoweth, is bound to do. In the 6 *serm. of Aug. de tempore*, is never a word of precepts or counsels.

13. There is great difference between the blessing of Christ, and the blessing of godly men. That good Christians at all times have brought their children to have the Bishop's blessing, you have showed nothing, *chap. 10*, and as little in this that followeth. Rufine nameth divers holy men, at whose hands he had himself been blessed. Hierom bath nothing, but of the prayers of godly men. Theodoret saith, that being a young man, he went with his mother, in the place where the holy man Aphrates remained, and was partaker of the blessing of his holy hand, which afterward he expoundeth to be prayers. And who findeth fault with prayers of holy men, whether they use the ceremony of laying on, or holding up the hands or no? It is the vain superstition of Popish Bishops' blessing, that we condemn, not the blessing or prayers of godly men.

17. Augustin writeth against those who thought they might be justified by a dead faith, which is void of good works, which availeth no man but to his greater condemnation. We teach according to the Scripture, that man is justified by faith without the works of the law, yet by such a faith, as worketh by love and is fruitful of good works. Although our Saviour Christ in this place doth not show how men attain to eternal life, but what perfect observation of God's law is required of them that look to be justified by the works of the law, as the scribes and Pharisees did. Neither that men are able to fulfil the law, but by the righteousness of faith, by which Augustin saith, "these things of the law which could not be fulfilled, are fulfilled by faith. *Exposit. quart. propos. in ep. ad Rom. Num. 19.*"

21. Christ neither commandeth, nor counselleth this perfection to all men, but only to this one, to discover his hypocrisy, and vain confidence that he had in himself, as though

he had kept the law, when he was far from it. *Leo. Serm. 2. de quadrag.* Hilary calleth this a commandment of leaving the world. Chrysostom upon this text, denieth that there is such perfection in contemning money, as is in abnegation of a man's self, in taking up the cross, and following Christ, which is commanded to all Christians. *Gaudentius Brixii. Epist. ad Germanium.* Paulinus who sold all that he had, both his own goods and his wife's, and gave it to the poor, yet forsook not his wife Theresa, and counteth it greater perfection for a man to forsake his goods in affection when he retaineth them in possession. Acknowledging that the leaving of his goods was but the beginning, not the perfection, which our Saviour speaketh of. *Epist. 2, Paulin. et Theras. Severon.*

Hierom upon this chapter verse 27. The profession of Popish Monks, is to leave labour, and all good exercises, to tire themselves with idleness and belly cheer like epicures. In Friar's profession is a fairer show of hypocrisy, but never a step nearer to the true imitation of Christ.

21. Augustin saith not, that thus to follow Christ, is to be without wife, and care of children, &c., for the Apostles many of them had wives, and some had children, and had property, as Peter his house, and John had to entertain and provide for the Virgin Mary: Matthew made a feast of his own goods. Augustin saith, that he himself had loved that perfection, whereof Christ here speaketh, and had sold all his goods, and given them to the poor, and also had exhorted others to do the like, and had some companions: yet preferred not himself before other godly men that had possessions, as some hypocrites did in his time, against whom he writeth. *Ep. 89, Ps. 103, Con. 3.* "There are some that hearing this saying of the Gospel, desired to do so, as also not to marry, nor to be troubled with children, nor to have any abiding place, but to go into a certain common life." Yet placeth he not the imitation of Christ in these things: for rich married men having children, and affairs in the world, may follow Christ by true denial of themselves, and taking up his cross daily, when wandering hypocrites, without wife and children, instead of following Christ in humility and poverty, may follow the devil in lying pride, envy, malice, and many other vices.

26. This is an impudent slander wherewith you charge us, as you do many times, to say, that God can do no more than he hath done or will do: but this we say, that God can do nothing contrary to his own will, word, nature, glory, and yet he is Almighty. *Cap. 17, ver. 1, Tertul. contra Praxag.* In the sacrament we dispute not what God can do, but what he will do according to his word. "Christ hath not taken away the nature of his body, but given immortality to it." *Aug. Epist. 57.* Therefore he will do nothing with it, that is contrary to the nature of it. Neither came he through the door nor through

the stone of the sepulchre, nor through the Virgin's body, although he came in after the doors were shut, and although the Angel rolled away the stone after his resurrection, and he was born of his mother being a virgin.

27. The Apostles left all things in affection, but not in use and possession, as is proved before. *Sect. 10.*

27. To do well in hope of reward, is not to be disallowed, but Christian men must have respect unto the glory of God, and their duty, though they should have none other reward.

28. All the Saints of God shall judge the world, and even the Angels, *1 Cor. 5. 2, and 3.* not to the derogation, but to the honour of Christ, as the members of his mystical body. *Beda in hunc locum.*

29. The Apostles left their wives, none otherwise than they left their houses, and all other things here named, which every man ought to leave and to follow Christ, if they be a hinderance to their calling as Christians, or as the ministers of the Church. *Chap. 8. 3.*

#### CHAPTER 20.

16. No man can write more effectually than Augustin doth against the Popish doctrine of election and free will in that place, whose words be these, and not as you have falsely translated them. "They who have not despised him that calleth, but have followed in believing," now without doubt they have believed willingly, what then followeth? therefore it is neither of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy. It is not because we cannot so much as will, but being called, nor perform our will, except God help us? After one sort God performeth that we be willing, after another sort he bringeth to pass that which we have willed. For that we should be willing, he would have it to be both his and ours, his in calling, ours in following. But that whereunto we have been willing, he alone performeth, that is, to be able to do well, and always to live blessedly. What can be more plain against Popery, then these sayings of Augustin? *Prosper. de voc. lib. 1. c. 22.*

23. A cursed gloss, that corrupteth the plain and manifest meaning of the text. The Scripture never promiseth the kingdom of heaven to them that are worthy of it, by the merit of their works, or that deserve it by well doing. It is the free gift of God, not of works, as Paul showeth *Ephes. 2.* And though God render to every man according to his works, yet he saith not, for the desert of his works. And our Saviour Christ commendeth not the desert of their works, which have fed him in the poor: but allegeth their works, as an open testimony of their faith. For the kingdom was prepared for them before the beginning of the world, by the eternal decree of God, by which they were chosen in Christ to the praise of his glory, and created to good works, *Ephes. 1. and 2.* and all reward due to

good works, dependeth upon the mercy of God, and not upon the merit of the work. *Euseb. Emis. Dom in Quinq.* Neither doth Chrysostom speak of greater or lesser merits, but of greater virtues and more excellent works. For albeit God give greater reward to greater virtues, yet it followeth not, that any virtue deserveth or meriteth. For the virtues, works, and rewards, are all and every one the free gifts of God. Hierom hath some words sounding to such a thing, yet not merits or desert: but his judgment upon deliberation, is to be taken out of his books against the Pelagians. "Our righteousness consisteth not of our own merits, but of the mercies of God, lib. 1. Righteousness is not in man's merit or desert, but in the grace of God, which accepteth the faith of believers, without the works of the law." Before the Pelagian heresy, maintaining the power of free will and merit of works against the free grace of God, did trouble the Church, divers of the Fathers were not so wary and circumspect in their words and phrases, as afterward they saw it was necessary for them to be: For the Pelagian heretics took hold of such terms and forms of speech, and alleged the sayings of the ancient Fathers, against their true meaning and right judgment, as of Hilary, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Hierom, and Augustin himself, as testifieth Augustin *de nat. et gratia, cap. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67.*

#### CHAPTER 21.

8. Your Palm Sunday procession is horrible idolatry, and abusing of the Lord's institution who ordained his supper to be eaten and drunken, not to be carried about in procession like a heathenish idol. But it is pretty sport, that you make the Priest that carrieth this idol, to supply the room of an ass, on which Christ did ride. Thus you turn the holy mystery of Christ's riding to Jerusalem, to a May-game and Pageant play. And yet you say, "such service done to Christ, is undoubtedly exceeding grateful, yet no less grateful, than that was done by his disciples," at this time mentioned in the text. Your argument and proof is none, but your bare asseveration. That which his disciples did, had the warrant of the Holy Scripture; but who hath required these theatrical pomps at your hands? or what word of God have you, to assure you, that he accepteth such will-worship? who detesteth all worship which is according to the doctrines and tradition of men, and not after his own commandment. *Mat. 15. Isa. 29. Deut. 12. 32.*

9. Holy words profanely abused, of them that expect a third coming of Christ in person, which the Scripture doth not teach, that maketh mention of the two comings of Christ, the one in humility to our redemption, the other in glory to judgment. And as for the attention and devotion of the people, that you speak of, they can have none of those matters which they understand not. And though some have a blind and superstitious affection, yet the common sort be walking

about the Church, and prating, even in Mass time, until the tingling of your sacring bell call them to worship your idol.

13. The temple was not builded properly and principally for sacrifice, but for prayer, as both this text doth testify, and Solomon in his prayer at the dedication of the temple, 1 *Reg.* 8. The external ceremony of sacrifice without faithful prayer, was nothing worth, but prayer without sacrifice was always acceptable unto God, *Psal.* 50.

16. The children that by instinct of God's spirit, cried in the temple, Hosanna in the highest, spake in the Syrian tongue which they understood, and also knew that they saluted our Saviour Christ as their Messias, whose coming they were taught according to the Scriptures to look for, although they understood not distinctly all mysteries of Christ's office, which none of his Apostles did thoroughly know, at this time. Therefore this is a beasty conclusion of yours, *ergo* prayers not understood of the party, are acceptable to Christ. If you urge the words of the Psalm, which nameth infants and sucklings that can neither speak nor understand, the meaning is not, that they praise God with their voice: but that the providence of God, to his great praise, is manifest out of their mouths, to whom he hath provided meat before they were born, and in that great weakness and ignorance, taught them to take it for their sustenance, and call for it in their crying voice, when they lack it. So that our Saviour Christ out of that text reasoneth from the less to the more, if God ordained his praise out of infants and sucklings, that cannot speak or understand, how much more out of these that can speak and have some understanding?

22. In respect of our own unworthiness, we are utterly out of all hope to obtain any thing that we pray for, and therefore pray not at all in respect of our worthiness, but we pray in faith of God's promises, which of his free grace, he hath made unto us, for the worthiness of Christ Jesus. Neither must we doubt of the expedience of those things which he hath promised, and will perform in time and manner, which by his wisdom he seeth to be convenient. But for such particular things, as he hath made no express promise to grant them, we must pray with submission of our request unto his will, nothing doubting, but he will grant whatsoever is for his glory, and our benefit to receive. If we were worthy, we need not humbly intreat his mercy, but challenge all things of his justice.

23. Though Heretics run unsest, yet we have inward calling of God, and outward calling of the Church, which is sufficient to warrant our ministry, both to ourselves, and to all true members of the Church of Christ, though the malignant brood of Antichrist will not acknowledge our office and calling, to their own confusion.

#### CHAPTER 22.

5. This is rightly noted, if you meant the true Church of Christ, but your intent is of

traitorous reconciling to Antichrist, and the see of Rome.

11. He that hath not good works, hath not a true, lively, and only justifying faith. The visible Church, hath both elect and rebroate in it. But the Catholic Church invisible, which is the body of Christ, consisteth only of God's elect, the true members of his body. This you know right well, but that you are disposed to slander us, wheresoever you can take occasion to blind the ignorant, by ambiguity, generality, or double understanding of any word.

21. Civil princes and magistrates, ought not to usurp ecclesiastical offices of preaching, ministering the sacraments, excommunication, or such like: but they ought to provide by laws, that these things be done according to the word of God, and to punish the offenders. The saying of Osius, cited by Athanasius, is against Constantius, that would determine by his imperial authority, contrary to the scriptures and the consent of the general council of Nice, that Christ is not eternal God equal with his Father. In such cases, nothing is to be yielded to temporal princes. Likewise, where the emperor would have a Church granted to the Heretics, Ambrose was not to yield, because it is against the word of God, that heretics should be allowed their assemblies: yet of the place of their assembly he saith, "Willingly I will never forsake the right, being compelled, I have not learnt to resist." And where he saith, a good emperor is not above the Church, he meaneth, he hath no authority to alter any article of faith, or rule of religion and doctrine, given to the Church by God. But he is over the Church to protect it, to maintain the truth of faith and religion by his authority, and to punish all offenders, whether they be of the estate ecclesiastical or civil. And therein he serveth God, as Augustin saith of Kings, when he doth those things, which none can do but Kings. *Ep.* 50. "He serveth as a king," saith he, "in making laws, commanding just things, forbidding the contrary, as Ezechias served God, destroying the groves and temples of idols. What man well in his wits, would say to kings, take no care who in your kingdom maintaineth or oppresseth the Church of your Lord God, let it not pertain to you, who within your dominion, will be religious or sacrilegious." So did Constantine the great call councils, and sit in them himself, *Euseb. de vitu Const. lib.* 1. and *lib.* 3. *Eccles. hist. lib.* 10. *cap.* 5. Athanasius himself was commanded by him, in causes pertaining to his duty, and clearing of himself from crimes objected in a council called by the emperor, *Socrates, lib.* 1. *cap.* 27. 28. 31.

30. Our Saviour Christ speaketh not of the state of the souls departed at this time, but after the resurrection, and therefore your argument is a most absurd conclusion, even like your doctrine. Christ doth not in all points, compare the Saints after the resurrection of Angels, for then they should be invisible, and without bodies, as the Angels are:

but in that they have no need, or use of marriage. Beside, it is false that you say, the Angels may be present in every moment where they list, for they cannot be in more places at once, than one: neither are they where they list, but where God appointeth them. *Didymus de spiritu sancto, lib. 1.*

30. True virginity, such as Paul commendeth, resembleth the Angels, and thereof spake the ancient fathers not of the filthy life of your popish cloisterers, and unchaste priests, who in not marrying when they cannot live chastely, resemble the devils, who are also unmarried.

32. The Saints departed out of this life, still live unto God, yet are they in the scripture oftentimes called dead men, and even in this place of the resurrection of the dead. Therefore it is no dishonour, to call them as the scripture calleth them. But it is a great dishonour to them, to honour them as idols, and to rob God of his honour, to bestow it upon them, as Papists do, who in a manner in all things, match them with Christ our only Saviour, which is only worthy of all honour and glory. *Apoc. 7. 10.*

40. We say not, that all the Law and the prophets depend upon faith only: but contrariwise we say with Paul, "The Law is not of faith, but the man that hath done those things shall live by them, *Galat. 3. 12.* Yet this we say with Augustin, "The Law commandeth, and faith obtaineth," *de nat. grat. cap. 16.* Augustin saith upon this text, "It may be rightly said, that the commandments of God pertain to only faith, if that faith be not understood to be a dead faith, but a living faith, which worketh by love." *De fide et operibus cap. 22.* But if any man fulfil the Law, he shall be justified by works without faith, which seeing no man is able to fulfil, the just shall live by faith. *Galat. 3. 11.*

#### CHAPTER 23.

2. Augustin saith not, that God preserveth the truth of the Christian religion in the Apostolic See of Rome, but showeth that so long as the truth of Christian religion is maintained, we must not depart from the unity of the Church for the evil life of the teachers or Bishops. He answereth an epistle of a Donatist unto Generosus, wherein was declared the order of Bishops, in a certain city, from Donatus the author of that schism. Whereupon Augustin saith, "If the order of Bishops succeeding one another be to be considered, how much more certainly and indeed wholesomely do we number from Peter, to whom bearing the figure of the whole Church, our Lord saith, upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not overcome it: for to Peter succeeded Linus," &c. He nameth the Bishops to Anastasius, among which he saith, there was never a Bishop that was a Donatist, "but out of Africa, they sent one ordained, who governing over a few Africans in the city of Rome, enlarged the term of Montenses, or Cuzupitæ. But into that order of Bishops, which is brought from

Peter himself, unto Anastasius, who now occupieth the same chair, although any betrayer had crept in, in those times, it should not have prejudiced the Church, and innocent Christians, for whom our Lord providing, saith of evil prelates or governors: Do ye those things which they say, but do not those things which they do." These be his words, by which his meaning is plain, that the wicked life of teachers infecteth not the whole Church, nor any innocent Christian, but that so long as they sit in Peter's, or Moses' or Christ's chair, that is, teach that which Moses, Christ, and Peter taught, they are to be heard, and the unity of the Church not to be forsaken for their evil life. He saith not, that whosoever shall be Bishop of Rome, cannot err in doctrine; or, we may safely believe whatsoever the Bishop of Rome saith, because he sitteth in Peter's chair. For Christ biddeth not the Jews to do whatsoever the Scribes and Pharisees said, for they said Gorban, which was contrary to God's commandment, *Matt. 15.* and many other things contrary to God's Law, *Matt. 5.* but only so long as they sat in Moses' chair, and taught the same doctrine which Moses delivered in the Law: for they sat not in Moses' chair, but in their own chair, when they taught their own traditions, and false doctrines.

3. Augustin speaketh against a railing Donatist, who called the Apostolic chair, with which the Catholics in Africa had communion, the chair of pestilence; being able to charge the Bishops that succeeded therein, neither with false doctrine, nor with evil life, which if he could have done, the fault had been in the men, not in the chair. Neither doth he speak only of the See of Rome, but also nameth expressly the See of Jerusalem, and consequently understandeth all the Churches planted by the Apostles, which retained the purity of doctrine delivered by the Apostles. Therefore he writeth thus: "But if all throughout the whole world, were such as thou dost most falsely accuse them, what hath the chair of the Church of Rome done unto thee, in which Peter sat, and at this day sitteth Anastasius, or the chair of the Church of Jerusalem, in which James sat, and at this day John sitteth, to whom we in the Catholic unity are knit, and from whom with wicked rage, you have separated yourselves: why callest thou the Apostolic chair, the chair of pestilence?" &c. In the second place which you cite, where Augustin saith, that our Saviour Christ, by the chair of Moses, figured his own chair, it is evident, that by the chair, he meaneth not the place where he sat when he taught but the doctrine which he taught. Therefore not the dignity of the See of Rome, but the dignity of the doctrine of Christ, wheresoever it be taught, and the continuance, consent, and unity in the same, is commended by Augustin: not appropriated to the see or bishop of Rome, any longer than the bishop of Rome teacheth the doctrine of Christ which is the chair of Christ and of Peter. It is not the wicked life of the Pope only, nor

principally, that declareth him to be Antichrist, but the doctrine of devils, which he holdeth, and the exaltation of himself in devilish pride above Christ, and all that is worshipped: while he arrogateth more to himself, than he alloweth to Christ, as in his wicked doctrine of pardons, dispensations, and such like. For under his Bull he pardoneth that for which the passion of Christ did not make satisfaction, as you hold, and dispenseth against the law of God, commandeth idolatry, and communion under one kind, directly against the commandments of God and Christ, &c.

8. In the Popish Church, the Pope is your master, of whom you learn, that you learn not of Christ: and though you did all agree in your heresy, you were never the nearer, but the further from the truth. Nevertheless, there hath been and still are great dissensions among you: as of the authority of the Pope, and of the general Council, questions not yet defined among you. But neither Luther, nor Calvin, desired to be credited any further than the word and doctrine of Christ did warrant them: neither is their authority otherwise esteemed of us, but so far forth as it is agreeable to the Holy Scriptures. And whereas you have one vicar, he is the vicar of Satan, whose doctrine he maintaineth, in prohibition of marriage and meats, in commanding of idolatry, and countermanning of Christ. But Christ never appointed any vicar general, but such as he himself is, even his Holy Spirit the comforter, by whom he is still present with his Church, unto the end of the world.

10. It is a slander of Wicliff, and of the godly in his time, though some persons, imagine such degrees and titles, to be here forbidden. But such doctors, masters, and fathers are forbidden, as be authors, teachers, begetters of new doctrines, and religious persons, as Francis, Dominic, Layola, and such like.

13. The Priesthood of the law was of God's institution, and therefore our Saviour Christ, as Cyprian saith, kept the honour that was due unto the Priests, but not as you say, in that he never reprehended the Priests, by that name. For so Cyprian saith not: And you forget at least the Priest that passed by the wounded man. *Luke 10, 13.* And was it no reprehension of the Priests think you? when he said, that he should "suffer many things of the high Priests and be slain of them," *Matt. 16, 21.* Yet he findeth no fault with their name which the Scripture gave them, no more do we with the name of Priest, as it cometh of Presbyter, and signifieth an Elder: but as it is commonly used for a sacrificing priest, such as the ministers of the New Testament are not. But rather the ignorance and wicked life of your Popish Clergy, hath made the name contemptible to most, and odious to some, that know the true etymology thereof.

15. God's great curse light on them, that teach a faith void of good works, to be enough for a Christian man. But you that teach all

good works, what proselytes do you make by your Circumcellion Jesuits, and Seminary Priests, compassing sea and land for them? Somervil, Parry, Throckmorton, Savage, Babington, and the rest of those murdering spirits, right children of hell, and of Satan that was a murderer from the beginning.

19. Gifts bestowed upon the Church, to the maintenance of true religion, be sanctified by dedication unto God: but gifts offered in superstition and idolatry, are accursed as the idols are. Popish altars that are set up to overthrow the altar of the cross, are not holy but cursed. And so is all that pertaineth to them. Neither have they protection of the Lord's altar that was in the temple, which was a figure of Christ's only singular true sacrifice once offered, and that never can be sacrificed again, as Augustin saith. "Neither did the altar of the temple sanctify by touching, for then the murderer which took hold of the horns of the altar, should be sanctified, whom God commanded to be drawn from thence and executed." *Exod. 21, 14, 1 Reg. 2, 28.* Neither if any man had offered any other gift than that which God commanded, had the gift been made holy by touching the altar, for it was the ordinance of God, by which the altar sanctified the gift, and not any quality in the altar. The saying of Theophylact, being a late writer in comparison of antiquity, is not so greatly to be regarded: whose words although they seem to be plain for transubstantiation, seeing he saith, Panes, the loaves of bread by divine grace, are turned into the Lord's body: Yet considering he was a Bishop of the Greek Church which never accepted the Popish heresy of transubstantiation, his meaning is not of any change in substance, but in use, of such bread as was offered by the people for the communion, and to the relief of the poor. You are sick of the disease of the Pharisees, which was covetousness, as Chrysostom and Theophylact note by magnifying the gifts of the altar.

21. By this we see, that in swearing by creatures, we cannot avoid swearing by God, yet this doth not justify swearing by creatures. For as the author of the imperfect work that goeth under Crystostom's name, saith: "he maketh himself an idolator, whosoever sweareth by any thing else beside God, and sinneth double, first, because he sweareth, and then because he maketh him God, by whom he sweareth." *In Matt. Hom. 12.* Swearing by creatures also is condemned by Bede, *in Matt. 5.*

29. To garnish the Sepulchres of the Prophets moderately without superstition, is not evil of itself, but this hath commonly been the manner of hypocrites by the subtlety of Satan, to persecute the Prophets while they live, and to make idols of their bodies when they are dead.

#### CHAPTER 24.

5. Luther and Calvin neither named themselves Christ, nor challenged any part of

Christ's office, or honour to them, but the Pope doth both: advancing himself above Christ, in his blasphemous pardons and dispensations, and in controlling of Christ's institution.

14. The Spaniards have procured these good preachers of the gospel, to pick a quarrel to spoil, and by murdering of infinite thousands, to despoile those countries. Witness their own countryman and fellow in religion, Bartholomæus Cassaus, in his Spanish Colony. Benzo the Italian in *hist. Novi orbis*. The like zeal of religion caused them to attempt invasion of this land. But God hath rewarded them according to their wickedness.

15. This Hippolytus was not that ancient Martyr, of whom Hierom writeth, but a later fantastical fellow, full of fables concerning Antichrist. That he should be no man, but a devil in the shape of man, that John the Evangelist shall come with Enoch and Elias, before the coming of Antichrist, that Antichrist shall bring devils with him in the shape of Angels, and command them to carry him up to heaven, with such like stuff. Yet he doth not expound this abomination, of the abolishing of the Mass, or the sacrifice thereof, nor speaketh of either of them: but flourishing in words, foresheweth the abolishing of all Christian religion, which shall never be, for Christ will continue with his Church to the end of the world.

22. Chrysostom hom. 77. interpreteth this place of the calamity of the Jews, which should have been all destroyed, through the great hatred and indignation of the Romans, and the text is plain, agreeing with his exposition. Yet is the time of Antichrist but short, in comparison of the eternal kingdom of Christ, as the whole time, between the ascension of Christ and his second coming, in the same respect, is called short. But that the reign of Antichrist shall be but three years and a half, is neither said of Daniel nor John: For in the same time, that John calleth forty-two months, in the same Chapter he calleth three days and a half, and afterward twelve hundred and sixty days, and a time, times, and a half time, that is half a propheticall week, for the comfort of the godly. Yet may not these days and years, be counted after our usual measure of time: for that were absurd and impossible.

23. Then believe not the Papists, for they draw the Church from the fellowship of all nations, to one city of Rome, or to a piece of Europe as the Donatists did to a part of Africa.

26. The Church of God had no glorious show in the sight of the world, for three hundred years after Christ, when they came together in secret places, to serve God. Therefore the glorious pomp of Popery in Italy, Spain or France, is not the bright and clear authority of the Church, whereof Augustin speaketh. The Church wanted not for three hundred years together after Christ, but in the midst of the hottest persecution, retained the same bright and clear authority among all true Christians.

29. You have said, that the persecution of

Antichrist, should endure but three years and a half, but you are never able to prove it of usual years, therefore it is no blasphemy to say, the Pope is Antichrist, though his tyranny hath continued almost a thousand years. But rather it is blasphemy, to say the Pope is God's Vicar: for that importeth God and Christ to be absent from his Church. Otherwise the Holy Ghost supplieth the want of his bodily presence, until he come again to judgment.

30. Hierom and Bede say, either the sign of the cross, or a banner of triumphant victory. The author of the imperfect work in Matthew by conference of the other Evangelist saith, "That the sign of Christ, is the very body of Christ, which is to be known, by the sign of his body, of them that crucified him." But if it be the sign of the Cross, it shall be no confusion to them that have abhorred the superstition and idolatry, committed with the sign of the Cross: but rather to them which overthrow the true Cross of Christ, that is, the virtue of Christ's sacrifice offered upon the Cross, which is the only glory of all true Christians: which thing the Papists do, by setting up many altars and a new sacrifice.

#### CHAPTER 25.

1. They that have a dead faith, void of good works, whether the lamp signify faith or charity, shall not be admitted into the kingdom of heaven.

8. Christians are in the favour of God, through the merits of Christ Jesus. Their justice consisteth not of their own merit, but of the mercy of God. *Hierom. cont. Pelag. lib. 1.* When the reward shall come, "he will crown his gifts, not thy merits." *Aug. Psal. 70. conc. 2.*

20. The will, the work and the fruit thereof, and faith from whence it floweth, are all the gifts of God, and no merit of man. Our Lord and Saviour, according to his mercy, saith Didymus, giveth us all things that may bring us to salvation, *Lib. 2. De. Sp. sanct. in fine.*

31. This kingdom is prepared for the elect of God, who if they live until, by hearing of the word of God, they may have faith, they are always fruitful of good works, though not of these here named. For Lazarus the beggar was not able to feed, clothe, or harbour Christ, yet was he full of faith, patience, humility, prayers, &c.

34, 41. Augustin, as he confesseth in his retractions, having to do against the Manichees, which held that men were of evil will, by creation of the evil god, defendeth the freedom of will from coercion by nature, and not from the thralldom of sin through the first man's fall. For even in the same chapter, he writeth upon the saying of Paul, I see another law in my members, resisting the law of my mind, and bringing me captive under the law of sin, which is in my members: "It is manifest that this came of the propagation of the first sin of Adam, and of evil custom." That they have all goodness only of God, in the same place he showeth where he saith, of those that by free will have received the faith of Christ. "They have confessed their sin, repented, displeased

themselves, such as they have been, and have pleased him, being such as they were made by him."

35. You falsify Augustin, he hath no such saying upon that Psalm, but contrariwise he saith, "This is the sacrifice of praise, to give thanks to him of whom thou hast what good soever thou hast; and by whose mercy, whatsoever evil thou hast of thine own, is forgiven thee." Against merit of works he is plentiful upon that Psalm. "The widow bought as much for two mites, as Peter leaving his nets, as Zaccheus giving half his patrimony. The kingdom of heaven is so much worth, as thou hast;" meaning, that God regardeth not the value of the work, as an equal price, for the kingdom which he giveth, of his mere and free grace, to his elect.

42. A lively faith that doth justify, is always fruitful of good works, as Augustin saith, "A good life is inseparable from the faith which worketh by love." *De fide. et oper. cap. 24.*

#### CHAPTER 26.

8. That which the woman did by special instinct of the Spirit of God, was by God's appointment necessary to testify his burial to be at hand. As for the cost bestowed upon the Popish Sacrament; suppose it were the same body of Christ, yet having no manner of use of such things, nor he requiring any such thing to be bestowed on it, were lost, and might be much better employed on the poor; whom from this time forward, he commandeth to be fed, clothed, harboured in his stead. For he shall not say, whatsoever ye bestowed upon the Sacrament, Altars, Churches, &c. But, whatsoever ye did to any of these little ones, ye did it to me. On Churches whatsoever is more than for convenience and comeliness, were better bestowed on the poor that need it.

10. The work which the woman did by special instinct of God's Spirit, was a good work, but not meritorious. As for the superstitious works of them that beautify idolatry with their riches, is neither good, nor meritorious. That which Ambrose did, the Popish Church will not do: for he brake the vessels used in the mysteries, to redeem the captives, and saith, "The Church hath gold, not to keep it, but to give it out, and to help in necessities. What need we to keep that which helpeth nothing?" Yet with Papists, gay and precious shows help much to devotion. Yet Ambrose saith further in the person of Christ. "The sacraments require no gold, neither do they please me in gold which are not bought with gold; the ornament of sacraments, is the redemption of captives." If the Papists break their chalices, it shall be rather to maintain war against the professors of the Gospel, than to redeem Christian captives out of the hands of the Turks and miscreants. Where you say the poor were best relieved, when most was bestowed on Churches, it is untrue. God's name be praised, the poor that be impotent indeed, have better provision for them in such places as the Gospel is received, than ever they had in Popery; as the Hospitals erected for the

orphans, widows, aged, and diseased, are a plentiful testimony.

11. This vain new-found gloss, is confuted by Augustin's authority, upon the same word, *John 12. Tract 50.* "He spake of the presence of his body; for according to his majesty, according to his unspeakable and invisible grace, it is fulfilled which he said, I am with you always unto the end of the world. But according to the flesh which the Word took upon him, according to that he was born of the virgin, according to that he was apprehended of the Jews, that he was nailed to the tree, that he was taken down from the cross, that he was wrapped in linen clothes, that he was laid in the sepulchre, that he was manifested in his resurrection, you shall not always have me with you. Why so? For he was conversant with his disciples forty days, according to the presence of his body, and they waiting on him by seeing, not by following, he ascended into heaven, and he is not here: for there he sitteth at the right hand of the Father. And he is here, for he departed not in the presence of his Majesty. According to the presence of his Majesty we have Christ always: according to the presence of his flesh, he said rightly to his Disciples, But me you shall not have always." Hierom upon this place saith; "Methinketh he speaketh of his corporal presence." Bede also upon this place writeth; "He saith he will not always tarry with his Apostles in presence of his body, whom he never left in power of his divinity." And upon *John 12.* he saith; "Christ should remain with them but a short time corporally." The ancient fathers understood this, not of the manner of his presence, visible or invisible, but of the presence of his body indeed, neither ever heard they of that fantastical exposition.

13. The good works of Saints may be recorded and set forth in the Church to the honour of God, without their holydays and commemorations. For Christ instituted no holyday of Mary Magdalen, nor any such matter, as the Popish commemorations are, nor commanded any image of her fact to be made, but a memory by preaching the gospel.

20. That he sat down with the twelve, it followeth not, that only the twelve were present at the Paschal lamb, but that all the twelve were present: yea by the institution of the Sacrament of the Paschal lamb, where it is commanded that none of it be reserved, it is manifest that there were more of his Disciples present, beside the twelve. For thirteen persons could not eat a lamb of a year old, and not being satisfied with that, have other meat to make up their supper, as it is plain by dipping the sop in the platter, that there was other meat than the roasted lamb, which had no sauce or broth, but herbs. Therefore, all this fantasy of the new sacrifice, and transmutation of bread and wine, into his body and blood, with the order of Priesthood there given them, this foundation of only twelve present, being overthrowen falleth to the ground. And where you say, the order of priesthood was given them at this Supper, other of your fellows think



not, till after his resurrection, *John* 20. 21. And there you hold that they were not full Priests until then.

26. Here are many words of the institution of a sacrifice, continuance of Christ's Priesthood in the oblation of the same, a new death of Christ in the Sacrament, concomitance, &c. but no argument out of the text, no authority of other places of Scripture, no testimony out of the ancient Fathers alleged for them: yet are we condemned of ignorance, not to understand nor to know the Scriptures, nor the power of God. Yet we be not so dull witted, but we understand what you mean by your sacrifice, transubstantiation, concomitance, and other such profane novelties and vanities of voices, which the Scripture knoweth not, nor you are able to show one iota of the Scripture for them. But let us consider the parts of this note. You say here is instituted both a sacrifice and a Sacrament, though the Scriptures give neither of these names to this action. As though our contention were for the name, rather than for the thing itself. The one you say we accept in a sort, the other we utterly deny, without all reason or religion. The name of Sacrament, because it signifieth that which this action is made by Christ, as we find in the Scripture, namely a holy sign, we accept with good reason and religion, and in such sort as the ancient fathers of the Latin Church, from whose tongue, this name of Sacrament is borrowed did acknowledge this action to be a Sacrament. In such sort as the ancient fathers did call this action a sacrifice by a *Metonymy*, improperly, because it is a memory of the only sacrifice of Christ's death and by *Synecdoche*, because the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving is offered to God for the redemption of the world in the celebration of this action. In this sort, we do not utterly deny the term of sacrifice. But in such sort as the Papists take it to be a sacrifice propitiatory, wherein the natural body and blood of Christ, are offered to God the Father by the priest in his mass, for the sins of the quick and the dead, howsoever the matter in compass of strange words and phrases be shrouded, to hide the horrible blasphemy therein contained, we utterly deny the name of sacrifice, because no such thing was instituted by Christ, but it is manifestly contrary to the Scriptures. And this I think is good reason and religion, to deny that which is not, and is feigned to be, to the derogation of the glory of our redemption, by the only sacrifice of Christ. Thus much for the name: now for the thing. You say it was instituted for the continuance of the external office of Christ's external Priesthood according to the order of Melchisedec. This is a false surmised end: for the continuance of Christ's Priesthood, is only in his own person, and passeth not from him, as the Apostle saith *απαβατον χειρι*, &c. He hath a Priesthood that passeth not by succession, therefore, he is able for ever to save those that come unto God by him, always living, that he may make intercession for them, *Heb.* 7. 24, 25. This is a continuance of his Priesthood, according to the order of Mel-

chisedec. As for that profane novelty, of the external office of Christ's Priesthood, because the Scripture teacheth it not, it is to be hissed out of the Church of Christ. The Apostle in the chapter before named, referring to Christ, whatsoever of Melchisedec pertained to Christ, maketh mention of no such external office. Beside that, this feigned continuance, of the external office of Priesthood, is contrary to the Scripture. Which teacheth, that the Priesthood, after the order of Melchisedec, is proper only to Christ, who is the eternal Son of God, without father in respect of his manhood, without mother in respect of his Godhead, having neither beginning of his days, nor end of life, which can agree to none but to our Saviour Christ, *Heb.* 7. 3. Therefore your Popish priesthood, challenging the continuance of Christ's external office of Priesthood after the order of Melchisedec, is a horrible blasphemy against the eternal Priesthood of the Son of God. Further you say, "It is a sacrifice, in that it is ordained to continue the memory of Christ's death and oblation upon the Cross." So indeed the Fathers do figuratively and improperly call it. And this were tolerable, if you would proceed no further. But you add, "that it is a sacrifice, to continue the application of the general virtue of Christ's death to our particular necessities by consecrating," &c. Whereby you mean transubstantiation of the elements, into the natural body and blood of Christ. But the Scripture teacheth us, that the Holy Ghost, through faith, applieth the benefits of Christ's death unto us for our redemption and salvation, and not the Priest by his Mass, *Rom.* 8. 2. *Gal.* 3. 13. 4. Where you say, moreover, that the "wine is consecrated into his blood apart, as shed out of his body," &c. you overthrow your own position of the unbloody sacrifice, which you say, you offer without shedding of blood. Again you say, "in this mystical and unspeakable manner, he would have the Church to offer and sacrifice him daily." But Christ never gave out any word, whereby you might gather that he would such a thing. Beside, the Scripture is plain, he would not any such sacrifice of himself, to be offered by others, which did not oftentimes offer himself, for then he should have died often, but once for all, and found by that one oblation, eternal redemption, and made perfect for ever those that are sanctified, *Heb.* 9. 12. and 25 and *cap.* 10. 14. Therefore he needeth not to be offered by any other. And where you say, that in mystery and Sacrament he dieth, it is contrary to the Scripture, which saith, he dieth no more, *Rom.* 6. 9. For seeing, for Christ's presence in mystery and Sacrament, you admit no figure, I cannot but understand a horrible mystery of Christ's daily dying in your Sacrifice of the Mass. But if you say the dying in Sacrament is figurative, it will follow, that the presence in sacrament is also figurative. And touching your high point of concomitance, which you say we understand not, where you said, the wine is "consecrated into his blood apart, as shed out of his body, &c. which was the condition of his

person, as he was in sacrifice and oblation:" I demand of you, whether the blood that was shed out of the body of Christ upon the Cross, was by concomitance, his whole body and soul, manhood and God? if it were not, why then in your sacrifice is that in the cup, by concomitance, not only the blood, but also the body of Christ, his soul, manhood, and God-head?

When you come to the Sacrament, as a matter of small moment, in comparison of the Sacrifice, you knit it up in two lines, not expressing what it is in deed, but affirming of it, that in deed it doth not. For not the Sacrament, "but the thing or matter of the Sacrament," as Augustin calleth it, which is the body and blood of Christ, feedeth our souls. This Sacrament therefore is a holy sign, and seal of our spiritual nourishment unto eternal life, by the very body and blood of Christ, which is the spiritual matter, represented by this sign, and who giveth grace, which is not received of any, but unto eternal life. Augustin in *John*, Tr. 26. Where you add the condition of receiving it worthily, it is contrary to your own principle, that Sacraments, of the work wrought, do give grace, so the receiver doth not withstand. But there is more required of him that shall receive worthily than not to withstand.

25. Here is wrangling about words, to no purpose, where the one Evangelist saith, he blessed, the other saith, he gave thanks. Yea, the same Evangelist saith, of the one part of the Sacrament, he blessed, of the other part, he gave thanks: therefore to bless and to give thanks, in this place, is all one: and seeing thanksgiving is not referred to the bread, no more is blessing. For if the Evangelists had meant to refer it to the bread, they would have added an accusative case, as Luke 9. What then? do we mean none other blessing or giving of thanks, than we do in saying grace at our ordinary refectons? Yes verily. We mean solemn blessing, which is praise and thanksgiving, by which the creatures are prepared to this holy action, as Oecumenius writeth: agreeable with the saying of the Apostle Paul, and of the ancient Fathers Justin, Ireneus, Cyprian, not meaning the whole consecrating to consist in this blessing or thanksgiving, but a part only: nor as you say, in that blessing, with the words following, which you understand to be none but these, "This is my body?" but in the whole action, according to Christ's institution: whereunto are required, taking, eating, drinking, showing of the Lord's death. *Theoph. Alexan. Epist. Pasc.* 1. But where you join blessing with the words which you call of consecration, to make it his body, you dissent from other elder Papists, which hold, that these words only, without any blessing, but with the Priest's intention, do make the body of Christ.

26. If you be better advised, now to take in blessing and thanksgiving, I hope you will shortly consent, to admit eating, drinking, and showing of our Lord's death, to be parts of the consecration.

Ambrose, whom you cite, speaketh of the Sacrament which is received. "This Sacrament which thou receivest, is made by the word of Christ. And by these Sacraments, Christ feedeth his Church, by which the substance of the soul is strengthened."

Augustin also, *Ep.* 59. saith, "Prayers are made, when that which is upon the Table, is blessed and sanctified, and broken to be distributed. In the sanctification and preparation of distribution of this Sacrament, I think the Apostle commanded prayers properly to be made. Which things being ordered, and so worthy a Sacrament being participated, thanksgiving concludeth all." Therefore neither Ambrose nor Augustin understand your magical kind of consecration, by crossing and murmuring of words with one breath, within which you conclude your Popish consecration.

26. Damascen, although he lived in a corrupt time, meaneth not Transubstantiation, which was not invented in his time, but the spiritual and supernatural change of the elements in the faithful receiver, into the divine food of our souls which is the flesh and blood of Christ, as appeareth first by his comparison, of the like change of the water in baptism, by grace of the Holy Ghost, into the laver of regeneration. He saith, "To the bread and wine which we are accustomed to eat, he hath joined his Godhead, and made them his body and blood, that by things accustomed, and that are according to nature, we may be conversant in things which are above nature. His body is truly united to the Godhead, the body which is of the Holy Virgin. Not that the same body which was taken up into Heaven, cometh down, but that the same bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of God. If you require the manner how it is done, it sufficeth to hear that it is done by the Holy Ghost, as the Lord, of the holy mother of God, by the Holy Ghost made flesh to subsist to himself, and in himself." These words declare his meaning to be of a spiritual and supernatural change, not of a corporal change of the bread and wine, whereunto he saith Christ hath joined his Godhead, that by eating of bread and drinking of wine, which be things accustomed and natural, we might be acquainted with things supernatural. But if his words of transmutation, or changing, do seem to import a Popish Transubstantiation: Then mark these words, in which he useth the term *μετεωρα* which, if there be any Greek word for Transubstantiation, might signify the change of being or of substance. Yet he taketh it for communion. For exhorting men with earnest affection to come to the Communion, he saith: "Let us be partakers of that divine fire coal, that the fire of the desire, which is in us, taking firing of that coal, may burn up our sins, and lighten our hearts, and that by participation of the divine fire, we may be fired and deified." No man doubteth, but this whole speech is figurative: and so is the rest. Cyprian's words are these, "This bread which our Lord did reach unto his disciples, being changed not in shape, but in nature, by almighty power of the word, is made

flesh: and as in the person of Christ, the humanity was seen, and the divinity was hidden, so the divine essence hath unspeakably infused itself into the visible Sacrament, that devotion might be into religion about the Sacrament, and a more sincere access unto the truth, whose body the Sacraments are, might be open unto the participation of the Spirit." This author, by change in nature, meaneth not change of substance, but of the qualities or properties of natural bread, whose nature is to feed the body, whereas this bread is made to nourish the soul. Therefore he saith, "That which meat is to the flesh, faith is to the soul: that meat is to the body, the word is to the spirit. Therefore the eating of this flesh, is a certain earnest affection and desire to continue in him. When we do these things, we prepare not our teeth to bite, but with sincere faith we break and divide: this holy bread." The undoubted Cyprian, for the author of this work is uncertain, in his *Epistle ad Magnum, lib. 1. Ep. 6.* expressly calleth the Lord's body bread moulded together of many grains, and his blood wine, which is pressed out of clusters of grapes. *Lib. 2. Ep. 3. Cocilio,* he saith, "The blood of Christ is not water, but wine." These words are plain against Transubstantiation.

Neither doth Ambrose, by the change which is wrought in the Sacrament by the words of Christ, mean the Popish pretended change: for of the bread and the wine, when they are consecrated by the word of God, he saith: "If there were such force in the word of our Lord Jesus, that those things began to be, which were not: how much more effectual in working is it, that they may be still which they were, and also be changed into another thing." An example hereof he giveth in every Christian man: "Thou thyself wast, but thou wast an old creature, but after thou wast consecrated, thou beganst to be a new creature." Here the change is manifest, not in substance, but in quality. And even in the chapter by you cited, his words are evident to declare, that he speaketh of no Transubstantiation. For after he hath said, that our Lord Jesus, contrary to the order of nature, was born of a Virgin, he addeth: "It was the true flesh of Christ that was crucified, that was buried: therefore this is truly a Sacrament of that flesh. Our Lord Jesus crieth out: This is my body: before the blessing of the heavenly words, it is called another kind: after consecration, the body of Christ is signified. He himself saith, it is his blood: before consecration, it is called another thing: after consecration, it is named blood." Also, by the same argument, of the supernatural generation of Christ by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, he proveth the truth of regeneration, where there is no change of substance, but in qualities and conditions. Therefore in the one Sacrament he meaneth no more Transubstantiation, than in the other. *Rebanus Maurus de instit. Cler. lib. 1. cap. 31.*

26. The text is plain, he said, "This is my body, This is my blood," to declare, that he gave o the faith of the worthy receiver, his very body and blood, by those outward elements of bread

and wine, which are figures and signs of his body and blood. And therefore, though he said not, "This is a figure or sign of my body and blood:" yet he said in the same sense, "This Cup is the New Testament in my blood." By which form of speech, he declared, that the visible element is a sign or seal of the New Testament established in his blood, shed on the Cross, and not converted or turned into his blood. For his natural blood is not the New Testament in his blood, neither is the Cup properly, but figuratively, the New Testament. Wherefore it remaineth, that it is a Sacrament, that is, a holy sign and seal of the New Testament, confirmed by the death and bloodshedding of Christ. And so the ancient Fathers mean, when they call the bread a figure or sign of his body, and not the outward forms or accidents of bread, separated from the substance of bread, for of that monster they never heard. Tertullian against Marcion, which denied Christ to have a true body, writeth thus, "The bread which he took and distributed to his disciples, he made his body, saying, This is my body, that is, a figure of my body, now it had not been a figure, except he had had a true body. For a void thing, which is a fantasy, could not have a figure. Or if he feigned the bread to be his body, because he lacked a true body, he ought to have delivered the bread for us. It would have made for Marcion's vanity, that the bread should have been crucified." These words of Tertullian declare, that he meaneth the bread to be a figure of Christ's true body, and not the accidents of bread. For if this fantasy of Transubstantiation, had been thought of in those days, Marcion would have taken hold of the abolishing of the substance of bread, to prove the body of Christ to be only in form or show, and not in deed, as the bread which is turned into it is. He might have confirmed his heresy, that the world was not created by God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, seeing he did away the creature of bread, to make it his body. Tertullian *Lib. 5* saith "By the Sacrament of the Bread and the Cup now in the Gospel, we have proved the truth of our Lord's body and blood, against the fantasm of Marcion." Augustin saith: "For of that it is written, that the blood of a beast is the soul of it, beside that I said, that it pertaineth not to me, what becometh of the soul of a beast, I may also interpret that precept in a sign. For our Lord doubted not to say, This is my body, when he gave the sign of his body." *Cont. Adimant. cap. 12.* The blood of a beast is a sign of the soul, or life thereof, so is the bread a sign of the body of Christ. What place is here for accidents of bread, to be called the sign of his body? except you will say, the accidents of bread were forbidden in the Law, and not the bread itself. But bread itself, as a sign of the life of the beast, was forbidden to be eaten, as bread is given to be eaten, as a sign of Christ. Other ancient Fathers are also in plain words directly against Transubstantiation, as Chrysostom, in *Epist. ad Casarium*. Theodoret, *Dial. 2* Gelasius Bishop of Rome *contra Eutychem*. All these in plain words af-

firm, the substance of bread and wine to remain after consecration.

28. The blood of Christ was not mystically shed in the Sacrament, but as it is mystically present. The Apostles and Evangelists using the present tense for the future, do signify, that the passion of Christ was even at hand. And therefore your vulgar Interpreter, according to the sense, hath truly translated the word, by the future tense. For it is not only said, that his blood is shed, but it is added, for many, unto remission of sins, and his body is broken, which was not but on the Cross. For if the blood of Christ was shed for the remission of the sins of the world in the Sacrament, the passion of Christ was needless: and so to establish your blasphemous sacrifice of the Mass, you make void and frustrate the most glorious and only sacrifice, propitiatory for sins, offered by our Saviour Christ upon the Cross. *De remiss. pec. Lib. 1. cap. 5.*

29. Vain shifts against the plain truth of the text, and the evident words thereof. The demonstrative pronoun this, declareth, that he spake of the wine in his hand. And so the ancient fathers have always taken it. Clemens Alexandrinus saith: "That it was wine which was blessed, he showeth again, saying to his disciples, I will not drink of the fruit of this vine." *Pædagog. l. 2. cap. 2.* Cyprian upon these words of the fruit of the vine, which he calleth the creature of the vine, inferreth: "In which part we find, that the cup which our Lord offered, was mixt, and that it was wine which he called his blood." *Ep. 65. Cæcilio.* Chrysostom also upon the same text, saith: "He meant to pull up by the roots a certain pernicious heresy, of them which use water in the mysteries, so that he showed, that when he delivered this mystery, he delivered wine, and now after his resurrection, in the bare table of the mystery, he used wine. He saith, of the fruit of the vine, which truly bringeth forth wine, and not water." *Math. Hom. 83.* Seeing Christ therefore delivered wine, as the text and the Fathers say, your three causes are vain. For the Sacrament is called bread and wine, because it is so indeed, although it be also called the body and blood of Christ, as it is indeed, after a spiritual manner, to the worthy receiver. But to examine your causes a little; you say, "Paul nameth it bread, because it was so before, as Eve is called Adam's bone." But Eve was not called Adam's bone absolutely, but bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh. And that she was indeed, at that present, in respect of her body, for I suppose you will not say, her soul was made of Adam's bone. Likewise in your second example: Aaron's rod devoured their rods; Moses calleth it Aaron's rod, that it was when he wrote, namely a rod, and the Sorcerers' rods were not true Serpents, but in show. Augustin saith of Aaron's rod. "The thing was called by that name, from whence it was turned, and into which it was returned again, therefore it ought to be called that which it was principal-

ly." *Quæst. sup. Exod. lib. 2. Quæst. 21.* Your third example of water turned into wine, is most impertinent: for there it is expressed, both what it was before the turning, and what it was after. Your second forged cause, "for that some things are called as they appear, and not as they are, as Angels are called men," is also unlike your matter, for the Angels that appeared, were not fantastical shows or accidents, but they appeared in very bodies, as of men, which they assumed for the time, as it is plain by the text. Your third cause is also vain: "that the Sacraments should be called bread and wine, because Christ is the true bread and wine, feeding us in body and soul unto eternal life:" for Paul nameth it bread, in them which eat it unworthily, to their condemnation.

41. Watching unto prayer is commended in this place; and in many other of the Scripture. And therefore in the Primitive Church they had set times of watching in prayer. But your Vigils, that is, holy day eves, and nocturnes, that is a certain task of Psalms, and other prayers, are rather mockeries of watches and prayers, than either that which Christ willed his disciples to do, or the Primitive Church used: although you say your religious persons use them still.

75. If you allege this for the Rock of the Church, there hath been enough said upon the 16th Chapter. If for: washing away his sins, to insinuate that his tears were a satisfaction of them: the same Ambrose saith again in *Luc. cap. 22.* "I read his tears I read not his satisfaction."

#### CHAPTER 27.

24. They that execute godly laws, against Popish traitors and heretics, be in no danger of Pilate's condemnation.

40. You must first prove, that Christ is as verily present in your popish singing cake, as he was present on the cross, and had by many arguments approved himself to be the son of God, or else your comparison is vain and ridiculous.

46. Calvin blasphemeth not, but honoureth our Saviour Christ, when he saith that he suffered in soul the wrath of God due for the sins of the world: which also he began to suffer in the garden, when he felt no torment of body, but yet was in such an extreme agony, that his body did sweat drops of blood, which was not fear of bodily pain or death only, for then he had been of greater infirmity than many of his servants, which through faith in him, have rejoiced in both. Therefore it was the burthen of sin, which he bare, and the curse of God due unto sin, which he took upon him, to deliver us from sin, and the punishment thereof, and not only the bodily pain of death, that enforced him that was God, to complain that he was forsaken of God. As for the triumph over hell gained by his death, Calvin doth not deny, and what by Scripture you can prove, of the descent of his soul into hell after his death, it shall be yielded unto you.

59. The honour done to Christ's dead body, was no doubt grateful, as a token of their faith and love towards him, but meritorious you cannot prove it. Hierom speaketh not of the laying of the Sacrament on the altar in the corporal: for there was no such laying and wrapping of it in Hierom's time. But he speaketh of a spiritual understanding, which afterwards he expresseth when he saith, "He wrappeth Jesus in a clean sindon, which shall receive him in a pure mind." Of the ministrations of the Lord's Supper he saith, "None is richer than he which carrieth the Lord's body in a wicker basket, and his blood in a glass." And if it be Silvester's constitution as you say, that the corporal whereon our Lord's body lieth, must be pure lincn: why do you lay it upon a gilt pattern, and carry his blood, which by concomitance you wot is his body also, in a gilt chalice? You have a certain poke for reservation: whether you call it corporal, or corporax, lined indeed with lincn, but the outside is silk, gold, silver, and pearls, &c. How doth that, and even your Pix and Canopy, agree with Silvester's constitution? I would also have marvelled, why you lay the body of Christ, as it was buried, but that you told us before, that he dieth in mystery and Sacrament, and therefore belike

he must be wrapped in the corporal and buried. But the decree is as truly Silvester's, as it is true that the same authors affirm, that Constantine was baptized by him after he was cleansed of a leprosy: which the ancient histories prove to be false, *Euseb. in vita Constantine, lib. 4.* who was present at his baptism in Nicomedia, as seemeth by history, *tripartit. lib. 3. cap. 12.*

## CHAPTER 28.

1. The cause of the women's coming, is expressed in the text, to finish the office of solemn burial, which they intended, and were interrupted by the Sabbath. Their desert the Scripture doth never make cause of God's free gift. The visitation of the Sepulchre in Hierom's time, was not for merit, as merit is accounted of Papists, but by sight of the place, to stir up their minds to the consideration of the benefits of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection, as the place you cite out of Hierom doth testily, little favouring popish superstition.

20. An impudent slander. We neither say nor think, that the Church hath failed many hundred years till Luther and Calvin: but we do constantly believe, that it hath always continued, and always shall continue, to the end of the world

## ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT OF MARK'S GOSPEL.

The book that Philo did write, is of a sect of Jews, not Christians, such as Josephus describeth the *Esses*. And Hieronym confesseth, that he writeth it as in praise of his own nation. *In Mar.* Who also saith, the life of all Christians, at that time, was such as Monks in his time endeavoured to be, so that they had no special order of Monks in that time, except all Christians were Monks. Epiphanius saith, this book of Philo, was intituled, *παι ιεωανων*, which name, though he labour to draw to Christians, by his conjectures, as though it were derived of Jesse, David's father, or of Jesus, before the name of Christians was published from Antiochia: yet is it most like that Philo meant the same, whom Josephus calleth *Essenes*, and even that description of them, which Eusebius transcribeth out of Philo, though he would draw it to Christians, is plain enough for that sect of the Jews, and unlike to the profession of Christians, except in certain ceremonies, of praying, fasting, and such like, which the Jews and especially the sect of the *Essenes*, observed. "For they had (saith he) the written books of men of old time, which being Actors of their sect, left them many monuments of the form of allegorical interpretations." Which though Eusebius do understand of the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists: yet it is certain, that the Apostles and the Evangelists, being many then living, or not long before that time when Philo did write, could not be called by

him *παλαιοι ανδρες*, men of ancient time. Therefore as Epiphanius and Hierom saith, they were common Christians of that time, or else as it is most like, a sect of Jewish *Essenes*, somewhat like indeed to Popish Cloisters.

The See of Alexandria, by the Council of Nice, without any respect of Mark sent thither by Peter, was judged equal to the See of Rome. For if they had had respect to Peter, they would have preferred the See of Antioch where Peter himself sat, rather than Alexandria, where Mark sent by Peter, did sit. The fixt Canon is plain. They decree, "that the ancient custom be observed, that the Bishop of Alexandria, have the oversight of the churches of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, because the Bishop of Rome hath the like authority of the churches near the city," which Rufinus called *Suburbicarius l. 1. c. 6.* Indeed Leo of Rome, could not brook the decree of the general Council of Chalcedon, by which the Bishop of Constantinople was not only preferred before the bishop of Alexandria, but also made equal with the bishop of Rome, and therefore writeth to Anatolius Bishop of Constantinople, to dissuade him, as also to Marcian the Emperor, and to Pulcheria the Empress, to have the decree staid, but for all his gainsaying and labour against it, the Council decreed it. For in matters of discipline and government of the Church, the fathers of Chalcedon knew, they had as great authority

as the fathers of Nice. Or as the fathers of Constantinople the first, where the like decree was made without any interruption or contradiction of the Romish See, which now in the time of Leo had gotten great stomach, and therefore could not away with it. No marvel then, if Gregory, coming after Leo, did not well allow it. Yet *lib. 5. ep. 60.* he is content, that in as much as Mark was sent to Alexandria by Peter, he himself being Bishop of Rome, should seem "to have authority over the seat of the disciple, for the master's sake, and the Bishop of Alexandria should have authority over the seat of the master," that was Rome, "for the disciple's sake." This was greater modesty, than any of his successors would ever show. In the other Epistle, you quote *lib. 6. ep. 37.* He acknowledged three

Sees of Peter, all equal in Principality, Antioch, Rome, and Alexandria. And whereas Eulogius of Alexandria, had ascribed as much to himself, as sitting in *Peter's Chair* even by Gregory's confession, as he did unto Gregory: he answereth in these words, "And whereas special honour by no means doth delight me, yet I rejoiced greatly that you gave unto yourself, the same that you bestowed upon me." Thus was Gregory a more fellow-like bishop than those that came after him, which can abide no man to sit in *Peter's chair*, but themselves, no man to have principality of dignity, or special honour, but themselves. Thus while you will needs bring in the dignity of Peter's disciple for his sake, unawares you have given *Peter's chair* of Rome a mate.

## THE ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON MARK'S GOSPEL.

### CHAPTER 1.

4. Forgiveness of sins is only in Christ: yet was the baptism of John, a true seal of forgiveness of sins by Christ, as the baptism of Christ's disciples was. The preparative to Christ's Sacrament, by which sins were indeed to be remitted, be your own words, and none of Augustin's: who was indeed deceived, because he supposed, that some were baptized again by Paul, which had received John's baptism, which the text rightly translated, doth not say: yet, he concludeth the matter in these words: "Yet lest any man should contend, that even in the baptism of John, sins were forgiven, after some larger sanctification to be given by the baptism of Christ, unto those whom Paul commanded to be baptized again, I do not greatly strive."

5. Ye are never able to prove, that Christ did institute any sacrament of penance.— John, by his doctrine and baptism, which was the seal thereof, prepared a way to Christ, but not to the baptism of Christ, for he preached not his own baptism, but the washing away of our sins, by Christ: therefore, he, also, was a minister of the baptism of Christ.

5. If he heard a particular confession of sins, of so many thousands as he baptized, he needed to have exercised his office more years than he did months.

8. Christ baptized none with water, John 4. 2. Notwithstanding, the baptism with water by his ministers, is necessary, if it may be had according to Christ's institution; neither doth Calvin teach otherwise. But if it cannot be had in them that are prevented by death, the lack of water shall not deprive God's children of their inheritance. *Ambrose de obitu Valentin. Imper.* doubteth not of the salvation of the Emperor, which was slain before he was baptized. "But I have heard," said he, "that you are grieved, because he received not the sacrament of baptism. Tell me, what other thing is there in us, but a will, but a request? The just, by what death

soever he be prevented, his soul shall be in rest." And the example of Martyrs, which were slain before they were baptized, *who, if they be washed in their own blood, this man's will hath washed him.* And the text of John 3, maketh no more for the necessity of water, than the like John 6, for giving the Communion to infants, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man," &c.

12. Blasphemy: Christ was free from sin, and, therefore, needed no repentance. But if to solve the matter you say, that doing penance is nothing but fasting, and such exercises of an austere and straight life, then with you there may be doing of penance without repentance, and sorrow for sins. And so your doing of penance, is not that *μετανοια*, changing of the mind, whereunto John and Christ exhorted. *Matthew 3. 4.*

15. No Christian man doth preach faith only, without repentance, or void of good works, though they preach, that faith without works doth justify

### CHAPTER 2.

5. Seeing sickness cometh for sin, men in sickness ought first to repent of their sins. For the sacraments without repentance, do nothing avail, in them that be of years of discretion. But when they are truly penitent of their sins, to confirm their faith in the promises of God concerning the remission of sins, they may desire the sacrament of the Lord's supper: other sacraments, for men baptized, the Church of God doth not acknowledge.

10. The Son of Man did forgive sins properly, as he was God; his Apostie, by assuring men of God's forgiveness, as God's ministers, did also forgive sins. *Matt. 9.*

10. God only forgiveth sins absolutely and properly: his ministers follow the sentence of God's word, in binding and loosing, remitting and retaining of sins, or else they lose their labour. And though their sentence be given before the day of judgment; yet it is accord-

ing to the sentence that God had before them, gave in his holy word, by which they know who is to be bound, and who to be loosed. *Hierom. in Mat. 16, Mat. 9.*

## CHAPTER 3.

10. Christ did heal them that touched him by faith; otherwise only touching of him, or his garments, was no benefit to any that were void of faith, *Ambr. in Luke, lib. 5. c. 8.* Judas kissed him, the soldiers stripped him, the high Priest's servants smote him, the people thronged and pressed him. But they touched him, saith Bede who received his faith and love in a true heart. *Mark lib. 1. c. 3.*

12. Of them that preach the truth, we may hear the sermons; and if their prayers be good, we may be partakers of their prayers. For, why should we judge them heretics that preach the truth, and pray rightly? If they be heretics closely to themselves, they hurt themselves and not us, which communicate with the truth which they profess openly; and not with heresy, which they hold privily. But if they preach heresy, though they preach some truth among, as all heretics do; the weak shall do well to forbear their sermons, and all men ought to refuse communion or fellowship in prayers and sacraments with them.

16. Peter is not always named first, for Paul nameth James before him, *Galat. 2. 9.* and *1 Cor. 9. 5.* he nameth him last of all the Apostles. And albeit, when the twelve are named, Peter is named first, it proveth no greater authority of Peter, than of a foreman of a jury, who is called first for order sake, yet hath no power or authority over his fellows. So was Peter a foundation stone and all the twelve were the same, as you confess upon the 14th verse of this chapter. Of Peter's primacy, *Matt. 16.*

33. That the Virgin Mary never sinned, not so much as venially in all her life, is a blasphemous heresy against our Saviour Christ Jesus: Who came to save that was lost, and had his name for because he should save his people from their sins, *Matt. 1.* Who did not unjustly reprehend her. *Luke 2. 49.* and *John 2. 4.* It is contrary to the Scripture in many places, "there is no man that sinneth not," saith Solomon, *2 Reg. 8. 46.* "There is no difference," saith Paul, "All have sinned, and are deprived of the glory of God, being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ." *Rom. 3. 23.* What were the authority of Augustin, against these and many such so clear testimonies of the Holy Scripture? But in truth you do falsely ascribe this heretical saying to Augustin, who hath no such assertion. But when the Pelagians named a great many holy men and women, who as they said, sinned not, and last of all the mother of our Lord and Saviour, which they said, it was necessary unto piety, to confess, to be without sin; Augustin answereth, "except of Virgin Mary, of whom I will have no question, for the honour of our Lord when we talk of sins. For whence

know we that more grace was given to her to overcome sin of all parts, which obtained to conceive and to bring forth him whom it is certain to have had no sin. This Virgin then excepted, if we could have them together all those holy men and women when they lived, and have asked whether they were without what think we they would have answered?" In this speech, we see, although Augustin will have no question of her sin, yet he doth not affirm that she never sinned. And elsewhere, he utterly overthrew the ground of this your heresy, affirming that she was conceived in original sin; "What is more undefiled, than that womb of the Virgin, whose flesh although it came of propagation of sin, yet it conceived not of the offspring of sin. *De genes. ad liter. lib. 10. cap. 18. Fulgen. de incarn. and gr. c. 6. Procopius. Anselmus lib. 2. Cur. Deus homo c. 16.*

39. That all sins are pardonable, except the sin against the Holy Ghost, we see it plain by the text: that any sin shall be forgiven after death, which is not forgiven in this life, no logician in Rhemes, can conclude in a true syllogism, either out of *Mark*, or *Matt. 12. 32.*

## CHAPTER 4.

11. You slander Bede, he saith not so. For how should heretics be brought to the Church, if they did not profit by reading and hearing? How was Augustin when he was a heretic, brought to be a Catholic, but by reading and hearing of Ambrose, as he himself confesseth? Bede's words are these, "To them that are without, and come not near to our Lord's feet, that they may be partakers of his doctrine, all things are done in parables, both the works and the words of our Saviour; for neither in those wonders which he wrought, nor in those secrets which he preached, they are able to know God, therefore they are not meet to attain to remission of sins, which is to be attained by grace of this faith." Of these words it is plain, that Bede spake not of every one that is out of the Church, but of obstinate despisers of the truth, which will not become scholars to our Saviour Christ.

12. We need not fear lest in these speeches God be made author of sin; for he withdraweth his grace from the wicked, and giveth them over to a reprobate mind, not as an evil author but as a righteous judge: and both those sayings are true. They have shut their eyes that they should not see, &c. And to them without, all things are in parables, that seeing they may see and not see, &c. For those that maliciously and obstinately refuse his grace offered, God will not have them to see that they may take it. And Christ revealed the truth to his Disciples, not because they were worthy, but because through God's grace they were willing to learn.

31. We hold not, that the Church hath more and more decayed, or been obscured since the Apostles' time until ours, for we know it was spread further, and acknowledged in a greater compass of the earth four or five

hundred years after the Apostles' time, than it was in the Apostles' age. But that it is drawn unto a smaller number since Mahomet in the East, and the Pope in the West have seduced great nations, he is wilfully blind, that will not acknowledge. As for the truth it was most perfectly known in the Apostles' times, albeit in matters necessary unto salvation, it was never obscured from the faithful members of the true Church of Christ, in any age.

#### CHAPTER 5.

28. When Christ dispenseth the miraculous gift of healing by touching of his garment, or his Apostles, or their napkins, or their shadow, the good Catholic conceiveth hope to be healed by such means. But since the gift of miracles is ceased, to look for help or holiness of such things, it is superstition, or tempting of God. Chrysostom in that place quoted, speaketh of the miracles done in the Primitive Church by the Apostles, and other which had the gift of working miracles in those times. That which Basil saith is this: He showeth that the death of all the Saints of God, that is of all true Christians, is precious in the sight of God, as the Psalmist saith. And although by the Jewish law, he that toucheth a dead body, was unclean, and must wash his garments; "Yet now," saith he, "he that hath touched a martyr's bones, receiveth a certain participation of sanctification, of the grace, that rested in the body: therefore precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his Saints." By touching a martyr's bones, he meaneth not superstitious touching, for which you abuse his words, but such touching as is necessary in them that bury the Saints, or gather their bones together for burial, after they be burnt, or otherwise dispersed by their persecutors. As it is manifest, by the Jewish pollution by touching, which was the office of burial, forbidden to the Priests. And the participation of sanctification which he nameth, is the holy communion or fellowship that Christians have, with the Saints departed in the Grace of God, whereof they were partakers in their life. Whereof they declare themselves to be partakers, which exercise such offices of charity, towards the bodies and bones of the Saints and Martyrs departed. And this is the right meaning of Basil's words, which you have perverted both in sense and translation. For what honour he thought meet to be given to the martyrs, he testifieth in the Homily upon the martyr Gordius. *Hom.* 48. "It is the most ridiculous thing that can be when the righteous despised the whole world, that we should take upon us to set forth their full commendation, of a few things which they contemned. Therefore a remembrance is sufficient for our perpetual profit. For they have no need of any increase to their glory; but a remembrance is needful for us, that we may imitate or follow them." In these words Basil declareth, that all other ways of honouring the martyrs and

Saints departed, than by imitation, are vain and superfluous. And that a remembrance for imitation, is sufficient for us to take perpetual profit by them. As for grace or virtue that is in their bones, to communicate to them that superstitiously touch them, is far, both from his words, and from his meaning.

30. While the gift of miracles continued in the Church, it is true that the grace and force of them came from our Saviour. But that by relics or garments of Saints, Christ worketh miracles at this day, is more needful to prove, than to show whence the grace and force of them doth come. Except you will avouch all the feigned miracles rehearsed in your legends, and the books of Saints' lives to be true: by this argument Christ can work miracles by relics and garments of Saints, *ergo* there is no question to be made, but all miracles of the legend were as truly done, as those that be recorded in the Gospel.

36. You would bear your sottish disciples the Papists in hand, that we have no better arguments to prove justification by faith only, without the works of the law, than these words of our Saviour, only believe. And therefore you draw our Saviour's words to be like a common inconsiderate speech of ours, when the physician saith, only have a good heart, where other things are necessary. But although the question of justification in this place, be not handled specially nor directly: yet the words of our Saviour Christ declare generally, that to receive any benefit from him, there is required at our hand nothing else but faith, that we may be able to receive it. And yet he meaneth not a dead and solitary faith, but a faith living, and which is fruitful of good works, yet not by the works, but by the faith only, his benefit is received. Hierom and Beda upon this text, extend it to justification by faith, as the very analogy from the body to the soul doth lead them.

#### CHAPTER 6.

3. Christ was God manifested in the flesh, both by the Scriptures and his glorious works. But the supposed presence of his body in the mass-cake, is contrary to the Scriptures, and the truth of his natural body. If you allege the words of Christ, *This is my body*, the Jews had many texts of Scripture, concerning the eternal generation of Christ, and his glorious kingdom, which seemed contrary to the infirmity and humility of his first coming, yet were not, being rightly understood. No more is that text of the presence of his body after a spiritual manner, to the faith of the worthy receivers, contrary to those Scriptures, which avouch the truth of his humanity: whereunto the Popish imaginary presence is contrary, and cannot be reconciled without fables, and feigned miracles, where none is, as Augustin saith, *De trinit. lib. 3. cap. 4.*

5. They wanted faith, which is the only instrument to receive the benefits of God.

9. Barefoot friars, with their sandals, be not so good as apes of the apostles in this their



special commission. Neither doth Augustin speak any thing of them. Their father Francis, was not born scarce a thousand years after Augustin.

13. Mark in declaring their commission, expreseth not that they had power granted to heal the sick, yet it is manifest, both by Matthew, and by that which Mark reporteth of their practice, that they had commission to cure the sick. Even so, although the visible sign of oil is not expressed in rehearsal of their commission: yet it is to be understood by their practice, that it was appointed them, so to use it: and not that they took it up of themselves, by any general commission. And so thinketh Euthymius upon this text.

13. They that have the power granted of God, as the apostles had, may do as they did; but who be they? or where be they now, that have the power of working miracles? But when there was such, these creatures were but external tokens of the grace of God, dispensed by the use of them, they had no miraculous medicinal virtue in them. For none could cure diseases by the same oil that the apostles occupied, out they that had the same gift of healing that the apostles had, and faith as the apostles had. Whereas if the oil had a marvellous medicinal virtue in it, every one without faith might have done the same as with a natural salve.

#### CHAPTER 7.

7. Precepts of men be not only such as be repugnant to God's commandments, but even such as are beside God's commandments, wherein any part of religion, or the service of God is placed. As this washing of hands before meat, and such like of themselves, are not repugnant to God's commandments, and may be used for cleanliness, but not for religion. So the Popish traditions, which they call the traditions of the Apostles and Ancients, and precepts of the holy Church, are either manifestly repugnant to God's commandments, or else superstitious inventions of men, by which God is worshipped in vain; and are nothing like to the decrees of the Council of the Apostles, Acts 15, nor to the doctrine which Paul delivered. 2 Thess. 2. 15. Notes upon Matt. 15. That our ministry and ministration are agreeable to the Scriptures, let the Scriptures bear witness, yea your own conscience and confession by silence; for if anything could have been alleged out of the Scripture against us, it should not have been spared.

11. Christ speaketh of the Jewish altar. The Church of Christ hath none such; therefore, it is sin to give to the idolatrous altar of popery. But to the maintenance of God's religion, it is not forbidden to give, so we neglect not under that pretence, other necessary duties commanded by God.

15. The Church of Christ forbiddeth not meats for religion's sake; but Antichrist attending to lying spirits, and the doctrine of devils, forbiddeth meats and marriages for religion, and in the abstinence placeth reli-

gion and holiness. As for your pretence of obedience, and chastisement, is but lying in hypocrisy, for that there is no chastisement of the body, in change of the meat. And those things which of you are not forbidden, as wines, spices, fruits, &c., are more incentive of lust, than common flesh, which you do forbid. Durand, also, howsoever you would cloak the matter, saith flesh is forbidden, and fish allowed, because God cursed the earth, but not the waters. Matt. chap. 15.

33. Christ's spittle worketh not miracles, but Christ by it, or any other thing whatsoever it pleaseth him, or without any thing, but by his own word, or will, worketh miracles. Therefore, we must not imagine any power or holiness, in ceremonies, or creatures, insensible, to do any thing of themselves, but when it pleaseth our Saviour Christ, to use them to such purposes, as in his Sacraments usually, or in his miracles extraordinarily.

34. The Popish Church doth apishly, and ridiculously, imitate our Saviour Christ, in conjuring out of the devils there, where there is none, and abuseth his holy words and actions, to a superstitious purpose. Neither doth Ambrose speak of exorcism used in the ministration of baptism, although he name a ceremony needless, and not used of you Papists, namely, the touching of the ears of him that was baptized, to signify that his ears should be open to hear the doctrine of the priest: and of his nostrils, that he might receive the good savour of eternal piety. "But the mouth," saith he, "the Bishop toucheth not;" adding a reason why they followed not Christ in touching the mouth, as well as the ears. But that they used spittle, or the Syrian word, *Ephphata*, Ambrose saith not. They had, in that time, many superfluous and burdensome ceremonies of man's presumption, about baptism, and other rites, whereof Augustin complained, and wished that they might be abolished. *Epist. 118, Januarii.*

#### CHAPTER 8.

7. That Christ by his blessing multiplied the loaves and fishes, it is always acknowledged of us. But that Popish blessing of bread, water, candles, flowers, and such like, whereof we have no commandment, nor warrant in the holy Scriptures, we say still, worketh no effect in them, but argueth an antichristian arrogancy in the blessers, which take upon them to add greater virtue or holiness unto them, than God hath given in the right use of them.

22. When our Saviour worketh miracles by touching, we are reverently and faithfully to esteem of it. But superstitious touching of any thing, where we have no word or promise of God, to receive benefit by such touching, we learn not of our Saviour Christ. By faith and the spirit of God, we challenge to obtain that which God hath promised in his holy word. But further to presume, by corporal touching or external application of, I cannot tell, and you are belike ashamed to express what, holy things, without faith

grounded upon God's word, and his spirit tried and proved by the same word, we know it is vain superstition, yea wicked presumption.

35. All the words of Christ and his Apostles, that pertain to the salvation of God's children, though not in number and sound, yet in weight and substance, are comprehended and expressed in the holy Scriptures: which are able to make us wise unto salvation. *2 Tim. 3, 15.* "The Lord of us all, gave to his Apostle," saith Ireucus, "power of the Gospel, by whom we have known the truth, that is, the doctrine of the Son of God, to whom also the Lord saith: he that heareth you heareth me: and he that despiseth you despiseth me and him which sent me. We have not known the disposition of our salvation by any other, than by them by whom the Gospel came unto us, which then indeed they preached, and afterward by the will of God, delivered it in the Scriptures, to be a foundation and pillar of our faith." *lib. 3, cap. 1.* If any thing therefore be alleged, as the Gospel, which is not contained in the holy Scriptures, we may safely say with Hierom, "This, because it hath no authority of the Scriptures, may as easily be condemned, as it is alleged." *Matt. 23.*

#### CHAPTER 9.

4. There may be personal intercourse betwixt the living and the dead, when it pleaseth God, for some special purpose, as in this singular example, and when the dead rose again, at the resurrection of Christ, and appeared to many at Jerusalem: *Matth. 27, 53.* but not when the dead will, *Luke 16, 26.*

13. That Elias shall be a Precursor of Christ in his second coming to judgment, it is boldly affirmed without authority of the Scriptures. That he was in the desert sometime, we find in the Scriptures, but continually he did not remain in the wilderness. And if he had, by so much he had been more unlike to Popish Hermits, of whom many never came in the wilderness, except you count that place, which is a quarter of a mile from a great city, or a populous town, a wilderness. Hierom saith: "It hath been doubted among many, by which of the Monks or solitary men chiefly, the wilderness became to be inhabited. For some fetching the matter far off, have taken the beginning from blessed Elias and John. Of which, Elias seemeth to us to have been more than a Monk, and John to have prophesied before he was born. But other, unto which opinion all the common sort doth agree, do affirm that Antony was the head or the beginning of this profession, which is partly true, for he was not so much before all, as by him the desires of all have been stirred up. But Amathas and Macarius the disciples of Antony, of which the former buried his master's body, do yet still affirm, that one Paul a Theban, was the prince, or first beginner of this matter, which we also, not so much in the name, as in opinion do approve." In these words you may see what principal professors

of Hermits' life, Elias and John Baptist were accounted by Hieronym. Yet the Hermits of his time, were nothing like Popish Hermits but only in name.

33. Heretics may work miracles, to confirm their erroneous opinions, but they cannot prove their erroneous opinions by the Scriptures, *Deut. 13. August. de unitat. ecclesie. cap. 16.* It is sufficient that we prove by the Scriptures which testify of the truth of Christ's natural body, that it is not present in the Sacrament, according to the Popish imagination, which is contrary to the Scriptures, and the judgment of the ancient Fathers. As for lying miracles, such as Papists work, to prove it by pricking their fingers to make it appear bloody, or by sorcery as Marcus the heretic juggled with the cup, "to make it appear purple and red, that Christ might seem to drop his blood into his cup:" we leave to Popish heretics. The word of God is a sufficient warrant for our doctrine, against all false and counterfeit miracles.

41. Reward for alms-deeds, proveth them not meritorious. For the reward is given according to God's promise, and his promise is according to his grace and mercy, and not according to the worthiness of the work: which also is God's gift, and not our merit: and therefore Augustin saith oftentimes, God "in rewarding our works, doth crown his gifts," not our merits. *Psal. 70. Con. 2. Psal. 101.*

#### CHAPTER 10.

4. The Christian Magistrate or Commonwealth, ought to permit no wickedness, which he knoweth and can punish: neither doth the Holy Church tolerate any thing that is "against faith and good life," as Augustin saith. Therefore the Church of Rome, and those Princes and Commonwealths, that permit open whoredom in stews, are not the Church of Christ, nor they godly Princes and Commonwealths, that suffer such gross wickedness, openly and daily committed.

9. Except in the case of fornication *Matt. 5. 32. 19. 9.*

11. Mark, Luke, and Matthew did write all by one spirit, therefore the exception expressed in the one, must needs be understood in the other. Else you may as well say, there can be no separation for any cause as you say, there can be no marriage after divorce for any cause.

19. The perfect keeping of God's commandments procureth everlasting life, but every breach of them deserveth the curse of God. *Galath. 3. 10.* Therefore no man attaineth to everlasting life by keeping of God's commandments, but by the mercy of God in Christ, apprehended by faith without respect of works or merits.

21. This was a special precept to this one person, in observing whereof, he should have declared in part, that he had kept the commandments with such affection, as the law of God required. But in neglecting this precept he declared that he was a carnal worldly man, far from the true love of God and his

neighbours: preferring temporal things before the reward of eternal life. As for the superstitious profession of Popish Monks and Friars, with their blasphemous opinion, to merit for themselves and for others that will pay for it: was far from the meaning of our Saviour Christ. Beside that, not one among a thousand of them, if they have any goods or lands before their profession, do sell them, and give them to the poor, but rather to their friends and kinsfolks, or unto the abbeyes, where they know they shall be wealthy and daintily maintained. The Pope also is good to many, and granteth them capacities to possess temporal goods and benefices, contrary to their former vow.

## CHAPTER 11.

8. You must first prove, that Christ is present in your Mass cake, as he was riding to Jerusalem, in such sort as you affirm. Secondly, if he were so present, seeing he commanded the Sacrament to be eaten; you carrying it about contrary to his commandment, cannot please him with any thing that you do. For now he is to be worshipped, at the right hand of God in heaven, and not upon earth. *Col. 3. 1. and 2.*

16. God cannot abide the profaning of the Church with heretical service, and preaching of heresy and blasphemy, therefore he abhorreth the Popish service and preaching, which is full of heresy and blasphemy. As for our preaching, being justified by the word of God expressed in the Scriptures, and referring all honour and glory of our salvation, to God and Christ only, must needs be far from blasphemy. But Popery giving part of the honour of God and Christ to creatures, and part to their own merits, and ceremonies of their own invention, is both heretical and blasphemous.

17. The sacrifice of Christ's body, was performed once by himself, to the eternal salvation of all his chosen; *Heb. 9. and 10.* And therefore the repetition thereof, supposed in the Popish Mass, is a most horrible blasphemy against the sacrifice and eternal Priesthood of our Saviour Christ. We minister the Lord's supper, according to his own institution. We have nothing to do with any man's invention in celebration of the blessed Sacrament, "The bread which we break is the participation of the body of Christ." *1 Cor. 10.*

26. Though more be required, than only faith, yet only faith obtaineth remission of sins, at God's hand. *Rom. 4. 6. &c.*

## CHAPTER 12.

17. This is a mere slander of godly Preachers, who as well teach the Prince's duty to God, as the subject's duty to the Prince. But Popists forbid Princes to yield that duty to God which they owe to him as Princes; namely, to set forth and maintain his religion by their laws, and to punish all contemners thereof. *Aug. Ep. ad Bonifac. 50.* And the Pope forbiddeth subjects to yield their obedience to their Princes if they displease him: not only those that renounce his heresy, but

even them that agree with him in religion: yea hirerh devilish Monks and Friars to murder them, as the example is manifest in France at this day.

19. A traitorous and heretical note confuted, *Chap. 6.*

21. Whosoever the Doctors deduce any argument out of the Scriptures, as rightly as this is deduced by our Saviour Christ, that it may be concluded in true and lawful syllogisms, out of the words of the Scripture, we acknowledge it to be the word of God, as well as that which is expressed in the text. But not every surmise, or unnecessary collection is warranted by this deduction. Neither would the Doctors themselves be otherwise credited in their collections, than if they be consonant to the holy Scriptures. "In my writings," saith Augustin, "I desire not only a godly reader, but also a free corrector." *De Trinit. lib. 3. cap. 7.* "We ought not to account the disputations of any men, though they be Catholic and praiseworthy men, as Canonical Scriptures, so that we may not, saving the reverence due to those men, disallow or refuse any thing in their writings, if perhaps we find that they thought otherwise then the truth is, being understood by God's help either of other men, or of ourselves. Such am I in other men's writings, such will I that other men be understanders of my writings." *Epist. 111. For Purgatory, Matt. 12. 32.*

24. We interpret the Scriptures, according to the analogy of faith, and confirm our interpretation by authority of the Scriptures themselves, taking the sense of the Scriptures out of the Scriptures themselves, as all true Catholics ought to do, by the judgment of Clemens, cited in the decrees. *Dist. 37. c. relatum.* When the Law of God is read, let it not be read or taught according to the power or understanding of our own wit. For there are many words in the Holy Scriptures, which may be drawn to that sense, which every man shall presume of his own head: but it may not be so. For you ought not to seek a foreign and strange sense without the Scriptures that you may confirm it by any means by authority of the Scriptures; but you must take their sense of truth, or the true sense of the Scriptures themselves. And in the chief matters of controversy between us and the Popists, we have the consent of the whole Primitive Church, and the most ancient and approved Fathers of the same. The power of God how great it is, we know: but we do not acknowledge that he will do any thing contrary to his will and his word. Therefore we do not believe, that his body is present in many places at once, for then he should not be like his brethren in all things, except sin, *Heb. 2. 17.* He should not retain a true body, whereunto our bodies in the resurrection, should be made conformable, *Philip. 3. 21.* yea he should have no body at all, *August. Epist. 57. Dardane.*

33. To the keeping of the law faith only is not sufficient, but perfect piety and charity are required. But to justification of a sinner, that hath not kept the law, faith only is suf

ficient, *Rom.* 4. and 5. yet that faith which worketh by charity.

#### CHAPTER 13.

14. Calvin's doctrine tendeth to none other end, but that God and Christ only might stand in the holy place, and have all that honour and service, which is due to him alone. The Sacraments of the Church, which be of Christ's institution, he acknowledgeth. As for the sacrifice of the Mass, as a horrible blasphemy against the only sacrifice of Christ's death, once offered for ever, he doth worthily abhor. And more properly is the sacrifice of the Mass, the abomination of desolation, which overthroweth the effect of Christ's only sacrifice, and maketh it like the sacrifices of the Law, which being often repeated, could never take away sins, *Heb.* 10. 11. Concerning the testimony of Hippolytus, *Matt.* 24. Cyprian, or whosoever was author of that treatise, speaketh not a word of the sacrifice of the Mass: but the words you take hold of, be these, against the Capernaïtes, which thought they should eat the flesh of Christ, sod, or roasted, and chopped in pieces: "whereas" saith he, "the flesh of his person, if it were parted in gobbets, could not suffice all mankind, which being once spent, religion might have seemed to have been lost, seeing he should have nothing left for sacrifice." His meaning is plain, if the flesh of Christ had been consumed before his passion, he should not have had his body to be offered in sacrifice, for the redemption of the world, and so the Religion of Christ should have come to nothing. For that he knew not your transubstantiation, his words following a little after do testify, where he saith: "The bread is meat, blood, life, flesh, substance, his body, the Church, which must needs be understood spiritually and sacramentally, or else you must make more transubstantiations than one.

20. Neither Daniel, nor John, tell the certain time of Antichrist's reign, according to our measure of time. *Matthæw.* 24. *Apoc.* 11. *Apoc.* 12.

22. We know the ordinary gift of working miracles, is long since ceased in the Church, and we mean not to counterfeit as you do, and long have done. Our faith being approved by the Scriptures, is confirmed by all the miracles of Christ and his Apostles.

#### CHAPTER 14.

6. Neither your authority, nor your cause, is any thing like to Christ's, therefore you ought not to abuse the words of his answer for your private gain. *Matt.* 26.

22. In the same book and chapter, he hath these words, "Thou hast learned, that of bread it is made the body of Christ, and that wine and water is put into the cup, but by consecration of the heavenly word it is made blood. But peradventure, thou wilt say, I see not the show of blood, but yet it hath a similitude. For as thou hast received the similitude of his death, so also thou drinkest the similitude of his precious blood, that there be

no horror of blood, and yet it may work the force of redemption." Also *cap.* 5, of the same book, he reheareth the words of the priest in the Liturgy used in his time. The priest saith, 'Make unto us this oblation ascribed, reasonable, acceptable, which is the figure of the body and blood of Christ our Lord Jesus.'" Lo what a friend Ambrose is to your transubstantiation, corporal presence, communion under one kind, and the sacrifice of the very body and blood of Christ in the mass.

23. The words of Ambrose are impudently falsified, which I have set down truly, ver. 22. 23. *Clemen's constitut. lib. 8. c. ultimo*, which is good authority against you, because you produce him against us, saith, that other were present beside the apostles. *Matt.* 26. And if it were true, that none were present but the apostles, which you say were priests, yet the commandment and institution is for all men to drink, as is manifest by Paul, *1 Cor.* 11. Or else by as great reason, you may say, the commandment to take and eat the bread, pertaineth not to all men, but to the priests only, because such only were present, as you say.

22, 24. We do certainly believe the words of Christ to be true, and his very body and blood to be given us, to be received spiritually. And yet we hold with Epiphanius in the same place, that the sacramental bread is "neither equal, nor like to Christ, neither to the similitude of his flesh, nor to his invisible deity, but is insensible as concerning power, whereas we know, that our Lord is all sense, all sensible, all God, all moving, all working," &c. Likewise we say with Chrysostom, that "this sacrifice is a token and sign of Christ's death: and that when our Saviour Christ delivered this mystery, he delivered wine of the fruit of the vine." Chrysostom therefore was no maintainer of transubstantiation, but of the truth of our Saviour Christ's words, in their right and sacramental sense and meaning. *Matt. hom.* 83.

66. Whether Peter came to Rome, or no, it is certain he feared not all the power of the world that was set against the Gospel.

71. Mark that, in Augustin's words, Peter's primacy and preferment is in order of the apostles, not in degree, honour, dignity, or authority. *Anbr. de incarn. Dom. c. 4. Cypr de unitate Ecclesie. Hierom. cont. Jov. lib. 1.*

#### CHAPTER 15.

11. When the Pope and his Prelates follow the tyranny of the Jewish high Priests, in persecuting Christ in his members, they are rightly compared unto them. And yet the name and office remaineth honourable, as of God's institution. For we acknowledge the singular sacrificing priesthood of our Saviour Christ, and the spiritual priesthood of all true Christians. And according to right etymology, the priesthood of the law of Christ, and of his members, should have another name than that which, in the New Testament, is given to the ministers of the Church: as in Hebrew, Greek and

Latin it hath. But seeing use hath otherwise gotten the upper hand, we contend not about the name. But where you say, the new priesthood after the order of Melchisedec, was begun when the old priesthood of Aaron ceased, it is true, if you understand it rightly, of the singular priesthood of our Saviour Christ, which never passeth from his person, and of which order there is no more, but he. *Heb. 7.* But when you mean thereby your Popish sacrificing priesthood, and that every Popish priest, is a priest after the order of Melchisedec, it is most horrible blasphemy against the Son of God, who only is a priest after the order of Melchisedec. Because as he only is the King of peace, and King of righteousness, so only is without father of his manhood, and mother of his Godhead, without genealogy of his Godhead, having neither beginning of his days nor end of his life, and therefore continueth a priest for ever, and hath no successors in this priesthood, being confirmed to him by oath of the Lord himself, after he hath said unto him, "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Read the 7th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and 110th Psalm, and I marvel if you will not spit in the face of every Popish Priest, that dare open his blasphemous mouth, and say he is a priest after the order of Melchisedec. That the ministry, eldership, or priesthood of the New Testament shall continue to the end of the world, we do acknowledge, and shall have the assistance of the Holy Ghost to teach it all truth, as every true Christian man hath the same promise. *John 16, 13, John 14, 16, and John 15, 26.* But thereof it followeth not that every priest shall always hold the truth, nor that every one that is called a Christian shall continue in true doctrine.

The prayer of Christ was performed in Peter, that in his great and gracious fall, his faith failed not, but brought him to repentance. Our Saviour Christ prayed for all his Apostles, that God would sanctify them in his truth, and for all that should believe in him through their preaching. *John 17.* Yet no man gathereth thereof, that every successor of the Apostles, and every true Christian hath a privilege hereby, that he cannot err, as you would insinuate by Christ's prayer for Peter, that the Pope hath as Peter's successor. Whereas that prayer specially concerneth Peter's person, in respect of his particular danger through his fall: and by analogy all Christians, as well as Peter's successors, who by Christ's intercession are holden, that their faith faileth not in temptation. *Luke 22.* And that Christ saith to all the Apostles, and in them to all true preachers: he that heareth you, heareth me: it is true while they preach nothing but that they have learned of Christ. For otherwise Christ speaketh not in them, nor by them.

15. If it be the faith of Popish Catholics, for all Christian Catholics abhor it, to conspire to murder their prince, to invade their

country with foreign power, to acknowledge the authority of an Italian priest, that hath set forth his Antichristian bull, to deprive their lawful prince of her royal estate, crown and dignity, life and allegiance of her subjects: no Christian judge need to fear, to give sentence against such Popish Catholics, for their heretical and traitorous faith.

30. True Christians say not so, but rather thus: The natural body of Christ can suffer no hurt or contumely: the Popish mass cake, can suffer hurt or contumely: *ergo*, the natural body of Christ is not the Popish mass cake, or the Popish mass cake is not the natural body of Christ.

34. See the answer, *Matt. 27, 46*; and thou shalt plainly perceive, that Calvin hath written nothing that soundeth against the honour of God, and Christ our only Redeemer.

46. This duty was acceptable before God, as proceeding from faith and love towards our Saviour Christ, but not meritorious. Neither is it commended as an example to faithful men, "to use all honour and devotion towards the bodies of Saints, and holy persons," for that were horrible idolatry, to use all honour and devotion, which is due only to God, towards dead men's bodies. But it is an example to use such reverent handling and laying of them up, as is a duty of charity towards the departed, and of faith in the resurrection, without any superstitious worshipping of the bodies. From which Joseph and Nicodemus abstained, though they buried the body of Christ himself, infinitely much more precious than the body of any other holy person. By this simple burial of our Lord, saith Beda, the ambition of rich men is condemned which cannot be without their riches, no not in their grave.

#### CHAPTER 16.

1. Still you plead for *Corban* your offering box, upon which foundation your Church is builded. These women's good will was commendable, but void of merit. And their faith had been a great deal more commendable, if they had not bestowed this cost upon one that was dead, but had waited for his resurrection the third day, according to his promise. There were other causes in his appearing first unto the women, than their charges bestowed in spices for his funeral.

7. A poor prerogative in naming Peter, to build up the kingdom of Antichrist. Although Peter be here named specially, not in respect of dignity, but in respect of his infirmity, because he having most shamefully fallen, was now especially to rejoice at the resurrection of his master, by whom he had obtained recovery from his fall.

12. Christ took upon him none other shape, but the disciples' eyes were holden, that they did not know him, as it is manifest, *Luke 24, 16*, so that the alteration of shape, was in their eyes, not in his body. *Beda, Mark 16 and Luke 24.* What Christ can do in altering his shape, we doubt not, but what he will do or hath done, we must learn out of his word.

16. A fond argument against justification by faith only, so often repeated. That faith which God respecteth only in justifying the ungodly man, is afterward fruitful of good works, which as Augustin saith, *go not before justification but follow him that is justified.* De fide. ct oper. cap. 14.

17. You are in hope to delude the world again with feigned miracles, and therefore you speak of the gift of miracles, as though it were still executed by certain. But if you will obtain credit by working of miracles, you must not bring in counterfeit cranks, out

of whom you have cast out devils, or whom you have made whole, as of late Margaret Jesop, a woman of your religion: But you must bring them that speak with new tongues, that take away serpents, that drink any deadly thing and it shall not hurt them, so shall you declare, that your former works are not feigned and lying miracles, but such as Christ gave power to his disciples to work in his name. And yet if you could do these things indeed, except your doctrine were agreeable to the holy Scriptures, we would hold you accursed.

## ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT OF LUKE'S GOSPEL.

He is buried at Constantinople: to which city his bones, with the relics of Andrew the Apostle, were translated out of Achaia the twentieth year of Constantinus. *And of the same translation also in another place against Vigilantius the heretic:* It grieveth him that the relics of the Martyrs were covered with precious covering, and that they are not either tied in clouts or thrown to the dung-hill: why, are we then sacrilegious, when we enter the Churches of the Apostles? was Constantinus the Emperor sacrilegious, who translated to Constantinople the holy relics of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy: at which the devils roar, and the inhabitants of Vigilantius confess that they feel their presence? *His sacred body is now at Padua in Italy, whither it was again translated from Constantinople.*

The estimation of Saints' relics, in Hierom's time, though it was somewhat excessive, yet it was far from the idolatry and superstition of the Papists. For this he writeth *ad Riparium contra Vigilant.* "But we do not worship and adore, I say, not the relics of martyrs, but neither the sun and moon, not angels and archangels, not cherubin, not seraphin, or any name that is named in this world, or in the world to come, lest we should serve the creature rather than the Creator which is blessed for ever. But we honour the relics of the martyrs, that we might worship him, whose martyrs they are." You see by these words that he alloweth honour, that is, a reverent estimation, but no worship, adoration or service, to be done to the bodies or relics of Saints: when yet it is to be thought, they had the true relics of Saints. Whereas yours are, for the most part, false and counterfeit, to deceive the people and to pro-

cure full offerings. And where you say Luke's body is now at Padua, whither it was again translated from Constantinople, how are you able to prove it? or how is it like, the Emperors of Constantinople, would suffer it to be brought into Italy? The sixth lesson upon Luke's day in your Popish Portius, saith it is still working miracles at Constantinople. But Blondus saith it is at Padua, with Mathias' body, and as like the one as the other. For Mathias hath another body at Rome, *ad Mariæ majoris*, and a third at Triers, besides parts in other places. And a little touch to the report of Hierom, concerning Luke's bones, Gaudentius Bishop of Brixia somewhat elder than he, was persuaded that they were in a Church which he dedicated at Fundi, as appeareth by his sermon made at the dedication, and so was Paulinus Bishop of Nola. *Epist. 12.* He saith they were brought out of Achaia, where Gaudentius saith, he ended his life with Andrew, in the city of Patræ: your Portius saith, he was buried in Bithynia. Hierom saith this translation was in the 20th year of Constantius, you say of Constantinus. And although in his second invective, against Vigilantius, Constantinus is named instead of Constantius through the printer's fault, yet the error is easily discovered, by the ancient chronicle that goeth under the name of Hierom: referring this translation plainly to the time of Constantius, though not agreeing with Hierom in the 20th year, but noting it in the two and twentieth year of Constantius. And might not Vigilantius have replied that Constantius was a sacrilegious Arian? of whose translation, Hierom taketh so great authority, whatsoever the relics were, and whether the devils did roar at their presence or no.

## THE ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON LUKE'S GOSPEL.

### CHAPTER I.

3. Ordinary means, are not to be neglected, but used for the discussing of controversies in Councils, but the holy scripture is the rule whereby the definition must be made, if it be true, as in the Council of the Apostles, Acts

15. But that the Pope is God's vicar, or President of general Councils, or hath any promise, that he cannot err, or any special direction of God's spirit, as the holy men of God had, which did endite the Scriptures, it is never able to be proved. Neither is the

preface, nor conclusion of the author of the second book of Maccabees, any thing like to this preface of Luke; which, though it be directed to one special person, yet it containeth nothing unworthy of the majesty of the Holy Ghost, as those of the Maccabees do. Where the author acknowledgeth his infirmity, asketh pardon, if he have not done sufficiently, writeth to serve the vain delight of men by variety of story: Whereas Luke, as the pen of the Holy Ghost, doubteth not to say, that he hath exactly attained to the truth of all things, and set forth the same to the certain confirmation of the faith, wherein Theophilus had been instructed, which is necessary for every Christian, though it was first written unto Theophilus. Beside, that second book of stories hath many things false, that are disproved by the first book of the Maccabees, and by Josephus, but specially matter contrary to the canonical Scriptures, as a commendation of Razis, for killing himself, 2 *Macc.* 14. It is, therefore, false and blasphemous against God's word, to say, that Luke useth like humane speeches, to the author of that book.

6. Christian men are just indeed before God, though not by their own merit, but by the justice of Christ imputed to them through faith. *Augustin de pecc. mer. and re. lib.* 2. c. 13.

6. Neither of those three things can be proved out of the text. For good men may walk in all the commandments of God, though they can keep never a one perfectly. And faith only in the merits of Christ, is imputed for righteousness to all those that are justified by God without respect of works. *Rom.* 4. Therefore keeping and doing of God's commandments, is not the cause of our justification before God, but the effect and fruit thereof. *Gaudent. Brixii, epist. ad Paulum.* So were Zachary and Elizabeth justified before God by faith, as Abraham was, and as a fruit of true justification, walked in all the commandments of God, in the sight of men blameless. For otherwise no man can say, his heart is clean. If God should examine our iniquities, who were able to abide it? Zachary and Elizabeth were holy and just persons, yet not free from sin. For Zachary as one of God's people looked to have remission of his sins, and salvation by Christ and not by his works. *Luke* 1. 77.

6. The word used by the Prophet in the 119th Psalm signifieth properly ordinances and statutes, as all that are meanly learned in the Hebrew, do know. And although the Greek interpreter in that Psalm, translated it *δικαιωματα*, your vulgar Latin interpreter, doth most commonly in the law, translate it *Ceremonias*, ceremonies, *Deut.* 4. 5. 6. 7. and so commonly almost in every Chapter. The Greek interpreter, not always *δικαιωματα*, but sometimes *νομον*, *προσταγματα*, *εντολας*, that is, the law, ordinances, commandments. And in the same chapter he translated it both *δικαιωματα* and *προσταγματα*, *Deut.* 11. ver. 32. by which it is evident, that the one word sig-

nifieth no more than the other. And that in *δικαιωματα* we must seek no greater mystery of justification, than in *προσταγματα*, which signifieth ordinances, commandments, decrees, or statutes. Saying that the Hebrew word is many times referred to precepts which be of ceremonies, as the vulgar Latin interpreter doth commonly translate it. And so it is most like, that Luke useth the word *δικαιωματα*, as it is commonly used in the Greek text of the law. Therefore, seeing you cavil about the sound of a word, contrary to the use thereof, our interpreters did well to avoid the term justifications, whereabout you quarrel, and to translate it according to the meaning of the Greek writer, and the usual acceptation of the Greek word. And why should not a Latin interpreter use Tully's word forthwith being apt for the Greek, rather than any barbarous term, not so fit or agreeable unto it?

10. The condition of the Church of Christ is otherwise, than it was then under the law. For now all things must be done in the congregation to the understanding and edifying of the people; insonuch, as if a man had the miraculous gift of tongues, he might not speak in the Church without an interpreter. *1 Cor.* 14.

14. Belike John is born again with you every Midsummer day. The joy that was at the birth of John, though it were great yet it was obscured by the glorious birth of Christ. And seeing Christ is not only born, but also hath suffered death, is risen again, and ascended into heaven: The joy of John's birth in the Catholic Church of Christ, is hidden and dimmed, as the light of a star, by the sun shining at noon days. John himself acknowledged, that he was to diminish, as Christ increased, *John* 3. 30. The Angel therefore did not prophesy of your Popish celebrating of his nativity, but of the joy that many should have, which looked for the redemption of Israel which was at hand, when John the forerunner of Christ was born. Otherwise the Church of God communicateth with the joy of God's Saints at that time, not only, nor chiefly, in celebration of the memory of John's nativity, but in contemplation of the performance of God's promises, at all times of the year.

23. Paul, who alloweth a bishop and elder to be the husband of one wife, is to be credited, what is meet for the ministers of the Church, rather than Hieronym and Ambrose. Against whom I oppose Clement Alexandrinus and Paphnutius, with the whole general council of Nice, who thought it not expedient that the ministers of the Church should abstain from their lawful wives. *Matt.* cap. 8. And seeing the Holy Ghost hath made no such law for them that receive the communion, to abstain from their wives, we take not upon us to be wiser than God. Otherwise all men are exhorted to live in marriage, soberly, and temperately: but not to separate themselves one from another, except it be for a time, by consent, that they may be exercised in fasting and prayer, and then to come together again

lest Satan tempt them for their incontinency. 1 Cor. 7. 5.

23. The words of the Angel, are profanely, superstitiously, and idolatrously abused by the ignorant Papists, as a prayer, when they are none, mumbled in Latin, whereof they know not the sense, said unto stocks and stones, yea to God himself: the learned sort, if not approving, yet winking at such shameful absurdities.

23. Papists in often repetition of these words do shamefully abuse them, seeing they say them not, nor can say them, in that sense they were uttered by the Angel and Elizabeth. Seeing they do so often, and so vainly repeat them upon their beads, like the heathen, rather in derision, than honour of Christ and the Blessed Virgin, Matt. 6. 7. And what mystery or sum of the Gospel soever be contained in them, the ignorant people understand nothing at all, who by your good wills, should not understand the words in their mother tongue. If the Grecians use them well in their Mass, why do not you use them in yours? If they use them superstitiously, why do you allege their example? The liturgies that you quote, be counterfeit under the names of James and Chrysostom. And the one of them is a good confutation of the other. For if the Greek Church had a Liturgy written by James the Apostle, who would think that Chrysostom would make a new? Again, if Chrysostom had made a Liturgy, he would not have made a prayer for Pope Nicholas, that lived almost five hundred years after him, nor for the Emperor Alexius, who lived seven hundred years after him. This stuff therefore is much later than the Apostle James, or Chrysostom's age.

23. First, it is a slander, that we make the Virgin Mary no better than other vulgar women. For we acknowledge that she was blessed above all other women, in that she was chosen to be the mother of our Saviour Christ, and that she was full of the graces of the Holy Ghost, but yet a woman, no goddess, a sinner, no Saviour, and yet as free from sin, as the infirmity of man's nature could be. Secondly, concerning our translation, we say, the Greek word signifieth, *freely beloved*, not full of grace: both in this place, and in the Ephesians the first: by the testimony of all Greek Dictionaries: by Chrysostom's judgment, whose words are these: *εκαταρεν*, he saith not *εχαρισταρο*, which he hath given, but *εχαρισωεν*, but whereby he hath made us freely beloved, that is, he hath not only delivered us from our sins, but also hath made us his beloved friends, as if one had gotten a scabbed fellow, rotten through pestilent sickness, age, poverty, and famine, and should by and by make him a beautiful young man, which shall exceed all other in beauty, &c. what clearer testimony can we have, that the Greek word doth signify, *freely beloved*? And yet it is true, that the Virgin Mary especially, and all other Christians generally, was, and are endued with excellent gifts of God's grace: as Chrysostom saith of all, and the

rest of the Fathers, whom you quote, say of the Virgin Mary. But our question is, whether the Virgin Mary had these graces of herself, or of the free gift and love of God, without her merits. And what the Greek word signifieth properly, not how it hath of some heretofore been imperfectly translated into Latin. Chrysostom. *Ex. Luke, cap. 1. De nat. Johannis Baptiste*, rehearseth these words of the Angel in this sort: *Peace be to thee, which hast found favour with the Lord.* That *ηλκο μενος*, Luke 16. is translated, *full of sores*, it proveth not, that all participles derived of such verbs, must signify such a fulness as you imagine, answer to your preface, sect. 59.

31. Though Augustin gather that she had vowed virginity, yet it followeth not of the text. Therefore Ambrose bringeth another cause why she asked how shall this be? &c. "She had read," saith he, "the prophecy of Isaiahs. Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bring forth a son, therefore she believed that it should be, but she had not read how it should be. For how it should be, it was not revealed to that great Prophet. For so great a mystery was not to be uttered by the mouth of a man, but of an Angel. Therefore now it is first heard: The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee. It is both heard and believed." The like saying is in Euthymius and Theophilact. Although Gregory Nyssen be of Saint Augustin's opinion concerning her purpose of virginity: which is not like, seeing she promised to marry with Joseph, as it is plain by the text.

42. Elizabeth acknowledgeth Mary to be the mother of our Lord, but not to be our Lady, neither doth the text say, that she sang, but with a loud voice she said. And the praise which she gave to the Virgin Mary, was the praise of God, who blessed her above all women: but yet made her not equal with Christ, that she might be called by those names which are proper to God and to Christ only, but of you Papists are applied to the Virgin Mary, to the dishonour of her Son, when you call her "our life, our salvation, and our sweetness, the mother of mercy, queen of heaven, lady of the world," &c.

48. The Church of God hath always had, and always shall have generations, in which the Virgin Mary hath been, and shall be called blessed: Neither do we derogate from her graces, blessings, or honour, when we cannot abide that the honourable mother of our Lord and Saviour Christ, should be made an idol, as she was of your forefathers, the *Collyridian* heretics; and as evil, if not worse of your Papists. For the *Collyridians* never desired her to command her Son, now sitting at the right hand of God the Father, as your blasphemous prayer doth.

48. The blessed Virgin Mary is never more dishonoured, than in your festival days, with those blasphemous Anthems, *Salve regina, Ave Maria stella, O regina mundi, Scala, Caeli, Thronus Dei, Janua paradisa*; "O queen of the world, ladder of heaven, throne of God,



gate of Paradise, O beati Maria, &c. O blessed Mary, who is able to bestow upon thee worthy the rights of thanksgiving and celebration of praises, which by thy singular assent, hast succoured the world, that was lost? What praises can the frailty of mankind pay unto thee, which hath found the way to recover life, by the only company." &c. These and like blasphemies against our Saviour Christ, be the chief flowers of your festivities. *Jube natum*, command thy son: and Bonaventure doubteth not to say, *Jure matris impera filio*, command thy son by the right of a mother: and, *Coge Deum*, compel God to be merciful unto sinners, beside the whole Psalter, *Benedictus, Te Deum, Quinquagesima*, all perverted, not to the honour, but to the dishonour of the Virgin Mary, whose greatest honour is, that Christ her son and Saviour, should have all honour ascribed wholly unto him, which properly appertaineth unto them. And this prophecy was fulfilled before there was any festival day of the Virgin Mary, and long before the people were taught to say the *Ave Maria*, or before any of your Anthems were made. For none of these be of any great antiquity. Acts 1.

63. Strange and profane names, are no where so common, as in Italy and Rome, where even the holy Cardinals, carry the names of heathen Romans and Grecians. Yea your holy fathers the Popes after they have, like Antichristians, renounced the names given them in baptism, by which they were first dedicated to Christ, do oftentimes choose unto themselves profane names, as Sergius, Leo, Julius Sixtus, that I speak nothing of the names received from the heathenish Saxons and Normans, better liked in Popery, and preferred by Popish Bishops in confirmation, before names of godly signification taken out of the Scripture, and given to children at their baptism.

75. We may have true justice before God, and true holiness also in his sight, but not perfect justice, nor perfect holiness in ourselves. And the end of our redemption by Christ, is that we should "serve God in true holiness, and righteousness all the days of our life;" and this grace we have also by our Saviour Christ's gift, as in the verse 13, being justified by faith, as a fruit thereof, not as the cause of our justification before God.

78. This is nothing but a malicious slander. Beza only inquireth unto what prophesies Zachary had respect, where the Greek interpreter useth this word, which Luke useth in this place.

80. The office of John the Baptist was singular, and therefore his living in the desert is no example for other men, least of all for Popish Hermits, who live not at all in the desert, but nearer to cities and places frequented, than many husbandmen in the country. Neither doth Hierom allow the opinion of them that counted John to be the first Hermit. *Mark, chap. 9.*

## CHAPTER 2.

14. Augustin in the same place citeth the text: "It is God who worketh in you, both to will and to work, according to his good will:" where he sheweth sufficiently that even the same good will is made in us, by the working of God. Again in the same place, "God bringeth to pass that we be willing." Therefore man hath no free will to accept God's benefits before God of unwilling, by his only grace, maketh him willing. "Without me," saith Christ, "you can do nothing." *Ergo*, not so much as to be of good will to receive him, when he offereth himself, but have this good will wrought by his grace in us.

19. The Virgin Mary, though she had great understanding, yet she did not perfectly understand all the mysteries of Christ, as it is clear by the 50th verse of this chapter, "They understood not the word that he spake unto them." Therefore either mend your note, or mend your Anthem. "The maid's womb did bear the secrets which she did not know."

35. The Virgin Mary tasted of great sorrows with our Saviour Christ, but not to the same end or effect: for his sorrows and sufferings, wrought our joy: her sorrow was partly a natural compassion of motherly affection, partly a conformation unto the suffering of Christ, which is required of all the members unto the head.

37. There is no doubt, but fasting though of itself it be no part of God's worship, which consisteth in spirit and truth, being also, as Hierom saith, not a perfect virtue, but a foundation of virtues, yet it may, and ought to be exercised to the glory and service of God, while by humbling our flesh, we are made more apt to worship him in spirit. That fasting is a matter of policy we never held. But that abstinence from flesh may be commanded for policy's sake, we confess. And to command it for religion's sake, it is the doctrine of devils and Papists, common to them with other old heretics. But if fasting or prayer, be an act of religion, whereby you worship God with *Latria*, then by your own doctrine, you are idolaters, when you serve and worship creatures with fasting and prayers, which idolatry is a great part of your Antichristian religion.

## CHAPTER 3.

8. The fruits of repentance being good works, declare the repentance to be true and unfeigned: if the repentance be true, the sins are forgiven, therefore the works are not satisfactory: for satisfaction pertaineth to justice, forgiveness to mercy.

11. Alms commanded as a true fruit of repentance, which he that is able, and will not give, shall not avoid damnation.

15. There was infinite difference between the holiness of John and of Christ, therefore John's holiness was no occasion of men's error, but their own negligence, which did not know the Scriptures, concerning Christ-

But this is your manner, to make small difference between the Lord and his servants. Yet it was most certainly known, saith Beda, to the Jews by the Scriptures, that the time of our Lord's incarnation was at hand. But it was marvellous blindness, that they believed of John o' their own accord, not to believe of our Saviour, who was approved of by so great signs and wonders, and testified by John himself also.

16. Only Christ's office and power it is, to baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire: now in the baptism ministered by his servants in the Church, and then in the baptism that was ministered by John; the baptism in both, is from heaven, as God's institution.

35 That which is a manifest error, not of the Evangelist, but of some writer that would correct the Evangelist, according to the error of the Greek translation of Genesis, being contrary to the truth of the Hebrew text, and an ancient copy of Luke in Greek, why should he doubt to omit?

23. Augustin saith not that Jacob and Heli were brethren by the mother, but that Heli descending from Nathan, adopted Joseph, being not his son by nature. Hierom citeth the law, *Deut. 25*, that the brother or kinsman should marry the wife of him that died without issue, whereby it appeareth that by the brother, he understandeth not the natural brother, but according to the Hebrew custom, such kinsman as was not forbidden by the law. *Levit. 18*. Only Eusebius out of Africanus, an Historiographer, supposeth that Jacob and Heli were brethren by the mother, and married both the mother of Joseph: which is not like, because such marrying, is incestuous by the law. *Levit. 13, 16*. Except we should say, that their marriage was like the incest of Juda with Thamar, which is also in the genealogy of Christ.

#### CHAPTER 4.

2. For Lent fast, Notes *Matt. cap. 4*. except Clement, constitution, which is a counterfeit book, lately brought to light, rejected of the ancient Fathers of the Primitive Church, as containing many things heretical, false, and frivolous, and yet altered since the ancient Fathers' age. That he bringeth in James the brother of John, writing and speaking with the rest of the Apostles, many years after his death, *Lib. 6. c. 14*. And in the 18th chapter of the fifth book, the celebration of Easter is prescribed, clean contrary to that, which Epiphanius testifieth to have been the constitution of Clement, the pretended author of this book, *contra Audian, Her. 70*. The same counterfeit Clement, *lib. 6. cap. 7*, calleth Philip, spoken of *Acts 8*, an Apostle, but *lib. 8. cap. 52*, he maketh him but a Deacon. These few reasons, among a great number, show the vanity and falsehood of that Apocryphal book.

8. If heretics allege the Scripture against Christ's Church, as the devil did against Christ, the Church must confound them by the Scriptures, as Christ confounded the devil.

But in this verse, Christ allegeth Scripture against the devil, not the devil against Christ. And this Scripture is as rightly alleged against the Church of Antichrist for adoring of creatures, as it was by Christ against the devil himself.

23. This proveth not, that the gift of miracles continueth unto this day. But when God doth work miracles, either by himself or by his servants, he chooseth the time, place, and persons, most convenient for showing his glory, and confirming the faith of his disciples.

30. There is no need to feign any monstrous unprofitable miracles in this place. He might pass through the midst of his enemies, without any alteration of his body, by striking them with blindness, that they could not see him, or by terrifying their hearts, that they durst not touch him. So saith Ambrose: "He went down through the midst of them, the mind of those raging people being suddenly either changed, or astonished." The same saith Beda, *Euseb. Emis. Hom. ser. 3. post 2. domi in quadrag.* Neither is there any ancient writer, that favoureth your monstrous imagination, that he went through men's bodies. For neither is it said, that he went through a door: neither will he make his body without space of place, for then his body should cease to be a body, as Augustin showeth, *Epist. 57. Dardano*. And though Christ by the absolute power of his divinity can do all things, yet will he do nothing contrary to his own will, his word, his glory. That his humanity, in all natural qualities, is like ours, his word beareth witness. *Heb. 2. 17*

#### CHAPTER 5.

3. Although it be true, that Christ's chair is in the Church, yet this is a fond collection. For if the ship were here the Church, then all to whom Christ preached that were on the shore and in the other ship, were out of the Church.

6. Peter's successors be true preachers of the gospel, as for the Pope that never preacheth the gospel, never casteth out Peter's net, to fish for men as he did.

10. By Matthew and Mark, it is evident, that Christ spake jointly to Peter and Andrew, "I will make you fishers of men." *Matt. 4. 19. Mark 1. 17*. Therefore it is a british collection, to gather Peter's prerogative, before all men in the office of fishing.

20. The words of Ambrose be otherwise than you cite them. "The Lord is great, which for other men's sake forgiveth other men: and while he alloweth some, he releaseth the faults of others, why should not a man thy fellow prevail with thee, when with God the servant hath the mean of intercession and the right of obtaining? Learn thou that judgest, to forgive, learn that thou art sick, to obtain forgiveness. If thou doubtst to obtain pardon of grievous sins: take to thee entreaters, take to thee the Church which may pray for thee, by contemplation whereof, the Lord forgiveth that which he

might deny thee." There is nothing hard in this speech, but the name of merit, which the fathers use oftentimes, when they signify any mean of obtaining, and not as Papists take it, for deserts. And the argument that he draweth from hence, that one man should be entreated by another to forgive, declareth that he meaneth not worthiness, or merit of works, to prevail with God: as he expresseth most plainly in other places, where he saith, "whence should I have so great merit, seeing mercy is my crown?" *Exhort. ad Virgin.* Affirming also, that a man is justified and saved by faith alone, very oftentimes. *In ep. ad Rom. cap. 2.* and 3. 4. 9. 10. 11. *1 Cor. 1. Gal. ca. 3. 5.* and elsewhere.

24. Christ as God forgiveth sins properly, here to the sick of the palsy. But *Matt. 9.* you hold, that Christ as man, forgave sins to this man. The power that Christ gave to his disciples to forgive sins, is to declare them to be forgiven by God. *Hieronym. in Matt. 16.*

28. Francis followed not Christ in preaching the Gospel, but did set up a new sect of his own religion, of whom they be called Franciscans, as of Christ Christians have their name. Yea, Francis was crucified for his sect, it we may believe his disciples' writings and paintings of him. Who, also, with the rest of begging friars, go about to abolish the Gospel of Christ, and therefore, did write a new gospel, and called it *the Gospel of the Spirit, and eternal Gospel*, which was expounded openly in Paris, and had been preached 55 years without controulment, till at last it was burnt secretly, at the importunate request and outerying of *Guilielmus de sancto Amore*, and others, of Paris: *Guil. de sanct. Amore de periculo novissimi temporis, cap. 8. Matheus Paris: Anno Domi. 1256.*

#### CHAPTER 6.

1. A false slander: we say not, that all things in the Scripture are very easy. But we say with Augustin, "that God hath graciously, and wholesomely so tempered the Scriptures, that by evident, or plain places, he might provide for hunger, and by dark places, wipe away loathsomeness. For nothing almost is beaten out of those obscurities, which is not found elsewhere, uttered most plainly. *De Doct. Christ. lib. 2, cap. 6.* And as for this *Sabbath second principal.* Epiphanius showeth plainly, that it was the last solemn day of the feast of unleavened bread, by conference of the Law. *Levit. 23. Epipha. Hæres. 51.*

8. It is enough for you to call us heretics, and say that we understand little or nothing in the Scriptures, but thereof let our preachings, writings, and conferences, bear witness. Yet we vaunt not of our understanding, but humbly thank the author thereof.

10. The Church ought to follow our Saviour Christ, in prayer, earnestly, when ministers of the word and sacraments are ordained. But this example is little followed in Popery, as common experience teacheth, where simony so greatly prevaileth in this matter, and most of all at Rome.

23. The sufferings of this life, are not worthy of the glory that shall be revealed in the children of God, *Rom. 8. 18.* Therefore, they be not meritorious of the reward of heaven; for eternal life is the free gift of God in Christ Jesus our Lord. *Rom. 6. 23.*

26. We preach mortification, and bearing of the cross of Christ, to be necessary for all Christian men, under pain of eternal damnation, which is no pleasant doctrine to carnal men. But your doctrine of pardons, absolutions, dispensations, converting of eternal pains into temporal, and then satisfaction by meritorious deeds, and other men's works sweetly paid for, be preachings of pleasant things, to serve the humour of itching ears.

31. Our Saviour, Christ, gave names of signification to his ministers, that we might not only learn the dignity of their office, but, also, their duty. And, therefore, we do rightly make our argument of the notation: of the Apostle's name: They be *legates, or ambassadors, Ergo, they cannot make laws, nor prescribe, or teach any thing, beside their commission, for this is the duty of legates.* Yet is their office of high dignity and authority, being the ambassadors of the King of Kings: because a legate, or ambassador, representeth the person and authority of the prince from whom he is sent. So an elder is a name of dignity, gravity, and authority; a bishop of vigilance, wisdom, diligence, which in so weighty affairs as concern his office, cannot be without honour and authority. Therefore, it is a lewd slander, that we deceive the simple in measuring the nature of sacred functions, by the primitive signification of their names. Their offices and functions are set down plainly in the Scriptures, as well for the dignity, as for the duty that belongeth unto them. And they have apt names given by the Holy Ghost, to admonish themselves of their duties, and other men both of their dignities and duties. But you would have dignity without duty. If he have the name of a priest, or a bishop, it skilleth not, though he lack learning, honesty, diligence, watchfulness, he is priest and bishop, good enough for Popery. And if he make laws, and teach, beside his commission, as the Pope doth, he is still apostle, or apostolic. But you labour in vain to blind the world any longer, with names and titles of honour, when the persons have nothing that without duty doing, can be worthy of any estimation, with them that know what belongeth to those offices and names. That the name of Apostles is not to be given to all that are sent, but only to them that have immediate commission from Christ, as first the twelve, and then Paul and Barnabas, to whom you hardly allow the name of Apostles, by full, special, and immediate commission, but by use of Scripture, we do willingly acknowledge; but that the name of Apostles absolutely was given to their successors, by use of Scripture you are not able to prove. For, in that general commission, they had no successors. And Epaphratus, is not called an Apostle simply, but your

Apostle, that is, saith Plotinus, *because they sent necessary things by Paul to him.* Oecum. Or, as Ambrose saith, *He was made their Apostle by the Apostle, when he sent him to exhort them:* by which interpretation, he was the messenger of Paul. Far unlike to Gregory, and his disciple Augustin, whom you call Apostles, of whom the latter was Gregory's apostle. But Gregory was not Christ's apostle: yet far from the sincerity, calling, and authority of an apostle of Christ. But the wonderful prerogative of Peter's primacy, above the rest of the Apostles, we see not, seeing it was a primacy of order, not for honour or authority. *Cypr. de unitat. eccles. Hieron. cont. Iovin. lib. 1. and Ep. Evagri.* Concerning the lesson you would have us to learn by the name of Apostle, we acknowledge that none are true Apostles, pastors, or teachers, but those that are sent of God, and have lawful calling by God and the Church.

35. If any precept be too heavy for you to bear, you mitigate it by making it a voluntary counsel. But to lend, without hope of restitution, is a part of true charity, which is one of the great commandments. Yet it is not to be meant of all men, but such as have need to borrow, not to serve their pleasure, or to increase their gain, but for their necessity. And it is manifest, that where we are commanded to lend, not only usury is not to be looked for, but even the principal must be adventured, never to be restored.

48. If faith be taken for bare knowledge, as in James 2, he that trusteth to such a faith, buildeth in the sand. Yet, true faith only sufficeth to justification, and bringeth forth good works as the fruits of a justified man: as Augustin showeth plentifully. *De fide et oper. c. 15. and 22, and 23.*

#### CHAPTER 7.

5. To build a Church or College, or any other place for the maintenance of God's service, or good learning, is a good work. But to build a Church or Monastery for the maintenance of idolatry, or idle superstitious hypocrites, such as your Monks are, is no work acceptable to God, but rather displeasing him.

30. John's baptism was a Sacrament, as verily as the Baptism and Supper of the Lord be now.

38. Outward signs of true repentance, and effects of love and thankfulness for sins forgiven, as our Saviour Christ himself interpreteth them, not works of satisfaction to obtain forgiveness of sins. For as Ambrose saith of Peter's tears, "We read his tears, we read not his satisfaction," in *Luke, cap. 22.*

44. Note that carnal men, with Papists, may be otherwise faithful. But with Christians, although the faithful be not free from all carnal affections, yet they have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts thereof, so that they cannot be truly called carnal men. The extraordinary works of devotion, towards the person of our Saviour Christ, are no example to justify pilgrimages to idols, super-

stitious worshipping of the memories of Christ and his Saints, although they were true, and not feigned relics. For tokens of exceeding great love, should be extended toward the poor members of Christ, to whom whatsoever is done of true love, he accepteth as done to himself. *Matt. 25. 40.*

47. Only faith obtaineth remission of sins, whereof love is an effect. For the argument is not, as the whole discourse of the text is manifest, from the cause to the effect, but from the effect to the cause. Many sins are forgiven her, therefore she hath loved much, as the words following do make it manifest. For to whom little is remitted he loveth little. The same thing declareth the parable of the two debtors, that forgiveness of the debt goeth before love, therefore is cause of love, and not love the cause of forgiveness of sins. So saith Ambrose: "According to man he offendeth more, who ought more, but by the mercy of our Lord, the cause is changed, that he loved more which ought more, if he have obtained grace or forgiveness," in *Luke c. 7.* The like manner of speaking, and use of the particle *or,* is in *John 15. 15.* "I have called you friends, for I have declared to you all that I have heard of my father," where this declaring is the effect, and not the cause of his love.

49. A slander, for we acknowledge the power of forgiveness of sins by the ministers of the Church, yet far differing from the power of our Saviour Christ, who as God forgave absolutely of his own authority, his servants, by declaring his will in forgiveness of sins. *Hieron. in Matt. 16.*

50. Remission of her sins, was not before attributed to charity, but by her great love it was showed, that many sins were forgiven her: as unto the debtor of a great sum. Charity therefore, was not cause of remission, but an effect thereof. And true it is, that faith only justifying, doth not exclude other causes, but only the merit of good works, "which follow a justified man, go not before to justification." *Aug. de fide et oper. c. 14.* And witness, that faith only doth justice before God, are almost all the ancient Fathers in express words. *Origen in ep. ad Rom. lib. 3. c. 3. Cyprian ad Quirinum, cap. 42. Hilar. in Matt. can. 21. Greg. Nazian. Orat. 22. de modest. Basil. de humilitate hom. 51. Ambros. in 3. ad Rom. and many other places. Chrysostom in ep. ad Rom. hom. 7. and many other places, Hieronymus, adversus Pel. lib. 1. in ep. ad Rom. cap. 3. and others.*

#### CHAPTER 8.

5. Paul speaketh not of rich women, that might relieve his necessity, and spare the Church: but of a wife that might be a burden to the Church, as the text is plain, and Clemens Alexandrinus testifieth. *Stron. lib. 3.* Otherwise it had been absurd, that they should leave their own wives, and carry strange women about with them, such long journeys as they travelled.

13. True justifying faith cannot be utterly

lost: but a dead and fruitless faith may be had and lost.

45. It is a weak argument for Peter's prerogative, that he is named only, or first. It is a stronger argument against his prerogative, that when the dignity and prerogative of the apostles is purposely in hand, he is not named first, as *Gal. 2. 9.* And yet Peter's primacy of order, or confession, is granted, not of dignity, degree, or authority.

55. This is popish evidence, which all the logicians in the world are not able to conclude, in lawful form of arguments, out of the text. The spirit of the maid and Lazarus returned, ergo, from a third place. For it cannot be thought, saith he, that they were called from heaven or hell. And why may we not, or ought we not to think, that their souls were where the souls of other godly persons departed were?

#### CHAPTER 9.

1. That which is proper to God, cannot be communicated to men. Therefore God only worketh miracles, and forgiveth sins by the ministry of man.

41. The church hath not at this day, power to cast out devils, or to work miracles ordinarily: th'erefore your ordinary offices of exorcists, exorcisms, and unctions, be mockeries of the gracious gifts of miracles.

55. Peter used not an ordinary, but a miraculous power, when he pronounced sentence of death against Ananias and Sapphira, not for defrauding the church, but for lying against the Holy Ghost, *Acts 5. 3.* For they might have kept the whole price, or not have sold their land, without blame, if they had not played the hypocrites.

#### CHAPTER 10.

13. Punishing of the body by sackcloth and ashes, is no satisfaction for sins past, but a help unto repentance, as a sign of humiliation. *Basil. in Ps. 29.*

16. It is all one to despise the ministers of Christ's Catholic church, and to despise Christ. But of the popish church, and the popish priests, it is not true.

21. The true children of the church, whose faith is builded upon the word of God, may learn out of the holy scriptures, the manner of Christ's presence in the sacrament, and all other things needful to know: when popish hypocrites, with their faith implicit, know nothing necessary for their salvation. For it is sufficient in popery, to believe as the church believeth, though they know not what the popish church believeth, nor upon what warrant of God's word.

28. Christ was not asked, by what means a man might attain to eternal life, but by what doing, or what kind of works, the kingdom of heaven were to be obtained: therefore he mocketh not: but directly answereth to the question, by fulfilling the law: which if any can perform in such perfection, as God's justice doth require, he shall be justifi-

fied by the works of the law, without the mercy of God in Christ. If he cannot, he is under the curse: and that is every man's case, seeing none is justified by the law, but by faith in Christ, *Gal. 3.* But the scriptures, you say, give examples of divers that have kept and fulfilled it, as far as it is requisite in this life. And first of David, of whom God testifieth that he kept his commandment, and followed me with his whole heart. What impudent abusing of the scripture is this? Is not the fall of David notorious? And doth he not in a hundred places in the Psalms, crave pardon for his sins and transgressions of the law? Therefore he kept God's commandments, but not perfectly, nor loved God with all his heart, might, strength, according to the commandment, *Deut. 6,* though he walked after God with all his heart, that is unfeignedly, and not as hypocrites and carnal men do, that profess religion. The like is to be said of the people: in Asa's days, which swore with all their heart, that is with full purpose, to keep their oath, and unfeigned desire to seek the Lord: yet did they not fulfil the law, but were sinners, and were justified freely by grace in Christ, as Paul affirmeth of all men without exception, *Rom. 3. 23.* As for the prophet, *Psal. 119,* confesseth, that he hath gone astray as a lost sheep, and even in the same verse you quote, prayeth that he may not err from God's commandments. Therefore that he sought God with all his heart, is not to be taken for a perfect keeping of God's law, but for an earnest and unfeigned desire of the spirit, against which even in the regenerate, the flesh always rebelleth, so that they cannot do what they desire, *Gal. 5. 17.* Ecclesiasticus doth not say that David loved God with all his heart, but from all his heart, that is, from the bottom of his heart, unfeignedly; yet not perfectly. For who can say, my heart is clean? I am pure from sin. *Pro. 20. 9.* And David confesseth his own sin even from his conception, *Psal. 51. 7.* The like is to be said of Ezekias, who with a sound heart walked before God in truth, that is, without dissimulation or halting, as hypocrites do, yet kept not the law perfectly, so that he could live thereby, nor loved God with all his heart, might, soul, &c. Last of all, Zachary and Elizabeth walked in all the commandments of God, yet fulfilled not the law, and though their life was blameless in the sight of men, yet were they not able to stand before God's justice, in whose sight no man living shall be righteous, *Psal. 143. 2.* Now where you have a vain evasion, in these words, as much as is requisite, &c. It is requisite of every one, that seeketh to be justified by the law, that he keep it perfectly without sin, else he is under the curse, and cannot be justified by the works of the law, *Gal. 3.*

30. Against this vain collection by allegory, the scripture is plain, that we are all dead in sin, by the sin of Adam, *Rom. 5. 12. Eph. 2. 1, 5. Col. 2. 13.* The counsel Acausianum, which you quote belike to prove that the

freedom of will is not lost in Adam, saith; "It is so inclined by the sin of the first man, and attenuated, that no man after could love God as he ought, or work that which is good for God's sake, except the grace and mercy of God prevented him." And if by those words you think there is any life left unto it, *cap. 22*, the counsel saith, no man hath any thing of his own, but lies and sin. And *cap. 21*, nature by Adam lost, by Christ is repaired. And whereas you seem to leave some life, justice, and freedom of will in man, which by Christ is recovered, increased, healed, and enabled: thus we read, *cap. 7*, the title of which is, that we are not apt to think any thing of ourselves, as of ourselves. "If any man do hold that a man by the force of nature can think any good thing, which pertaineth, and is expedient to eternal life, or that he can choose either to be saved, that is, to consent to the preaching of the gospel, without illumination and inspiration of the Holy Ghost, which giveth to all men the sweetness, in consenting and believing the truth, he is deceived with a heretical spirit, not understanding the voice of God, saying in the gospel, without me you can do nothing: and that of the apostle, not that we are apt of ourselves to think any thing, as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God." And touching understanding, the apostle saith, the natural man understandeth not those things that be of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. So that neither the will nor the understanding have any heavenly life in them.

35. That which is bestowed for the full recovery of the wounded man, is a duty of charity, therefore commanded. So is whatsoever we are able to do, pertaining either to the perfect love of God, or the love of our neighbour as ourself, is of duty though it be not expressly named, but generally commanded, and it is sin to omit it. That which Augustin saith of Paul: he did bestow more, when he went a warfare at his own cost, it is to be understood of the general liberty that all preachers have to live of the gospel. Yet was it his duty, in that special case, to forbear that liberty, or any other thing that is lawful, that he should not give any hindrance to the gospel of Christ. *1 Cor. 9. 12*. Therefore it had been sin in him, to use that liberty to the hindrance of the gospel. So that it was no work of supererogation as you term it, but of duty in that case, to forbear it. Again he forbeareth, that he should not abuse his power in the gospel, *1 Cor. 9. 18*. If he abuse his power in the gospel, he sinneth, ergo he forbearth of duty: for it is his duty to avoid sin. What then, did the other apostles sin in not labouring as the idle monks objected to Augustin? No, their ease differed from his, as he showeth plainly in the same book, *cap. 22*. They used their liberty to no hindrance of the gospel: he could not use it, but with impediment of the gospel. Therefore works of supererogation are not proved by Paul's ex-

ample. Neither by his counsel unto virginity, which is not to be neglected where God hath given the gift, and it may serve to the advancement of God's glory, which every one is bound to procure, to the uttermost of his strength, *Deut. 6. 5. Luke 10. 27*; though the special state of virginity be not commanded generally, because God hath not given the gift to all men generally. And so must Optatus be understood. Chrysostom interpreting this parable allegorically, as many of the fathers do, yet acknowledgeth, that the governor of the church can bestow no more than is contained in the gospel. For seeing nothing can be added to the two Testaments, neither may the law of God receive any increase or diminishing, what is then, which the governor can bestow more than he hath received? but that which is his own duty, in which he is bound to endeavour, that he lay out that which is committed to him that he hath received, &c. *De eo qui inc. in latrones sermon*. By Chrysostom's judgment therefore in this place, he can do no works of supererogation. Euthymus upon this place saith, I will pay thee, if thou shalt bestow any thing of thine own that may profit him. For teachers do add of their own, when they dilate the interpretations of the words of God. For they take indeed the argument or substance of the matter out of the two Testaments, but by their own speeches they bestow greater pains upon them that are diseased. This author gathering the judgment of the ancient fathers of the Greek church, could find no works of supererogation in this text.

42. God be praised, there be in our church many that have chosen the best part with Mary, which all Christians ought to do, even that part which shall never be taken from them. By example of Martha and Mary, saith Ambrose upon this place, is set forth the devotion of the one laboursome in works, and the religious attention to the word of God of the other: which if it be joined with faith, is preferred before those works themselves, as it is written, Mary hath chosen the best part which shall not be taken from her. Let us therefore study to have that which no man can take from us, that our hearing be not slight for fashion, but diligent. For the seeds of the word of God itself are wont to be taken away if they be sowed by the highway side. Let the desire of wisdom move thee as it did Mary, for this is a greater, this is a more perfect work. Neither let the care of service turn thee away from the knowledge of the heavenly word, neither reprove thou them, nor judge them to be idle whom thou seest occupied in study of wisdom. There be also which have chosen the contemplative life, which have purposed to keep virginity or widowhood, which offer to God, as he hath enabled them, and as they see it for his glory, the free will offering of their goods and labours. Not to merit or make God debtor unto them, but to testify their zeal, and thankfulness toward God. Before whom they acknowledge, that

when they have done all they are commanded, which is more than they can, they are unprofitable servants: and therefore look for reward by God's only mercy, according to his promise, and not according to their deserts. The true church was many hundred years without monks, friars, or nuns, and may be without such votaries, as you mean, always. And when the church had monks, which were religious indeed, they were soon weary of their hard labour, which was their profession, as appeareth by Augustin's work, *de opere Monachorum*: and shortly degenerated into idleness the mother of all vices, whereof grew such inconvenience, as was not to be suffered in any Christian commonwealth: and therefore they are necessarily and most justly abolished.

## CHAPTER 11.

27. Bede's words be these: "And let us with these words, lit up our voice against Eutyches, which denied the truth of Christ's human nature, after it was assumed of his Godhead." Meaning that we have a good argument, to prove the truth of his human nature in these words of the woman, which our Saviour Christ doth not deny, but showeth a greater happiness in them that hear the word of God and keep it. *Euseb. Emis. homi. Doni. 3. in. Quadr.*

29. Although our Saviour Christ, by the virtue of his death, overcame hell and the devil: yet his soul which he committed unto his Father's hands was in Paradise, where he promised the thief should be with him, *Luke 22. 43.* But that his soul was three days, that is, from the time of his death until his resurrection, in hell, it is contrary to the opinion of many Papists.

32. They declared their inward sorrow for their sins, by outward signs of humiliation.

41. Alms is a worthy fruit of charity, and therefore hath great commendation in the scriptures. But not to be a cause of salvation, as by your pretended places of holy writ, you go about to prove. First you bring Ecclesiasticus, which is no canonical scripture, and yet you falsify his words. For he saith not, that alms extinguish sin, but his words are after your own translation, "alms resisteth sins:" after the Greek: "Alms shall be clear from sins." In the second place, your vulgar Latin translation is corrupt, for according to the original tongue, in which Daniel did write, the text is, "break off thy sins with righteousness, and thy iniquities with favour toward the afflicted." That is, as thou hast sinned much in injustice and cruelty, so now break off that course of sin, and take the contrary way of justice and humanity. Your third place is Tobias, which is no canonical scripture: where I marvel that you add not out of your Latin text, which is not in the Greek, that alms delivereth from all sin." But whereas Tobias saith, that alms delivereth from death, it must be either understood as it may agree with the canonical scripture, or

else it must be rejected, as the saying of a man, and not of God. The fourth place is of our judgment, which shall be "according to our works," which are the fruits and true effects of a lively faith, by which the elect are discerned from the reprobate. Last of all, where you say, "here they make clean and satisfy for the Jew's former offences, the text saith not so: but to them which give alms of a true faith, all things are clean without any ceremony of washing, such as the hypocrisy of the covetous Pharisees had invented, for purification and cleansing of God's creatures. Augustin saith not, that "alms is done for a propitiation to God of former offences." But his words are, "Our life must be changed into better, and by alms God is to be entreated for sins past, not to be bought after a sort, that we may always commit them without punishment." Alms therefore, are not a propitiation for our sins, which is only Christ Jesus, *1 John 2. 2*, but a fruit of true repentance, whereby God turneth unto us, when we with a true faith, that showeth itself by such fruits, turn unto him. "For only the faith of Christ doth make clean," Augustin saith, in *Psalm 88*. And that only faith doth justify. The fathers quoted, chapter 5. of this Gospel.

46. The name of priests is not odious with us, because the Jew's Priests were naught, for we hold, that Christ is our only high Priest, and that all Christian men and women are Priests. But the wicked life, and blasphemous heresies of popish Priests, have made them odious to all good men.

47. To build the prophets' sepulchres, so hypocrisy and superstition be away, is not evil. But it is much more excellent to follow the doctrine and virtues of the prophets, than to build and garnish their monuments.

## CHAPTER 12.

5. These are slanders, that the Protestants teach security of salvation: and that fear of hell maketh men hypocrites: although the faithful by God's promise are assured of salvation, and we must avoid sin, not only for fear of punishment in hell, but chiefly for love of God our merciful Father.

11. It is not enough for a Christian Catholic, to say that he is a Catholic man, and that the church whereof he is a member, can give a reason, &c., for a Christian Catholic must be ready to give an account to every one that asketh of the hope that is in him. *1 Peter 3. 15*. Again, this answer that you set down, restraineth the promise of wisdom and mouth to be given, to a sophistical form of words, which a parrot may learn to pronounce, and is indeed a crafty evasion, rather than a clear confession. For every heretic may say as much as you teach a popish Catholic, for a sufficient confession.

21. He is rich to godward, that trusteth in God and not in deceivable riches, which is rich in good works, and is ready to distribute, &c. *1 Tim. 6. 17, 18*. But store of merits and meritorious works, the scripture never speaketh,

of, neither doth God reward our merits, but his own gifts. *Aug. in Psal. 70, conc. 2. In Psal. 101.*

35. If to gird our loins be to keep chastity and continency, then married men may keep chastity and continency, for this commandment extendeth to all true Christians. Therefore, saith Beda, "He teacheth his scholars to gird their loins to retain them from the love of worldly things." Euthymius saith, "He propoundeth to them the virtue of working. For they that have any work in hand have their loins girded up. Or by girding the loins he exhorteth to the binding of concupiscence."

#### CHAPTER 13.

3. Your interpreter meant true repentance, howsoever you draw his word to penance, out of which you would pick satisfaction.

5. A true faith, by which we are justified before God, cannot be void of good works, but a dead faith is like the fig-tree.

22. The straight way, as well in religion, as in life, is the way that leadeth to life: and the ancient way wherein all that are saved have entered.

24. The mortification of the flesh, and abnegation of men's selves, not Popish penance, which is easily bought out by a Pope's pardon, are the straight way, mentioned in the text: as for the Popish Church's discipline, is easy enough for them that have money to redeem themselves from it, seeing the Pope setteth up an open market of dispensations and pardons: so that for money you shall have liberty, either to commit sin, or else pardon for any sin that you shall commit, and of penance due for the same.

28. Augustin saith, it is madness to think they can communicate with Christ in his Sacraments, which communicate not in his word. Therefore, as he saith there also, "They eat and drink the body and blood of Christ in a Sacrament: and are not acknowledged, because they acknowledge not by the Gospel, his members dispersed over all the world."

31. The Jews lost their pre-eminence by their own will, which cannot be called free, when it was thrall to sin, and not made free by the Son of God. Therefore neither the Pelagian nor the Popish heretic, hath any argument here, to prove free will. "For free will," saith Augustin, "to owe God we have lost all through the greatness of the first sin." *Ep. 107, Vitali.* Again, "That part of mankind, to which God hath promised deliverance and an eternal kingdom, may it not be repaired by the merits of their own works? God forbid. For what good can he work that is lost or cast away, except he be delivered from perdition. What by free will? God forbid that also. For man using free will amiss, lost himself and it also. For as he that killeth himself, killeth himself while he liveth, but in killing himself liveth not, neither can he revive himself when he hath slain himself. So when man sinned by free will,

sin got the victory, and free will was lost. For of whomsoever a man be overcome, to him he is addicted or bound as a slave. This truly is the sentence of Peter the Apostle: which seeing it is true, I pray you what liberty can there be of him that is a bond slave, but when he delighteth to sin? For he serveth freely that doth his master's will gladly. And by this he is free to commit sin which is a slave of sin. But to do justly he shall not be free, except he, being delivered from sin, begin to be a servant of righteousness. That is true liberty, for the joy of well doing, and a godly bondage to obedience of the commandment. But whence shall a man that is bond, and sold, have this liberty? except he do redeem him whose saying that is: If the son shall make you free, then shall you be free indeed. Which thing before it begin to wrought in a man, how can any man boast of free will in a good work, which yet is not free to work well? except he extol himself being puffed up with vain pride, which the Apostle beateth down when he saith, you are saved by grace through faith," &c. *Eucherid. ad Laurent. cap. 30.* This is the Catholic faith concerning free will. And whensoever any ancient godly father seemeth to avow free will, he meaneth against the Manichees' and stoics' freedom from coercion, which we acknowledge, and not freedom from the thralldom of sin since the fall of Adam.

#### CHAPTER 14.

14. That good deeds may be done in respect of the reward that is promised, we acknowledge: but not only, nor principally, for our own reward's sake, but for the glory of God more principally.

23. Man's will is free from compulsion, or enforcing: for if it were enforced, it were not willing but nilling. Yet is it not free from slavery and thralldom unto sin, which is the freedom we deny, and the Pelagians with the Papists affirm, *chap. 13.*

#### CHAPTER 15.

7. Our Saviour meaneth not, that there are any so just, that they need no repentance: *For all have sinned. And there is not one just. Rom. 3. 10. 23.* But rather hypocrites, such as the Pharisees were which thought they had no need of repentance. As Augustin holdeth *In Qu. Evang. lib. 2. c. 32.* Ambrose upon this place interpreteth that one sheep, to be all that are saved by Christ. "That sheep is one in kind, but not in particulars, for we are all one body, but many members. And therefore it is written: ye are the body of Christ, and members of his members. Therefore the Son of Man came to save that which was lost: to wit, all. For as in Adam all die, so in Christ all shall be quickened. The rich shepherd therefore, of whose flock all we are but the hundredth part, hath innumerable flocks of Angels, Archangels, &c." You see therefore that by the just which need no repentance. Ambrose understandeth not men,



but Angels. Beda understandeth the just to be such as because they have not committed the greatest sins, are slow to good works, and very secure. These I suppose have need of repentance. Euthymius and Theophylact agree with Ambrose, *Eucher. lib. 2. cap. 15.* Therefore there are no men that need no repentance simply, but in comparison of them that are wholly fallen from God, as open sinners and excommunicate persons.

10. Our hearts and inward repentance, are not known to the Angels, but by the fruits and true effects thereof. For God only knoweth the hearts of all the sons of men, and their heart's repentance, 1 Reg. 8. 39. And although the elect, after the resurrection, shall be like in glory to the Angels, yet it followeth not, that they shall be like in all things, and much less, that their souls now in heaven, be like the Angels; whose presence and ministry God useth in the preservation of his chosen, in procuring the means of their conversion and salvation while they are in this world. And though they be as near God in heaven, as the Angels, yet it followeth not, that either the one or the other, see and know our affairs, otherwise than it pleaseth God to reveal them. For that profane speculation, that God is like a glass, in whom all things done in this world may be seen in heaven, is a vain devise of an idle brain, without all authority of Scripture: yea contrary unto it, which teacheth that God only searcheth the heart and secret thoughts of man: which therefore are unknown to Angels and blessed spirits, except it please God of special dispensation, to reveal them. And if they did or might know all our affairs as well as God, yet it followeth not, that we should pray unto them, having a commandment and promise to call upon God, and to be heard for Christ's sake; and neither commandment, nor promise, nor example in the Scripture of any godly person, that prayed unto them.

23. Augustin meaneth the oblation of Christ upon the cross to God the father, the remembrance whereof, is celebrated in the Lord's Supper, as he declareth himself more plainly. *Octoginta trium Questionum. Qu. 61.* He is our Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec which offered himself a sacrifice for our sins, and hath commanded the similitude of that sacrifice to be celebrated in remembrance of his passion, so that we may see the same thing which Melchisedec offered to God, now to be offered in the Church of Christ throughout all the world. Remember that Melchisedec could not offer the natural body of Christ, so many hundred years before it was conceived and born of the Virgin Mary. Therefore that which Augustin saith is offered in the Church, is not the natural body of Christ: but bread and wine, in remembrance of his passion, as a sacrifice of thanksgiving. *Cæsarius Arelatensis hom. 4. de Pasca,* referreth it to the effect of Christ's death, whereby pardon is granted daily to penitent sinners.

## CHAPTER 16.

8. The faithful know not out of the word of God, that they may gain salvation by their money, but that by being good stewards, and making them friends of the unrighteous mammon, they may gain testimony of their liberality, which shall not be unrewarded. Otherwise, money is too base a thing to gain salvation by, which the Son of God bought for them, not with gold or silver, or any such corruptible trash, but with his precious blood. 1 Pet. 1, 18, 19.

9. That alms, although greedily accepted of God, is meritorious, the Scripture never teacheth, nor that alms purge sin, or gaineth heaven. Notes 11th chapter of this Gospel. The prayers of the poor are indeed procured by giving of alms, if they be thankful persons upon whom it is bestowed, but no patronage in heaven. The Prophet David, no doubt was a good alms-man, yet he acknowledged no patrons in heaven, but God the Lord: "Whom have I in heaven," saith he, "but thee?" *Ps. 73, 25.* Neither doth the text say, the poor shall become patrons, but "they may receive you into the everlasting tabernacles," which is to be understood parabolically. Your alms shall be a testimony of your charity and liberality, which shall be everlastingly rewarded, proceeding from true and lively faith, as our Saviour Christ showeth. *Matt. 25.* Neither is it possible to gather a conclusion out of this place in due form of syllogism, that the Saints departed to pray for the living, or that they may receive their friends and benefactors into their heavenly mansions, otherwise than by their testimony, if in the judgment of God, they shall be found faithful. Finally, alms given to a hypocrite, in the name of Christ, of true faith and charity, is as acceptable to God, as given to a holy person, and shall be as well rewarded. Seeing God hath not made us judges of men's sincerity, which have need, but commanded us to show neighbourhood to all that be in necessity, especially to those that be of the household of God, as far as we can discern them. *Chrysostom Hom.* But all these points neither concluded out of the text, nor warranted by any other Scriptures, let us see how you prove out of the doctors. First, Hierom hath nothing sounding to such a purpose, except you mean those words in the end. "To me, according to the former interpretation it seemeth, that we ought to make us friends of the unrighteous mammon, not any kind of poor, but those which may receive us into their houses and eternal tabernacles, that when we have given them small things, we may receive of them great things, and giving another man's goods, we may receive our own, and sow in blessing, that we may reap blessing: for he that soweth sparingly, shall reap sparingly." These words declare his meaning sufficiently, that we must make choice of the godly poor, as near as we can, to whom the kingdom of heaven belongeth; and give plentifully

that we receive the reward plentifully. Here is neither patronage, nor prayer of Saints departed, nor merit of holy men. Ambrose, the next Doctor, saith no more but, "That by giving liberally to the poor, we may procure the favour of the Angels, and the rest of the Saints." Lo, this Doctor nameth the Angels, which receive no benefit by our alms, and all the Saints, as well rich as poor. For all the blessed spirits do love them that are beneficial to the poor members of Christ their head. But of special patronage, prayer, merit, authority to dispose the heavenly mansions, &c. here is no mention. Perhaps Augustin will say more, because he is quoted in two places: in the first he hath these words: "The Gospel hath admonished us to make friends of the mammon of iniquity, that those which make, they may receive into eternal tabernacles, who are they that shall have eternal tabernacles but the Saints of God? And who are they shall be received of them into eternal tabernacles, but they which have served their need, and cheerfully administered unto them that they lacked? Let us remember therefore, that in the last judgment our Lord will say to them, which shall stand at his right hand, I was hungry, and ye gave me to eat, and the rest that ye know. And when they shall ask, when they have done this duty to him? he answereth, when ye did it to one of these my little ones. These little ones are they, which receive into eternal tabernacles," &c. Hitherto we have nothing of patronage, prayers, or merits of Saints. In the other place he saith, "The just and the Saints, are signified in this place, which do bring them into eternal tabernacles, which have communicated earthly goods for their necessities, of whom also he saith, that if any man give unto any of them a cup of cold water, in the name of a disciple, he shall not lose his reward." In the former part of this saying, he rehearsed the words of the text: in the latter he showeth the plain and direct meaning, that no work of charity showed toward God's children, shall be unrewarded. Chrysostom at last speaketh of patronage, or pleading, saying: "Orators and sophisters, stand at the judgment seats of men, pleading for them that suffer wrong, and often for them that do wrong, but the acts of alms," saith he, "standeth at the tribunal seat of Christ, not only pleading, but persuading the judge himself, that he himself doth plead for the guilty person, and give sentence for him; and although he have sinned a thousand times, he crowneth him, and proclaimeth him conqueror: for he saith give alms and all shall be clean." Here, you see, he had occasion in following of his comparison, to have said: the Saints departed plead for us, pray for us, merit for us: yet that which he speaketh of patronage, is of alms itself, yea principally of Christ himself, who is our only mediator and advocate before God, who rewarded them that com-

fort his members for his sake, of his mere mercy and grace, not for the merit of their work. Gregory also hath the name of patrons, but not according to your meaning; his words are these, "It availeth much to beat down the pride of him that giveth, if when he giveth earthly things, he do earnestly weigh the words of our heavenly master, which saith, make you friends of the mammon of iniquity, that where you fail they may receive you into eternal tabernacles: for if through their friendship, we attain the eternal tabernacles, in giving, doubtless, we ought to consider, that we rather ought to offer gifts to patrons, than give rewards to needy persons. Hereof it is said by Paul, let your abundance supply their need, that their abundance may be a supply to your need: namely, that we should consider diligently, that those whom we now see needy we shall one day see abounding, and we that are seen abounding, if we be negligent to give, shall one day be needy. Therefore he that now giveth temporal aid to a poor man, in that he shall hereafter receive of him eternal things, as I may so say, doth as it were till the earth for corn, which rendereth more plentifully that which she hath received. It remaineth therefore, that pride never ariseth of our gift, seeing that of that which the rich man giveth to the poor, he doth it, that he be not poor for ever." Here is neither merits, nor prayers of Saints departed, but the poor made, as it were patrons of the rich, even in this life, that the rich should not be proud of their liberality, because they know that except they be rich in good works by relieving the poor, they shall be everlastingly poor. Whereas if they make them friends of their mammon, they shall be joined in reward of eternal life, with the poor members of Christ, who accounteth done unto him, whatsoever is bestowed in relief of them. So that eternal life is the free gift of God, by Jesus Christ, unto all them which by the fruits of good works, declare that they take hold of it by a true and lively faith.

22. Abraham's bosom is still the receptacle of the faithful, by Chrysostom's judgment, who prayeth that he and all his people may enjoy it after their death, *De Lazaro. Con. 3.* The reward also of affliction patiently suffered, we acknowledge to be of God's mercy, and not man's merit.

23. For as much as the death of Christ, was as effectual to redeem them that lived before he suffered actually, as them that live since: seeing in God's sight, our Saviour Christ, is the Lamb that was slain from the beginning of the world, we believe that the godly fathers were in heaven or Paradise, which is here called *Abraham's bosom*, before the resurrection of Christ, as well as after. For inasmuch as they were justified by faith in his blood, they received the same crown and reward of righteousness that we do, being justified by the same means. And yet our Saviour Christ was the first man that in his whole manhood

entered into heaven, into the fulness and perfection of glory which is prepared for all God's elect, at the general resurrection. Nevertheless, the virtue of Christ's death opened heaven, to be a receptacle for the souls of the righteous from the beginning of the world. "The Spirit," saith Solomon, "returneth to God that gave it," *Ecc. 12. 9.* So saith Leo, *De pass. serm. 11.* And we heard before, that Augustin denieth it to be a part of hell, *Epist. 99.* But Zachariah, you say, calleth it a lake without water. Indeed Zachariah nameth a lake or pit without water, which is too uncomfortable a place to understand it of Abraham's bosom, which the Prophet meaneth of the captivity of Babylon, from whence the Church was delivered. Theodoret saith, it may be understood either of eternal death, or of the error of idols. Hierom, saith, *The rich glutton was in this lake.* Therefore he understood it not of Abraham's bosom. Further you say, it is called of Isaias, a prison: but that is as unlike, that a place of happy and joyful rest, *Chrysost. de Divit. Lazaro.*, should be called a prison. Let us see what the ancient fathers say to the matter. First, Hierom understandeth this prison of the bonds of sins and errors. So doth Cyril in Isaias, *Lib. 4. Orat. 3.* Yet, *lib. 3.* he saith that "Christ went to preach to the spirits in Hell, and appeared to them that were detained in prison, and delivered them all from bonds, necessity, pain and punishment." Therefore, in neither of both places he understandeth Abraham's bosom, by the prison spoken of in Isaias. And if by this latter exposition he correct not his error in the former, yet by the latter he showeth, that the text is not necessarily to be understood of any prison after this life. As for the name of *Limbus patrum*, it is altogether unknown of the ancient doctors, which, if it signify, as you say, the brim of hell, it cannot be far from the place of punishment, as the text is plain of Abraham's bosom. And Chrysostom saith plainly, *it is Paradise*, against the conceit of them that imagine it to be hell, *Paradisus. &c.* "The bosom of Abraham, was the poor man's Paradise. The rich man saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. But some man may say to me, is Paradise in hell? I say this, that the bosom of Abraham is the truth of Paradise, yea I confess it is the most holy Paradise," *ex Luc. hom. de Dicit.* And Tertullian chargeth Marcion the heretic with this opinion, that the fathers of the Old Testament had their place of refreshing in hell, by this text of Abraham's bosom. But he confuteth him even by the same Scripture, saying, that "Hell is one thing, Abraham's bosom another thing, wherein not only the souls of the Jews, but of the Gentiles also that are faithful, shall have rest until the general resurrection," *Lib. 4. cont. Marcion.* Whether the hell of the damned be called the lower hell, in respect of this mansion of the fathers, Augustin, *Ps. 85.* professeth ignorance, and only doubteth. But *Ep. 99.* he utterly denieth Abraham's bosom to be hell, or any part of hell, because *Hell in the Scripture, is never taken for good.* The same

he saith, *de Gen. ad lit. lib. 12. cap. 33. and cap. 34.* where he proveth that Paradise is heaven, he saith, "How much more then may the bosom of Abraham, which is after this life, be called Paradise? But that there was such a place whereunto our Saviour Christ first descended, specially to deliver the fathers that were in it, you quote a great number of doctors. First Irenæus in the place quoted, hath never a word of the descending of Christ into hell, but of the effect of his life and death, to the salvation of all his members. His words are these: "Wherefore he gave meat to his disciples as they were sitting, signifying them which sat in the earth to whom he came to minister life. As Jeremy saith; The Lord, the holy one of Israel, remembered his that were dead, which had slept before in the earth of defection, and came down unto them to preach salvation unto them to save them. And for this also his disciples' eyes were heavy when Christ came to his passion, and finding them sleeping, first, he let them alone, signifying the patience of God, in the sleeping of men. But coming the second time, he awaked them and raised them up, signifying that his passion is the awaking of his disciples that slept, for whom also he descended into the lower parts of the earth, to see that of the creature which was unwrought, with those eyes of which he said to his disciples; Many Prophets and just desired to see and hear, what you see and hear. For Christ came not for them only which believed in him in the time of Tiberius the emperor: neither for those men only which are now, hath the Father provided, but for all men which from the beginning according to his power in their generation both feared and loved God, and lived justly and godly towards their neighbours, and desired to see Christ, and to hear his voice. Wherefore all such in his second coming he shall first awake out of sleep, and raise up them as well as the rest which shall be judged, and he shall place them in his kingdom." These words I have set down at large, that you may see he speaketh not of the supposed descent into hell, but of the virtue of his life, death, burial, and resurrection, which extendeth itself to all the elect of God, and shall be made manifest at the second coming of Christ. Eusebius saith, "That the ramping Lion, the devil, after he had opened the wide mouth of hell, coveted to have devoured the soul of our Saviour, with other which came down into hell, against which he prayed in the words of the Psalm, deliver me from the mouth of the Lion." By which place it is rather proved, that Christ did not descend into hell after his death, seeing he was saved from the mouth of the Lion, according to his prayer uttered by the Psalmist: And somewhat before this place, he interpreteth the complaint of Christ that he was forsaken, when his body was on the cross to be made in the midst of hellish torments when "he beheld himself compassed about with all the devils in hell, as it were a multitude of wild beasts ready to devour him." Eusebius therefore hath much against you,

but nothing for you. Much less *Gregory Nazianzen* in the place noted. For he saith no more but, "Christ descended, that we might be exalted." Chrysostom, the first of them that you have named, saith that "Christ descended into hell, and disturbed them all, and destroyed that castle filled with tumult and trouble." Which may be rightly understood of the virtue of his death, destroying the power of hell that it hath no force against those whom he hath redeemed. But he addeth further, that "although it was hell, yet it held the holy souls and precious vessels of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." In these words either he taketh the word hell largely, for the state of them that be dead, or else he is contrary to himself in other places, which I have cited before, where he affirmeth *Abraham's bosom* to be Paradise, and prayeth that he and his people may be taken up into *Abraham's bosom*. Epiphanius against Iacian the heretic, that denied Adam to be saved, saith: "For what cause descended Christ into hell? How after his sufferings when he had slept three days, did he rise again? And how is it fulfilled that he should have dominion over the dead and over the living, and of what living and dead, but of those that have need of his help above and beneath?" That Christ's descent into hell and his resurrection was to Adam's salvation, I see it proved by these words, but that Adam was in hell, or that Christ descended after his death, this place saith nothing, but rather that Adam, with the rest of the fathers, was in heaven. For who were they that were above then? but Adam and the rest. Ambrose speaketh of the force of Christ's death, which overcame death and hell to the salvation of all God's chosen: and not of the fetching of the fathers out of hell. For after he hath showed, that the devil by death reigned in the punishment of sinners, until the coming of Christ, he addeth these words, *Erperis peccati, &c.* "Christ being void of sin, when he went down to the bottom of hell, breaking the locks and gates of hell, after he had destroyed the dominion of death, he called back to life, out of the jaws of the devil, souls bound with sin: and this is written for a divine triumph, with Eternal characters, while he saith, Death where is thy sting, Death where is thy victory? which felicity of health restored, Paul considering, crieth out, As by Adam death entered into this world, so by Christ salvation is restored to the world." In these words, is nothing to maintain *Limbus patrum*, nor yet the popish manner of Christ's descent into hell. Hieron hath the like meaning, and his words be these: "By the blood of thy passion, through thy clemency, thou hast delivered those which were holden bound in the prison of hell, in which there is no mercy. Finally, after our Lord arose again, those that were holden with the bond of the sins of Adam, or as some will have it, of accustomed error, arose again with him, and appeared in the holy city." These words declare, that he speaketh of all that had deserved hell, which by the death and

resurrection of Christ, were delivered from hell. For that he meaneth not of *Limbus patrum*, as I have declared before, he affirmeth, that the rich man clothed in purple, remained in this lake of hell, and obtained no refreshing. "But to them," saith he, "which were bound, and which to be delivered by the mercy of Christ, the speech is directed. Be you turned, you that are bound to the munition of hope: and the sense is, You that are bound and holden of cruel and terrible hell, which hope for the loosing of your bonds, at the coming of Christ," &c. Hieron therefore must either be understood to speak allegorically, or else he should most absurdly place all the fathers in torments of hell with the rich glutton. Augustin, *ep.* 99, as is before showed, denieth that *Abraham's bosom* is hell, or any part thereof, but Paradise: yet he affirmeth, that Christ descended into hell. But into *Abraham's bosom*, saying he hath "not found, what benefit he bestowed upon those just, that were in Abraham's bosom when he descended into hell, from whom he never departed, according to the blessed presence of his divinity." In the other place that you quote, Augustin affirmeth nothing, but conditionally: "If it seemeth, that it is not absurdly thought, that the old Saints which held the faith of Christ to come, were in places most far off from the torments of the ungodly, but yet in hell until the blood of Christ, and his descent into those places, delivered them: truly from henceforth the good faithful redeemed with that price already shed, know not hell at all." You see he doth not absolutely affirm, but as an opinion, of some received, whereof he himself was not thoroughly persuaded, and which in some places he holdeth not: as *Epist.* 99. *De gen. ad lit. lib.* 12. *cap.* 33. and 34. Paulinus in his Panegyricall Poem, writeth some things poetically of Christ's conquest of hell, but directly of the Patriarchs in hell, and Christ's descent unto them, he speaketh not, and therefore is added to make up a number: as most of the rest are. Cyril hath these words: "And when now it was time that he should preach to the spirits in hell, for he came to have dominion as well of the living as of the dead, he suffered death for us. And this suffering proper to our nature, he did undergo willingly, according to the flesh: although as God he was life naturally: that hell being spoiled, and he made the first fruits of them that sleep, and the first begotten among the dead, as the Scriptures say, he might give return to life unto nature." These are the words of Cyril, which compared with that he writeth upon *Isaias*, do come something near your purpose, to declare his opinion. Gregory also affirmeth, that Christ descending into hell, delivered "only them that believed in him, while they lived and led a godly life." Of so many doctors as be quoted, you see how few do hold, that *Abraham's bosom* was in hell, or that the fathers were in hell before the coming of Christ. And of them that held it, how some place them in rest, as Augustin and Chrysostom: some in pain, as Cyril and Hieron.

rom, if he speak of their state. Hereby it appeareth, that this opinion in these ancient times of the Church, was neither generally received, nor constantly maintained: the same writer sometimes being of contrary opinions, as Chrysostom: and sometimes certain, sometimes doubtful, as Augustin. Let the indifferent reader judge therefore, whether you do impudently affirm your *Limbus patrum* to be confessed and proved of all the ancient writers, or we deny it with Purgatory, when neither of both is found in the Scriptures, and both by consequence are contrary to the doctrine of the Scriptures. We may be bold, I think, with modesty to say, that Augustin said of a like forged place: "The first place, the faith of Catholics by divine authority, hath believed to be the kingdom of Heaven: the second, Hell, where all that forsake or receive not the faith of Christ, shall feel eternal punishments. *Tertium penitus ignoramus, immo nec esse in Scripturis sanctis invenimus.* The third place we are utterly ignorant of, yea, we find in the holy Scriptures that it is not." *Aug. Hypognost.*

23. Hierom's words are these, "We thy creatures give thanks unto thee, O Christ our Saviour, but whilst thou didst die, thou slewest our so mighty adversary. What was more miserable than man before? which being thrown down with the terror of eternal death, received the sense of living, to this end only, that he might perish. For death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them which had not sinned after the likeness of the transgression of Adam. If Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were in hell, who was in the kingdom of heaven? If thy friends were under the punishment of Adam offending, and they which had not sinned, were held guilty of other men's sins, what is to be thought of them which said in their hearts, there is no God? Which are corrupt and made abominable in their wills, which have declined, being made unprofitable together, there is not that doth good, no not one. And if Lazarus be seen in the bosom of Abraham, in a place of rest, what like hath hell and the kingdom of heaven? Before Christ, Abraham in hell, after Christ, the thief in paradise. And therefore at his resurrection, many bodies of them that slept, arose, and were seen in the heavenly Jerusalem." These words contain a rhetorical amplification of the benefit of Christ's death: out of which we can no more prove, that Abraham and Lazarus were in hell before Christ, than that they were damned. As those first words declare, "What was more miserable than man?" &c. And that he saith, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were in hell, he rather aludeth to the phrase of the vulgar interpreter, who translateth *Sheol*, that signifieth the grave, by the word *Infernus*, which concerneth the bodies, rather than the souls, as it appeareth by the last words, that many of them that slept arose at his resurrection. And yet I will not excuse Hierom altogether from this opinion, that they which died be-

fore Christ's death, went in soul to hell, by which he meaneth, that they had not so clear light of heavenly felicity, as after Christ's resurrection; whereof there may be some doubt: but of *Limbus patrum* devised by the Papists he knew nothing, nor of Christ's descent into it. *Augustin, Ep. 99. Ludo.* denieth that Abraham and Lazarus with the Patriarchs were in hell, or that Abraham's bosom is any part of hell, saying, "I could never find in the Scriptures, that hell is named for good. And it be never read in the divine authority, verily that bosom of Abraham, that is a habitation of a certain secret rest, is not believed to be any part of hell, although even in those very words of our great master, where he saith, that Abraham said: Between you and us there is a great chaos established, I think it may sufficiently appear, that the bosom of that so great felicity, is not a certain part, and as it were a member of hell. For what is that great chaos but a great distance separating them far asunder, which not only is, but also is established between them, &c. To the same effect he writeth, *De gen. ad lit. 12, cap. 33.*

28. Those that judge Purgatory to be placed in this great distance, are not worthy the naming. For none of the ancient fathers for 400 years after Christ knew purgatory, or durst affirm it. Neither can the Papists agree where to place it. Where you make it no doubt, that Christ by his descending delivered some souls out of Purgatory, there is not one of the ancient Fathers that will take your part. Augustin, whom you name, speaketh not of Purgatory, but of hell. "But because evident testimonies do make mention of hell and sorrows, no cause cometh to my mind, why our Saviour should be thought to come thither, but to save them from the sorrows thereof, But whether all whom he found in them, or some whom he judged worthy of that benefit. I do not seek, or am not certain. Yet I doubt not but he was in hell, and performed this benefit to such as were placed in the sorrows thereof." These be Augustin's words: but you conclude hercot, that he took none out of the hell of the damned: ergo, out of Purgatory. As though you would enforce Augustin to acknowledge your division of hells, which it is certain he knew not: for if he had, he needed not to have doubted, whether Christ took all or some from thence. And as for Purgatory, he was never certain of it, therefore he could not speak so resolutely of it, to say that he doubted not, but Christ saved some from the sorrows of it.

28. There is no doubt but charity remaineth with the Saints in heaven, but it is ill proved by example of a damned spirit in hell. Again, that love which they have, is not now carnal and special towards their friends in the flesh, brethren, kinsfolks, and other, but spiritual and general toward all the elect of God, whom they love as themselves. Another conclusion is: if these in hell have means to express their desires to Abraham,

much rather may the living pray to the Saints, and be heard of them. I marvel you do not infer, if those in hell have such charitable affections, much more the Saints in heaven. But these parabolical speeches prove no more, than the end of the parable, namely, that they which in this life refuse to credit the holy Scriptures, may not look to be called by any extraordinary visions or apparitions. And yet if you would infer rightly, you should make your argument thus: If damned spirits to Saints far off can express their cogitations, much more may Saints that dwell together understand one another. As for men living, they have no means but by audible voice to express their desires, which cannot ascend so high as the Saints in heaven, who also lack the natural instruments, whereby such a voice may be received. But you have a conveyance, by the continual passage of souls and Angels, which Augustin thinketh indeed may give intelligence of some things, but not of all things, but only so much as it pleaseth God that they should know. Wherefore it were good first to know out of the Scriptures, whether it please God that Saints should know such affairs of the living. And secondly, whether it is his pleasure, that we should direct our prayers to them. If the Scripture do reveal neither the one nor the other, how should we know what is God's pleasure? Yea, seeing we have express commandment, to call upon God by Jesus Christ in all our necessities, with promise that we shall be heard in any request that is meet for us to attain: we cannot call upon Saints without breach of God's commandment, and distrust of his promise. Yea, seeing prayer is a sacrifice, it is to be offered only to God, and not to Saints. They therefore blaspheme God, which give the glory which is proper to God unto creatures, and not Calvin, who denieth that the voice of our prayers upon earth can be heard of Saints in heaven. As for the speeches uttered by Abraham and the damned soul, you might as well understand that they were parabolical rather than historical, as you acknowledge they were not uttered with corporal instruments.

29. "He might know these things," saith Augustin, "by the report of Lazarus: not when they were doing by men alive, lest it shall be false which the Prophet saith; Abraham knew us not. Therefore we must confess, that the dead know not what is done here, while it is a doing here, but afterward do hear it, of them which by death go from hence unto them. Not all things indeed, but such things as they are suffered to declare, who also are suffered to remember those things which it behooveth them to hear, to whom they declare them. The dead also may hear some things of the Angels which are present in those affairs, which are done here, even so much as he to whom all things are subject, doth judge that every one of them ought to hear." Thus Augustin wandereth in his imaginations, how the dead may know what is done among the living,

whereas he should rather have acknowledged with Chrysostom, that this is a parable, or with Ambrose, that it is a narration wherein many things are spoken parabolically, of which we must not ground any doctrine not taught elsewhere in the Scripture. As for example, you may as well say, that souls have fingers and tongues, and that elemental water will quench hell fire, as that Abraham knew what books were written after his death. But our Saviour Christ's purpose is not so much to declare what was spoken to and fro, as what might be answered to the importunate and impudent affections of the damned spirit. And albeit that the doctrine of the Church was comprehended in the Scriptures, might be revealed to Abraham after his death; yet it followeth not, that Abraham knew all things, as you affirm the Saints do in beholding the majesty of God: neither doth Augustin affirm, that they knew any more than it pleased God to let them have the understanding of, either by dead men's report, or by relation of Angels, or by any means whatsoever. More rightly you should gather as Eusebius Emisenus doth of this text. *Sufficit enim hos audire*, saith he, *si his credere voluerint. Omnibus enim ad salutem sufficit soli Mosis et Prophetarum libri, si tamen berne intelligantur*

## CHAPTER 17.

10. A servant by doing his duty to his master, deserveth not so much as liberty, much less to be his master's heir, *ergo* the servants of God, doing their duty, deserve not to be God's heirs of the kingdom of heaven, but of his mere favour and grace he giveth it them. Of which also he accepteth them not as servants, but as friends, yea as sons and heirs, and their service being not the thousand part of their duty, also he accepteth, and rewardeth of his mercy and not of their merit. Neither doth Paul say, that by cleansing ourselves, &c. But if a man shall cleanse himself, he shall be a profitable vessel, because the Lord will acknowledge him as his own, in whom this effect of his Spirit worketh this cleansing. For it is God that worketh in us both the will and to be able to do any such thing, according to his good pleasure, *Phil.* 2. 13. *Marcus Heremita de iis qui putant se operibus justificare:* "The Lord willing to show, that all the commandments are of duty to be performed, and that the adoption is given by his own blood, saith, when you have done all these things that are appointed unto you, then say, we are unprofitable servants, we have done that we ought to do. Therefore the kingdom of heaven is not the hire of works, but the grace of the Lord prepared for his faithful servants."

14. The leprosy was not healed by the Priest, but declared to be healed, so are sins declared to be forgiven by the Priest, and not properly forgiven, *Hierom in Matth.* 16. And whereas you say, out of the author of the book *De visit. inferni*, that a man must not despise God's ordinance, it is true. But both your author and you, have to prove auricular con-

cession to a Priest, to be God's ordinance. As you acknowledge that book to be none of Augustin's, so you should have done well to have signified, as the truth is, that the author was a man neither learned nor eloquent, and that those books were most impudently ascribed to S. Augustin: but then your quotation of his authority had been nothing worth.

14. They went not to the Priest to be cleansed, but that they might declare, that they were cleansed. And therefore this collection, of going to the Priest to shrift, is vain and ridiculous: being nothing else but a beggarly petition of two principles, namely, that necessity of shrift is God's ordinance, and that there is a Sacrament of absolution.

19. We see that he was whole before he gave thanks, therefore faith only made him whole, and that his thanks followed his faith, as an inseparable fruit thereof, not as a cause of his healing.

23. No man must look to see Christ his maker in the Popish elevation, or procession. For Christ shall not come into this world so often as the Priests will consecrate, but once in the end of the world, with majesty and glory.

#### CHAPTER 18.

1. We should pray always, not in voice, but in mind lifted up to God: as for Popish canonical hours be of superstition, rather than true devotion. For all times and places, are allowed for vocal prayer, as you term it.

8. We say not, that the Church ever decayed or ever shall decay in faith: although the Church may err in matters of doctrine, yet not to leave the faith in the foundation. But by your own confession, under the tyranny of Antichrist, faith shall be rare, and therefore the faithful few, and not so notorious, among so many wicked. Such we say was the state of the Church under the tyranny of the Pope, which is Antichrist.

13. Not as the Popish priests and people knock and kneel to the idol of the Mass cake. Augustin hath neither such words nor such meaning.

17. We must not be children in understanding, 1 Corinth. 14. 20. which is the mark you shoot at, for you would have men as ready to believe, whatsoever you tell them in the doctrine of the Church, as children are ready to believe every fable.

20. Keeping of God's commandments alone, doth purchase life everlasting, if a man can keep them perfectly. But if he once break one commandment, he hath purchased the curse of God. *Mark 12.*

22. This was a commandment to that person, but neither commandment nor counsel to all Christians: neither is it observed of Popish hypocrites, which sell not all to give to the poor, but to their friends or cloisters.

30. Life everlasting, is the free gift of God in Jesus Christ, Rom. 6. 23. Although God giveth it to them that forsake all things for Christ, not as a reward of merit, but as a gift of mercy.

#### CHAPTER 19.

4. External offices done to Christ's person by those that believed in him, were acceptable to him, otherwise not. Herod desired to see Christ, the multitude followed him, and thronged him, which after were ready to cry Crucify him. The Pharisees divers times entertained him, Judas kissed him. But whereas you say, the external offices of devotion, &c. are recommended to us for example: we know he hath recommended the poor afflicted for his sake to be relieved, but not to be honoured in all respects as his person was, of them who acknowledged him to be the Son of the living God. As for his Sacraments and Saints, require no such external offices, neither are they acceptable to him or his Saints. As for the pressing of superstitious Papists, to be near the idol of the Mass, and to see it held up or carried about, contrary to the institution of the blessed Sacrament, hath no colour of defence by example of Zaccheus who desired to see Christ, no although Christ were as verily to be seen in the Sacrament, as he was in the way, seeing this Sacrament was ordained to be eaten and drunken, not to be gazed and looked upon.

8. Alms and all other deeds of charity, are a duty of thankfulness for sins forgiven, no satisfaction, as is manifest by the parable of the servant, that owed ten thousand talents: *Math. 6. 18.* But in your discourse of restitution, you open a great mystery of iniquity, whereby the Jesuits, Seminaries, and other broods of treason and impiety are maintained, and not of the Pope's mere liberality. For while you teach restitution to be necessary which all good men do acknowledge, you have found out a case whereby infinite masses of money may be brought to the Pope's disposition, and such as be factors under him. For if the parties injured be not known, dead, or otherwise not to be satisfied, you determine, that the goods ill gotten, must be bestowed on the poor, or upon good uses, and that is not amiss. But you will not trust the conscience of the wrong doer, to bestow it as he list, but according to the advice of your superior, which is the Pope and his clergy, which have cure of souls. So that while you challenge to the Pope and ourselves, the disposition of goods gotten wrongfully, you take upon you an office far worse than Judas exercised, and by this means, ill gotten goods are worse bestowed, to maintain treasons, heresies, and treachery, and if need be, open wars against Christian Princes. But why I pray you, if the Extortioner, Usurer, Simoniak, Briber, &c. have the conscience to restore where he cannot to the parties injured, which ought first to be regarded, may he not bestow it uprightly and sincerely upon the poor, or other good uses? Or, if he lack advice, why may he not take it of godly and wise men, though they have not the charge of his soul, and though the Pope never hear of it? But whereas Zaccheus restored fourfold, it was not for satisfaction of his sins, but a fruit of his true repentance, whereby he

declared, that the injury he had done to any man, displeased him so much, that he accounted it no better then theft, and therefore was content to restore, as if he had been convicted of theft. Therefore, where you come in with large bestowing upon Christ of all, or a moiety, or four-fold restitution, despising the rich man's penny, groat, or crown, you plead well for Corban, and yet you are content to play small game, and to take even the poor widow's mite, if she have no more, or not much more to give, not contemning the rich man's pound. But why did not Christ challenge the disposition of this four-fold restitution, that Judas might have had the fingering of it? Or by what right may Christ's pretended Viar challenge that Christ did not? At least wise, if Christ could not intend it, why did he not commit the disposition of it to Peter, as his deputy in those weighty cases of conscience, reserved to his own jurisdiction? We know that liberal alms of a cheerful giver pleaseth God, as a fruit of faith, and shall have great reward. He is blind that cannot see, as well in this place, as in divers other, how under colour of merit, satisfaction, extinguishing of sin, and last of all, of restitution, you seek not only to devour poor widow's houses, but to be lords of rich usurers' and oppressors' goods.

17. The diversity of the rewards we acknowledge, which are according to the diversity of his gifts. For of his mercy he crowneth his gifts, not our merits. *Aug. in Psal. 70. conc. 1.* Otherwise every child may conceive, that the gain of ten pounds, doth not deserve the government of ten cities.

#### CHAPTER 20.

35. The Greek is none other than your own translation which you may be ashamed to correct having in your preface preferred it before the Greek.

36. The Scriptures never affirm, that good men by their works, merits or deserts, are worthy of heaven: but only by the grace of God in Christ Jesus. In whom they are accepted as worthy. And that man's works, done by Christ's grace, do condignly or worthily deserve eternal joy, it is contrary to the opinion of the best of the Schoolmen, who upon the saying of Paul, *Rom. 8.* "The sufferings of this life, are not worthy or condign," &c. invented the distinction of *Congruu* and *Condignu*. But to examine your texts of Scripture, which you bring to prove your new Popery. The first being no canonical Scripture, must either be understood according to the perpetual doctrine of the canonical Scripture, or else be rejected. By faith therefore, which is tried in temptation, they were found worthy, and not of the merit of their works. And though he that loveth his father more than Christ, is not worthy of him; yet it followeth not, that he which loveth Christ more than his father, is worthy of Christ. For our sins do properly deserve God's wrath, but our good works, because they are not perfect, nor ours, but God's gifts

in us, deserve not to us God's favour and grace, which is freely given. Thirdly, Paul prayeth, that the Colossians "may walk worthy of God," according to his acceptance, not according to the merit of their good works in this life, but that at the length, they may be made worthy in Christ their Redeemer, by whom they obtain remission of their sins. Fourthly, Christ showeth not what the faithful are by the merit of their works, but by acceptance of his grace, through his merits: therefore they are not called worthy, as Christ is called worthy, *Apo. 5. 12.* for it is said before expressly, ver. 4. "that none was found worthy to open the book, and to read it:" but the words you cite, be *Apoc. 4. 11.* and are spoken of the Godhead himself. Behold into what horrible blasphemy you run, while you maintain the merit of man's works (though done by the grace of Christ) to make men as worthy of the joys of heaven by them, as God is of glory, power, and majesty of his own nature. And whereas you say it is all one, to be counted worthy, and to be worthy indeed by the Greek, it is false. For though in one of our English translations it be once so translated, peradventure the word (counted) being omitted through oversight, yet the wicked are not unjust only by imputation, but by merit of sin and unrighteousness that is inherent: whereas the righteous are not perfectly just, by merit of justice inherent, but by imputation of the righteousness of Christ through faith. Neither are we so ignorant of the Scripture, but that we know the dignity of God's grace, whereby not only we are accepted, but also our labours rewarded, but altogether of the grace of God, and not of the merit of our works, which are not made worthy of reward, (for then they should be perfect) but in the merits and worthiness of Christ are counted worthy of eternal life.

36. Our Saviour sayeth not, that the Saints are now, but after the resurrection they shall be equal to the Angels. Neither saith he, in all things, but in that, they shall have no need or use of marriage. That any Saints, as the Virgin Mary, John Baptist, the Apostles, shall be above all angels in dignity, the Scripture doth not teach, therefore it is presumptuously, and blindly, though never so boldly affirmed.

#### CHAPTER 21.

4. No alms is meritorious in any respect, nor any alms is acceptable, without true faith and love. Bede allegorizing this widow to be the Church, saith, "The Church casteth all her living into the gifts of God: which understandeth even all that she liveth not to be of her merit, but of God's gift, when she sayeth, *God be merciful to me a sinner.*"

37. The godly may take great profit of solitariness, though they go not into the wilder ness. Yet idle in solitariness, is not so good, as well occupied in the Church.

#### CHAPTER 22.

15. Christ our Paschal lamb was sacrificed on the cross, where he was slain for us, 1



*Cor.* 5. 7. A sacrament and memorial of which oblation, he instituted in his last Supper.

17. Whether there were two cups divided, or one only whereof Luke speaketh here by anticipation, certain it is, by Matthew and Mark, and the consent of all the ancient writers, that these words, "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine," were spoken of the cup of the New Testament. And although they were not, yet you could not so avoid the fruit of the vine: for according to your own exposition, he did drink the fruit of the vine now in the kingdom of God, which is the celebration of the sacrament of his blood in the New Testament.

19. "As the bread of the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is no more common bread, but is the body of Christ, so also this holy ointment is no more bare ointment, nor, if a man had rather so call it, common ointment, after it is consecrated, but it is the gracious gift of Christ, which through the coming of the Holy Ghost to it, by his divinity hath power to work." *Cyrl. myst.* 3. As the ointment is the grace or gift of Christ, so the Sacrament is the body of Christ by his judgment, nor any other transubstantiation in the one, than in the other. Of the verity of Christ's flesh and blood, we doubt not: neither do we doubt, but that the same being eaten and drunken, do bring to pass, that both Christ is in us, and we in Christ: which words, because you deny the sense of them, you have gilded out of Hilary's saying, which declare, that he speaketh of a spiritual manner of eating, as he saith before: "We do truly under a mystery, receive the flesh of his body, and thereby we shall be one, because the Father is in him, and he in us."

19. The former words prove no presence, but mystical and sacramental, yet that Christ is truly received of the faithful. The word of the present tense, which is given, signifieth that the body of Christ was then given to be offered on the cross, and not in the Sacrament. For Christ offered himself but once, like as he died but once, and "by one oblation found eternal redemption, and made perfect for ever those that are sanctified." *Heb.* 7. 27. *cap.* 9. 12. 25. 26. 23. *cap.* 10. 10. 12. 14. Against these plain testimonies of the Scripture, what blasphemy is it to say, he offered himself twice, died twice, shed his blood in sacrifice twice? yea to set up a continual repetition of that sacrifice which was singular, because once offered it was sufficient, which none could offer but himself, who is an eternal Priest, void of sin immortal, and which he offered by his eternal spirit." *Heb.* 7. 24. 26. 27. 23. *cap.* 9. 14. And therefore the Fathers of the Primitive Church, do not call the celebration of the Lord's Supper a sacrifice in that sense, you say, but because a spiritual sacrifice of thanksgiving is offered therein: and improperly, because it is a memory of the only sacrifice of Christ offered on the cross. Not one of them saith it is a sacrifice propitiatory, or that Christ offered himself twice, or died twice for us. No not Gregory Nissen, whom

you place in the first rank, because he seemeth to say most for you: for his scope is to prove, that Christ suffered death of his own will, not by necessity of nature, or malice of his enemies: and therefore he saith, "he tarried not for the necessity that hung over him of Judas' treason, nor the violence of the Jews, as thieves, nor the unjust sentence of Pilate, that their malice should be the beginning and cause of the common salvation of men: but prevented it by his own purpose, and by a secret kind of sacrifice, which could not be seen of men, he offereth himself a sacrifice for us, and sacrificeth an oblation, being both the Priest and the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. When did he perform that? when he gave to his disciples, being gathered together, his body to be eaten, and his blood to be drunken, then he openly declared, that the sacrifice of the Lamb was already finished. For the body of a sacrifice is not meat to be eaten, if it be living: wherefore when he gave his body to be eaten, and his blood to be drunken, unto his disciples, his body was already offered by a secret and invisible means, as it pleased the power of him, that worketh the mystery. And his life was in them in whom the same power laid it down, and together with the divine virtue that was joined with it, was in that region of the heart. Therefore if any man will begin to measure the time from thence, when the sacrifice was made to God by that great High Priest, which by a mean that could not be expressed in words, nor seen with eyes, offered as it were a lamb, he shall not depart from the truth." These words of Nissen declare, that Christ, in purpose of his death, offered himself to God, before he was slain of the Jews: not that he instituted a sacrifice to be offered of others: signifying that the actual oblation of himself on the Cross, was the execution of that he purposed before, and not of the malice of his enemies, as it was a sacrifice. Also he showeth that this mystical sacrifice in purpose and will, was offered by himself, and could be offered by none other, no more than the execution thereof by his actual death. Therefore, though in show of his words, you dream of great aid, yet in substance of matter he helpeth you nothing at all: but if he be well marked, maketh much against you. Leo in neither of both the sermons, calleth the Lord's Supper a sacrifice, but speaketh of the only sacrifice of Christ, offered on the Cross. In the former he saith, that "Jesus being certain of his purpose, and void of fear in the work of his Father's disposition, finished the old Testament, and did erect a new Paschal: for when his disciples sat down with him, to eat the mystical Supper, while in Caiphas' hall they were treating how Christ might be slain: he ordaining the Sacrament of his body and blood, did teach what manner of sacrifice should be offered, not removing from this mystery, the very traitor." The Sacrament of his body and blood did show, that his body and blood should be that sacrifice, which he should offer. For eating

this bread, and drinking this cup, we show the Lord's death, wherein his body and blood was sacrificed. If you ask of Leo, where, and when this sacrifice was offered, in the next sermon he telleth you: "Christ our Paschal, as the Apostle saith, was offered, who offering himself a new and true sacrifice of reconciliation to his Father, was crucified not in the temple, the reverence whereof now was ended, nor within the compass of the city, which was to be destroyed, for the merit of the wickedness thereof, but abroad and without the tents: that the mystery of the old sacrifices ceasing, a new sacrifice should be laid on a new altar, and the cross of Christ should not be the altar of the temple but of the world?" of the same sacrifice he speaketh in the apostrophe unto Christ. "Now also, the variety of carnal sacrifices ceasing, that one oblation of thy body and blood, filleth the differences of all sacrifices: for thou art the true Lamb of God, which takest away the sins of the world, and dost so perform all mysteries in thyself, that as there is one sacrifice for all oblations, so there is one kingdom of all nations." These words of Leo, as every man may see, pertain to the death of Christ, which fulfilled the difference of all sacrifices: which thing, if it had been done by a sacrifice in the Supper, the sacrifice of his death had been needless. Hesychius calleth the Lord's Supper a sacrifice, by allusion unto the old sacrifices, and as it is a memory of the only true sacrifice of Christ's death, saying: "Aaron and his sons, do rightly eat it: for except Christ entreated by the mouth of the Priests, do come himself, and sanctify the Supper, and dedicate those things which are done, they are by no means made the Lord's sacrifice." The same mystery he saith a little before, to be both bread and flesh. And lib. I. he saith, that "the Cross did make the flesh of Christ, which was unapt to be eaten before his Passion: for who desired to eat the flesh of God? apt for meat after his Passion. For if he had not been crucified, we should not eat the sacrifice of his body. But now we eat that meat, receiving the remembrance of his Passion." These places of Hesychius, do open his meaning sufficiently, in what sense he calleth the Sacrament a sacrifice. Gregory lived in a corrupt time, more than six hundred years after Christ, yet that he meaneth not a sacrifice properly, but figuratively, it appeareth in the latter place by you quoted most plainly. "But it is necessary, when we do these things, that we slay ourselves in contrition of heart unto God: for we which do celebrate the mysteries of our Lord's Passion, ought to follow that we do. Therefore it shall then be truly a sacrifice to God for us, when we have made ourselves a sacrifice." See you not that it is a spiritual sacrifice, as the sacrifice of ourselves?

Cyrrillus, though not so ancient as the bishop of Jerusalem, whose title the book of Mystagogie doth carry, yet doth expressly call it "a spiritual sacrifice. Dionysus calleth it often *ιερουργιαν* a sacrifice or holy work: yet by

many words declareth, that he meaneth a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for the death of Christ, whereof the Sacrament is a memorial. "How should the divine imitation," saith he, "boetherwise performed in us? if the remembrance of the most holy works of God, were not always renewed with praises and sacrifices of the Priests. For this we do, as the Scripture saith, in the remembrance of him." In Ignatius is nothing but the name of sacrifice, which showeth not what kind of sacrifice, and therefore if we should admit that Epistle as authentical, it is nothing to the purpose, to or fro. But Justin doth most expressly say, it is a sacrifice of thanksgiving, and that Christians have none other sacrifice. "For I myself do affirm, that prayers and thanksgiving, made by worthy persons, are the only perfect and acceptable sacrifices to God. For these are the only sacrifices that Christians have received to make, to be put in mind by their dry and moist nourishment, of the passion which God the Son of God, is recorded to have suffered for them." Where is now the sacrifice propitiatory of the body and blood of Christ? Likewise Ireneus, speaking of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, calleth it "an oblation which the Church in all the world doth offer to God, even to him which giveth us nourishment, the first fruits in the new testament, according to the prophecy of Malachi." Which afterward *cap. 33.* he interpreteth to be the prayers of Saints. And *cap. 31.* he saith, "We offer unto him not as to one that hath need, but giving thanks for his gift, and sanctifying the creature." Tertullian in neither of both the places hath any more than the name sacrifice, whereby he meaneth the public prayers and thanksgiving of the Christians. "We sacrifice," saith he, "for the Emperor's health, but to our God and his, and as God hath commanded, with pure prayer." *Ad scapud.* Likewise the prophecy of Malachi, he interpreteth of spiritual sacrifices. *Adversus Judeos:* namely "setting forth of God's glory, praise, and hymns," *Adversus Marc. lib. 3.* "and simple prayer out of a pure conscience," *lib. 4.* Other sacrifices than these Tertullian never knew Cyprian in his Epistle to *Cæcilius*, declareth sufficiently that the Sacrifice whereof he speaketh, is only a memorial of thanksgiving for the Passion of Christ. "Because," saith he, "we make mention of his passion, in all sacrifices, for the sacrifice which we offer, is the passion of our Lord, we ought to do nothing but that which he did." And so it is called by Rabbanus Maurus, who lived 800 years after Christ, and yet showeth that there was none other sacrifice in his time. *De instit. Cler. lib. 1. cap. 32.* The celebration of the Supper therefore is a sacrifice, as it is the Passion of Christ, namely, a thankful memorial of the sacrifice of Christ's Passion.

Eusebius is as plain as is possible for the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, prayers and memorial of Christ's one sacrifice offered on the Cross. "A memory of this sacrifice

we have received to celebrate, at the table by the signs of his body, and of his healthful blood, according to the divine laws of the New Testament." Again he concludeth the whole matter of sacrifice in these words, "We offer sacrifice and incense, when we celebrate the memory of that great sacrifice according to the mysteries delivered concerning it. And offering to God for our salvation, thanksgiving by devout hymns and prayers: and when we sacrifice ourselves unto him wholly, and to his word, the high Priest leaning on him with body and soul?" What can be plainer against your blasphemous sacrifice? Nazianzen only nameth the oblation of unbloody sacrifice, "by which we are united to Christ, and made partakers of his passion and divinity," meaning doubtless the memorial of that sacrifice. For the propitiatory sacrifice of the body of Christ, for the redemption of the world, he calleth, "The sacrifice that cannot be sacrificed, or the unofferable sacrifice. *In sanct. pasch. Or. 4.* And the Sacrament itself, he calleth "The figures of salvation." *Ad imper. Irasc.* Chrysostom, as other ancient Fathers do, divers times calleth the Sacrament a sacrifice: but in one place he expoundeth his meaning so plainly, as no man but he that is overcome with impudence, would wrangle any longer about that term. For resolving that doubt, how Christ is said to be offered daily, whom the Apostle to the Hebrews, teacheth to have offered himself but once, he concludeth in these words, "This which we do, is done in remembrance of that which was done. For do this, saith he, in remembrance of me: we offer not another sacrifice, as the high priest, but the same always: but rather we work the remembrance of a sacrifice." *In ep. ad Heb. Hom. 17.* Ambrose in the former place, saith, "Therefore having in remembrance his most glorious passion and resurrection from the dead, and ascension into heaven, we offer unto thee this undefiled sacrifice, this reasonable sacrifice, this unbloody sacrifice, this holy bread and cup of eternal life." And in the first chapter of that same book, he saith, "This reasonable oblation, is the figure of the body and blood of Christ," meaning a holy sign for memory of Christ offered on the cross. In the second place which you quote, he saith, "Before a lamb was offered, now Christ is offered, he is offered as a man, as receiving passion, and he offereth himself as Priest, that he may remit our sins: but here in an image, there in truth, where he maketh intercession for us, as an advocate with the Father." Mark that Christ is not offered here in truth, but in an image of similitude: and that he is not offered by the Priest, but by himself as he was on the Cross, seeing the Sacrament is an image and representation of that sacrifice, not a sacrifice in truth.

Hierom also divers times useth the name of sacrifice, but his meaning was none other, than of the rest of the fathers in that time. "Christ," saith he, "offered in the figure of his blood, wine and not water." Again he

calleth the institution of the Sacrament, "The mystery which he expressed for a figure of his passion, and of proving the truth of his body." Here is not a sacrifice propitiatory of the body and blood of Christ, but bread and wine offered in a figure of his body and blood, and of his Passion. Augustine likewise calleth it a sacrifice, but not in that sense you say. For thus he writeth of it: "Christ is our Priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec, which offered himself a sacrifice for our sins, and hath commended the similitude of that sacrifice to be celebrated in the remembrance of his Passion, that the same thing which Melchisedec offered to God, now we see to be offered in the Church of Christ throughout the whole world." *Orat. trium quest. 61.* Now choose whether you will say, that Melchisedec offered praise and thanksgiving, or bread and wine. For the natural body of Christ he did not offer. But the same that Melchisedec offered, the Church doth offer, similitude of the sacrifice of Christ's death. Again he saith, "This is the sacrifice of the Christians, we being many, are one body: which also the Church frequenteth in the Sacrament of the altar known unto the faithful, where it is showed unto her, that in the same oblation which she offereth, she herself is offered. *De civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 6.* Again, speaking of the sacrifice of Christ's death, he saith, "He himself is the priest that offereth, he himself is the oblation, of which thing he would the daily sacrifice of the Church to be a Sacrament, seeing he is the head of his own body, and she is the body of the same head. As well she by him, as he by her accustomed to be offered." *Cap. 20.* And most plainly against Faustus the Manichee. *Lib. 20, cap. 21. Sed quid agam, &c.* "But what shall I do, and when shall I make manifest to so great blindness of the heretics, what force that has which is sung in the Psalms. The sacrifice of praise shall glorify me, and there is the way where I will show my saving health: The flesh and blood of this sacrifice before the coming of Christ, was promised by sacrifices of similitudes: in the passion of Christ, it was given by the truth itself, after the ascension of Christ, it is celebrated by the Sacrament of remembrance." Much more hath Augustin in other places, but this is sufficient to declare, in what sense he calleth the celebration of the Lord's Supper a sacrifice.

Fulgentius also, which followed him much in doctrine, thereof thus writeth: "Hold this most steadfastly, and doubt nothing that God be the only begotten Son, the Word, being made flesh, offered himself for us, a sacrifice and oblation of sweet savour to God: to whom with the Father and the Holy Ghost, by the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Priests, in the time of the Old Testament beasts were sacrificed: and to whom now, that is in the time of the New Testament, with the Father and the Holy Ghost with whom he is one God, the holy Catholic Church ceaseth not to offer the sacrifice of bread and wine

in faith and love. For in those carnal sacrifices there was a figuring of the flesh of Christ, which he himself being without sin, was to offer for our sins, and of that blood which he was to shed for the remission of our sins. But in this sacrifice there is thanksgiving and commemoration of the flesh of Christ, which he offered for us, and of the blood which the same God shed for us." Mark that Christ is not offered to God his Father, but the sacrifice of bread and wine to Christ, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, for thanksgiving and remembrance of the death of Christ.

Your next quotation is, of all the Greeks upon the 9th to the Hebrews. For Chrysostom's judgment you have it before, that the oblation of the Church, is rather a remembrance of a sacrifice, than a sacrifice properly.

Theophylact, following him, *Heb. 10*, saith, "Here ariseth a question, Whether we also do offer unbloody sacrifices? I answer, We do: but we keep a remembrance of the Lord's death, and it is one, not many sacrifices, seeing he was offered but once. For we offer the same Christ always, nay rather we keep a memory of that oblation, wherein he offered himself, as though it were done now." These words are manifest, that it is called a sacrifice figuratively, and improperly, which is rather a memorial of the sacrifice offered by Christ himself.

Oecumenius with all the Greeks, out of whom he gathered his commentary, hath in a manner the very same words: And saith further, that Gregory in his *Apologetico* saith, That "the mysteries which now are done and practised, are exemplars of greater mysteries:" meaning redemption purchased by the death and passion of Christ.

Primasius also agreeing with Chrysostom, and the other Greek interpreters, answereth to the same objection, Whether our Priests do not daily offer sacrifice? "Truly," saith he, "they offer, but in the remembrance of his death; and because we sin daily, and have need daily to be cleansed, because he can die no more, he hath given us this Sacrament of his body and blood, that as his passion was the redemption and absolution of the world: so this oblation might be redemption and absolution to all that offer in true faith, and have good intention." Again he saith, *Istud*, &c. "This is not repeated for the infirmity thereof, because it could not give perfect health, but in remembrance of the passion of Christ, as he himself said, Do this in remembrance of me." His meaning therefore is, that our faith being confirmed by this Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, applieth the benefit of Christ's passion to the forgiveness of our daily offences, and therefore is not properly a sacrifice, nor a repetition of the sacrifice of Christ, but a celebration of the remembrance of Christ's death, according to Christ's own institution. In which there is no one word that soundeth toward the setting up of a sacrifice: though the celebration of the Supper were commonly called so.

The council of *Nice*, 1, nameth oblation an offering in divers canons, but in none other sense, than the fathers before cited.

The council of *Ephesus*, in the Epistle to *Nestorius* use more words, and therefore do more plainly express their meaning: "Fore-showing the death of the only begotten Son of God, that is of Jesus Christ according to the flesh, and likewise confessing his resurrection, and ascension into heaven, we celebrate in the Churches, the unbloody service of that sacrifice, so also we come to the mystical blessings, and are sanctified, being made partakers of the holy body and precious blood of Christ the Redeemer of us all," &c. It were hard to gather a sacrifice propitiatory of these words, which show how the service of the sacrifice is celebrated, namely, by preaching of the Lord's death, resurrection, and ascension, and participation of the holy Sacrament of the very body and blood of the Son of God.

14. The Council of Constantinople the 6th, *cap. 32*, nameth the unbloody sacrifice, as the celebration of the Communion was commonly called, whereby was meant, that it was not properly a sacrifice, nor a sacrifice propitiatory for a sin, seeing without shedding of blood, there is no remission of sin, *Heb. 9, 22*. And also it findeth fault with them, which alleging Chrysostom's authority, in his exposition of *Matthew's Gospel*, offered wine only in the holy Table, and did not mingle water with it. By the oblation of wine, we may see they were far from a Propitiatory sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ.

The second Council of *Nice*, though it were a collection of an idolatrous unlearned company of Greekish Prelates, gathered to serve the idolatrous humour of Irene the wicked Empress, yet approving that counterfeit Epistle of Athanasius, wherein mention is made of blood that flowed out of an image of Christ, that was crucified at Berytus: They allow also these words of it; "This is that blood of our Lord, which is said to be found among many men, neither must true Catholics think otherwise, than that which is written of us, as though any part of the flesh and blood of Christ, might be found in the world, but that which is daily made spiritually in the altar by the hands of the Priest." So that although against the Council of *Ephesus*, they speak grossly of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, yet they mean not carnally, as the words do sound, but as appeareth by these words of the Epistle, they mean that the flesh and blood of Christ is present spiritually.

As for the Councils of *Lateran*, *Constance*, *Florence*, and *Trent*, being late chapters of heretical and blasphemous Papists, they are not to be alleged in any controversy between us seeing they were gathered by heretics, especially and purposely against the faith of the Catholic Church.

19. In these words authority and commandment is given to the Church, to celebrate the mystery of the Lord's Supper: but the special calling, ordaining, and appoint-

ing of the Apostles and their successors, to be ministers of the Church was after his resurrection: as appeareth Matt. 28, Mark 16, Luke 24. But most expressly John 20. But to make his body, or to offer it in sacrifice, there is no authority given by these words, for Christ instituted a Sacrament, not a sacrifice, of his body and blood. For the faithful being made perfect by the only oblation of Christ offered by himself on the Cross, need none other sacrifice, but a memorial and Sacrament thereof, to confirm their faith in the remission of sins, purchased by his sacrifice. And although the Paschal lamb was slain before it was eaten, yet Christ did institute the Sacrament of his body and blood, before he was slain, nevertheless to be continued as a perpetual memorial of his death. As the Sacrament of the Paschal lamb was instituted before the deliverance of the people out of Egypt, yet to be a perpetual remembrance of that deliverance, which figured the spiritual deliverance of all the church, from the tyranny of Satan and the power of hell. Now whereas you quote divers ancient fathers, to prove that Christ by these words, "gave commission and authority to the Apostles, and to all Priests that be their successors, to sacrifice his body." Concerning the first, *Dionis. cel. Hierarch. cap. 3.* hath no word of any such matter: and to go further with you, not in all his works. Ireneus saith, "That Christ giving counsel to his disciples, to offer unto God the first fruits of his creatures, not as though he had need, but that they themselves should be neither unfruitful, nor unthankful: he took that bread which is of the creature, and giving thanks, said, This is my body. And the cup likewise, which is of that creature that is with us, he confessed to be his blood, and taught the new oblation of the New Testament, which the Church receiving from the Apostles, offereth to God in all the world, to him which giveth nourishment unto us, the first fruits of his gifts in the New Testament, whereof in the 12 Prophets, Malachi did foreshow," &c. This prophecy of the sacrifice, afterward he doth expound of prayers, thanksgiving, praises, and works of charity, cap. 33. and 34. His words declare, that in his time, bread and wine were offered to God, that is, dedicated to the holy use of the Sacrament, whereby thanksgiving prayers, and praises, were offered to God, and charity among Christians confirmed.

Cyprian in that Epistle to Cecilius, contendeth earnestly for wine to be offered in the cup, as Christ did institute the Sacrament in wine and not in water. But by the oblation and sacrifice, he meaneth none otherwise than Ireneus doth, and as we have showed in the section next before: not a sacrifice of his natural body and blood. "I would have thee know," saith he, "that we are admonished that in offering the cup, the Lord's tradition be observed, and that nothing else be done, but that our Lord did first for us. That the cup which is offered in remembrance of him, he offered mixt with

wine. For when Christ saith, I am the true vine, the blood of Christ verily is not water but wine. Neither can the blood of him by whom we are redeemed and quickened, seem to be in the cup, when to the cup is wanting wine, by which the blood of Christ is showed, which is set forth by the Sacrament and testimony of all the Scriptures. The cup, the wine, the bread, is offered in remembrance of Christ, not his body and blood properly sacrificed or offered." Chrysostom, *Hom. 17. in Ep. ad Heb.* as we have declared before, saith, it is rather a memory of a sacrifice indeed, which the Church offereth, "An exemplar of that which was offered once, and offered unto the holy of holies. Ambrose, in Psalm 38th, saith, "Let us Priests follow him as we may, and offer a sacrifice for the people," &c. But in cap. 10. ad Heb. he hath the very words that Chrysostom writeth upon the same text: answering the objection how the Church offereth a sacrifice, when the sacrifice of Christ once offered, was sufficient. "This that we do, is done in remembrance of that which hath been done. For do you this, saith he, in the remembrance of me, we offer not another sacrifice as the high Priest, but the same always, but rather we work the remembrance of a sacrifice."

19. The text and the ancient doctors are so plain in this case, that you are constrained to confess, that this sacrament is a lively representation, exemplar, and form, and also a figure of Christ's sacrifice upon the Cross. "But it is so a figure of that sacrifice," you say, "that it is the selfsame body sacrificed and immolated in the sacrament, under the shapes of bread and wine." This saith none of the ancient Fathers, which say, it is an exemplar, a commemoration, a figure of that sacrifice, no not Chrysostom and Ambrose, whom you quote, but as I have set down their words before. It is so the same sacrifice, that it is rather a remembrance of a sacrifice, then a sacrifice indeed, or properly. But here you accuse our perversity or ignorance, that think it therefore not to be Christ's body, because it is a memory or figure of his body. For to be a figure of a thing, and yet the thing itself, you say, repugneth not. Your ignorance, although it be great, I will not here accuse, but your impudence, that shame not to say, that to be a Relative, and the Correlative of the same at the same time, and in the same respect, repugneth not. I think *Sorban* itself, would hiss out this monstrous absurdity: For you may as well say, that Isaac to be Jacob's father, and Jacob's son also, repugneth not.

But you have examples to demonstrate the matter, that a thing may be a figure of itself. First you say, "Christ the Son of God, is a figure and character of his Father's person, being yet of the selfsame substance. If you had been well jerked when you were lads for giving the Correlative to his relative, you would have said thus: The son of God is a figure or character of his father's person, yet he is the selfsame person that his Father is

And if you will abide by this conclusion, your example may serve to prove: That this is a figure of Christ's body and sacrifice, yet is it also the selfsame body and sacrifice. But if you dare not affirm so much, lest you should fall into that sabbellianism, what perversity shall I say, or ignorance, or impudence is it, to frame your example, so, as it is nothing like to the matter which it is brought to demonstrate?

Your second example is, Christ's body transfigured in the Holy Mount, was a figure and resemblance of his person glorified in heaven: Why say you not of his body glorified in heaven: that the relation may be right and proper? but because you seek to run away under a mist of doubtful words. But who will grant unto you, that Christ's body there transfigured, was a figure of his body glorified, when not his body, but the glorious shape which then he took upon him, was a figure or part of his divine and heavenly glory, where with he is now invested in heaven. For his face now shineth not as the sun, but ten thousand times more bright than the sun: his body is not now covered with garments white as light, but shineth most gloriously as the body of the Son of God.

A third example you have, That the sacrifice is no less a true sacrifice, because it is commemorative of Christ's Passion, than those of the Old Testament were less true, because they were prefigurative of the same. Indeed it wanteth nothing but Christ's institution, but that it might be a true sacrifice. For if the Sacrament had been ordained by Christ to be a sacrifice commemorative, as they were to be sacrifices prefigurative, it had been as true a sacrifice as they: and yet being commemorative, as it is, though not a sacrifice, it could not have been the same thing whereof it is commemorative, no more than those sacrifices were the same sacrifice, or thing, whereof they were prefigurative.

20. The Greek maketh nothing for very blood in the chalice, but speaketh of the blood of Christ, shed upon the cross: for in the chalice it was not shed, but the cup is the New Testament, in the blood of Christ, shed upon the cross, or the redemption of the world.

20. The Apostle to the Hebrews, chap. 9, doth most plainly declare, the figure of the sprinkling of blood by Moses, *Exodus 24*, to be accomplished in the sacrifice of Christ's death, and bloodshedding once offered upon the cross: whereof the Sacrament is a memorial, and no sacrifice. Therefore it is a most wilful perverting of the sense of the Holy Ghost, to draw those words of Christ, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, to a second sacrifice. And whereas you say, he alludeth unto the words of Moses, *Exodus 24*, it is more like, that he alludeth to the words of Moses used about the institution of circumcision and the Paschal lamb, *Gen. 17. Erod. 12*, which were sacraments as this is. The difference you make of the standing piece or goblet of Moses, as you call it, and the chalice of Christ, is ridiculous. By which you would

make fools believe, that Christ used not a common cup or pot, usual to be drunk in at meat, but a consecrated chalice, such as you occupy at Mass. Whereas the Greek word used by all the three Evangelists, and Paul, signifieth none other but an usual drinking cup or pot, whether you will call it a standing piece, bowl, goblet, or chalice. Wherefore your conclusions are such, as you are accustomed to make, either upon none, or upon false premises, or upon true premises most absurdly and brutishly inferred, as in this place. The cup is the New Testament in Christ's blood: *Ergo*, Christ's blood in the chalice, is the blood of sacrifice. Whereas by true logic, it followeth after this manner, that all the Papists in the world are not able to avoid. The cup is the New Testament in Christ's blood. The natural blood of Christ, is not the New Testament in Christ's blood. Therefore the cup is not the natural blood of Christ, which was sacrificed on the cross, but a sacrament and holy memorial thereof. In the celebration whereof, a part of Christian religion doth consist, as in the celebration of baptism. And by these sacraments, in that they be seals of faith, the benefits of Christ's passion are applied unto us, through the working of the Holy Ghost, but not by sacrificing again the body and blood of Christ. Yet doth not the sovereign worship of God in the New Testament, consist principally in any external religion, service, or sacrifice, offered by any mortal creature, but as our Saviour Christ saith expressly, in spirit and truth *John 4. 23*.

20. The relative, which, in the Greek, as well as in the Latin, is governed of the noun blood, and not of the word chalice. For the relative must, according to true grammar, be referred to that which went next before it in construction and composition, which is the name blood, and not the word chalice. The Greek, as it is now read indeed, following the Hebrew phrase, which is usual in the Holy Scripture of the New Testament, goeth somewhat from the common phrase of the Greek tongue, but of Basil was read, without all controversy, according to the common Greek construction. And therefore all your trifling of the real presence, and true sacrificing, is nothing but vain and unlearned insultation. For no ancient writer, for a thousand years after Christ, or more, ever observed any such matter out of this text. And therefore, whereas you say, that Beza turneth himself roundly upon the Holy Evangelist, charging him with solecism or false Greek: without all conscience and honesty you slander him most impudently. For he nameth not solecism of false Greek, but *solecophanes*, which is an appearance of incongruity, where there is none indeed. Except you would be taken for such ignorant asses, that you know not the difference, of *solecismus* and *solecophanes*, your malicious slander can have none excuse. Indeed, he saith, that these words might be added to the text, out of the other Evangelists, as in divers other places both he and others

have observed, by conference of copies, and testimony of the ancient Fathers: Yet he standeth not upon this conjecture, but that either the ancient reading was, as Basil witnesseth, or else, that it is a Hebraism in the same sense. And where he saith, it cannot be truly said, neither of the chalice itself, nor of the contents thereof, that it was shed for us: you affirm, it is to give the lie to the blessed Evangelist, or to deny this to be Scripture. But I pray you, consider, upon what ground you charge him with such open blasphemy. Do you hold indeed, that the chalice, in proper speech, was, or could be shed for us? Nay, the contents you will say; well, there is one figure granted. And for the contents, shall we not believe the word of Christ, which saith this cup is the New Testament? Yes doubtless. Why then it followeth, that the New Testament is the contents of the cup. Was the New Testament shed for us, or could it be shed for us? No verily. Therefore Beza without giving the lie to the Holy Evangelist, might say, that it cannot be said in proper manner of speaking either of the cup, or of the contents thereof, that it was shed for us. And yet acknowledge, those words to be Scripture, being referred to the noun, blood, which was indeed shed for us on the cross: So miserable be your flights, and shifts of falsehood, forged upon impudent lies, and malicious slanders, gross ignorance, and unlearned collections. God be praised, who daily maketh your folly and madness, more and more manifest to all men.

24. The Apostles were not void of the Spirit of God, for no man can acknowledge Jesus to be the Lord, but in the Spirit: although they were not so plentifully endued with the gifts of the Holy Ghost as afterward.

31. Our Saviour Christ, by these words giveth no superiority to Peter, but foresheweth his infirmity, greater than of the rest, in respect whereof, he had need of a special prayer to uphold him, that his faith should not fail in that great temptation: Admonishing him, what his duty was, after he had experience of his own frailty, and of the comfort of God's grace, to strengthen his brethren, by assurance of God's mercy, whereof he had so great trial in himself. And as concerning the Pope's supremacy, or prerogative, not to err, I say, as in the like collections of the Papist. All the Logicians that are, or ever were, cannot rightly conclude in due form of syllogism, either the one or the other, out of the words of this text. Which is sufficient to confute all the large discourse that followeth. Nevertheless, I will examine all the arguments, as they lie in order. He calleth Peter by name twice, not to put them out of doubt, that he is their superior, but to admonish him seriously, in what danger he specially, and the rest generally, were through the malice of Satan, and their own weakness, which was not yet known unto them. "And lest the eleven Apostles," saith Bede, "should glory, or attribute unto their own strength, that they almost alone, among so many thousand Jews should be said

to have continued with the Lord in temptations, he showeth, that they also, if they had not been protected by the aid of the Lord, assisting them, might have been broken in pieces with the rest, through the same storm or tempest." Neither doth any of the ancient Fathers for five hundred years after Christ, gather out of this place Peter's superiority or prerogative of not erring: and although they had done so, yet their collection should have had no ground out of the words of the text. *Prosper cont. Cass. cap. 35. Drogo de sacram. Dominica passion. Bernardi contemporaneus.* Basil citeth this text to prove that we ought to pray for them that are sought in temptations. You say "he prayed specially for Peter, to this end that his faith should never fail, and that he being once converted, should after that forever confirm, establish, or uphold the rest in their faith." But the truth is, he prayed specially for Peter, because Peter specially, and through his greater presumption, was in danger of greater temptation: that in so grievous a fall, he should not through weakness of faith, fall away, for that signifieth the word *καταπερα*, but be converted, and become an example of God's mercy, to all penitent sinners. "As I," saith Bede, speaking in the person of Christ, "by prayers protected thy faith, lest by temptation of Satan it should have failed: So thou also remember, to lift up and comfort thy weak brethren, by example of thy repentance, lest peradventure they should despair of pardon." In these words therefore, is taught the duty of Peter, and of every Christian man, that hath tasted of God's protection in temptation: to use his example and experience, to the comfort of others, no prerogative granted, that Peter from henceforth shall never err, nor any that succeedeth in his chair at Rome, whereof here is no mention in the world. Neither was Peter ever after this, appointed to confirm, establish, or uphold the rest of the Apostles in their faith otherwise than a fellow member of charity to comfort them, in this present danger, or in any like. And as for the confirmation, establishing, or upholding of the rest of the Apostles in the truth of the gospel, they received it of the Spirit of Christ, equally with Peter, and not of the prerogative of Peter's chair. Yea when Peter walked not aright according to the truth of the Gospel, in a contention being stirred up, by Cerinthus the heretic, as Epiphanius testifieth, at Antioch in his own See, he was reprehended openly by Paul, and so his faith, which began to waver, was confirmed by another Apostle, as the faith of the rest at another time was by him. Therefore Peter, by these words, was not made superior over the rest of the Apostles, and the whole Church: neither had any singular privilege, by Christ's prayer and promise, that his faith should never fail. Christ prayeth for all his Apostles, that God would sanctify them in his truth, yea for all that should believe in him through their preaching, yet hath not every true Christian such a privilege, but that he may err from the true faith, though not finally unto condemnation.

Further, where you say that none other Apostle, Bishop, or Priest, may challenge any such prerogative, either of his office or person, otherwise, than joining in faith with Peter, and by holding of him: In part it is true. For neither Peter, nor any other man hath any such prerogative, as you surmise. But Paul the Apostle, neither joining with Peter, nor holding of Peter, was bold to reprehend Peter, Barnabas and others, upon assurance of the truth of the gospel, which he had learned by revelation, according to the Scripture, and to convince him of error and dissimulation, before all men. That he joined not with Peter in that his error, it is manifest by his reprehension. That he held not of Peter, he declareth as plainly, saying, that he was an Apostle of Christ, neither of men nor by men, *Galat. 1, 1, and 12*, but by Jesus Christ immediately, as the rest of the Apostles were. The Scripture therefore, nothing favouring this false gloss, you come to the Doctors: and first to Leo, himself a Bishop of Rome, and a great maintainer of the dignity of his See, therefore somewhat partial in this case, and rejected in the general Council of Chalcedon, for the supremacy which he laboured to establish. But what saith Leo? Verily his words do not a little extol Peter's dignity, yet not so much as you would bear us in hand, by your false translation. The words of Leo be these: "Prayer is made specially for the faith of Peter, as though the state of the other should be more certain, if the mind of the principal were not to be overcome. In Peter therefore, the strength of all is defended, and the aid of God's grace is so ordered, that the steadfastness, which by Christ is given to Peter, by Peter should be conferred to the Apostles." In these words Peter is neither called the head, nor said to be invincible. But if we shall further ask of Leo, how this steadfastness is conferred by Peter to the rest of the Apostles, and to the whole Church, he will not answer, by his successor the Pope; but, "confirming us by his exhortation, and not ceasing to pray for us, that we be not overcome by any temptation." And this he saith not only for himself, as Pope and Peter's successor, but for all the people of God and specially for the citizens of Rome, where Peter sat and died, as in the words following it is manifest. Therefore Leo out of these words of Christ, gathereth no such superiority or prerogative of the Pope, in not erring, as you would enforce out of him, but without any warrant of his words or meaning.

Next followeth *Augustin, lib. Q. Nov. test. Q. 75*, an author worthy to avouch such a matter, namely, a counterfeit Augustin, for a false interpretation, which no man but more than beastly impudent, will ascribe unto Augustin the ancient father whom neither in words, nor matter, this writer doth any thing resemble, but rather writeth many things directly against Augustin. And yet is falsified both in words and sense: for

these are his words: "He prayed for Peter, and did he not pray for James and John, that I speak not of the rest? It is manifest, that in Peter all are contained. Because he saith in another place, I pray for them Father, whom thou hast given unto me, and I will that where I am, they also be with me." These words, if the authority of the writer were any thing worth, are against the prerogative of Peter, showing that the prayer of Christ, extended to all the Apostles as well as to Peter. But the circumstance of the text is plain that it was specially for Peter, in respect of his greater infirmity and danger.

Thirdly, Ambrose is brought in, writing, but no place quoted where, lest your falsification and false collection might more easily be espied. But by likelihood you mean *Enar. in Ps. 43*, where he hath these words, "The adversary is compelled to tempt the holy ones of the Lord to his own loss. For while he tempteth them, he maketh them better, that he which is tempted, may instruct others, who seemed weak to his own self. Finally Peter is set over the Church, after he hath been tempted of the devil. And therefore our Lord signifieth before hand, what thing that is, that afterward he chose him a pastor of the Lord's flock. For to him he said: But thou after thou be converted, confirm thy brethren. Therefore the holy Apostle Peter, was converted to his amendment, or to become good corn, and was sifted as wheat, that with the Saints of the Lord, he might be one bread, which should be nourishment unto us. For while we read the acts of Peter, and know the precepts of Peter, he is made unto us a nourishment unto eternal life and salvation." Here is Peter made an example of the profit, that the Saints reap by temptation, but no privilege of supremacy or prerogative of not erring, ascribed either to his person, or office, or succession. But you argue that the Church was to be preferred, no less afterward, than in the Apostle's time, therefore the privilege was granted to the office in succession, and not to the person of Peter. Thanks be to God, the Church's preservation is otherwise provided for by Christ the only true head thereof, and needeth not the Pope's supremacy, or infallibility, as is manifest by the Scripture. *Eph. 4, 11, 12, 13, &c.* This argument therefore, consisteth of two vile sophisms: the one a beggarly petition of the whole controversy, that Peter had such a privilege and prerogative, as cannot ever be proved out of the holy Scriptures: the other a false assignation of that to be cause, which is no cause at all of the Church's preservation. Yet you are not ashamed to say, "Hereupon all the fathers apply his privilege of not failing, and of confirming others in faith, to the Roman Church and Peter's successors in the same." And yet you are not able to bring any one of the ancient and authentic Fathers, that lived within four or five hundred years after Christ, that either acknowledgeth such a privilege of the Romish Church, or of the Bishops thereof,



or that gather any such thing out of this text. Cyprian saith, "To the Romans, whose faith by commendation of the Apostles is praised (perfidia) falsehood or false dealing can have no access." He speaketh against the impudence of certain heretics, that being driven out of Africa, sought entertainment at Rome, which the godly Church there would not consent unto. Cyprian therefore speaketh not of the Romans absolutely, but those whose faith was praised by the Apostle, from which faith if they swerved, as they confess themselves, it should be to their greater shame. *Ep. 31.* Again he speaketh not of error in faith, but of false dealing, and neglect of discipline. For if Cyprian had been persuaded, that the Church and Bishop of Rome could not err, he would never have so openly dissented from them as he did in the question of rebaptizing of them, that were baptized by heretics; in which he with the Council of Africa, did openly oppose himself, against Stephanus, Bishop of Rome, and the Church of Rome also, as many other Bishops of the East Church did, declaring thereby that the Bishop of Rome's authority, in those times was not acknowledged, nor his privilege of not failing in faith, once heard of. And as for this present text, of Christ's prayer for Peter, it is so far off, that Cyprian could gather any prerogative of the Bishop of Rome out of it, that he doth extend it generally, to all the members of Christ: "Yea he prayed so earnestly for us," saith he, "that we read in another place: And the Lord said to Peter: behold Satan hath desired to toss you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, lest thy faith should fail. If then he laboureth, and watcheth and prayeth for us, and our offences, how much more ought we to be earnest in prayer, and to pray, and first of all to entreat our Lord himself, then by him to satisfy God the Father." *Epist. 8.* Again he writeth: "Our Lord prayed, and he prayed not for himself, but what should he entreat for himself being innocent: but for our offences, as he himself declareth, when he saith to Peter: Behold Satan hath desired to toss you as wheat, but I have prayed for thee, lest thy faith should fail." This is Cyprian's judgment upon this text, which proveth, that he acknowledgeth no such privilege or prerogative, as is now-a-days pretended.

As for Bernard who lived almost a thousand years after Cyprian, when Antichrist had openly invaded the tyranny, it is no marvel, though he were deceived, to yield to such a prerogative, as none of the ancient Fathers of the Primitive Church would ever acknowledge. As for the distinction that the Pope may err personally, but not judicially, or definitively, is vain, seeing neither of both parts, can be proved out of the Scriptures. Neither had the high priesthood, or Moses' chair any such privilege, in respect of their office, that the high priest could not err: seeing, the contrary is manifest in the Scripture. Vria the high priest did set up an idolatrous altar in the Lord's Temple, and

did offer sacrifice upon it. *2 Reg. 16.* Eliashib, through ignorance of God's law, contracted affinity with Tobia the Ammonite, and made him a great chamber in the house of the Lord. *Nehem. 13, 14.* Caiphas was a Sadducee, and condemned Christ. But admitting your distinction, it is to be proved that Bishops of Rome have erred judicially, and definitively. The Bishop of Rome in Tertullian's time erred not only personally, but also definitively, when he acknowledged the prophecies of Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla, and gave letters of peace to the heretical Churches of Asia and Phrygia, which had been excommunicated by his predecessor, as witnesseth Tertullian, *contra. Praxeam.* Liberius erred not personally, but judicially and definitively, when he subscribed to the Arians, as testifieth Athanasius. *Apolog. 2. Ad solitaire vitam agentes, Hieronymus. in Catalogo. Damasus in pontificati. Marianus Scotus. Petrus Damianus epist. 15, cap. 16.* Honorius did not only fall into heresy, but also in a decretal epistle, did publish and confirm the same, as was proved in the Council of Constantinople the sixth, where he was condemned for a heretic. "With these also," saith the Council, "we have foreseen to be cast out of the holy Catholic Church of God, and to be accused, Honorius, which had been Pope of old Rome, because we find by his writings, which he made to Sergius, that in all things he followed his mind, and confirmed wicked doctrines. *Const. 6, act. 13.* Likewise *Leo. 2,* in his Epistle to Constantine, approving the sixth general Council, writeth thus: "Likewise we accuse the inventors of this new error, Theodorus Bishop of Haran, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, Petrus, successors of the Church of Constantinople rather than Prelates. And also Honorius, which did not lighten this Apostolic Church, with the doctrine of Apostolic tradition, but by profane treason, endeavoured to subvert the immaculate faith." Augustin also citeth the decretal epistle of Innocentius to the Bishops of Numidia, wherein he holdeth, that to receive the Communion, it is necessary for infants." *Cont. duas Ep. Fel. ad Bonifac. lib. 2, cap. 4.* And saith of him expressly. "Who defineth that little children, cannot have life in them, except they eat of the flesh of the Son of Man." Thus did Innocentius err definitively, in a matter confessed by the Papists themselves, to be an error, that the Communion is necessary for infants: which was a common error in Augustin's time, holden of all the Church, for any thing that we can read to the contrary. And it is a monstrous lie to report, that Augustin saith: That in the office, or seat of the Pope, our Lord hath set forth the doctrine of truth. For writing against the schism of the Donatists, he speaketh of the chair of unity, not of Popery. "Our heavenly master," saith he, "hath forewarned this thing," meaning Schism or dissension, "so greatly to be avoided, that of evil governors he as-

sureth the people, that the chair of wholesome doctrine should not be forsaken of them, in which even evil men are compelled to speak good things. For they are not their matters which speak them, but God's, who hath placed the doctrine of truth in the chair of unity. Wherefore he being true, and the truth itself, of governors doing their own evil things, and speaking the good things of God, saith: do ye those things which they say, but do not those things which they do, for they say and do not." All men see that here is nothing in the world for the prerogative in the Pope's chair, that he cannot err: but that unity is not to be broken for the evil manners of the teachers, so long as they teach the truth. When you prove, that the Pope for his public, judicial, and definitive writings, hath no good warrant, as Luke, Mark, Solomon, had for their Gospels, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, we will admit their case to be like. But while the world standeth you shall never prove the best of the Pope's writings, to be equal with the Canonical Scripture. For in any men's writings, although there be the like truth, yet is there not equal authority, as Augustin saith.

That Augustin and the Bishops of Africa did write to Innocentius and Cælestinus, Bishops of Rome, it was not for that they ascribed this pretended prerogative, either to their persons or to their office, and seat, but as good Catholic Bishops, have always used to confer one with another, when any question hath arisen in the Church, to require their mutual consent in the truth, and against heresies, as in those three epistles quoted, which were written to Innocentius, of their proceedings against the Pelagians it appeareth. But when the Bishops of Rome, would have usurped authority over the Churches of Africa, by colour of a counterfeit Canon of the Council of Nice, they were not regarded, either in respect of their persons, or their office and seat. *Conc. Afric. cap. 105.* Yea they count it an absurd thing, "that any man should believe, that God could inspire any one man, with the justice of examination, and did deny the same, to innumerable priests, gathered together in council, as they were, to cut off appeals unto the See of Rome. *Epist. ad Cælest.* Neither doth Chrysostom, in his epistles to Innocentius, acknowledge any such prerogative or privilege of the See of Rome, but as one Christian friend to another, being himself in banishment, desireth his furtherance for the benefit of the Church, showing how injuriously he had been dealt withal.

Basil also in purposing to write to the Bishop of Rome for his counsel, concerning the affairs of the Church, and touching the Council of Ariminum, doth but practise that care of all Churches, which in the same epistle he commandeth in Athanasius, without ascribing any superiority or prerogative to the Bishop of Rome. If Hierom being a priest of the Church of Rome, doth once or twice ask counsel of Damasus his proper Bishop and

Diocesan, what great marvel is it? or what privilege or prerogative of the See doth he acknowledge? which confesseth that Liberius subscribed to the Arians. And yet in divers epistles Damasus asketh counsel of Hierom in many questions, as Hierom did of him in one, about the use of the term Hypostasis for unity's sake.

Cyprian in the place quoted, speaketh not of the Bishop of Rome's prerogative, but of obedience to be given to every Bishop in his own diocess, and namely to himself, against the timorousness of Cornelius Bishop of Rome, who was moved by the threatening brags of one Felicissimus, a wicked schismatic, excommunicated by Cyprian and other Bishops of Africa, to yield something unto him. Whereupon Cyprian sheweth, what inconvenience would ensue, if he did not continue constant, in rejecting him and his proud heretical company, after their cause hath been once judged by their proper Bishop, in the province where their offences were well known. And therefore writing against their gadding to the See of Rome, he saith, "And what cause had they, to come and to bring tidings of a false Bishop, made against the true Bishops? For either they are pleased with what they have done, and continue still in their wickedness, or if they be displeas'd and go from it, they know whither they should return. For seeing it is decreed of us all, and it is also meet and right, that every man's cause should be heard there, where the crime was committed, and a portion of the flock is ascribed to every pastor, which every one should rule and govern, as he that is to give account of his doing to the Lord: verily, they over whom we have government, ought not to run about, nor by their crafty and deceitful rashness, to set at variance the concord of Bishops agreeing together. But there to plead their cause, where they may have both accusers and witnesses of their crime: unless to a few desperate and lost persons, the authority of the Bishops placed in Africa, seem to be less, which have already judg'd of them, and with the gravity of their judgment, have condemn'd their conscience bound with many snares or cords of offences. Their cause is already heard and known, sentence is already given of them, neither is it meet, that the censure of priests should be reprehended, through lightness of a moveable and inconstant mind."

This writeth Cyprian of Fortunatus and his accomplices, that being condemn'd in Africa, sought restitution at Rome, as though the authority of the Bishops of Africa had been less than the authority of the Bishops of Rome and Italy, which Cyprian would never acknowledge for his time, though heretics by such gadding about, never ceased to molest him.

The words of Hierom are these: "But thou wilt say, the Church is founded upon Peter, although in another place, the same thing is done upon all the Apostles, and they

all do receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the strength of the Church is established equally upon them: yet for this cause one is chosen among the twelve, that the head being appointed, the occasion of schism might be taken away." By which words Hierom meaneth, that Peter was chief of the Apostles, in order to avoid dissension, not in authority or prerogative of not erring. And elsewhere he acknowledgeth every Bishop to be of equal authority with the Bishop of Rome, as in his epistle to Evagrius, reasoning against a custom of the Church of Rome. "Neither is the Church of the city of Rome to be esteemed one, and the Church of the whole world another, both France and Britain, and Africa and Persia, and the East, and India, and all barbarous nations adore one Christ, observe one rule of truth. If authority be sought, the world is greater than one city. Wheresoever a Bishop be, either at Rome or at Eugubium, either at Constantinople or at Rhegium, either at Alexandria or at Tanis, he is of the same worthiness, of the same priesthood. Power of riches, and baseness of poverty, make not a Bishop higher or lower. But they are all successors of the Apostles."

#### CHAPTER 23.

43. No man ought to defer conversion, but to repent as soon as he is called, as this thief did, for God giveth not the grace of repentance, according to the will of man, but according to his own pleasure, and purpose. Neither must any man look to obtain salvation by faith, which is void of good works. For such was not the faith of this penitent thief, but fruitful of good works, as the place and time could suffer. But to go straight to heaven, without satisfaction or punishment for his former sins, every Christian man may be assured, not only by this example, but also by manifest testimonies of Scripture, if he die in the Lord, *Apoc.* 14. 13. *John* 17. 24. *1 Cor.* 5. 1. *John* 5. 24. &c. And as for our satisfaction and punishment for our former sins, is not found in the Scripture, but is contrary to the general doctrine of remission of sins by the free grace and mercy of God. For thereby every one that truly believeth and confesseth Christ, may challenge as certain knowledge of his salvation, by the general promises of God in the Scriptures, as the thief by these special words of Christ uttered unto him. Neither was this good thief saved by any other means, than all Christians are saved, namely, by the free mercy of God in Jesus Christ apprehended by faith: *Prosp. cont. Cas. p. 14.* Which Angelomus in *2 lib. Reg. c. 12.* confirmeth the example of Peter and this thief.

*Drogo de sacra. Dom. passion.* He maketh this thief to be Adam that is a pattern of all sinners that are saved. *Julianus Tolet. prog. lib. 2. cap. 1.* Wherefore we should learn, not to despair, but to believe steadfastly, that if we do truly repent as this thief did, we shall as certainly receive pardon for our sins, at what time soever it be, as God promiseth

by *Ezekiel* 18. 21. For God will not reject an humble and contrite heart, *Psal.* 51. 19. Secondly, that true faith is never void of good works, as repentance, love of God and our neighbour, hatred of sin, confession, and other external works, as time and opportunity may serve. Thirdly, that Christ gave remission of sins freely, and not of merit for zeal or reprehension of his fellow, but of his mere mercy and grace, by which he gave him faith and repentance: as he doth to all that are converted to him. So the ministers of the Church ought to assure penitent sinners of forgiveness and the kingdom of heaven, without any satisfaction or punishment for satisfaction, which is never required on their part in the Holy Scriptures. Neither have they any commission to require it any of God's of elect, or to delay the reward of any for whom Christ hath satisfied to his Father, as he hath for all that are redeemed by him. Last of all, every man that by faith applieth unto himself the general promises of God, may be as sure of salvation, as he was. For they are as true of every one in singular, as they are of all in general. "And this thief was justified on the cross," saith Augustin, "by that consummation and brevity, which the Apostle, *Rom.* 10, maketh general to all men, who having all other members of his body fastened on the cross, and having those two free, believed with his heart to righteousness, and confessed with his mouth to salvation, and immediately obtained to hear, this day thou shalt be with me in paradise." *Ad Simplicia lib. 1. q. 2.* Likewise Ambrose saith: "It is a most excellent example to desire conversion, that pardon is so soon granted to the thief, and that grace is more plentiful than his prayer: for our Lord doth always grant more than is asked." *In Luke cap. 23.* The like comfort for all penitent sinners, is gathered out of this example, by *Cyprian De cœn. Dom. num. 7.* And *Chrysostom in Gen. hom. 55.* and in a manner by all the ancient Fathers. Therefore the Papists do wickedly go about to make it almost singular and extraordinary.

55. The cause of the women marking of the place of Christ's burial, is expressed in the text, whereunto the popish manner of watching the idol of the sepulchre in their churches hath no resemblance, and therefore is nothing else but gross superstition, and meekery of the mysteries of our faith, wherefore the burial of Christ is one. The impiety is so much the greater, when the sacrament, ordained to be received, to assure us of life, is laid in the grave as though it were a dead body. Or if because it was ordained to be a remembrance of Christ, they may do with it what they will, to signify the actions and passions of Christ's body, why do they not likewise baptize it, bind it, scourge it, crown it with thorns, and nail it to a cross, as well as they bury it, and raise it out of the sepulchre.

#### CHAPTER 24.

1. The observation of the Lord's day, is taught in the Scripture to be apostolical, and

not grounded upon uncertain tradition unwritten, as other Papists affirm.

47. The Papists are under this curse, which preach that the Church consisteth in communion of the Romish Pope, and not in the communion of all nations.

30. Although this were to be understood, of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, as some of the ancient Fathers do think, yet it is no example, nor warrant of ministration in one kind. For the breaking of bread, should be here taken figuratively for the whole Sacrament, by Synecdoche, which is used when a part is named for the whole. And Chrysostom upon that promise of Christ, that he will drink the cup of the fruit of the vine, anew in the kingdom of his father, saith expressly, "After his resurrection in the bare table of this mystery, he used wine. Of the fruit of the vine," saith he, "which verily bringeth forth wine and not water." Neither is there any of the ancient Fathers which think that our Saviour Christ here gave the Sacrament, that gathereth example or warrant of ministration in one kind. Finally, you cannot say, that he gave bread only, as the Sacrament, except you will also say that he consecrated in one kind, which you all confess to be unlawful and sacrilegious.

47. The universal Church of Christ, is wheresoever the gospel or doctrine of salvation is embraced, and not tied to the city or congregation of Rome, which when it was a member of Christ, was a particular Church, and not the universal Church, Hierom misliking the custom of the Church of Rome, that a priest should be ordained by the testimony of a Deacon, saith: "What! dost thou bring forth unto me the custom of one city?" But now Rome is not the universal Church, nor any sound part thereof: but the whore of Babylon, the seat of Antichrist. *Apoc.* 17. 18.

Seeing the Scripture doth not express, in what form Christ lifted up his hands, it is great presumption to affirm, that it was in the similitude of the cross. Neither is it any thing like, because Jacob laid his hands overthwart, or across upon his nephews' heads, that Christ did so, seeing here was not the like cause. For Jacob laid his hands after that form, because the younger son which should be the greater, was placed at his left hand,

and the elder at his right hand. Neither was the sign or figure of the cross in any estimation with the Apostles, or the faithful in their time. Valentinus the heretic, was the first that made any great account of it, as testifieth *Ireneus lib. 1. cap. 1.* Tertullian, indeed, reckoneth signing with the cross to be an old tradition, which yet is no more certain to have been used by the Apostles, than other like ceremonies which he there nameth, as the tasting of milk and honey by them that were baptized, and the abstinence from washing for a week after baptism, oblations for birth days, and such other long since abolished, which they should not have been, if they had been ordained by the Apostles, as necessary for Christian religion. The like may be said of Basil's testimony. Augustin in the place noted, speaketh not of the sign of the cross, which Christ never commanded to be set on men's foreheads but of the seal or mark wherewith the true worshippers of Christ are marked, *Apoc.* 7. in their foreheads, to signify that they should not be ashamed to confess the reproach of Christ, which is the glory of the Christians. Finally, when you ask what form a Christian man can use to bless himself, rather than the sign of the cross? I would first know, how a Christian man can bless himself, seeing the Apostle saith, it is without all controversy, that the lesser is blessed of the greater or better. *Heb.* 7. 7.

Secondly, that the sign of the cross is dedicated in the death of Christ, rather than the signs of other things that were likewise instruments of his passion.

Thirdly, how it is a convenient memorial of Christ's death, which is not ordained of Christ, nor taught by his Apostles to be such.

But you say whosoever it be, "that Bishops and Priest's do bless with an external sign, no man can reprehend, being warranted by Christ's own example and action:" As though every action of Christ, were an example for us to follow. But admitting this to be an example, and action to be followed, Popish Bishops and Priests are justly to be reprehended, because they are not content with that external action of Christ, which they read in the Holy Scripture, of imposition or lifting up of hands, but they will use another whereof they have no warrant in the Scriptures

## ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT OF JOHN'S GOSPEL.

There are but eight books of Cyrils' commentaries remaining, four of them being lost. Instead of which Jodocus Clitoveus, added four of his own writing, namely the fifth, the sixth, the seventh, and the eighth, which of

these great learned Doctors of Rheims, are accounted for the books of Cyril, and sometime devoutly alleged, as the authority of Cyril: as in the preface and *cap. 10. vers. 29* of this gospel and elsewhere.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

## CHAPTER I.

1. A horrible slander of Calvin, who teacheth none otherwise of the Godhead of Christ, than the papists themselves. Affirming that he is God, of God the Father, in respect of person as the Son, yet very God, of one and the same Godhead that the father is God, which is not multiplied by communication of generation, but is one and most singular in all the three persons. Which most true and perpetual doctrine of the Church, he hath maintained in his writings against the Arians, Sabellians, and Trinitarians of our age, while the authors of this slander take their ease, and never once opposed themselves against them.

1. The protestants are nothing like the Arians, for they acknowledge the words of Christ to be true, in such sense as he spake them, and as the ancient fathers of the church did take them and expound them, for many hundred years after Christ, as in places convenient is proved. *Mat. 26. Mark 14. Luke 22.*

12. Men have no freedom of will, to accept the grace of God offered, until they be by grace prevented. And although they be not forced or drawn by necessity, yet they are by the grace of God made willing, which by nature were altogether unwilling. The word which they have here translated power, signifieth dignity, or authority, which is given only of God's grace, as the words of the text are manifest, to them that receive Christ by faith; which is not of "him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but is the gift of God." *Eph. 2. 8. Rom. 9. 16.* By this power, saith Cyril upon this place, he understandeth adoption and grace: afterward most safely he inferred, that they are born of God, that he might show the greatness of grace, which joyneth together strangers from God, and maketh them the sons of God, and of love giveth freely the nobility of the lord to his servant. *Eus. Emiss. hom. in nat. Dom.*

14. Blind devotion of ignorant papists, who understand not the words, much less the mystery expressed in these words, *Verbum caro factum est*, or *Homo factus est*, at which they kneel, as you say, although I suppose it is not generally observed of all papists.

26. John acknowledgeth, that he is only a minister of the external action and element, and that Christ is the author and giver of spiritual grace: other difference he showeth not.

42. Cephas signifieth any stone, such as Peter was one, appointed to be one of the twelve foundation stones of the church. But if the pope cannot err in his decretal Epistles, Anacletus saith it signifieth "a head, or beginning, or first." *Dist. 22. cap. Sacro. sanct. Anacl. Ep. 3. Virgilius Euthero.*

42. A wretched conclusion: "Christ looked upon Peter, ergo, he appointed and preferred him to be chief apostle, the rock of his church, and his vicar." The addition of his name Cephas proveth that he was appointed to be a stone, whereon the church should be builded, but not a singular or the only rock thereof, no more than the addition of Boanerges proveth

that James and John were the only children of thunder, or that Barnabas was the only son of consolation. Neither was the name of Simon changed, for he was still called Simon, by our Saviour Christ, *Mat. 16. 17. chap. 17. 25. Luke 22. 31.* and *John 21. 15.* and by James *Acts 15. 11.* That Christ builded his Church upon Peter, as upon a rock, and most firm stone, as Cyril saith, it is no controversy; seeing he built it jointly upon the foundation of all the apostles, and the faith and doctrine of Peter, which was the faith and doctrine of all the apostles, is the rock whereupon the church is builded, and not the person of Peter, as the same Cyril testifieth. *Dialog. de Trinit. lib. 4. in Isa. lib. 4.*

## CHAPTER 2.

2. The only presence of Christ at the marriage, is not sufficient to make it a sacrament, as baptism and the Lord's supper are sacraments. But his word of institution, *must come to the outward element, that it may be made a sacrament*: as Augustin teacheth expressly, *Tract. 70. in Joan. de Cataclysmo, c. 31.* Augustin in the places by you quoted nameth marriage a sacrament, as he doth many other things; but not a sacrament of the New Testament, the institution whereof he acknowledgeth to have been before man's fall, *de sup. et con. lib. 1. cap. 21.* the same teacheth the Master of the sentences, *lib. 4. dist.*

3. The Virgin Mary maketh no express request to our Saviour Christ, to work any miracle, and if she did, yet he did nothing at her request, but according to his own wisdom and good will.

3. Whether the Blessed Virgin knew the time of the manifestation of Christ, is not certain: but it is most certain that Christ knew his own time better than she, and therefore he had no need to be admonished by her. Although the words do import no request, but only signify that the wine failed. Whereby she might mean, that she did modestly refer it to his pleasure, whether he would supply the want of the wine by some godly exhortation, or by working a miracle. If she were persuaded that he would begin his miracles at her request, as you are bold without all warrant to affirm, she was much deceived: for he would not yield to her motion, whatsoever her meaning was. Therefore this place nothing favoureth her intercession to Christ, and much less our prayers to her.

4. The phrase is no more subject to divers senses here, than *Mat. 8. 29.* where the only sense is, What have we to do with thee, Jesus thou son of God? therefore your latter interpretation is right. Christ had nothing to do with his mother, nor she with him, in matters pertaining to his office, and commission of his Father. And therefore his words were a reprehension of her intermeddling with that wherein she had nothing to do. For we may not so excuse her, that we accuse our Saviour Christ, who did not reprove her unjustly, but as she deserved, though not only for her

own cause, but for instruction to others, who might take offence by her interpellation, to think that he was in matters of his office, subject to his mother, which he utterly denieth: and therefore doth nothing at her request, but as he himself saw it expedient. His mother required a miracle, saith Augustin, but he did not acknowledge human bowels when he should work divine works, as though he should say, That of me which worketh a miracle thou didst not conceive, thou art not mother of my divinity. *Tract. 8. in Joan.* Chrysostom upon this place, *Hom. 20.* thinketh that she was tickled with *van glory and ambition*, as also when she sent to speak unto him, when he was preaching, *Matth. 12. 4.* Which although it be not gathered out of the text necessarily, yet it showeth that the Virgin Mary in his judgment was not void of sin, nor so reputed of the ancient fathers.

5. It cannot be proved by these words, that she took not the reprehension of Christ, to pertain unto her: but rather the contrary, seeing that now she requireth perfect obedience to be given to his word, no longer taking upon her to admonish him. Where you say, "our Lady by her divine prudence," &c. the speech is insolent, and cannot be excused of blasphemy, whatsoever your meaning is. For though she were endued with singular wisdom of God's spirit, yet it cannot be rightly called "her divine prudence." Further where you say that she doubteth not, but Christ will grant her petition, you speak beside the book, seeing the Gospel maketh no mention of any petition, neither could she have faith or certain persuasion of a miracle, seeing he had not only not promised any such thing, but also sharply rebuked her, for offering to intermeddle in such matters, as did not appertain unto her. What wilful blindness is this? that you will not acknowledge that Christ said directly and expressly, "his time was not come but that she had no repulse though he seemed to say, his time was not come." Shall we believe you, or the Evangelist? which reporteth that he said, "my time is not yet come." Finally, where you say, "she doubted not but he would begin a little before his ordinary time for her sake," as *Cyrl* thinketh he did, it is monstrous presumption to ascribe such persuasions to the blessed Virgin, wherein she should have grievously offended: if being before admonished that he had nothing to do with her in such matters, and that his time was not yet come: contrary to his express word, she should have conceived such presumptuous persuasions as you ascribe unto her. Neither doth *Cyrl* think as you say, neither can any such thought be gathered out of the words of that Chapter. "He showeth," saith *Cyrl*, "how great honour is due to parents, when straightway he for his mother, cometh to the act, which as much as was in him, he had deferred for a short time. These words of *Cyrl* declare, that he tarried the full time which in his divine wisdom he saw to be most expedient for working this miracle.

9. He that seeth water turned into wine, and seeth that by all senses it is judged so to be, hath need to know, how bread is turned into the natural body of Christ, contrary to the judgment of all his senses. When the Scripture, never mentioneth any such conversion: yea when it is certain by the Scriptures, that the body of Christ never leeseeth the essential properties of a body, he hath need to know, how the body of Christ can be under such a shape, wherein it hath no essential properties of a natural organical body.

15. Christ as King and high Priest, yea very God, had all authority to punish offenders, in soul, body, and goods: but the ministers of the Church, his servants, by this example, may not take upon them temporal punishment of men, in body and goods at their pleasure: whereby you insinuate the Antichristian power, which the Pope would usurp, not only to excommunicate Princes, but also to procure conspiracies against their lives, to murder them, and to deprive them of their kingdoms and dignities, contrary to the manifest Scriptures, and the judgment of all the godly fathers of the Primitive Church. For it is manifest that Christ in this place, useth his divine authority, as he declareth by raising up the temple of his body after it was by them put to death. *Cyrl in Joan. lib. 2. cap. 32. Chrysost. in Joan. hom. 22.* None but Antichrist therefore, that boasteth himself as God, will presume to do that which Christ here did, by the same warrant that he did it. The civil authority of magistrates, is otherwise sufficiently established over mens' bodies and goods.

24. Howsoever this doctrine be grounded upon the text the Papists practise commonly against it, who give the Sacrament commonly to them that were never instructed in the mysteries of Christian religion, if they once come to years of discretion, although they know neither the Lord's prayer, ten Commandments, articles of faith, or any thing else necessary to salvation: except it be to pronounce the words ill favouredly, in a tongue whereof they have none understanding.

#### CHAPTER 3.

5. Spiritual Baptism with the Holy Ghost, is necessary to salvation, as our regeneration: whereof the outward baptism is a seal, not to be neglected where it may be had according to God's institution.

5. It is not necessary in this place by water to understand material water, but rather the purifying grace of Christ, as in the 4th Chap. ver. 11. whereof the washing with water in baptism, is an outward sign or seal, which also is termed fire, *Matth. 3. 11.* The water therefore in Baptism is not our regeneration properly, but a Sacrament and seal thereof. *Isidorus Origin. lib. 7. Cap. de Spirit sancto.*

Secondly, where you say, that John's baptism "had not the spiritual grace," it is false; for it had remission of sins joined unto it, *Mark 1. 4.* although not of the ministry of John, but of Christ the fountain of all grace.

Thirdly, where you say, No man can enter into the kingdom of heaven, without external Baptism, you teach the contrary yourself soon after, saying, that in two cases, it is not necessary. Augustin affirmeth as much, saying, "That the visible Sacrament is then supplied invisibly, when not the contempt of religion, but the article of necessity exclude the mystery of baptism." *De Baptis. cont. Don. lib. 4. cap. 22.*

Fourthly, you slander Calvin, to match him with the Pelagians, which promised eternal life to all infants, without Baptism, in respect of their innocence, denying original sin. Whereas Calvin holdeth all infants under the sentence of eternal damnation for the guilt of original sin, yet excepteth the elect who are born again by the Spirit of God, although the Sacrament of Baptism be sometime lacking, not through their default, but because they are prevented by death. In which case it is otherwise supplied, as in your two cases.

Fifthly, you slander Calvin and us, whom you charge to think, that only faith doth so serve, that the external element of water is superfluous or not necessary when it may be had according to Christ's institution. For in some cases you confess it not necessary. And indeed the words of our Saviour Christ, are not properly of the external Sacrament, more than *John 6.* of the other Sacrament. "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you." Whereas all infants are excluded from that Sacrament, and consequently should be excluded from life, if the words were meant of the outward Sacrament. And the fathers of the ancient Church, which thought Baptism was necessary, did likewise think the Communion to be as necessary for infants, as Augustin, Innocentius Bishop of Rome, and all the Church of their time, for any thing that we can gather by their writings. Finally, when the word of water in this text, signifieth the purifying grace of Christ, rather than the outward element of Baptism, here can be no argument drawn out of this place, that Sacraments confer grace of the work wrought, but according to the dispensation of God's spirit, which worketh according to his own pleasure.

31. The doctrine and Baptism of John was from heaven, though there was infinite difference between the ministry of John, and the Majesty of Christ.

#### CHAPTER 4.

2. St. Augustin thinketh the Apostles were baptized by Christ himself, rather than by John, but without authority of the Scripture, and contrary to this express text. And therefore we must rather admit that which he sayeth in the same Epistle, reconciling this text with that of *John 3. 22.* "That he baptized with the presence of his majesty, but he baptized not with his own hands. For the Sacrament of baptism was his, but the ministry of baptizing, pertained to his disciples." Again, he baptized not by himself, but by his disciples. *Tract. 15. in John,* he affirm-

eth, that Christ baptized in spirit, as he doth continually, not in body. Chrysostom also in *John 3. 22.* hath these words: "The Evangelist showeth afterward, that Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples, whereupon it is manifest, that in this place also it is so to be understood." In *John Hom. 28.* and upon this text he sayeth: "He himself did not baptize, but the messengers did so report, when they would stir up the hearers to hatred of him." *Hom. 30.* Cyril, also upon the former text, saith: "Christ baptized by his disciples." In *John lib. 2. cap. 57.* Euthymius upon that place *John 3. 22.* readeth in the plural number: "They baptized, and not he, for the Evangelist saith afterward, that Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples." Again he saith, "some copies have, *He baptized,* which is understood that he did not by himself, but by his disciples." Bede also following Augustin saith upon this text: "Jesus did both baptize and not baptize. He himself baptized because he himself cleansed, he himself baptized not, because he did not himself dip in water." Theophylact, in *John 3. 22.* saith: "When thou hearest that he baptized, think not that he baptized by himself, but by his disciples, for that work of the disciples, the Evangelist referreth to their master." Therefore the consent of so many fathers is to be preferred, before the bare conjecture of one father, and that against the express words of the text.

20. By adoration, is meant worshipping of God generally, as the word plainly signifieth, and not offering of sacrifice only, or chiefly. Neither could any office of religion, be done, acceptably to God in any other place, by them that did not communicate with the ark and Temple at Jerusalem. Which was not preferred in respect of antiquity or succession only, but because it had the word of God in many places of the Scriptures. Whereas the Schismatical Temple, was directly contrary to the holy Scripture. Neither had the true Temple at Jerusalem continual succession in the true worship of God, for it was divers times profaned, and the worship of God clean taken from it, as in the days of Achaz *2 Reg. 16.* and in the time of Manasses *2 Reg. 21.* Then was it laid waste and destroyed, by the space of seventy years, and was not after that fully builded in forty-six years, *John 3.* After that restitution it was divers times profaned and polluted with idolatry, as in the tyranny of Antiochus, when it was dedicated to Jupiter Olympus, *2 Macc. 6.* and at other times. Therefore the authority of the Scripture, was the only sufficient warrant thereof, as it is of true religion at this day. The Lord revenge your blasphemy against his holy Supper, which is celebrated by our Church, according to that we have received of the Lord himself in the Gospel, wherein you can show no ground for your Popish Mass.

23. The spiritual sacrifice prophesied by Malachi, is interpreted by all ancient writers

that speak of it, to be prayers and thanksgiving, and not the oblation of the natural body of Christ, but the sacrifice of thanksgiving, offered in the celebration thereof. *Ireneus lib. 4. cap. 35. Justinus dial. cum Tryphon, Tertull. adver. Judæos, and contra Marc. lib. 3. Cypr. lib. 1. adver. Judæos, Num 16. Chrysost. in Ps. 93. and 95. Hier. in Zach. lib. 2. cap. 8. in Malach. cap. 1. Cyril, in Joan. lib. 1. cap. 91. Aug. adversus Judæos, cap. 9. Theodoret in Malach. 1. who allegeth this very text, and Paul 1 Tim. 8. for prayer. Augustin also, applieth it "to spiritual and inward prayer." *Tract. 15. Chrysostom "to the spiritual sacrifice of ourselves,"* required of the Apostle, *Rom. 12. In John Hom. 32. Cyril understandeth by spirit, "spiritual worship, and the rule of life according to the doctrine of the Gospel, which is acceptable to God the father."* *In John lib. 2. c. 93. Origen to the same effect understandeth "worship proceeding from them, which having the earnest of the Spirit, walk according to the Spirit."* *In John Tom. 14. Euthymius, expoundeth it, "for prayer, praises, and thanksgiving, and the sacrifice of righteousness."* Theophylact, for "worshipping of God in mind and soul." So that the whole consent of the ancient fathers, beside the evidence of the text, is contrary to this popish interpretation, whereby spirit and truth is referred to the gross counterfeit sacrifice of the Mass. Finally, though some external elements, as water, bread, and wine by the Scripture are required unto the service of God, in respect of our infirmity, yet the true worship of God even in the use of these, as of any other external rite allowed by the Scripture, is in spirit and truth, not in body and shadow.*

39. They which believe because the Church teacheth so, must afterward much rather believe, when they hear Christ himself, teach in the Holy Scriptures.

#### CHAPTER 5.

2. All miracles that God did from the beginning, are not recorded in the Scripture, but so many as are necessary for the confirmation of the Church in faith to attain eternal life. And now concerning your observations, I say it is not proved by this place, that God giveth virtue of miracles and cure to water, for then it should have been alike medicinable at all times. Secondly, the text calleth not the pond *probatica*, but saith, that at or near *probatica*, which was the sheep gate, there was a pond called Bethesda, *Neh. 3. 1. and 32.* And albeit the sheep appointed for sacrifice were washed therein for commendation of the sacrifices which is not proved, yet we may not conclude, that therefore miracles are wrought about the Sacraments of the New Testament, otherwise than we read in the Scripture of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, bestowed on them that were baptized. For the Sacraments have sufficient credit of the word of Christ, and need not daily to be confirmed by miracles. Thirdly, the text doth not teach that this miracle was wrought on festival

days, but at a certain time when it pleased God. As for the miracles done at the memories and feasts of Saints, when we see them, and have examined them by the Scriptures, we will admit them. Fourthly, it is not proved that Angels, much less special Saints, are patrons or workers of miracles, in certain places. For who can say that one Angel was always appointed over this pond? and though he were, yet it followeth not, that God useth the ministry of mens' souls to such purposes. As for the force of divers waters, superstitiously attributed to the prayers or presence of Saints, which both stories and experience sheweth to be natural, hath no ground out of this place. Fifthly, pilgrimage is still idolatrous gadding about, for any warrant it hath out of this place, except the Papists first can prove that any such miracles are wrought at such places, as the Scripture testifieth of this: secondly, if any false miracles be there wrought to maintain idolatry and false worshiping of God, contrary to the Scriptures, they are to be condemned with the workers of them. *August. De unitat. Eccl. cap. 16.* Sixthly, we grant that man's reason in miracles known to be done by him, must yield to God's pleasure. Seventhly, whether this pond were a figure of Baptism, we will not contend. Eighthly, if upon so weak a collection, you can promise salvation without Baptism, to men that desire it and cannot have it, much rather you might acknowledge the same grace of Christ to pertain to infants, which are excluded from Baptism by necessity, without any fault of theirs, if they appertain to God's election.

14. God is our Ghostly Father, to whom we must go by repentance for release of his fatherly correction, and not to any Popish priest.

29. Good works which proceed from none but a justified man, do prove that a man is justified before God, by faith without works.

34. The testimonies of John, Moses, and the Prophets, are not the testimonies of men, but of God, speaking by men. So of his Apostles, Bishops, and Pastors, testifying of him out of the Scriptures, which are the word of God, and not of man.

39. Papists cannot find one jot of Popery allowed, either by express words of the Scripture, or by necessary conclusion out of the same, and therefore by their will, would not have Scriptures searched by the common people.

39. We confess, that the Scriptures are not only to be read, written, or painted on walls, but diligently to be searched, and deeply to be studied, in which we know eternal life is to be found, without all addition of Popish doctrine which is not to be found in Holy Scriptures. Chrysostom upon this text saith, *Hom. 39. in Joan.* Christ sendeth us to the testimony of the Scriptures. By this example let us take from them armour against Heretics. The whole Scripture inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God



may be perfect, furnished to every good work : Not that he may abound in some things, and in other things be wanting, for such an one is not perfect.

43. He meaneth every false Prophet, that cometh to them in his own name, as Theudas, Judas Galileus, Barcochbas, and such like, which are all Antichrists or adversaries to Christ, whom the Jews received, and were deceived by them. The Pope is that great Antichrist, which was prophesied to sit in the temple of God, that is, in the visible Church, and to deceive the greatest part of them that profess Christianity, although the Jews which are out of the visible Church, do not receive him. 2 *Thess.* 2.

#### CHAPTER 6.

27. "The Sacrament," saith Augustin, "is of some received unto destruction; but the matter itself, whereof it is a Sacrament, is received of every man to life, of no man to destruction, whosoever shall be partaker of it." *In Joan. Tr.* 26. Therefore these words of Christ, are not of the Sacrament, but of the matter of the Sacrament, which is his flesh and blood, to be eaten spiritually by faith, whereof also Augustin saith: "Why preparest thou thy teeth and belly? Believe, and thou hast eaten." *Tr.* 25.

32. The true bread here signifieth, the true food of eternal life, but thereof it followeth not that the Sacramental bread, is called bread in the Scripture in the same sense as though it were not material bread made of corn after consecration, but only spiritual food. For seeing it was material bread, before consecration, there is no word of Scripture, to prove that it is not so still. But contrariwise, the cup is called the fruit of the vine after consecration, "which is wine," saith Chrysost. *in Matt. Hom.* 83. Therefore the bread is likewise "bread made of corn," and so Cyprian saith it is *Lib. 1. Ep. 6. Magno*. The doctrine of Transubstantiation, was not heard of in the Church for more than six hundred years after Christ. *Annot. in Matt.* 26. The places of *Jer.* 11. and *Gen.* 49, though of some ancient writers they be referred to Christ, yet if they be rightly considered pertain not unto him. The former is of the adversaries of Jeremy, who conspired to fash him in prison and, said, Let us destroy him with wood instead of bread. The other place is of the abundance of wine, that should grow in the land of the tribe of Juda. But if we follow the old writers' exposition, they make nothing for Transubstantiation.

44 Without force or violence, of unwilling he maketh us willing, by changing our will to embrace Christ gladly, and otherwise we never taught. Yet our will by corruption of nature is bound to sin, and not free, before it be altered by God's Spirit. The words of Augustin *In Cont. 2. Ep. Pel. lib. 1. cap. 19.* be these, "How many enemies of Christ every day, by the secret grace of God are suddenly drawn to Christ? Which word if I had taken out of the Gospel, how many things would

this Pelagian Heretic have said of me for it, when even now he wrestleth not against me, but against him which crieth, *No man can come unto me, except the Father which sent me shall draw him.* For he doth not say, *shall lead him,* that we might by any means think that his will doth go before, who is drawn if he were willing before? and yet no man cometh except he be willing. Therefore he is drawn by marvellous means, that he may be willing by him which knoweth to work within, even in the hearts of men, Not that men, which cannot be, should believe against their will, but that of unwilling, they may be made willing. In the other place his words are, That he might teach us that even to believe is of gift, not of merit, *As I said unto you,* saith he, *no man cometh to me, but he to whom it is given of my Father.* And where our Lord said this, if we remember the Gospel before, we shall find that he said also: *No man cometh to me, except the Father which sent me shall draw him.* He said not, shall lead him, but, shall draw him. This violence is done to the heart, not to the flesh, why then dost thou marvel? Believe and thou comest: Love, and thou art drawn. Think not that this is a sharp and grievous violence, it is sweet, it is pleasant, Sweetness itself doth draw thee." These sayings we allow better than you, which maintain Free-will in part, with the Pelagians.

49. They that did eat Manna, as corporal food only, and not as spiritual meat by faith, died both body and soul, as they that eat the blessed Sacrament unworthily. But they that did eat manna by faith, worthily, did eat the flesh of Christ spiritually, and drank his blood spiritually, for they drank of the spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ, *1 Cor.* 10. 4. Where the Apostle saith expressly, that our Fathers were all baptized, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, that we do, and all drank the same spiritual cup for they drank of the rock, which was Christ as we do. So doth Augustin understand the place, saying, *Quicumque in Manna,* &c. "Whosoever understood Christ in manna, did eat the same spiritual meat which we do. But whosoever sought only to fill their bellies of Manna, which were the fathers of the unfaithful, they have eaten and are dead. So also the same drink. For the rock was Christ. They drank therefore the same drink that we do, but spiritual drink, that is, which was received by faith, not which was drunk in the belly, but into the heart by faith, had no power of eternal life in it. And Manna was not a figure of the Sacrament, but of the body and blood of Christ, which is the heavenly or spiritual matter of the Sacrament. For all that receive the Sacrament do die naturally, as all they that did eat Manna, and as many as receive it unworthily, deserve also to die spiritually as

they did that received Manna unworthily. The comparison you make, because it speaketh confusedly of the Sacrament, and of the matter of the Sacrament, and hath also many obscure applications, had need to be more plainly set down, before we can admit it, or wholly reject it. Specially, you must declare, how the Sacrament is to every man, what he liketh best: whether the ark in which it is reserved, for a perpetual memorial, be the Pix, and whether there be any days, in which it cannot be received, as of the Sabbath day, and such like.

52. The Jewish *how* was not of inquiring the manner as the Virgin Mary's *how* but of denying and not believing the matter. Therefore saith Cyril in the next chap. *lib. 4. cap. 14. in Joan. Oportebat igitur fidei primum, &c.* "It had been meet, therefore, first that they had set the roots of faith in their mind, and then to have inquired those things, which are to be inquired. But they before they believed, inquired out of season. For this cause our Lord did not expound, how that thing might be brought to pass, but exhorteth that it be sought by faith. So to his disciples which believed, he gave pieces of bread, saying: Take ye, and eat ye, this is my body. Likewise he gave the cup about and said: drink ye all of this. This is the cup of my blood, which shall be shed for many, unto remission of sins. Thou seest plainly, that to them which inquire without faith, he hath not expounded the manner of the mystery: but to them which believed although they inquired not, he hath set it forth." By this place it is evident, that believing Christ's words to be true, we may inquire in what sense they are true, and after what manner spiritually or corporally, the flesh of Christ is to be eaten, and his blood drunken. Also in that Christ gave pieces of bread, we are taught, that it is not by transubstantiation, but after a spiritual manner that the flesh of Christ is to be received: namely by faith, through the mighty working of the Holy Ghost, not only in the Sacrament, but also without it.

53. This place proveth inevitably, that the flesh of Christ is truly eaten without the Sacrament, therefore spiritually, as well without it, as in it. For else all that die without participation of the Sacrament, should be void of eternal life. Concerning the place of Augustin: he declareth in the same Sermon, the manner of the eating of Christ's flesh, and drinking his blood to be spiritual. *Tunc autem, &c.* Then shall this be, that is the body and blood of Christ shall be life to every one, if that which is taken in the Sacrament visibly, be eaten spiritually in the truth itself. The words of Leo be against the Eutychian heretics, which did not believe the truth of the body of Christ, and therefore could not rightly receive the Sacrament of his body and blood, when they did not believe, that he had a very true body and blood.

53. Although these words are not proper of the Sacrament, but of the matter of the Sacrament, yet the argument is good to prove

the necessity of drinking, as well as of eating, seeing Christ hath given the visible Sacrament of both. And it is strong against the Papists, who understand it only of the Sacrament. For although by their fond conceit of concomitance, they hold the blood to be in the body, yet they do not drink it according as Christ requireth, who addeeth not that word superfluously, but to express that his flesh and blood is a perfect nourishment, which consisteth, as Justinus saith, "as well of dry as of moist nourishment, to be eaten and drunken."

53. This is monstrous impudence, to grant the premises, and to deny the conclusion. For if these words be proper to the Sacrament, it followeth of necessity, by these words, that whosoever doth not eat and drink the Sacrament, is excluded from life. Contrariwise, if whosoever receiveth not the Sacrament, be not excluded from life, then these words are not proper of the Sacrament, and sacramental eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ. But further, you say, Augustin applying these words to infants, did not mean, that they could not be saved without receiving sacramentally: as the heretics and Erasmus did unlearnedly mistake him. To say nothing of us whom you count heretics, as heretics have always counted true Catholics, Erasmus had more learning than all the rabble of the Rhemists, and had read as much of the ancient Fathers, as all the Prelates in the Chapter of Trent, that have invented a new meaning of Augustin, which can never be gathered out of his words, but is directly contrary to the same. The words of Augustin, even in the place by you quoted, are these: "I say let us hear our Lord, not speaking this of the Sacrament of Baptism, but of the Sacrament of his holy Table, whither no man rightly cometh, but he that is baptized, except you shall eat my flesh, and drink my blood, you shall have no life in you. What seek we any further? What can they answer to this, except stubbornness will bend their striving sinews against the constancy of truth? Or is there any body that will dare to say this also, that this sentence pertaineth not to little children, and that they may have life in them without the participation of this body and blood; because he sayeth not, he that shall not eat, as of Baptism, he that shall not be born again, but sayeth, if you shall not eat, as it were speaking to them which could hear and understand, which indeed little children cannot do? But he that sayeth this, doth not mark, that except this sentence do bind all men, that they cannot have life without the body and blood of the Son of man, the elder age also in vaintaketh care for it." What can be more plain, than that Augustin meaneth here, as he speaketh, of the Sacrament and sacramental receiving at the holy Table, and that this Sacrament of the Lord's body, in his opinion, was as necessary for infants, as the other of Baptism; neither is there any one word, to insinuate your pretended sense in all that Chapter, or in any other place, where he speaketh to the same effect, as in the four and

twentieth Chapter of the same book. *Optime Punic Christiani*, &c. "The Christians of Africa, do very well call Baptism itself, nothing else but salvation, and the Sacrament of the body of Christ, nothing else but life. Whereupon? but, as I think, of an ancient and Apostolic tradition, which they hold, as a thing ingrafted into the Church of Christ, that no man without baptism and participation of the Lord's table, can come, not only to the kingdom of God, but neither to salvation nor eternal life." And a little after: "What other thing also do they, which call the Sacrament of the Lord's Table life, but that which is said, I am the bread of life, which came down from heaven, and the bread which I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world, and except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. If then so many, and so great divine testimonies, do agree, neither salvation, nor life eternal is to be hoped for to any man, without baptism and blood of our Lord, in vain it is promised to little children without these. Moreover, if nothing but sins do separate a man from salvation and eternal life, nothing is loosed in little children, by these Sacraments, but the guiltiness of sin."

Innocent, Bishop of Rome, was of the same opinion, as is manifest in his Epistles to the Bishops of Numidia, cited by Augustin, *Cont. duas ep. Pel. lib. 2. cap. 4. and li. 4. c. 4. cont. Jul. lib. cap. 2. Ep. 106. Bonifacio cont. Pelag. Hypognost. li. 5. ep. 23. Bonif.* where he writeth of the Sacrament given to an infant: which custom you confess, yet was it erroneous, because this Sacrament ought not to be received, but of them that examine themselves, which infants cannot do. *1 Cor. 11. 28.* And therefore your Popish Chapter of Trent, although it were true that the Fathers held not opinion of the necessity of this Sacrament for infants, as the contrary is manifest, yet cannot excuse the Church and Fathers of that time, from a gross error, if they only thought it was lawful to give the communion to infants.

54. By participation of the flesh and blood of Christ, which is the matter of the Sacrament, we are made partakers of eternal life both of body and soul, whereof the Sacrament is a lively seal, and certain assurance. But without the Sacrament also, we may eat the body and drink the blood of Christ spiritually by faith, the Holy Ghost in unspeakable manner feeding us therewith, as he doth infants, which are not to be received to the Lord's table. And this is the true sense of all the Doctor's words alleged in this section, which we acknowledge, except where they thought the Sacrament to be necessary for infants also.

55. This saying of Cyril, is true of Manna and the water taken for corporal food only: but as they were the Sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, they were the same spiritual meat and drink that we receive, as testifieth Augustin, cited before.

58. Contrary to the express commandment of Christ in the institution of the Supper. The

Chapter of Trent vainly goeth about to prove out of this place, which speaketh not of the Sacrament, but of the matter of the Sacrament, that the one half of the Sacrament is not necessary. Albeit seeing that eating and drinking is so often joined in this Chapter, they might well know, that drinking is here to be understood, though it be not expressed, and that by eating of this bread, is meant a full participation of Christ, which is both meat and drink unto us. And that Christ by this bread, meaneth not the Sacrament in form of bread, as they call it, is manifest by this argument. Whosoever eateth this bread, shall live for ever, but whosoever eateth the Sacrament shall not live for ever: therefore whosoever eateth this Sacrament eateth not this bread. Again, the words are general, both of Priests and People, whereupon you may as well conclude, that the Priest need not consecrate, but in one kind of bread, as that the receiving in one kind is sufficient. Neither doth Augustin say, that the Church hath authority to alter Christ's institution, but to dispose of circumstances which are accidental, as of time, place, and such like, which pertain not to the substance of Christ's institution. Now for receiving in both kinds, he took as good order as could be, both instituting the Sacrament in both kinds, and giving express commandment, that all should drink of it. But thou art not ashamed to say, that both Christ and his Apostles, beside the Ancient Fathers of the Primitive Church, left you example of receiving under one kind. For Christ's example you quote *Luke 24. 35.* But in expounding the same text, you dare not affirm it to be the Sacrament, and if it were, you might therefore prove, that Christ did consecrate in one kind also, which you hold to be an absurdity.

Secondly, if it were the Sacrament, as some of the Fathers hold, Chrysostom telleth you, "that he used wine at the same table," in *Math. Hom. 83.* upon his promise to "drink the fruit of the vine anew in the kingdom of God." For his Apostles, you note, *Act. 2. 42.* where either you must grant the figure Synecdoche, that is, that the part is named for the whole, or else you must say, that the Apostles who brake the bread to them, did also consecrate in bread only: for it is not said, They continued in receiving of bread, but in breaking. But it is most like, that the Evangelist meaneth, of their mutual feasts of love, which more at large is expressed vers. 46. which after the Hebrew or Syrian language, were by Synecdoche, called breaking of bread. That the primitive Church gave the blood only to children, you quote Cyprian de *Lapsis nu. 10.* where mention is of the cup given to a child, but no word to prove, that the cup only was given, except you will say that the blood only was given to old folks, as well as to children. For the words are, *Ubi vero*, &c. "But when the solemnities being fulfilled, the Deacon began to offer the cup to them that were present, and the rest receiving it, their place was come." Next is Tertullian, for reserving the body only, *lib. 2.*

*ad uxorem*: where mention is made of a superstitious custom, that women had to reserve the Sacrament, and "receive it daily before other meat:" but nothing to prove, that they reserved not the one kind as well as the other. The like, I say, to the place of Cyprian, where a woman kept the Sacrament in her chest, which he calleth, *Sacrum Domini*, "The Holy Sacrament of the Lord:" Why should we not understand both kinds as well as one? although if a superstitious custom of one kind only were proved, what lawful practice can be proved? the reservation was unlawful, and if it were in one kind, it was more unlawful. That the sick person was houselled in one kind, it is contrary to that which Eusebius hath, if you do understand it. The Priest being sick, so that he could not come to Scapion that sent for him, gave to the boy his messenger, a little of the Eucharist, and teaching him how to use it for the sick man's case that was ready to die, "bade him wet it, and drop it into the old man's mouth:" whereby it appeareth, he gave him of both kinds, and so the child did, *αρεβελξεν ο παις κει ανα το ενεχης το στομαχι*. "The boy did moisten it, and withal, did pour it into his mouth: and after he had swallowed a little, he gave up the ghost:" but if he had given him only of the cup, what needed these two verbs to express the delivery thereof. In that fragment of the Epistle of Basil to Casarea Patricia, there is no word to prove that the Eremites received the Communion in one kind, or reserved it in one kind only. The causes of your practice proceed of Antichristian pride, in that you will seem wiser than Christ, who instituted the Sacrament in both kinds, than the Apostles and Fathers of the Primitive Church, who gave it in both kinds, and yet knew what belonged to the reverent use of the Sacrament, better than you. And for the same cause that you say, the priest must consecrate in both kinds, the people also ought to receive in both kinds. For they in eating and drinking, ought to show the Lord's death, and the separation of his blood from his body, or his blood shedding, until he come. *1 Cor. 11. 26.* But it is a fine reason that you gather of Saint Paul's words, *1 Cor. 10. 18.* They that eat of the sacrifices, are partakers of the altar: therefore it was enough to eat only of one kind, to be partakers of the whole. But who will grant you this conclusion? or that it was lawful to abstain from the drink offerings, because by eating, they were made partakers of the altar? They were made partakers of the altar, which took no benefit thereof, although they observed the whole institution of God, much less spiritual benefit should they obtain, that break the ordinance of God, and were partakers of one kind only.

62. This insinuation is your own imagination, without ground of the text, or testimony of ancient Fathers. Christ by these words doth remove the offence, which they took of his base condition in the flesh, and therefore could not see his divine power, whereby he was able to give his flesh and blood to be

eaten, and drunken, which his divine power was manifested in his glorious ascension. And yet the ascension of his body from the earth, and placing thereof in heaven, is a sufficient argument to prove, that he giveth not his flesh and blood to be received after a bodily manner, in what shape or form soever disguised, but after a heavenly, divine and spiritual manner, by the unspeakable working of the Holy Ghost. Which uniteth his natural body and blood to us, though distant as far from us in place, as heaven is from earth: so that we are truly made "flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone," and lively members of his mystical body: not only in this Sacrament, but also in Baptism, and by spiritual communication through faith, by which "Christ dwelleth in our hearts." *Galat. 3. 27. Ephes. 3. 17.* Augustin doth rightly use the argument of Christ's ascension, to prove that Christ giveth not his body, as carnally present in the Sacrament, but to be received spiritually by faith. *August. in John, Tract. 27. 30. 31. and specially Tract. 50.* he saith of his natural body: "He ascended into heaven, and he is not here," with much more to that effect. Again, *De verbis Apost. Ser. 2.* upon this text he saith: "What if you shall see the Son of man ascend where he was before? What meaneth it, doth this offend you? Thought you that I would make parts of this body which you see, cut my members in pieces and give them to you? What then if you shall see the Son of man ascend where he was before? Verily, he that could ascend whole, could not be consumed. Therefore he hath given us an wholesome refection of his body and blood, and hath briefly soluted so great a question of his integrity. Let them therefore eat which eat, and drink which drink: let them hunger and thirst: let them eat life, let them drink life. That to eat is to be fed, but so to be fed, that it faileth not whereof thou art fed. That to drink, what is it but to live? Eat life, drink life, thou shalt have life, and life is still whole. For then this thing shall be, that is the body and blood of Christ shall be life to every one, if that which is taken visibly in the Sacrament be spiritually eaten and spiritually drunken in the truth itself." *Matth. 26.*

63. The flesh of Christ separated from his divine and quickening Spirit, whereof it hath power of life, as the Capernautes did imagine it, profiteth nothing. But being united to his divine Spirit, according to the sayings of Hilary, Cyril, and the rest that are here cited, it is not only profitable, but also necessary for our salvation, in his incarnation, sacrifice and feeding of us therewith, either in the Sacrament or without it. Neither do we teach otherwise. But the Papists hold this error of the Capernautes, of his flesh separated from the quickening virtue and power that it hath of the word united to it, when they teach that the body and blood of Christ, may be verily and truly, and not only, sacramentally eaten and drunken of the wicked, to whom it giveth no life, contrary to the express words of Christ, so often repeated in this Chapter, and the con-

sent of the ancient Fathers: "This is therefore," saith Augustin, "to eat that meat, and to drink that drink, for a man to abide in Christ, and to have Christ abiding in him. And by this he that abideth not in Christ, and in whom Christ abideth not, out of doubt he neither eateth his flesh, nor drinketh his blood spiritually, though carnally and visibly, he presseth with his teeth, the Sacraments of the body and blood of Christ: but rather he eateth and drinketh the Sacrament of so great a thing to his condemnation." *Tract 26. in John.* Again, of wicked men, he saith, "It is not to be said, that they eat the body of Christ, because they are not to be counted among the members of Christ. And that I speak not of other things, they cannot be both the members of Christ, and the members of an harlot. Finally, he himself saying, he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him, showeth what it is, not only in Sacrament or sacramentally, but in very deed, to eat the body of Christ, and to drink his blood." *De civit. lib. 21. cap. 21.* In declaring in what points the carnality of the Capernaïtes consisted, you confess with Augustin. *De Doct. Christ. l. 3. c. 16.* that these words of Christ, "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man," &c. be figurative. Wherein then standeth the figure? in the words, "Flesh and blood," or in the words "Eating and drinking?" Verily our Saviour Christ doth so plainly affirm, "The bread which he will give to be his flesh, which he will give for the life of the world," that we must needs understand his body crucified, and his blood shed for us, or his humanity sacrificed for us: then it remaineth, that the figure be in eating and drinking, and so the whole question is of the manner of eating and drinking which is either literal and without figure, as Papists take it receiving into the mouth and body, or else spiritual and figurative, as Augustin there teacheth, "by communicating with the passion of Christ, and by sweet and profitable recording, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us." Which communication by faith and the working of God's Spirit, is the eating and drinking of his very body and blood, either in the Sacrament, or without it, and which giveth eternal life to all that receive the body and blood of Christ either in the Sacrament or without it.

64. It is want of faith in the Papists, that they think our Saviour Christ cannot give us his flesh and blood, to be eaten and drunken of us, except it be received with the mouth into the body, and to believe that which they believe contrary to the word of God, though it be never so contrary to sense, it is no true faith but a false persuasion of lies. Finally, though Judas did not believe the doctrine of Christ, yet it is not like that he showed any outward token of unbelief, seeing it is not said, that the twelve continued with him.

66. In the thirteenth section, you confess the words of Christ to be figurative: now forgetting yourself you say, the disciples revolting,

proveh that he spake not metaphorically, upon a fond imagination, "that his Apostles would have plucked them by the sleeves," &c. which we never read that they did at any time. But indeed, the cause of their revolt, was for that they understood literally, that which he spake of eating and drinking figuratively. Which is one cause also, that the Papists long since have revolted from the Church of Christ, and the faith of the ancient Fathers, who understood the words of the institution of the Supper, as these also of the spiritual or heavenly matter of the Supper, to be figurative. For if Christ had spoken here of eating and drinking literally, as the elements are received in the Sacrament, how was it possible they could have understood him, before the Sacrament was instituted? for their infidelity had then been excusable. But when he had said ver. 47. "he that believeth in me, hath eternal life," they might, if they had not been obstinate, have understood, that the manner of eating and drinking of his flesh and blood to have eternal life, was by faith and believing in him: and not after any gross manner, as they imagined, and the Papists likewise: whereby they destroy the truth of his natural body, in taking from it the essential properties of a body, as quantity, place, shape, and such like.

68. Peter worthily beareth the person of all true members of the Church, when for no cause he will revolt from Christ, who only hath the words of eternal life, from which if Calvin, Luther, or an Angel from heaven would draw us, we must hold him accursed. To the saying of Augustin, *Tr. 27. in John,* we must add that which he saith in the same place, as the conclusion of the same matter. "Let all this avail thus much unto us, that we eat not the flesh of Christ, and drink the blood of Christ only in Sacrament, which many evil men do, but let us eat and drink unto the participation of the Spirit, that we may abide in the Lord's body as members, that we may be quickened by his Spirit, and not be offended, although many do eat and drink the Sacraments temporally, which in the end shall have eternal torments."

#### CHAPTER 7.

17. Christ is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, out of whom no man can live well. But they that live well in Christ, are assured of the truth.

20. The Pope is Christ's adversary, and not his vicar, because he denieth the offices of Christ to be peculiar unto him.

39. The Popish Sacrament of Confirmation hath no institution or ground in the Holy Scriptures. *Isidorus Origin. lib. 7. cap. de Sp. sanct.* understandeth this of the effect of baptism.

59. And Antichrist hath also some wicked among the good, which secretly serve him and hinder the execution of just laws against his adherents. Otherwise, it will be hard to prove that Gamaliel was a servant of Christ, but against his will.

## CHAPTER 8.

32. He that is justified once by faith only, persevereth and abideth always in keeping of his commandments, according to the measure of grace and strength, that he doth receive of the spirit of sanctification.

34. So it be understood, there is no great matter; whether it be translated or not. You might have been as bold to translate it, as to expound what it meaneth, but that you would seek a knot in a rush. *Apocalypse* 19.

36. Augustin saith not, that man was never without free will, but the contrary, that man is never perfectly free in this life. "When a man beginneth not to have grievous crimes, as every Christian man ought not to have them, the man beginneth to lift up his head to liberty." But this liberty is only begun, not perfect. "It is true, man when he was created, received great strength of free will, but by sinning he lost it. *De verbis Apost. Serm.* 2

39. Good works declare men to be children of Abraham, and so meaneth James, as is plain by his words, "Show me thy faith by thy works," &c.

49. Christ was not a Samaritan, that is a heretic and schismatic in such sense as they called him so.

## CHAPTER 9.

4. The text speaketh of working: meriting and deserving are a cursed gloss beside the text.

6. We marvel not, that Christ and his Church useth such Sacraments, and external ceremonies in curing our souls, as be of Christ's institution. But we marvel how any man dare make medicines for curing of souls, that they never learned of the heavenly physician.

22. Many words to little purpose. Our translation hath not simply excommunicate, but adding, out of the synagogue. And the Jews before Christ, had the same discipline that the Church now hath, of casting them out of the fellowship of the faithful, that for their disobedience deserved it. The true Church only hath true excommunication, the heretical assemblies, such as the Popish Church is, counterfeit censures: Whose blessings God curseth, and blesseth their cursings. As for the state of England which the Pope hath cursed, God hath ever since wonderfully blessed. And the Spanish Navy being the power of all Papistry, which the Pope blessed, had the curse of God following it until it was almost destroyed.

24. We grant not your Popish miracles, as you would insinuate, but say of them, as Augustine said of miracles, of the Donatists, "Away with these miracles, which are either fables of lying men, or wonders of deceiving spirits, for either those things are not true, which are reported, or if Heretics have any miracles, we are the rather to take heed of them." But true miracles that God worketh by his Saints, to confirm the truth taught in the Scriptures, we embrace and acknowledge to the glory of God.

## CHAPTER 10.

1. Calvin and Luther had lawful calling both of God and the Church. But the lineal succession of Catholic Bishops in every country, is not necessary. For many heretics have succeeded good Bishops, many good Bishops have succeeded heretics in line and place, but not in doctrine. It is the succession of doctrine therefore, that is to be regarded, and not of place or persons: and that is the true meaning of all the doctors which you quote. Irenæus speaketh of continuance of doctrine, from the Apostles unto his time, against the new heretics Valentinus, and Marcion. So doth Tertullian against the same, and all other heretics that were before his time. Cyprian speaketh against them which without lawful calling thrust themselves into the office of Bishops. *Augustin Epist.* 165. although he allege the succession of Bishops from Peter and other like reasons, yet in the end concludeth: "Although we presume not so much of these documents, as of the Holy Scriptures." Likewise *contra Epist. Manich. cap.* 4. Although he allege many arguments to hold him in the Catholic Church, beside the most sincere wisdom, which is gathered out of the Holy Scriptures, yet he confesseth that all those arguments must give place to the demonstration of truth: which truth may always be plainly proved out of the word of God, which is the truth. *Joan.* 17. 17. Neither hath Lirinensis any thing to the contrary in all his book.

22. Christ being in the Temple in the feast of the Dedication, which was instituted by the Church in the time of Judas, Maccabæus, did not thereby allow whatsoever Maccabæus did in his life without the warrant of God's Law. Thanksgiving to God, for restitution of the Temple, after the horrible profanation thereof, is a thing approved by God's Law: but a memorial thereof, is an indifferent ceremony, which was not instituted by Ezechias, after the profanation of the Temple by Achaz and Urias, nor by Josias, after the same was most horribly polluted by Manasses and Amon, nor by Zorobabel and Jesus, Esdras or Nehemias, after it was re-edified, when it had been utterly destroyed by the Chaldees. As for your Popish hallowing of Churches hath nothing like unto it but the name, the vain shadow whereof pleaseth you so much, that contrary to your custom, and profession, you are bold to translate the Greek *Enecnia*, which your vulgar Latin text retaineth, Dedication, and durst not translate *Scenopegia*, cap. 7. the feast of Tabernacles.

29. Though divers of the Latin Fathers, did read so, yet the original text is otherwise, neither can any of the Greek Fathers be brought to avouch this reading, although Cyril be ridiculously named, whereas that 7th. book is not of Cyril, but of Chietoveus making. Therefore the Lateran council, did not rightly allege this text against Abbas Joachim, whose error by manifest texts of Scripture uncorrupted, might easily have been confuted. As for the slander of Autotheism, is

answered before, *cap.* 1. Gregory Nazianzen, calleth the Holy Ghost *αυτοκευτος* and *αυτοφως*, which is all one, as if he had called him *αυτοδους*, and yet he denied not his proceeding from the Father and the Son. Marius Victorinus *Afer lib.* 3. *contr.* Arrianos, doubteth not to say that Christ is *αυτογιος μορφη* in respect of the substance of his deity. This quarrel showeth some want of learning, but more abundance of malice.

## CHAPTER 11.

44. Jodocus Chitoveus you should say, if you could speak the truth: for the seventh book of Cyril is lost. Augustin applieth this text indeed to the authority that the ministers of the Church have in absolving sinners. But that Christ reviveth none in the Church, but by the ministry of the Priest, Augustin saith not.

51. Peter's seat hath no privilege by Christ his prayer, for divers Bishops of Rome, Antioch and Alexandria, have been Heretics. As many high Priests were idolaters and Sadducees, as this Caiaphas was. But God would have this saying of that high Priest to be propheticall, that the Jews should have less excuse of their obstinate incredulity, when the cause and virtue of his death was uttered by their own high Priest, though he spake in another meaning. But this is a miserable argument: Caiaphas prophesied once by special direction of the Holy Ghost, which touched his mouth saith Chrysostom, not his heart: *Ergo*, the Romish Caiaphas cannot err. For the privilege of Peter, *Luke.* 22.

## CHAPTER 12.

5. There is no such need or use of Church ornaments, whereof you speak, as was of the anointing of Christ, for the mystery of his burial, therefore the case is nothing like.

8. Augustin *Tr.* 50. *in John*, saith: "Not according to the presence of his body in which he was born, crucified, rose again," &c. *Matth.* 26. "He was to tarry but a small time, with the Church corporally." *Beda in 12. John.*

20. The text is Grecians, which were Jews dwelling among the Gentiles, or at least proselytes, that were bound by the law, to visit the Temple at Jerusalem. But now saith Paul, "I will have men to pray in all places," &c. *1 Tim.* 2. 8. "neither in the mountain nor at Jerusalem, but in spirit and truth," saith Christ, *John* 4.

39. They neither would nor could be willing, because they were reprobate. And that also doth Augustin signify in the same place. Therefore he addeth immediately: "For God foresaw their evil will, and he to whom things to come cannot be hid, foreshowed it by the Prophet. But thou wilt say, the Prophet telleth another cause, not of their will. What cause telleth the Prophet? That God hath given them the spirit of compunction: eyes that they should not see: and ears that they should not hear: and hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart, I answer that their will hath deserved even that. For God so

blindeth and hardeneth by forsaking and not helping, which he may do by judgment secret, but he cannot do it by judgment unjust." Again; *de bono perse.* *lib.* 2. *cap.* 14, he saith: "In the same lump of perdition were those Jews left which could not believe, when so great and excellent miracles were wrought in their sight, for why they could not believe, the Gospel hath not spared to tell saying: But though he had done so many miracles," &c.

## CHAPTER 13.

5. The doctrine is very true, yet not so aptly gathered out of the text.

10. That the relics of former sins remitted, are to be cleansed by devout acts of charity and humility, none of the Fathers whom you cite, do teach in any one word. Ambrose contendeth for a ceremony of washing the feet, of them that are newly baptized, which the Church of Rome did not observe in that time. And answering this objection, why the feet need to be washed, when all sin is washed away in Baptism, he saith: "Because Adam was supplanted by the Devil, and poison was shed upon his feet, therefore thou wastest thy feet, that in the same part, in which the Serpent deceived, greater aid of sanctification may be added, that he may not supplant thee afterward. Therefore thou wastest thy feet, that thou mayest wash away the poison of the Serpent. Also it profiteth unto humility, that we should not be ashamed in a mystery, of that we do not disdain in obedience." This saith Ambrose to maintain the ceremony of washing of feet after Baptism. *August. Epist.* 108, gathereth no more of this text, but that Peter was baptized, and denieth that he did penance, as they which were called penitents used to do for heinous offences: but as all Christians had need to repent, or to do penance daily, for their daily sins and transgressions, which he proveth by the ordinary use of fasting, alms, and prayer, in which we say, "forgive us, as we forgive, thereby manifesting that we have sins to be forgiven, and with these words humbling ourselves, we cease not after a sort, to do daily penance:" but of cleansing of sins remitted he speaketh not. *Tr.* 56. *in John*, he saith: "That in Baptism a man is washed wholly, feet and all. But when he liveth afterward among men, he treadeth on the earth, therefore human affections, without the which in this mortality we live not, are as it were feet, when we are affected with human matters, and so affected, that if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and there is no truth in us. Therefore he washeth our feet daily, which maketh intercession for us: and that we have need daily to wash our feet, that is, to direct the ways of spiritual steps, we confess even in the Lord's Prayer, when we say, forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors: for if we acknowledge our sins, as it is written, verily he which washed his Disciples' feet is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all sin, that

is, even to our feet, in which we are conversant on the earth." What impudent merchants are these, to quote these places for cleansing of sins remitted? And if this ceremony had been used of the Apostles for purging of small offences and filthiness of the soul, which is false, yet why should holy-water and such ceremonies, as the Apostles never knew, remit venial sins, as they call them? What Ambrose saith you have heard before, but if Bernard's authority in this case be sufficient, you must make ablation of feet the eighth Sacrament. For he affirmeth, and endeavoureth to prove, that it is a Sacrament, as Ambrose doth, that it is a ceremony meet to be retained, and continually to be used after Baptism.

14. Not only by the Church's authority, which never accepted this ceremony for a Sacrament, but by the Scripture itself, we know that it is none: because it is no seal of God's grace, nor hath any promise annexed unto it, as Baptism and the Lord's Supper hath. Therefore it was only an example of humility, as the plain words of Christ are, although by occasion of that example, other doctrine was inferred of our spiritual washing by Christ, once wholly unto regeneration, and daily of our feet, for our daily transgressions. Wherefore there is no reason why we should believe the Popish Church, that the Cup is not necessary for the communicants, contrary to the manifest institution of Christ, and the practice of the Apostles, expressed in the Scriptures.

#### CHAPTER 14.

12. All miracles that serve to confirm the doctrine delivered in the holy Scriptures, we receive and admit, although we be not bound to believe any man's report of miracles, but only the writing of the Apostles and Evangelists. But all miracles that serve to maintain false doctrine or superstition, which is not taught in the Scriptures, we esteem, as Augustin did of the miracles of the Donatists, that either they were fables, or illusions of evil spirits, by what man soever they be recorded, or written. *De unit, Eccl. cap. 16.* As for miracles which you affirm to be done by images, if they were not most impudent forgeries, as has often been discovered, yet seeing they tend to maintain idolatry forbidden expressly by God's commandment, they ought to move no Christian man, but so much the more to abhor those idols, and that Antichristian sect of Popery that maintaineth them. No man need to marvel, say you, if they do miracles. Indeed miracles done by them are no marvels. No marvel if they sweat, when their paper heads be smeared on the inside with hot oil. No marvel if they bled at the nose, when blood is poured in at the top of their heads. No marvel if they move their eyes and lips, when a false knave behind pulleth the wires fastened to those devices by which they move. No marvel if they speak, when a devilish wretch speaketh in a trunk behind them. These, and such

like miracles done by them, no man need to marvel at.

15. It is possible to love Christ, and to keep his commandments by his grace, but not perfectly, because he giveth to no man perfection of strength in his frailty, *Rom. 7. 18. &c. Gal. 5. 17. &c.*

16. If you will not translate any words that have divers significations, you must leave five hundred more untranslated than you have done.

16. The Holy Ghost shall ever remain with the Church, and with every true member thereof: Yet not every true member of the Church, nor every minister thereof, which is a successor of the Apostles may challenge all privileges, that the Apostle had, necessary for conversion of the world, but not for the perpetual government of the Church.

17. The true Church of Christ can never fall unto apostasy, heresy, or to nothing, but therefore it is an impudent slander, to affirm that we say so. Yet many of the visible Church shall fall from the faith, into heresy and apostasy, *2 Thes. 2. 1. Tim. 4.*

28. This place is true of the humanity of Christ, which the Arians blasphemously applied to his divinity: which in many other places is proved most plainly, to be equal with his father. So conference of Scriptures, if the Papists would give over their prejudicate opinions, would end all controversies between us: as well that of the corporal manner of presence of Christ in the Sacrament, as other. For these words, "This is my body," must be so understood, as they may be not contrary to other places of Scripture, that avouch the truth of Christ's humanity, which cannot stand with their transubstantiation and carnal manner of presence.

#### CHAPTER 15.

2. Wicked men may be members of the visible Church for a time, and so of Christ, being ingrafted to Christ sacramentally, but not in deed. "He that bringeth no fruit, cannot be in the vine," saith Chrysostom, *Hom. 75. in John.* "Although by faith he seemeth to be joined to Christ," *Euthym. 15. John.* Augustine understandeth these branches in respect of the humanity of Christ. "The vine and branches," saith he, "be of one nature. Therefore when he was God, of which nature we are not, he was made man, that his human nature might be a vine, whereof we men might be branches." *John Tr. 80.*

2. The true members of Christ may continually increase by his grace in the fruits of faith, which are holiness and righteousness.

3. Augustin doth not so expound it, but showeth how water doth cleanse in Baptism, namely by virtue of the word, his words are these, "Why doth he not say, you are clean for Baptism, wherein you are washed? but he saith 'for the word which I have spoken unto you, but because even in the water, the word doth cleanse. Take away the word, and what is the water but water? The word cometh to the



element, and it is made a sacrament, even the same as it were a visible word." &c.

4. Augustin saith not, that no man can be sure of perseverance, but that these speeches are used by him which knoweth who shall persevere, that no man through security fall into pride or presumption, but of perseverance he affirmeth. *cap. 12.* "To the first man, which in that good in which he was made right, had received that he might not sin, that he might not die, that he might not forsake that good, an aid of perseverance was given, not whereby it should come to pass that he should persevere, but without the which he could not persevere by free will. But now, unto the Saints predestinated by the grace of God unto the kingdom of God, not only such an aid of perseverance is given, but such, that even perseverance itself is given to them, not only that they cannot persevere without this gift, but also that by this gift they are not but perseverant. For he not only said: without me ye can do nothing but also he said: you have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and have appointed you that you may go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit may abide. By which words he showed, that he had given them not only justice, but also perseverance in it. For when Christ so appointeth them that they go and bring forth fruit, and that their fruit should abide, who dare be bold to say, peradventure it shall not abide? All Christians, therefore, ought to be assured, that they shall remain in the vine, keep his commandments and such like conditions as be required of them. For as Augustin saith, "He that maketh men good, maketh them also to persevere in good."

4. Whosoever is not a lively member of Christ, can do no good work, but meritorious to salvation, which is the gift of God's grace, to man can do anything.

10. The just man, such as the true Christian man is, shall live by faith, that is, shall be justified before God unto eternal life by faith only. Which faith throughout the course of his temporal life, cannot be unfruitful of good works, and is never alone or solitary, although a man be justified before God "by faith without works." *Rom. 3.*

24. So far forth as Luther and Calvin teach nothing but that Christ taught, the Papists are as deeply in sin in not believing them as the Jews, though they work no miracles: seeing the doctrine they teach, is already confirmed by all the miracles of Christ and his Apostles.

27. Provided always, that the Prelates of the Church teach nothing but that which is agreeable to the Holy Scriptures, inspired by the Holy Ghost.

#### CHAPTER 16.

2. The translation of Geneva, which so translateth, hath in the margin, "or put you out of the synagogues." The one in effect is as much as the other.

12. Though the infirmity of the Apostle, could not yet bear that he had to say to them it followeth not that those things are not con-

tained in the Holy Scripture. Augustin upon this place saith: "When he himself hath not uttered these things, which of us can say, these and these they are? Or if he dare be bold to say, how doth he prove it?" Yea he proceedeth the further and saith: "If we had read any of these things in the books established by canonical authority, which were written after the ascension of our Lord, it were not sufficient to have read it there, except it were also read there, that the same is one of these things, which our Lord would not then tell his disciples, because they could not bear them." By this saying of Augustin you come short to tell us of any thing that is not contained in the Scriptures, that it is in the number of those things, which Christ would not tell his disciples. Leo, comparing 15 *John 13*, with this verse, *ser. 2. de Pentecost*, to the same effect.

13. The Church can never err in any point necessary to salvation, nor any true member thereof, continue therein. For this promise is to every one of the Apostles, and to every Christian man and woman, to their comfort, unto eternal salvation. Yet were the Apostles deceived for a time in some things, as in the calling of the Gentiles: and true Christian men may err, but not finally to their damnation. Therefore the full accomplishment of this promise Augustin referreth unto the life to come: "I think," saith he, "that this cannot be fulfilled in any man's mind in this life, for who living in this body, which is corrupted and weigheth down the soul, can know all truth, when the Apostle saith, we know but in part." *Tract. 96. in John.*

13. The Spirit of Truth is promised to all the Church, and to every member thereof, for whom our Saviour Christ prayeth, saying, "sanctify them in thy truth, thy word is the truth." *John 17. 17.* and is not restrained to any one governor, which is not ordained by Christ, nor yet to general councils, which if they err from the word of truth, are not led by the spirit of truth. And yet are general councils a good mean, in matters of question, where the ministers of the Church, which have the special gifts of knowledge and understanding in the Scriptures, may by mutual conference of the word of God, find out the certain truth, as in the council of the Apostles. *Acts 15.*

23. To ask of Saints in the name of Christ, is to make Christ a mediator between us and the Saints. But Christ saith, "whatsoever you ask the Father in my name, he will give it you," not whatsoever you ask of Saints in my name, the Father of the Saints shall give you. We may see upon what ground the Popish faith is builded. And yet you say untruly of all your prayers to Saints for many in your Portiee conclude not with *per Christum Dominum nostrum*: "By Christ our Lord." For example among a great number, take a few. In that office which you call *servitium beate Mariae*, there be three lessons which be all prayers to the Virgin Mary, which begin, *sancta Maria virgo virginum, &c. Sancta*

*Maria piarum pisisima, &c. Sancta Dei genitrix, &c.* In which this conclusion is not. And yet no less is asked of her, than eternal life. And because they be very blasphemous, it shall not be amiss, for the ignorant in the Latin tongue to translate them. The first is, "Holy Mary, Virgin of virgins, mother and daughter of the King of all kings: bestow thy comfort upon us, that by thee, we may deserve to have the reward of eternal life, and to reign with the elect of God forever." The second, "Holy Mary, of all godly women most godly make intercession for us, of all godly women the most godly, that by thee, oh! Virgin! he may receive our prayers, which being born for us of thee, reigneth above the heaven, that by his love our offences may be put out." The third, "Holy mother of God, which worthily hast deserved to conceive him whom the whole world could not comprehend, by thy godly intervention wash away our sins, that being redeemed by thee, we may be able to climb to the seat of eternal glory, where thou remainest with thy Son without end of time." And what call you this but a prayer? "By the blood of Thomas which for thee he did spend, make us Christ to climb, whither Thomas did ascend." The Popish Poet forgot *per Christum Dominum nostrum*, or else it needed not when the blood of Thomas was added to the blood of Christ. Again, *per te Thoma post levæ munera amplectetur nos Dei dextera*. "By thee, Thomas, after the gifts of the left hand, let the right hand of God embrace us, lest the enemy, the world, or the works of the flesh do carry us away captive to hell. Again, *opem nobis, &c.* "O Thomas reach thy help unto us, rule them that stand, lift up them that lie, correct our manners, acts, and life, and direct us into the way of peace. Moreover in a prayer to Osmund: *Confessor domini, &c.* "Thou confessor of our Lord, help the people with thy prayers, that being void of vices, they may be associate unto thee, and whom thou findest preventing thy solemnities, thou teacher of people cause that they may accompany thee." To Anne. "Thou that wast happy, being conceived with such a virgin, make us in the last hour to die without sin." Again, "Anne, thou healthful mother, make us to live to Christ." To Catharine, "Hail virgin worthy of God, hail sweet and gentle virgin, obtain for us the joys, which thou dost possess with glory." By these few, among a shameful rabble of Popish prayers, you may see how true it is, that their "Church concludeth all her prayers," *per Christum dominum nostrum*, "even those also that be made to Saints."

## CHAPTER 17.

17. The Church cannot err, nor any faithful man finally, in matters necessary to perpetual salvation. But if the Church or any man depart from the word of truth, they must needs err. Though in matters necessary to salvation, the true Church, and every true Christian, be preserved from erring finally.

Augustin interpreteth, sanctifying in the truth, "to be sanctified in Christ, which is the word and the truth." *Tr. 108. in John*. Whereof it followeth, that neither the true Church, nor any Christian man, can fall finally from Christ.

19. Christ offered not his body and blood in the Sacrament to his Father, but to his disciples in remembrance of his only once oblation thereof to his Father, by which he perfected forever his Saints. *Heb. 10. 14.*

20. The Canon of the Mass, is too base to be matched with this divine prayer of our Saviour Christ, which yet followed his Supper, and not went before it, as the Popish Canon becometh before consecration.

## CHAPTER 19.

17. The Scripture never calleth the cross whereon Christ died, holy, but rather cursed. For Paul proveth that Christ became accursed for us, by that he suffered on the cross, according to the Scripture: "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." *Gal. 3. 13.* And for many hundred years after Christ, there was no mention or regard what became of it. But when superstition began to grow, it was said to be found in Constantine's time by Helena his mother, which it is not like that Eusebins would have omitted in the life of Constantine, writing of Helena, matters of less importance than that invention, if it had been so indeed. But howsoever it was, it was credited in the latter times, and much esteemed, not without some spot of superstition. For if there had belonged any religious care of it to the Church of Christ, the Apostles would have procured the keeping of it, and not suffered the Church to have been three hundred years without it. For it had been an easier suit for Joseph and Nicodemus to obtain of Pilate, than the body of Jesus himself. But in the latter times, as superstition did more and more increase, and miracles were feigned unto it, the cross also was multiplied in number, and the pieces were made thereof so many as would load a ship, if they were laid together, as Erasmus saith. Which also is defended to be possible by the suspected authority of Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, *Ep. 11*, where he saith: "That cross holding a living force in matter void of sense, doth since the time it was found, so lend the wood of it to the innumerable desires of men almost daily, that it sustaineth no diminishing, and continueth as if it had never been touched, men daily taking part of it, and yet worshipping it still whole. But this incorruptible virtue and solidity that cannot be consumed, it did drink in truly of the blood of that flesh, which having suffered death saw no corruption." But this is so gross a fable, that the Censors appointed according to the Council of Trent in the low countries, for shame had commanded their *ind. expurg.* to be put out of the books of Johannes Sartorius, who allegeth it to justify the hyperbolical saying of Erasmus. But let

us see what is alleged out of the ancient writers concerning it. First, Cyril speaketh of the sign of the cross, which doth put men in remembrance of many good things against Julian, which slandered the Christians, that they worshipped the wood of the cross, by painting the image of it in their forehead and before their houses. Hierom being in Jewry, writeth in the person of Paula and Eustochium to Marcella, of the memories of Christ's birth, life, death and burial, that were in those places, among which he reckoneth, *Crucis lambe lignum*, to lick or kiss the wood of the cross, whereby it seemeth they were persuaded that the cross was there, and yet it may be the words be allegorical, as many other in that epistle: "To see Lazarus come forward bound with clothes." Meaning to be in the place where Lazarus was raised, and to remember his coming forth. *Leo, Epist. 72*, writing to the Bishop of Jerusalem, showeth that he may be put in mind of both the natures of Christ, by the places where his miracles are wrought, and his passion suffered. "This thing the very cross itself doth speak to thee incessantly:" by which words it could not be proved, that Leo was persuaded, that the cross itself on which Christ died, was then at Jerusalem: but that in the end he saith: "I received reverently, a little piece of our Lord's cross, with your commendations." *Hon. 8, de passion.* he speaketh magnificently of the cross, "that it was the altar of the world, in time of the passion of Christ. That Christ carried the trophy of his triumph, and on the shoulders of his invincible patience, he brought into all kingdoms the sign of salvation to be honoured, as though even then, by the very similitude of his work, he confirmed all his followers, and said, he that taketh not up his cross and followeth me, is not worthy of me." In which saying, except you grate upon the words, "the sign of salvation to be had in reverence or honoured," is nothing sounding towards your superstition. Although in the words following, Leo expoundeth his meaning, how it is to be honoured, by admonishing men of their conformity unto Christ's death and passion. Evagrius a writer in a more superstitious time, telleth a miracle of Christ that was showed when Thomas Bishop of Apamea, carried the cross whereon Christ died, about the Church to be worshipped of men which earnestly desired to see it, at such times as he used not to show it, because Chosroes having lately destroyed Antioch, they thought it should be the last time that they should see it. For they were next in danger, which they escaped for that present time, and an image of that miracle was hanged up in the Church, which soon after, with all the city was consumed with fire by the Persians. In which story, if it be true, it is to be noted, that the cross was supposed then to be at Apamea, where soon after, by all likelihood, it was burned with the Church in which it was kept. Paulus Diaconus a late writer, also telleth how Tiberius Constantinus found

a great treasure hidden in the earth under a marble cross, which he caused to be taken up: saying, "Do we tread under our feet our Lord's cross, wherewith we ought to defend our forehead and breast?" In which story, the judgment of Tiberius Constantinus which would not tread upon it, is no more to be esteemed, than the judgment of many Emperors before him, which had seen it in their palace and suffered it to lie, or of him, whosoever he was, that did hide the treasure under it. Now come we to the epistle of Paulinus, and the story of Ruffinus, in which, mention is made of the invention of the cross. And first, concerning the credit of that epistle lately brought to light, the reader must be admonished, that the style rather savoureth some monkish character, than that Paulinus, whose epistles unto Augustin have long been read and known, and the Popish censors, as we have showed before, are ashamed of it. But admitting it to be authenticall, let us see what credit it deserveth. First he sendeth to Severus "a part of a little piece of the wood of the divine cross," and that his relie might be the better esteemed, he telleth the whole story of the invention of the cross by Helena. In which story it is worthily to be considered, how well the writers thereof agree, that we may verily think it was forged. Seeing Eusebius, who writeth the life of Constantine, and in the same rehearseth the acts and buildings of Helena in Jewry, maketh no mention of any such matter. Therefore that brief note in the chronicle, bearing the name of Eusebius, is doubtless an addition of some later writer. Ambrose then is the most ancient writer, that maketh mention of that invention. *De obitu Theodos.* And he saith plainly, that three crosses being found, the cross of Christ was known by the title that Pilate fastened unto it. "The healthful cross was known by the title." Ruffinus saith, the title could not betray the cross of Christ. Sozomenus and Nicephorus say, the letters were worn out. *Soz. lib. 2, cap. 1. Niceph. lib. 8, cap. 29.* Paulinus saith: the way to discern it, was revealed chiefly to Helena herself. Ruffinus ascribeth the device to Macarius Bishop of Jerusalem: so doth Sozomenus, Theodoret, and Socrates. Paulinus saith it was known by raising up a dead man to life. Ruffinus saith it was discerned by restoring a sick woman to health, with whom agree *Socrat. lib. 1, cap. 17, Theodoret. lib. 1, cap. 18.* Sozomen addeth, that it was reported also of a dead man to be restored to life. Paulinus saith, the cross remaineth whole at Jerusalem, but yet so, that albeit innumerable pieces be daily cut off at the request of men, it is nothing diminished, but remaineth as though it had never been touched. Ruffinus saith that Helena left part of it at Jerusalem, the rest she sent to Constantinople, which as all the inhabitants of Constantinople affirmed, Constantinus inclosed in his own image, and there it was in the time of Socrates. How it came to Apamea, let Evagrius tell. Man-

deville saith, it was whole at Constantinople in his time, although the monks of a certain Abbey in Cyprus, affirmed that they had a part of it, to get an offering. Paulinus saith that the Bishop of Jerusalem yearly at Easter, "bringeth it forth to be adored, himself being the principal of the worshippers." Ambrose saith, that to worship it, it is an heathenish error and vanity of ungodly men. For these are his words: "She found the title, she adored the king, not the tree verily, for that is an heathenish error, and vanity of the ungodly. But she adored him that had hanged upon the tree, which was written in the title." Therefore if the invention of the cross were not a forged matter, as by the diversity of reports, it seemeth to be, yet by the judgment of Ambrose agreeable to the holy Scripture, the cross cannot be worshipped without heathenish error, and vain impiety. Finally, the placing of Mary and John, for so you call those blocks, by the rood in the Popish Church hath no more warrant in the word of God than the rood itself, for anything we can see in this chapter.

20. The tongues of all nations are sanctified by the Holy Ghost, to utter the great and magnificent things of God. *Acts 2, 11.* The writing of Pilate, to the derision of Christ, is a vain reason of the sanctifying of these three tongues. For by Hebrew it is most like the Evangelist meaneth the Syrian language, which then was the vulgar tongue of the Jews; and in Latin was no part of the holy Scripture first written.

34. By those sayings of Augustin and Chrysostom, it might be rightly gathered, that those fathers acknowledged but those only two sacraments, in that sense and kind of sacraments and mysteries, baptism and the Eucharist, which flowed out of the side of our Saviour Christ.

#### CHAPTER 20.

11. Howsoever Hierom, in the person of those two women, in whose name he wrote that epistle, esteemed of the monument, the Apostles made small account of it, nor the Church before the time of Constantinus, which was about 300 years. And although the sepulchres of martyrs, and the remnants of their bodies, be reverently to be esteemed, yet the superstition and idolatry of Papists, worshipping feigned and counterfeit stuff for the most part instead of true relics, is no way to be excused.

19. It can never be proved that Christ's body came either through the wood of the doors, or through the stone of the sepulchre, or through the clausure of his mother's womb. And concerning the last, the Scripture is evident to the contrary, where it is said, that our Saviour Christ was presented to the Lord, according as it is written: "Every male that first openeth the matrix," &c. *Luke 2, 29.* The same affirmeth Hierom. *Cont. Pelag. lib. 2,* saying, "He opened the gates of the virgin's womb, that was shut." For the immaculate virginity of Mary, con-

sisted not, in that the clausure was not stirred, but in that, she was free from the company of man. What he writeth against Helvidius of such things as do accompany a natural birth, which he acknowledgeth to have been in the birth of Christ, and rightly saith not to be more shameful than the cross of Christ, I had rather that they should read in Latin, than I express in English: *Solus est masculus alaperius vulvam, qui in veritate sanctus vocaretur. Vulvam quippe matris eius non concupiscentia mariti concubentis, sed omnipotentia filii nascentis aperuit. Ful. de in car. and gra. f. cap. 13.* Again I cannot see how it can stand with the article of his nativity, that he came out of his mother's womb, the clausures not stirred, when such a coming cannot properly be called a birth: whereas the Scripture, speaking of his nativity, useth the terms that are commonly spoken of in the birth of all men. *Matt. 1, 21, and 25. Luke 2, 6, and 7, and 11, &c.* Whether all parts after his birth, remained as close as before, as divers ancient Fathers think, I will not contend. It is sufficient to know so much as the Scripture teacheth, that Christ was truly born of a virgin. Leo saith, "It was an error of the Manichees to deny that he was born corporally of the Virgin Mary," in *Matt. ser. 4.* Therefore we must so acknowledge that he was born of a virgin, that we do not deny that he was born corporally. Neither is it said, that Christ came through the doors being shut, but after the doors were shut, which yet at his entry were opened miraculously, as to the Apostles the prison doors. *Acts. 5, 19, and 12, 10.* So I say of the stone, if he arose before the Angel removed the same. *Matt. 28.* You say, "that some say, he came in at the window," yet are you able to name none of us, that so saith or thinketh. But where we say, the door opened unto him miraculously, or that he came in late, after the doors were shut, you say there be flights to defend falsehood against express Scriptures: but we may well say, you have nothing but brazen faces, to oppose against the manifest truth. For where have you any express Scriptures, that he came through the wood of the doors being shut, the express words of the Evangelist are, after the doors were shut. But you add, that our exposition is against the Apostle's "testimony, who therefore took him to be a spirit, because they saw him stand suddenly in the midst of them, all the house being close shut." Which is a weak testimony, that he came through the wood and iron of the doors. They thought him to be a spirit when he walked on the waters. *Matt. 14, 20.* Yea it is no certain testimony, that he came in miraculously, for it might be, the door was opened unto him by some of the house unknowing to them. But admitting that he came in miraculously, your gross imagination is contrary to the testimony and argument of Christ himself, when to remove that false suspicion out of their minds, he saith, "handle and see me, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you

see me have." *Luke 24.* Which argument, had been altogether insufficient, to prove the truth of his bodily presence, and resurrection in body, if they had been persuaded that, after your fantasy, he came through the boards of the door: or that their senses, concerning his body, could have been so greatly deceived, that delivering them bread to the judgment of all their senses, he had delivered in the same compass and shape of bread, not bread, but his natural body sitting still in their sight. If therefore the Apostles had understood the words of the Supper, as Papists do, they could not have been persuaded by the arguments of their senses, which Christ offereth, of the truth and certainty of the resurrection of his body from death to life. But all the Fathers, you say, "confess that he went in, the doors being shut." That he came in miraculously, the most do think, and so do we, but not that his body came through the wood of the doors. Ambrose saith, "Thomas had cause to wonder when he saw, that after all bodies were shut, the joints not hurt, his body gotten in through places enclosed, where no way was. And therefore it is marvel, how the bodily nature, through an impenetrable body did pass, his coming being invisible, his presence visible, he being easy to be touched, hard to be deemed." This he speaketh of the Apostle's error: but his resolution upon the words of Christ, "handle me," &c., is this. "Therefore not by an unbodily nature, but by quality of bodily resurrection, he passed through the places shut, where no usual way was. For that which is touched, is a body, that which is handled, is a body, and we shall rise again in the body. For it is sown a natural body, it riseth again a spiritual body." In these words it appeareth, that Ambrose esteemed the quality of Christ's body, after his resurrection, to be the same, which shall be of our bodies after they be risen again. Therefore, except you will ascribe a perilous error unto him, you must acknowledge, that he meaneth no more but a miraculous entrance, without passing of his body through the substance of other bodies, except you will acknowledge the same passage to be the quality of all glorified bodies. Augustin *Ep. 3.* saith: "The same virtue of his divinity brought forth his body, being an infant, through the virgin's bowels of his immaculate mother, which after brought in his body, being a young man, through the doors, that were shut." That is, he was born miraculously by his divine power, he entered in miraculously by his divine power, when the doors were shut, the truth of his body still remaining, to which, as he saith elsewhere, "he gave immortality, he took not from it the nature." *Ep. 57. De Civit. 22, cap. 8.* After he had told the miracle of the ring that fell from the woman's girdle, being both fast and whole, he saith, "They believe not this, which believe not, that our Lord Jesus Christ was born of the virgin's womb of his mother being whole, and entered in to his dis-

ciples after the doors were shut. But let them inquire of this, and if they find this to be true, let them believe the other." Admitting this miracle of the ring to be true, as Augustin was persuaded it was, upon the report of the noble woman, from whom it fell, yet it followeth not, that the substance of the ring went through the substance of the girdle, but that the one substance giving place for the time, returned again when the other was passed. Some incredulous Jew, seeing that the car of Malechus was so soon healed, would not believe that Peter's sword went between it and his head, as we are sure it did. So we say of the birth of Christ, and of his entry, the doors being shut. The place through which his body passed, might be whole, and shut before and after he passed, but not in the instant of his passing, because that is contrary to the nature of a true body, such as his was. Cyril saith, "Our Lord entered unto his disciples suddenly by his omnipotence, after the doors were shut, overcoming the nature of things," with more words to the same effect, arguing nothing, but that he came in after a wonderful manner, which we do acknowledge: yet not altering the nature of his body, but subduing the nature of other things to himself, as he showeth, in his walking upon the water. Which Hierom also allegeth, to prove the miraculous entering of Christ. "But though he entered after the doors were shut, which the nature of human bodies doth not suffer, therefore we shall deny both Peter and our Lord to have had true bodies, because they walked upon the waters, which is against nature. By this it appeareth, he meaneth a marvelous manner of entering, but yet such, as taketh not away the truth of Christ's body, "from which, if you take distance of space," as Augustin saith, "you take the body clean away. Or if you take the bodies from the qualities of bodies," he meaneth essential qualities, "there shall be no place where they may be, and if they be no where, they be not at all." This saith Augustin of the nature of Christ's body, agreeable to the nature of all true bodies. *Ep. 57.* Leo saith to the same purport. Now, what God is able to do if he will, we doubt not: but when we know his will by his word, concerning the truth of our Saviour Christ's human body, wherein he was made like unto us in all things, *Heb. 2, 17, &c.*, we cannot admit such miracles, as be contrary to his will revealed in his word, upon pretence of his Almighty power. And if you detest the heresy of the Ubiquitaries, as contrary to faith and the common rules of nature and divinity, for the same reasons you should leave your heresy of the body of Christ being in many places at once, and yet without the due space of place, whereby according to Augustin's rule, it is made to be in no place, and consequently, to be no body at all.

21. In the words of Christ, is no institution of any Sacrament, because there is no visible element whereunto the word may be added

to make a Sacrament. But he reneweth the commission granted before to his Apostles, and to their successors, by declaring the pleasure of God, to pronounce sentence of forgiveness of sins to all that are truly penitent, and of the retaining of them to the obstinate and impenitent. And this is the authority that the Apostles and all Ministers of the Word and Sacraments their successors have, to forgive and retain sins. Gregory bishop of Rome saith; "Then the absolution of the president or overseer is true, when it followeth the pleasure of the eternal Judge." *Hom. 26. in Evang.*

22. He giveth the Holy Ghost by a visible sign, to assure them of the authority which he gave them, which was, by preaching the gospel to remit and retain sins, for which purpose he opened their mind, that they might understand the Scriptures, *Luke 24, 45. &c.* That you add he did it "for the grace of the Sacrament of Orders," as Augustin saith, it is an impudent untruth: for neither that counterfeit Augustin, whom you quote first, nor the true Augustin, *Cont. ep. Parm. l. 2. c. 11,* doth once name the Sacrament of Orders. For of the power or grace that is given to them that are ordained ministers of the Church, the question is not now: but whether there be any Sacrament of Orders: and whether this power be absolute; or following the judgment of God, to be executed by preaching and declaring the will of God out of his word, or by ceremony only. Concerning which matter, Augustin saith in the place by you alleged, that Christ by giving the Holy Ghost: when he gave power of remission of sins, "doth show sufficiently, that they do it not, but the Holy Ghost verily by them, as is said in another place. For it is not you that speak, but the Holy Ghost which is in you. And the Holy Ghost is so in the governor or minister of the Church, that if he be not a hypocrite, the Holy Ghost worketh by him, both to his own reward, unto eternal health, and to the regeneration or edification of them, which by him are either consecrated, or have the Gospel preached unto them." These words declare what manner of authority the ministers of the Church have, in remission of sins, either when they minister the Sacrament of Baptism, or when they preach the gospel. Cyril also in the place noted, is of the same judgment with us. "And certainly it pertaineth to the only true God, that he be able to loose men from sins. For to what other person is it lawful to deliver the transgressors of the Law from sin, but to the author of the Law itself? For so we see it to be done in men's affairs. For no man without punishment resisteth the Laws of kings, but the kings themselves, in whom the crime of transgression hath no place. For it is wisely said, that he is ungodly, which will say to a king, thou doest unjustly. How then hath our Saviour given to his Disciples the dignity and power of the divine nature? Certainly, because it is not against reason, that sins can be forgiven by them which have the Holy Ghost in them. For when they remit or retain, the spirit which

dwelleth in them, remitteth or retaineth. And that shall be by them as I think by two means, by baptism and by repentance. For either they bring men that believe and are approved for holiness of life, unto baptism, and diligently keep the unworthy from it: or when the children of the Church offend, they rebuke them, and pardon them when they repent. As Paul sometimes delivered the fornicator among the Corinthians, unto the destruction of the flesh, that his spirit might be saved, and received him again, that he should not be overwhelmed with greater sorrow." Ambrose hath none other meaning, nor any word of the Sacrament of Penance: but reasoneth against the Novatians, which denied that sins could be forgiven after baptism by the ministry of men, wherein you do impudently be lie us, to match us with them. His words are these: "What skilleth it whether the Priests do challenge this authority given unto them, by repentance, or by baptism? there is one ministry in both. But thou wilt say, that in baptism the grace of the mysteries doth work: what? in repentance doth not the name of God work?" By these words it appeareth, that Ambrose acknowledgeth no Sacrament of Penance or repentance. For then he would have said: Doth not the same grace of the mysteries work in penance? Are they not both sacraments alike? But he saith, "Doth not the name of God work?" meaning, that the grace of remission of sins, which is granted in the name of God to the penitent, is as effectual without a sacrament, as in a sacrament.

23. At the institution of the Holy Sacrament of our Lord's Supper, there was no word of sacrifice or power of sacrificing given to Priests. But where you say, the second faculty of priesthood, consisting in power to remit sins, is here instituted: you confess they were made but half Priests before. But how I pray you could they baptize or minister the Lord's Supper, without power of remission of sins unto the penitent? Therefore here is no Sacrament of penance instituted, but the authority of their Apostleship, confirmed and renewed unto them and their successors, ministers of the Church. Moreover, you shall never be able to prove, that the power of remission of sins doth imply confession to a Priest, or satisfaction of work: neither is there any word in the Holy Scriptures, to declare these two parts necessary to repentance. Neither doth it follow of any necessity, that men are bound to submit themselves to the judgment of Priests, if they have authority to forgive sins. Neither were their power given in vain, if none were bound to seek absolution at their hands: for they are bound to offer it to all true penitent sinners, although they seek it not at their hands, yea to exhort and desire men to be reconciled unto God by their ministry, *2. Cor. 5. 20. Luke 24. 47.* Again, men may seek absolution at their hands, though they be not bound to submit themselves to their judgment, nor yet to confess all, or any of their particular mortal

sins unto them. And where you quote Cyprian de Lapsis, he speaketh not one word of the necessity of the confession of all sins to a Priest, but of them that had openly fallen to idolatry, who were bound openly to acknowledge their sin, before they could be received into the communion of the faithful: commending them also, which although they had not openly fallen, yet having but only thought to yield to idolatry, being pricked in conscience confessed the same to the Priest, and sought comfort and wholesome medicine, though it were but for small wounds, in comparison of them that had yielded in act. Hierom saith, "That as in the law the Priest maketh the leper clean or unclean, so here also the Bishop or Priest bindeth or looseth, not them that are innocent or guilty, but according to his office, when he heareth the diversities of sinners, he knoweth who is to be bound and who to be loosed." Here is no word of the necessity of Confession, but only he showeth that the Bishop or Priest, hath none other power of binding and loosing, than the Priest of the Law had in making clean or unclean, which he did none otherwise but by declaring and pronouncing who was clean, and who was unclean. So the minister of the Church hearing that there be sinners penitent and unpenitent, knoweth to bind the one, and loose the other.

Moreover, where you say the authority to retain sins, consisteth especially in enjoining satisfaction, &c. It is altogether without the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, yea contrary to the same, which teach, "that all penitent sinners are by the ministry of the Church, to be assured of remission of their sins freely through the redemption of Christ." *Rom. 3. 25. 25. 1. John 2. 1. and 2. &c.* For by the death of Christ, is made a full satisfaction to the justice of God for our sins, and not by any works of ours. Christian men therefore look to have remission of their sins in the Church, and by the ministry thereof after baptism, contrary to the heresy of the Novatians, but not by any sacrament of penance. For neither Ambrose, Socrates, or Hierom, do once name the sacrament of penance in the places noted: but show that the ministers of the Church have authority as well to loose as to bind, to forgive sins as to retain: whereas the Novatians granted the one, and denied the other. Augustin joining reconciliation of them that are bound to baptism, doth not thereby acknowledge a sacrament of the one, as well as of the other. The like is to be said of the lamentation described by Victor Uticensis: and the complaint of Cyprian, *Ep. 54.* for the necessity of reconciliation by the ministry of the Church, of those that are bound by the same, doth not prove a sacrament of penance, which is the matter we stand upon. That the power here given, is exercised by preaching and denouncing the promises or threats of God, either publicly or privately, you know not what it meaneth: but even the Fathers whom you have cited, do testify the same, as appeareth by their sayings before remembered.

That confession may be made profitably when a man's conscience cannot otherwise be satisfied, we deny not: but that it is always necessary for obtaining remission of sins, we utterly deny. The saying of Chrysostom we acknowledge, understanding this power to be given to the ministers of the Church, as ambassadors of Christ, whose sentence being uttered in earth according to their commission, is ratified in heaven. But how this power is exercised, *Chrysost.* also showeth, *cap. 6.* of the same book, "not only by teaching and admonishing, but also by prayer." And concerning the necessity of confession to the Priest what Cyprian saith in his book de Lapsis, I have showed before. The former place is a commendation of them which confessed, even their purpose of defiling themselves with idolatry, though they did not accomplish it in act, in comparison of other that would be restored to the fellowship of the Church, without any confession when they had actually and openly fallen: which doth not argue any necessity of confession, in the same or in any such. In the second place he urgeth open confession and satisfaction to the Church which by their fall was offended, of them that had openly fallen into idolatry. So the place nothing proveth the necessity of confession of all sins, nor satisfaction to the justice of God. Cyril also, or Origen, in *Leu. lib. 2.* speaketh of hard discipline and open penance for open and heinous sins: the words are these: "There is yet a seventh way of remission of sins, although hard and laborious, remission of sins by repentance, when the sinner washeth his bed with tears, and his tears are made his bread day and night, when he is not ashamed to declare his sin to the Lord's Priest, and to seek medicine according to him which saith, I said, I will confess mine unrighteousness against myself, and thou hast remitted the impiety of my heart." You must remember there are six other ways of remission of sins, in which no confession unto the Priest is required, neither is it here required as necessary, but in case of that hard and laborious kind of repentance, which was appointed to open and notorious offenders. And yet by the text of the Prophet, which he citeth, it may seem he meaneth by the Priest of God, our Saviour Christ: for the Prophet speaketh of confession to God only. Tertullian in his book *de penitentia*, speaketh only of public confession of them that had openly fallen. *Hierom. in Eccles. 10.* saith, "if the serpent the devil hath bitten any man privily, and without any man's knowledge hath infected him with the poison of sin, if he that is stricken doth hold his peace, and do not repent, nor will confess his wound to his brother and master, the master which hath a tongue to cure him, cannot easily profit him: for if the sick man be ashamed to confess his wound to the physician which he knoweth not, medicine or physic heal not." This place doth not infer a necessity of confession, but where the conscience is especially troubled, not to the Priest, but to any learned brother, which by

comfortable exhortation may cure him. Basil saith, "The confession or declaration of sins, is after the same manner as the showing of the passions of the body. Therefore as men do not open the passions of their body to all men, nor to any kind of men, but to those that are skilful to cure them, so the confession of sins ought to be made to them that are able to heal them, as it is written; you that are able, bear the infirmities of the weak, that is, take them away by careful looking to them." These words do not affirm that all our sins must of necessity be confessed to a Priest, but that choice must be made of a godly learned physician of the soul, when we do make declaration of any of them, whether he be Priest or no, that is able to minister spiritual medicine unto them. Whereby it may rightly be gathered, that in vain men make their confession to many Popish Priests, which be altogether unlearned and unskilful. Basil speaketh for the instruction of them that lived in monasteries in his time, among whom many were learned and able to give good counsel that were no Priests. But Leo you say nameth Priests, *Ep.* 80. he doth so indeed, and secret confession as sufficient against them, that required open confession as necessary: yet saith he not, that confession to the Priest of all sins, is always necessary. For that it is expedient in some cases, for men to confess their sins to their Pastor, we deny not, but you have not proved that it is always necessary. The words of Hierom be as I have declared before. "When he hath heard the diversities or divers kinds of sins, he knoweth who is to be bound, or who to be loosed:" namely, the penitent to be loosed, the impenitent to be bound. Which he cannot do, by hearing the variety of sins: for all sins are to be pardoned to them that repent, and no sin is to be remitted to the impenitent. That Ambrose heard sometimes secret confessions, and kept them secret, we give credit to Paulinus: but that confession of all sins to a Priest is necessary to obtain remission of sins, neither Ambrose nor Paulinus, nor any ancient godly Father doth tell us. Augustin, *hom.* 49. speaketh of open penance for them that had openly committed adultery, as it appeareth by the example of Theodosius the Emperor, which he bringeth to persuade them, saying, "God would have the Emperor do open penance before the people, specially because his sin could not be kept close, and is the Senator ashamed of that the Emperor was not ashamed?" I have answered before to Ambrose, and Cyprian, that neither of them speaketh a word for the necessity of the confession of all sins to a Priest. The author of a book, *de vera et falsa penitentia* writeth against Augustin by name, and by the stile showeth himself to be a late writer in comparison of Augustin. Yet he thinketh not confession to a Priest to be so necessary, but that if a Priest be wanting, a man may confess to his neighbour, and shall have pardon, as the lepers that went to show their faces to the Priests, were healed before

they came to them. But that confession of secret sins is not necessary to be made to any man, but only to God, Chrysostom showeth *Hom. de penitent. et confessione*: "it is not necessary to confess in the presence of witnesses, let examination of thine offences be made in thought, let this judgement be without a witness, let God only see thee making thy confession: God which casteth not thy sins in thy teeth, but looseth thy sins for thy shame." Again, in *Ep. ad Heb. Hom.* 31. "I say not to thee that thou ought to bewray thyself abroad, nor that thou shouldst accuse thyself before other men. But I will have thee obey the Prophet saying, reveal thy way to the Lord, confess thy sins before God." The like saying he hath in *Psal.* 50. *hom.* 2. and in many other places of his works.

#### CHAPTER 21.

7. Augustin in that allegory, doth not in one word signify the preferment of Peter before the rest of the Apostles. If Gregory himself a Bishop of Rome, and so near the open manifestation of Antichrist in that See, that he prophesied of the forerunner, gather something for Peter's primacy, it is no marvel: yet it is little that he saith in this *Hom.* 21. for the Pope's supremacy. His words are these: "I think your charity doth already consider what it is that Peter draweth the net to the land. For to him the Holy Church was committed, to him it is said specially, Simon Johannis, lovest thou me? Feed my sheep. That which is afterward opened in voice is now signified in work. Therefore, because a preacher of the Church doth separate us from the ways of this world, surely it is necessary that Peter draw to land the net full of fishes. For he draweth the fishes to the steadfastness of the shore, because by the voice of holy preaching, he showeth to the faithful the steadfastness of their eternal country. This he did by words, this he did by epistles, this he doth daily by signs of miracles. So often as by him we are converted to the love of eternal rest: so often as we are separated from the tumults of earthly things: what are we else, but sent into the net of faith, as fishes, and drawn to the shore?" In these words, there is no more granted to Peter, than was true of all the Apostles, yea, than is true of every Preacher of the Gospel. Bernard is so late a writer, that we defer nothing to his authority.

15. Christ maketh not Peter his Vicar general, more than every one of his Apostles, who had every one a general charge of all the flock of Christ's sheep.

17. As *Matt.* 16. the Church was promised to be builded none otherwise upon Peter than upon all the Apostles, and that the keys of heaven should be given to him, no more than to all the Apostles: so Peter here is made no more general Pastor and governor of Christ's flock, than all and every one of the Apostles is. Nor all the logic in the world can otherwise conclude out of the words of the text. Neither do the Protestants uphold their



Archbishop against the Puritans, as you call them, avouch or prove any such preeminence of Peter above the rest of the Apostles, that he should be their head, and they to depend of him, nor acknowledge any primacy of Peter, but a primacy of order, as the ancient Fathers do, not of authority. The Archbishop's authority for external government of the Church, hath better arguments to uphold it, than the feigned supremacy of Peter. Your only reason to prove a difference of preeminence betwixt Peter and the rest, is, that Christ asked Peter whether he loved him more than the rest. Where for equal charge, no difference of love had been required. This is nothing but a foolish sophism, where that is taken for the cause, which is not the cause indeed. For the cause why Peter was bound to love Christ more than the rest, was that Christ had forgiven him more than the rest, according to the Parable, *Luke 7*. For having thrice denied him, he causeth him thrice to confess that he loved him, and willett him to declare his greater love, by more diligent and painful feeding of his flock. Wherefore Peter's greater love proveth not any greater authority given unto him, but that he is bound to greater duty and service in the Church of Christ. And this is the uniform consent of the most ancient writers upon this text. Augustin finding no supremacy of Peter in this Scripture, proveth thereby the duty of all shepherds to feed the flock of Christ, for the love of Christ. "Our Lord doth first ask that which he knew, and that not once but twice and thrice: Whether Peter doth love him: neither doth he hear any thing of Peter so many times, but that he loveth him: neither doth he commend any thing to Peter so many times, but that his sheep should be fed. There is rendered to a threefold denying a threefold confession, lest his tongue should be less serviceable to love, than it was to fear, and lest death approaching should seem to have expressed more of his voice, than life present. Let the duty of love be to feed the Lord's flock, if it were a token of fear to deny the shepherd. They which feed the sheep of Christ with this mind, that they would have them to be their sheep and not Christ's, are convinced to love themselves and not Christ, of desire of glorying, or ruling, or gaining, not of love of obeying, of helping and pleasing God. Against these men therefore doth the voice of Christ watch, so often repeated, whom the Apostle lamenteth, to seek their own, and not the things of Christ." *Tract. 123 in John*.

Cyrl finding as little for Peter's supremacy, hath these words, "For seeing Peter which with the rest was adorned by Christ himself with the name of Apostleship, denied him thrice in the time of his passion, there is now of right required of him a triple confession of love, that thrice denying, might be recompensed with an equal number of confessing. So that which was committed in words, is cured with words. Now he asked of him if he loved more than the rest. For he that had experience of the greater mercy of our Lord to-

ward him, ought of right to be affected with greater love. For though all the disciples generally were stricken with great fear when our Lord was betrayed, yet Peter's offence was greater, who in a very short time denied Christ thrice. For so much therefore as by the mercy of our Saviour he obtained forgiveness of a greater sin, there is justly demanded of him greater love. For to whom more is remitted, he ought to love more, as he saith elsewhere. Hereof the Church receiveth a rule of asking them thrice, which come to baptism, that by thrice confessing of Christ, they may be numbered among the faithful. The teachers of the Church also do learn, that they cannot otherwise be joined to Christ, except they study with all care and diligence, that the reasonable sheep may be well fed, and be in good health." And a little after. "Therefore by thrice confession of Peter, the crime of thrice denying is avoided. And he saith, Feed my lambs, renewing unto him the dignity of Apostleship, lest by his denial that happened by human infirmity, it might be thought to have been weakened." *Lib. 12. c. 46. in John*.

Chrysostom, though not so plainly yet sufficiently expresseth the same sense: "There are indeed many other things which cause us to have trust in God, and which do declare us to be noble and approved. But that which doth most of all procure unto us the love of God, it is the love of our neighbour, which Christ exacteth of Peter: for when they had ended their meat, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, &c. But wherefore, omitting the rest, doth he speak to Peter? He was the mouth of the Apostles, and principal. Wherefore Paul also went to see him, beside the rest, and withal to show him, that now he was to be trusted: for as though he had forgotten his denial, he doth commit the care of his brethren unto him, neither mentioneth his denying, nor casteth it in his teeth, he only saith, If thou lovest me, take care of a thy brethren, and that love which thou hast showed in all things, and wherein I delight, and thy life which thou didst say thou wouldest lay down for me, deliver it for my sheep." And a little after he addeth, *Ter interrogat*, &c. "He asketh thrice, and always commandeth the same thing, that he might show how great care he hath of his sheep, and that is the greatest argument of love." And lest you should think he ascribed greater authority to Peter, than to the rest of the Apostles, for that he saith in the same Homily, that Christ committed to Peter the charge of the whole world: He saith the same of Peter and John together; "Seeing they were to take upon them the charge of the whole world." *In John hom. 87*. Therefore his meaning is, that Peter as first in order, was the mouth of the Apostles, to testify of all their love, and that was spoken to him of feeding the sheep of Christ, belongeth equally to all the Apostles. Beda agreeth in words fully with Augustin. Now to the places which you cite out of the ancient Fathers: First I say

the place of Cyprian is falsified by Pammilius, contrary to the ancient edition in print and many written copies yet remaining, yea contrary to the citation thereof by Gratian in the Decrees c. 24. q. 1. c. *Loquitur*. in which is no mention of the primacy of Peter, and the very argument of the place is directly contrary unto it. The very words of Cyprian be these: "To the same Peter he saith after his resurrection, Feed my sheep. And although after his resurrection he giveth equal power to all his Apostles, and saith: As my Father sent me, I also send you, receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall remit, they shall be remitted unto him, whose you shall retain they shall be retained: yet that he might manifest unity, he disposed by his authority, the original of the same unity, beginning of one. Verily the rest of the Apostles were the same thing that Peter was, endued with equal fellowship, both of honour and power, but the beginning proceeded from one, that the Church may be declared to be one." By this true allegation of Cyprian, which maketh altogether against Peter's supremacy, you may see what is shamefully foisted in by the Papists, which nowadays have none other shift to keep their credit with their sottish scholars, but to corrupt and falsify the writings of the ancient Fathers and others, as appeareth by their *Index expurgatorius* lately printed to their shame perpetual, which they determined to have been kept in secret. And that Cyprian's meaning is, that all Bishops have equal authority, these words in the same book do plainly convince: "The Bishop's office is but one, part whereof is hidden in whole of every several Bishop." So that every one hath the whole authority for his part. *Rabanus Maurus de institut. cler. lib. 1. cap. 4.*

But that the vile practice of the Papists may be laid open, not only in falsifying the writings of the Fathers, but also in wilful perverting their meaning against their own knowledge and conscience, it shall not be amiss to set down their own words, namely the judgment of the University of Douay, approved by the censors according to the decree of the Council of Trent, concerning the book of Bertram. The title, "How the book of Bertram, Priest of the body and blood of our Lord, being amended may be tolerated."

"Although we make no great account of this book, and therefore we would not greatly care if either it were no where extant or utterly lost; yet seeing it hath been already oftentimes reprinted, and hath been read of most men, and being prohibited by name, hath been made known to all men, seeing also the heretics do know of the prohibition thereof by divers catalogues, and that he was a Catholic Priest and a Monk of the Abbey of Corbey, and was well beloved and revered not so much of Carolus Magnus, as of Carolus Calvus, and doth help the story of that age: and seeing that in other Catholic ancient writers, we hear very many errors, and extenuate them, excuse them, and very oftentimes by devising some pretty

shift we deny them, and do feign some commodious sense unto them, when they are opposed against us in disputations or in conflicts with the adversaries: we do not see, why Bertram doth not deserve the same equity and diligent recognition, lest the heretics should jangle against us, that we burn up and prohibit antiquity which maketh for them, and therefore it is no marvel that so few things seem to make for them, when we Catholics do so unreverently hiss out and destroy antiquity, which but in show dissenteth from us. Moreover, we fear lest this book not only by heretics, but also by unruly Catholics, by means of the prohibition thereof, may be read more greedily, alleged more odiously, and do more hurt being inhibited, than if it were permitted."

Upon these considerations they take order, and show how this book at the next printing shall be falsified, by adding, putting out, changing of the words and sentences, and by perverting the whole scope and meaning of the author. Out upon you antichristian heretics void of all truth and honesty, as your own words and deeds declare.

The sayings of Chrysostom be shamefully wrested to maintain the Pope's supremacy, which he uttered to show the dignity of every Priest, or Minister in the Church. For they are spoken to comfort Basil, whom he set forward to be Priest, when he avoided it himself. Wherefore Basil in the beginning of this book, complaineth that he was deceived by him, and asketh what he should gain by this office that he might be persuaded that he was not deceived. Chrysostom answereth, "what greater gain can there be, than when it is certain you do those things which Christ himself said to be arguments of love towards himself? For speaking to the chief of the Apostles, he said; Peter doest thou love me," &c. And so proceedeth in all the discourse, showing out of this text, the dignity of the Church Ministers, to whom Christ hath committed the charge of that he loved best and in exercising of which charge, he would have our love towards him, specially to appear. So in the former place by you cited, he meaneth not by Peter's successors only the Bishop of Rome, but all good Ministers of the Church. His words are, "He committed his sheep to Peter, and to them that come after him." For it had pertained nothing to Basil, if he had spoken of the dignity and prerogative proper to the Bishops of Rome. In the second place he saith: "Wilt thou still quarrel with us, that thou hast not been well deceived, when thou shalt be made ruler over all the substance of God, and when thou doest the same things, which when Peter did, he would have him to be of power, and to excel the rest of the Apostles: for he saith, Peter doest thou love me more than these," &c. It is manifest that he meaneth that Basil being called into the ministry of the Church, was made equal with Peter in dignity, if he would endeavour to be equal with him in love? And that the matter

wherein Christ would have Peter to excel, was in love and diligent feeding of his sheep: The charge whereof, is not to be committed but unto chosen men, such as afterward Chrysostom describeth: and not to the Bishop of Rome only.

Now concerning Gregory, which condemneth the name of universal Bishop as Antichristian, we go not about to clear him from all usurpation of jurisdiction more than to his See appertained. For the mystery of iniquity preparing to the open manifestation of Antichrist, long before did work in the See of Rome. And yet all that he ascribeth to Peter, doth not make Peter or the Pope, such a supreme governor, as you would have him. That the sixth of the Council of Chalcedon, seeing it appeareth not in the acts of the Council, but a contrary decree, wherein the Council made the Bishop of Constantinople equal with the Bishop of Rome, notwithstanding all the labour that Leo then Bishop of Rome could make by himself and his deputies, deserveth no credit. His predecessors alleged a counterfeit Canon of the Council of Nice for their prerogative, but the forgery was discovered in the Council of Africa, *cap. 105*. Where you say, the Council of Chalcedon would not give any unjust title to any man, you acknowledge the dignity of the See of Constantinople equal to the See of Rome in all things, seniority except, to be just, which was granted and concluded in the last session, *Act. 16*. And whereas you say, the title of universal Bishop offered to the Bishop of Rome, I know not in what sense was true and lawful, and only in the Bishop of Constantinople and other which had no right to it, it was insolent, unjust, and antichristian, you speak clean contrary to Gregory's mind, who condemned it as simply unlawful in any man, and saith: "That none of his predecessors would use that so profane title, although it was offered by the Council of Chalcedon. *lib. 4. ep. 80. ep. 36*. and a name of proud appellation, being given to himself, *lib. 7. ep. 30*. In the same epistle he denieth, that he commanded the Bishop of Alexandria, and saith that such "proud terms proceeded from the root of vanity, which ought to be far from his hearing." Whereby it is manifest, that although he thought too highly of the

dignity of his See of Rome yet he was far from the antichristian pride, of the most that succeeded him. Finally, the reason that he useth in condemning the name of Universal Bishop, and why he refuseth it, do plainly declare, that it cannot be just or lawful in any Bishop, or in any sense.

Moreover, we deny not but Leo the Great took too much upon him, as some of his predecessors had done before him, yet did he never arrogate half so much as the Popes do at this time. The authority of Bernard, who lived in the time of Antichrist's chief exaltation, and was in many points deceived with his errors, is not to be regarded in this controversy. The Greek Verb signifying to govern as a shepherd ruleth his sheep, addeth no more authority to Peter, than to any other Bishop or Elder of the Church, to whom it is also used. *Acts 20. 28*.

18. That Peter was martyred, may be concluded out of this place: but that he was crucified, it cannot be proved out of the words of this text. And least of all that he was crucified at Rome. And although many of the ancient writers affirm that he died at Rome, yet it may be doubted of, seeing other parts of their report, as of Peter's sitting five and twenty years at Rome, are confuted by the Scriptures. Beza in this place doth not absolutely deny Peter's being at Rome, nor yet his crucifying there, but that most impudent fable of the passion of Peter, bearing the name of Linus, by which it might be concluded, that Peter was justly condemned for drawing men's wives from their husbands. But the fable is worthy of no credit.

25. There is written sufficient, that we may believe that Jesus is Christ, and that believing we may have life in his name, *John 20. 31*. therefore all things necessary to salvation are contained in the Scriptures. The Evangelist saith not, that any thing is omitted of his doctrine, but of his acts: For though he spake more words than he expressed, yet all the doctrine that he uttered in those words is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. The Apostles preached nothing but that which was contained in the Scriptures. *Act. 17. 11. and 26. 22. Rom. 1. 2. Gregorius Bæticus Hibernæ scdis episcopus ad Gallum Placidium*

## ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

It is needless to write any thing against the scope of this preface, when there is none so sottishly addicted to Popery, but if he have the understanding of a natural man, he may easily perceive how wretchedly you go about, to wring out of the Acts of the Apostles, a usurped title of headship, for the city of Rome. First you say it delivereth the Gospel to be translated from Jerusalem, the head city of the Jews, to Rome, the head city of the Gentiles. Which is utterly false in both parts. For

neither was the Gospel translated from Jerusalem, at that time where the history of the Acts recordeth that Paul came to Rome, for then the Church flourished there under James, and many ten thousands of the Jewish nation, were believers, *Acts 21. 20*. Neither doth Luke in the Acts, so much as in one word insinuate, how the Gospel was first brought to Rome, for it had continued there many years before Paul came thither, as appeareth by his Epis-

tle to the Romans. Except that he maketh mention of Aquila and Priscilla, lately come from Rome to Corinth, upon the commandment of Claudius, by which Aquila, perhaps, the Gospel was first brought to Rome. But hereof we will not contend. Certain it is, that the Gospel was not taken from Jerusalem, nor sent, as it were, to Rome when Paul was delivered to the Romans. For it was there long before; the Church, as you confess, being planted there by Peter himself. Again, what blasphemous impudence is it to say, "That St. Luke cared not to tell the appearing of Paul before Cæsar, because his purpose was no more, but to show the new Jerusalem of the Christians, where Christ would place the chief seat of his Church:" when it is certain that he ended his story before Paul did appear. For upon his appearance, he was delivered, as he testifieth himself, *1 Tim.* 4. 17. And as for that, which you make his only purpose, what antichristian presumption is it to affirm, that to be his only purpose, which he doth not in any word signify? Whereas his purpose is sufficiently to be gathered out of the preface unto his Gospel, whereunto he joineth this second book of the Acts, to declare the doctrines and doings of the Apostles, conformable to the deeds and doctrine of their Master, for the certainty and assurance of the faith of Theophilus, and of the whole Church. Again it is false, that you say, "The Fathers and all Catholics, have always looked to Rome, as the Jews did to Jerusalem. For although, while the Church flourished there, they had some respect unto it, because it was the chief city of the Empire, to which and from which, might be most convenient concourse, and recourse: Yet did they not so regard the Church of

Rome, that they would be always ruled by it.

Polycarp coming to Rome, would not give place to the Church of Rome, nor to Anicetus Bishop thereof, in the celebration of Easter. *Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 26.* When Victor Bishop of Rome, about the same question, would have excommunicated the bishops of Asia, he was countermanded by them, and was rebuked by Irenæus, Polycrates, and others. *Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 25.* Cyprian and the Bishops of Africa, would not yield to Stephanus, in the question of the baptism of heretics. *Epis. ad Pomp. et Conc. Aph.* Firmilianus and the Bishops of the East, stood against him in the same cause, *Apud. Cyp. Ep. 75. Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 4.* The Council of Nice made all the Patriarchs equal with the Bishop of Rome, *cap. 6.* The Bishops of Africa forbade the ambitious titles which began to be given to the bishops of Rome. *Conc. Carth. 3. cap. 6.* They forbade appeals to Rome. *Conc. Milevit. cap. 22. Aphrycan. cap. 92.* The general Council of Chalcedon regarded not the negative voice of Leo Bishop of Rome, or of his Legates. *Acts 16.* The Church of Ravenna, in Italy hard under the Pope's nose, for many years together, would not acknowledge his superiority. *Platini in Don. 1.* Yea it is so far off, that the Fathers esteemed Rome to be Jerusalem of the Christians, that they judged it to be Babylon of Antichrist. *Tertull. cont. Marc. lib. 3. Aug. de Civit. lib. 16. cap. 17. et lib. 18. cap. 2. et 22. Hiero. Algasiquest. 11. et in Esa. lib. 13. cap. 4. Præfat in Didym., &c.* To conclude, 3. Luke writeth no more of Peter and the rest of the Apostles, than he knew certainly to be true. Of Paul he wrote more at large, because he kept him company in all his peregrination, and was present at the most matters, whereof he writeth.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

### CHAPTER I.

5. The ministry of man giveth not the Holy Ghost, but Christ by man's ministry as well in the baptism of John, wherewith he himself was baptized and received the Holy Ghost, as also in the baptism of his Disciples. Hierom saith, that our Saviour Christ received the Holy Ghost immediately after his baptism: "That it might be declared unto us that it is a true baptism whither the Holy Ghost cometh." *Cont. Lucif.*

7. It is for us to know the coming of Antichrist, so far forth as God hath revealed in the holy Scriptures. But you the ministers of Antichrist would have no inquiry to be made of him, lest he should be found in the See of Rome, the Western Babylon, as Augustin doth call that city.

11. We believe, that Christ's flesh is verily eaten, both in that sacrament, and otherwise in baptism, and without both by faith, after a spiritual manner, for so doth Chrysostom mean, notwithstanding his ascension. But

his ascension and sitting at the right hand of God in heaven, until he come to judgment, is a sufficient argument against the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament, or anywhere else used by Augustin, *Tr. 27. John and Tr. 50.* "You shall not eat," saith Augustin, "this body which you see, nor drink that blood which they shall shed, that shall crucify me: I have commended unto you a certain sacrament, which being spiritually understood, shall give you life." *Ps. 98.* "If Jesus died not, of whom is this sacrifice a token and figure." *Chrys. Matt. Hom. 83.*

14. Their wives are comprehended, as well as other women, for it were inconvenient to think the Apostles would exclude their own faithful wives, and remain shut up with other women. And it was expedient that their wives also should be confirmed by the Holy Ghost, who were partly to be companions of the painful peregrination of their husbands, partly to remain patiently without them. And if you had not forgotten your note immedi-

ately before given, upon the 13th verse, you would not have excluded them out of this company, except you would deny them to have been true members of the visible Church.

14. For the assumption of the Virgin Mary, there is nothing brought but counterfeit stuff, Denis, Damascen, Athanasius. For in that sermon entitled to Athanasius, the author doth so distinctly express in plain terms, that which was concluded in general councils long after his death, that it may easily appear to have been written many hundred years after his death. For although the truth of the two natures, and one person of Christ, was known and acknowledged of Athanasius before the heresies of Nestorius, Eutyches, and the Monothelites did spring: yet he did not speak so expressly against their subtleties, as the author of this sermon doth. For that which is alleged of Dionyse, there is nothing extant, but the report of one Juvenalius in the said oration of Damascen, who citeth whole matter out of the stories of Euthymius, which by all likelihood, is that Euthymius that wrote upon the Gospels, the Psalms, and Panoplia, which are now extant, in the days of Alexius the emperor of Constantinople, long after the days of Damascen. Beside this, the very manner of the narration, argueth it to be fabulous. Euthymius reporteth that Juvenalius bishop of Jerusalem, being demanded of Pulcheria the empress concerning the body of the Virgin Mary, which was believed to be buried at a Church in Gethsemani, which the empress desired to be translated to Constantinople, to a Church which she had built in Blachernis the third year of Martianus the emperor: the said Juvenalius answered thus: "Out of the authority of the holy books, there is nothing written of those things which pertain to the departure of the blessed Virgin, only out of an ancient and most true fame we have received," &c. And so setteth down the manner of her death and assumption, and proceeding in his tale to show that Timothy and Dionysius were there, he rehearseth a large discourse out of an epistle of Dionysius to Timotheus, forgetting that a little before he said, he had nothing but only by fame. And if you will needs have this history to be true, we must needs affirm that the lessons which you read on the assumption day, taken also out of a counterfeit Hierom as the style bewrayeth, are false and untrue. For in them the author saith, that he did write this treatise, that Paula and Eustochium might have a Latin gift, to keep the solemnity of this feast. "Lest peradventure, if there come in your hands that Apocryphal writing of the passage hence of the blessed Virgin, you should receive doubtful things instead of certain. Which in desire of reading thereof, many of the Latins through love of piety, do embrace more dearly, specially seeing of these matters no other thing can be proved, but that the glorious Virgin as this day departed out of her body. And her sepulchre is showed to us which see it unto this present time, in the midst of the valley of Josaphat,

which valley is placed between the mount Silo and the mount Olivet, which also you of Paula, have seen with your eyes, where in honour of her is built a Church of marvellous workmanship of stone, in which, as you may know, it is reported there of all men that she was buried, but now her tomb is showed to be empty, to them that see it. These things I have said to this end, because many of us doubt whether she were assumed together with her body: or else died leaving her body behind. But how, or at what time, or by what persons her most holy body was taken away, or where it is laid, or whether she be risen again it is unknown. Although some would affirm that she is already raised up to life, and clothed with blessed immortality in heaven with Christ. Many also affirm that John the Evangelist, the minister of the blessed Virgin is risen again: because nothing is found in his sepulchre but Manna. But what of these things may be judged most true, we are uncertain. Yet better do we commit the whole matter to God, to whom nothing is impossible, than that we would rashly define any thing by our authority, which we do not prove." If this authority be good, which being read in your popish service maketh the story of her assumption apocryphal, and the matter itself doubtful: then is the other story which you have set down false, that maketh it certain. If that which you have set down be true, then is that false which you read solemnly in your Church service. Beside this, compare their reports of the place of her burial, and the one author convinceth the other of falsehood. Your Church lesson out of a counterfeit Hierom, saith, the Church and place of her burial standeth in the midst of the valley of Josaphat. Juvenalius bishop of Jerusalem, in your fable out of Damascen, saith, the Church and sepulchre in Gethsemane, which according to the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, is in mount Olivet, and after John's gospel, on the other side of the brook Cedron. Whereas the valley of Josaphat is between the city and the brook, and between the city and mount Olivet, as the other author truly saith. Are you not ashamed therefore, to avouch that bodily assumption, which your own Church doth not affirm, and for proof of it, to allege such fabulous forgeries as are convinced to be false by your own service book? Now concerning your quarrel against us for abolishing of the festivities of the assumption, nativity, and conception of the Virgin Mary, by which means, as you say, she shall have no festivity at all. First, know ye, that we have no religion in any festivities of creatures, neither do we celebrate any of their feasts in worship of them, for, as Augustin saith, "We have no religion of men that are dead, for if they lived godly, they are not accounted such, that they would seek such honours, but they will have him to be worshipped of us, by whose illumination, they rejoice that we be fellow-servants of their degree or dignity. Therefore they are to be had in honour for imitation, not to be worshipped for religions."

*De vera religione* cap. 55. Secondly, these are abolished in our Church, because their institution was most superstitious: the one, for a feigned assumption of her body, whereof your own writers are uncertain, as Durand, and the author of your *Matin's* lessons: the other, for to maintain the heresy of the Franciscan Friars, that she was conceived and born without sin, which is contrary to the Scriptures. Finally, as in a thing indifferent, we make choice of days and times for the assembly of the congregation, besides the Lord's day, such as are thought most expedient, according to that liberty which the Church hath in matters of indifference, without esteeming the dignity of Saints by the number of festivities, as you do. And therefore we rather retain the feasts of the purification and annunciation of Mary, because they may be more proper to Christ, in whose honour, and not in the honour of his servants, we keep all such solemnities and festivities.

Where you say, we cannot abide the praises of the blessed Virgin Mary, it is a lewd slander, for we do very well allow all praise that may be given to her, without dishonour of God, and Christ her Son and Saviour. And whereas you call to witness the ancient writers, as though they ascribed unto her such blasphemous praises as you do, you abuse the reader greatly, for all in a manner that you allege is counterfeit, and forged by authors much later than those whom you name. As that Homily of Athanasius, whereof I have spoken before, those liturgies bearing the names of James, Basil, and Chrysostom, whose gross forgeries have been long since discovered. To these add the sermons gathered upon Augustin *De Sanctis*, whereto if any credit be to be given, remember that in the 39th Sermon, he doubteth of the assumption of Mary, which is an ancient approved truth with you: yet there it is said, that no Catholic story doth declare it, and moreover, that the Catholic Church doth not know it. And for a good proof that Augustin is not author of these homilies, he allegeth the testimony of Isidorus, who lived about 200 years after Augustin. Yet if it maintain any piece of Popery, it is authentic with you, and either it must be Augustin, or at least Fulgentius. But the alleging of Isidorus proveth that it is neither of both. As for most holy and ancient Euphrem, if we admit that special oration that you cite under his name for authentic, yet he must be understood as Cyrillus. That in regard of the great honour that God vouchsafed her, to have Christ born of her, those praises are ascribed to her, not as a meritorious or principal efficient cause of our redemption, but as a holy vestal and instrumental cause of the conception and birth of Christ, by whose only merit and worthiness our redemption and salvation is perfected, as by a proper and principal only meritorious efficient cause thereof. That which Irenæus, Augustin, and other do write of the concurring of both sexes to our salvation, is not to make the blessed Virgin

Mary a meritorious, or proper efficient cause of our salvation, as Eve was of our condemnation, but only to show, that as by a woman sin entered into the world, through the suggestion of the serpent, so by the seed of a woman the serpent's head is bruised, God using the faith of Mary for the conception of Christ, as the devil used the incredulity of Eve, to the deception of Adam.

Concerning the tragedy of Gregory Nazianzen, whither you send us in the margin it seemeth you make no great account of that testimony, being yet in appearance of words very rank for your purpose. But either you know that it is falsely ascribed to that ancient father, which was written by an author of much later time, or else you acknowledge, that in such poetical speeches is small force to prove matters in controversy. Indeed, as they that be learned in the Greek tongue do observe, the author of that tragedy neither in words, nor sentences cometh near to the style of Gregory Nazianzen, nor yet keepeth the law of the *Iambick* verse, which Gregory in that kind of poetry doth precisely observe. Moreover, he affecteth some phrase, by imitation of Euripides, which as it is not like that the grave father Nazianzen would have done: so if he had attempted the matter, he would have better deserved it, than this writer doth. Finally, in this place he attributeth to the Virgin Mary in his poetical vein, that which you deny to be the meaning of such titles and praises as are given unto her: and in other parts of that poem, he hath many things which I am sure you will not allow for good divinity. Among which let this example suffice, that in one place he bringeth in the same blessed Virgin, condemning herself of greatest and most extreme folly. Finally, your sophistical interpretation of the meaning of the titles and terms given to the Virgin Mary, cannot excuse him of blasphemy, any more than the same pretences may excuse a man of treason, that giveth the proper titles of a kingdom to a King's mother, under colour that she is an intercessor for him to the King, and brought forth the person of the King into the world. And yet some of your prayers unto her, can be excused by neither of both these shifts, as these: "Command thy son. By the authority of a mother command thy son. Compel God to be merciful," and such other. See the notes upon *John* 16, 3. Beside the honouring of Mary with the title of Queen of Heaven, and such like is condemned by Epiphanius for a heresy. *Her.* 78, and 79. And there is no cause, why such titles should be given her in respect that she was the mother of Christ. For as Augustin saith, *De sancta virg. cap.* 3. "She was more happy in that she conceived the faith of Christ, than in conceiving the flesh of Christ. If then these titles be unmeet for piety in respect that she received the faith of Christ, which grace is common to all God's children, then are they more unfit in respect that she conceived the flesh of Christ.

To conclude therefore with the saying o'

Epiphanius, *Her.* 78. "Whether the holy virgin died and was buried, her falling in sleep is in honour, her death in chastity, and her crown in virginity: or whether she were slain, as it is written the sword shall pierce thy soul, her glory is among the martyrs, and her holy body in praise and commendations, by whom the light arose into the world: or whether she hath remained, for it is not impossible for God to do all things that he will, for her end is known to no man: we ought not to honour the Saints more than is convenient, but honour their Lord." *Her.* 79. "She was indeed a virgin, and an honourable virgin, but not given to be worshipped, but she herself worshipping him that was born of her flesh, and came from heaven from the bosom of his father. For which of the Prophets hath commanded any man to be worshipped, much less a woman? Therefore let Mary be in honour, let the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost be worshipped." Finally the Colliridian heretics might excuse their idolatry, by such interpretation as you make of their meaning, and by as good reason might offer their cakes, as you do your candles and other offerings.

15. Peter practised no authority, but only a primacy of order, as Chrysostom showeth upon this text. "Now consider this also, how Peter doth all things by the common sentence of the disciples, nothing by his own authority, nothing by commandment." And when Beza calleth him *Antistes*, the chief of the company, he meaneth in order, not in authority, as though Peter were the Bishop, and the rest of the Apostles only his chaplains at hand, or at commandment.

26. In the word of God, we read that lots are directed by God only. *Prov.* 16, 33. But perhaps you had respect to the toy of Thomas' lots, when they added the direction of Saints.

#### CHAPTER 2

1. Augustin calleth the mysteries which he gathered out of the numbers 40 and 50 sacraments. By which you may see, how largely he useth the term. And that it is not by and by a sacrament, as baptism and the Lord's Supper are, which Augustin calleth by the name of a sacrament or mystery generally.

4. Of confirmation here is no word. And it cannot be proved by the text, that the fiery tongues sat upon any more than the Apostles, who were to be preachers of the Gospel unto all nations. Although we read, that the gift of tongues was granted to others also, therefore it is no inconvenience to think, that the whole number received that gift, but the Apostle specially. Neither doth Beza absolutely deny, that the Virgin Mary was present, but derideth the fond picture of the Papists, in which she is painted in the midst of the Apostles, as though she were chief of their College.

14. The Pope willingly resigneth this part of Peter's office, in preaching first, and commonly preacheth neither first nor last.

23. It is a most impudent slander, that Luther or Calvin ever taught that God was the author of the traitorous sin of Judas. And it is a knot in a rush that you find, when you charge Beza with false translation where he rendereth the word providence. For what signifieth providence, but foreseeing, and what is foreseeing in God, but foreknowledge?

24. Christ suffered nothing in soul after his death: but Augustin, in the place whither you send us, saith nothing at all to this purpose.

27. The article of Christ's descending into hell, is not grounded upon this text, but upon other places of Scripture. "Upon those just," saith Augustin, "which were in the bosom of Abraham, when he descended into hell, I have not yet found, what benefit he bestowed, from whom according to the blessed presence of his Godhead, I see that he never departed. As even in the same day in which he died, he promised the thief, that he would be with him in Paradise, when he was to descend to loose the sorrows of hell." *Epist.* 99.

27. He suffered nothing in soul after his death, but before his death, he suffered the pains due for our sins.

27. All the Fathers do not affirm, that Christ went into hell to deliver the Patriarchs and just that were there. First, *Ter. cont. Marcion lib.* 4, saith, "Hell is one thing, and Abraham's bosom is another thing." Chrysostom saith, it was an holy Paradise. *Ex. Luc.* 16. *Hom. de divinite.* Augustin *De genesi ad liter. lib.* 12, *cap.* 33, saith of Abraham, "I see not how we can believe, that he was in hell:" and *cap.* 34, "How much more after this life, that bosom of Abraham, may be called a Paradise." Moreover, where you call it a blasphemy of Calvin, to say that Christ suffered the pains of hell on the cross, you betray greater malice than wit or learning. For what dishonour is it to our Saviour Christ, to suffer that which was necessary for our redemption, namely, that torment of hell, which we had deserved, and which the justice of God required that he should endure for our redemption. Or rather, what is more to the honour of Christ, than that he vouchsafed, to descend into hell for us, and to abide that bitter pain, which we had deserved to suffer eternally? And what may rather be called hell, than the anguish of soul, which he suffered, when he being God, yet complained that he was forsaken of God? Again, where you say that Calvin should teach that he did not otherwise descend into hell, it is false: for he acknowledgeth, that the virtue of his death, did overcome hell, which in some sense, may be called a descent into hell. Furthermore, if descending into hell, be taken according to the Hebrew phrase, for entering into the state of the dead, that are departed this life: Calvin also acknowledgeth, that in this sense also, Christ descended into hell. Finally, if Christ's descending into hell, as some of the

ancient Fathers did expound it, were nothing but his burial, he confesseth that also, though it be not the true sense of that article. Yet so doth Ruffinus expound it, and testify, that this clause of the descending into hell, in his time, was neither in the creed of the Church of Rome, nor in the creed of the Oriental Churches. *Ruff. in symb.*

Now concerning the Hebrew words, after which the Greek are used, they be not proper for soul and hell, as you do more boldly than wisely affirm. Beza opposeth not himself against the Scriptures at all, nor against the ancient fathers, neither doth translate falsely of purpose, but truly, against purgatory, and *Limbus patrum*.

33. Amendment of life requireth of necessity sorrow for sin, and departing from the former sins, which they that are to be baptized, do profess, which is that penance whereof Augustin speaketh. *De fid. et oper. cap. 11.* But *ep. 103.*, he showeth repentance after baptism. "Men do also penance, if after baptism they have so sinned that they are worthy to be excommunicated, and afterward to be reconciled, as they do, which in all Churches are properly called penitents." Again he saith of another kind of repentance, "For repentance is a daily punishment of good and humble faithful men: in which we knock our breasts, and say, forgive us our debts," &c. But of the sacrament of penance he speaketh not a word.

42. It cannot be proved, that this was the blessed Sacrament, and much less, that it was ministered in one kind. *Cap. 20.*

44. This living in common was neither anabaptistical community, nor papistical monkery. But such as ought always to be among all Christians. That no man account that to be his own, which the necessity of his brother requireth, to be bestowed on him. For that the Christians then had property in their goods, and might so hold it, it is manifest by the words of Peter to Ananias, *Cap. 1. 4.* Chrysostom saith, the Christians were then so affected, as the people were in his time, when God shook the city with an earthquake, where there was no community, but in charitable affection. They that lived in Monasteries, in Augustin's time, were both in religion, and conversation, far differing from Popish monks and nuns, who labour not with their hands, as those did, but live idly, of the sweat of other men's brows, and devour that which should relieve them that be in necessity. Against which sect budding up in his time, Augustin wrote his book *De opere Monachorum*. But of the true solitary persons, he writeth *De morib. Eccl. Cath. lib. 1, cap. 31.* such saith Erasmus, as I would were now in the world, signifying that the Popish cloisters are nothing like them. *Casarius Arelat. Hom. 20, hom. 25.*

47. No Papist is able to prove, that there was any visible Church for five or six hundred years after Christ, that maintained all the chief points of Popery.

### CHAPTER 3.

1. This was the time of the evening sacrifice, when the religious Jews resorted to the Temple to pray: But for Popish canonical hours which are their morning service, it maketh nothing at all.

6, 12. These notes do one of them fight against the other: for in the former you say this power was in Peter properly, in the latter you say, the Apostles in such works, do it not by any proper power in them, You cavil against that we say: this was a miracle done by Christ by the hands of the Apostles, as though they had no more to do than a dead instrument. But who is so simple, or rather senseless, to think that the Apostles wrought miracles as dead instruments? when Christ himself saith, it is not you that speak, but the spirit of your Father, which is in you, *Matt. 10. 20.* Doth he mean that the Holy Ghost speaketh in them as in dead instruments? or rather is the author and suggestor of that wisdom, according to which they make answer. So when the Scripture saith, that God "only doth work great miracles," *Psal. 136. 4.* We must still acknowledge God to be the author, and man to be the instrument of all wondrous works, that God worketh by their hands: and so the Apostles confess themselves.

16. This faith might be the man's faith in Christ, whom he heard them name: or the faith of miracles in the Apostles, apprehending only the power of Christ, by which this man was healed. Which although in the Apostles it was joined with the whole belief of Christian Religion, yet in some it was without that belief, which wrought no less miracles in the name of Christ than this, *Matt. 7. 22.*

21. Gregory Nazianzen was such an heretic, which so citeth this place in Greek, as it cannot otherwise be understood, but that Christ must be contained in heaven, and howsoever it be translated, this sense must needs be concluded out of the words. For if heaven must contain Christ, Christ must be contained of heaven, or as you translate it, heaven must receive Christ, *ergo* Christ must be received of heaven. And if this presence in the sacrament draw him not from heaven, then is his presence in the sacrament not corporal.

### CHAPTER 4.

19. The confirmation of the Apostles was nothing like a Popish confirmation which they that receive are never the better for it. True Catholic Christians, if they be forbidden by enemies of the Church, ought to answer as the Apostles did. But Papists that be counterfeit Catholics, if they do not obey the Christian magistrates, or governors of the Church, are justly punished.

28. The malice of the Jews was of the devil, and of themselves: but God did not only permit, but also use their malice most holily and justly, to bring his purpose to effect.

37. The rest also brought the price, and laid



it at the Apostles' feet, but of kissing their holy feet, is here no mention. And although Mary kissed the feet of Christ, it is no warrant for the Pope to offer his feet to be kissed even of Kings and Emperors. When Cornelius fell down at Peter's feet, Peter would not suffer him, *Acts 10. 15.* The people of the East country, were full of ceremonial reverence, in falling down, kissing, and such other external rites of humiliation. and the rather to Epiphanius, because he was an adversary to heretics, and opposed himself against the proud Bishop of Jerusalem, which favoured some heresies. But the duty of all men is evil gathered of that immoderate zeal of the people, which Epiphanius himself did not allow. For he was forced by the throng to suffer such things, and did not willingly of purpose stay in one place, to receive such honour of the people, as the envious Bishop of Jerusalem did falsely object unto him, as it followeth immediately in Hierom. But if such kissing of feet be commendable, how cometh it to pass, that the Pope only hath holy feet to be kissed, and not other Bishops and Clergymen as well as he?

## CHAPTER 5.

2. Augustin is cited out of new found sermons, which yet have not obtained credit of Antiquity. The text is plain, for what sin they were punished. Neither can it be proved that they promised the whole, but that they affirmed they brought the whole, when they withdrew part. Sacrilege is condemned by many other places of Scripture, although it be not by this. And if it be also by this, as some fathers of better credit than you cite do suppose, yet the principal cause is manifested by the words of the Apostles, to be lying and hypocrisy. Now what heretics they be, that teach man to commit sacrilege, you must name more particularly. The popish clergy in Henry the eighth's time, consented to the suppressing of monasteries: and some Papists at this day without conscience of sacrilege, do enjoy their lands, and dwell in their houses, peradventure you mean them. If you mean us, as we do utterly detest sacrilege, so we think it not only lawful, but necessary, to put down idolatry, and to apply to good and godly purposes, things dedicated to maintain false worship, superstition and idolatry. *Hesych. lib. 2. cap. 10. in Livit.*

3. Every thing that Peter said or did, with you argueth his Popedom: but either you must bring better arguments, or else children will laugh you to scorn. The punishment laid upon these hypocrites, was greater than excommunication, the end whereof is intended to be the repentance and amendment of the excommunicat, which was not in this case. *Hesych. lib. 2. cap. 10. Livit.* Neither doth Augustin judge, as you say, that it was excommunication, but saith, that Paul in delivering the incestuous Corinthian to Satan, sought by destruction of the flesh, to provide for his spiritual salvation, "that either by some punishment, or corporal death; as Ana-

nias and his wife fell down at the Apostle Peter's feet: or else by repentance, for he was delivered to Satan, that he might slay in himself the wicked concupiscence of the flesh." These words, as all men may see, prove not that Ananias and his wife were excommunicated, but that Peter of charitable affection used this severity, wishing, if it were God's will, the salvation of their souls. That the excommunication of Paul, *1 Cor. 5.* had the corporal vexation of Satan incident unto it, cannot be proved by the text. For every one that is cast out of the Church of Christ, is delivered into the power of Satan, although he suffer no bodily vexation by Satan.

4. They that have as great power to keep their vow of virginity advisedly made, as Ananias had to deliver the whole price of his land, sin damnably if they break it. But if they have rashly vowed that, which they are not able to perform, they have sinned in making such an unadvised vow, but it were better for them to marry, than to live incontinently out of marriage. *Hier. ad De. ad Epip. Hær. 61.*

4. Not every one that taketh from the Church, or that lieth to God's ministers, sinneth against the holy Ghost, as these did, although he sin against God. For the Holy Ghost is not in all God's ministers, to know things done in secret, as he was in the Apostles, and therefore they tempted the Holy Ghost, whom they knew to be in the Apostles after a miraculous manner.

10. The text saith, they were punished so severely, for lying to the Holy Ghost in defrauding of the price, and tempting the spirit of God.

11. The fear of God fell upon the whole Church, and unfeigned reverence towards God's Ministers: whom they feared not as tyrants, but loved as fathers. "A father and a Bishop ought to be loved, not to be feared." *Hierom. Ep. 62. ad Theophilum.*

15. God wrought greatly by Peter's ministry, that he cured even those that came under his shadow, but this proveth not the Popedom of Peter, and much less that Peter worketh still miracles from heaven: as that counterfeit Augustin doth seem to insinuate, who lived long after Isidorus, that was 200 years after Augustin, as it is manifest by citing his saying, as an ancient author. *Ser. 3. de sanct.*

39. When you see the end of that doctrine which Luther preached against you, then boast of the victory of the Popish Church. We see the fall of Babylon daily more and more: and the madness of them that seek to uphold her, made daily more and more manifest. But especially we know out of the holy Scriptures, that the Popish rabble is the Synagogue of Satan and kingdom of Antichrist, and that the doctrine which we teach, is the faith of Christ.

## CHAPTER 6.

3. The ministry, wherunto the Deacons were assigned was an holy ministry, and the tables wherunto they were appointed to

serve, were holy tables, neither was their office exercised in profane things. For the Apostles, although they distinguish the preaching of the word from serving tables, yet do they not thereby condemn that service of tables which they themselves did exercise before, of profaneness. For the provision for the poor members of Christ, is a holy service, and no profane thing. Paul appointeth the collection for the poor, to be on the Lord's day, which he would not have done, if it were a profane matter, *1 Cor. 16. 1, 2.* And yet it is not denied, but their ministry was used also, to other holy purposes, as teaching, baptizing, and assisting the Apostles and other principal pastors in their spiritual charge and ministry. But that they were occupied about the Altar, as the popish Deacons are, or had any office like unto theirs, neither any of the places which you quote or cite doth show, nor any testimony of antiquity doth show. The Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp, that now go under their names, though they have nothing for the Popish Deaconship, yet are they not authentic, but gathered out of the Apocryphal constitutions of that counterfeit Clemens. Dionysius, though not of that antiquity which is pretended, yet doth not he name the Deacons, in the place by you quoted, which bring forth the bread and the cup, for the ministrations of the Sacrament, but certain principal ministers. Although it is no inconvenience to withstand the Deacons, seeing it is certain by Justinus, that they were used for the distribution of the Lord's Supper. Finally, we acknowledge that the Deacon's office is holy, according to the testimony of most ancient Fathers, and therefore it is not that profane and ridiculous order of Popish Deacoury

#### CHAPTER 7.

16. The bodies of the Patriarchs were not translated to be made idols, as the manner is in Popish translations, but to testify to the posterity, their faith in the promise of God, whereby they looked for the spiritual possession of the land, although they died in banishment. Such causes favour not Popish superstition. Chrysostom saith, that Joseph caused his bones to be removed, "lest the Egyptians should abuse his body, to occasion of impiety." *In Gen. Hom. 67.* Augustin though not altogether free from error, in that book *De cura*, yet of burial and all things thereto belonging, he saith, "They be rather the comfort of the living, not the help of the dead." *De cura, cap. 2.*

33. The ground was holy by the presence of God in his minister the Angel, according to his pleasure: but that holiness continued not after the departure of the Angel. So all places were holy, which it pleased our Saviour Christ to sanctify with his presence, but not all places or persons which he touched, for then Judas and the soldiers that crucified Christ, should have been exceedingly holy.

The personal presence of Christ in the sacrament, must first be proved before any sanctification of places in that respect can be conclu-

ded. And then it must also be proved how far he will have his holiness to proceed. For that presence in the mouths and stomachs of the wicked, doth not sanctify them by your own doctrine, nor I think in the belly of a mouse or other beast that happeneth to eat your consecrated host. To reverence any place in respect of God's presence, where he hath appointed the same, is no superstition, but to esteem the land of Jewry to be holy, because Christ hath sometime trodden upon it, from whence he hath withdrawn his presence, is gross superstition. Hierom in the places noted, ascribeth no holiness to the ground, but in respect of the lively remembrance, that men may have by sight of those places, in which Christ was conversant, and wherein he wrought his miracles, otherwise, "It is no commendation," saith Hierom, "to have been at Jerusalem, but to have lived well at Jerusalem." There is as ready a way to the court of heaven from England as from Jerusalem. *Ep. 13. ad Paulinum.*

35. Christ is our only Redeemer from spiritual bondage, who only paid the price for us. Moses was a minister of their bodily deliverance from Egypt. But neither Moses nor any Saint, can be inferior mediators and advocates unto God for us, except they can also be inferior Christs and Saviours. For there is but one Mediator Jesus Christ, who is our advocate with the Father, *1 Tim. 2. 5. 1 John. 2. 1.* Saviour, Redeemer, Mediator, and Advocate, be the proper offices of Christ, and therefore are not communicated to his servants.

43. This argument as lightly as you esteem it, beareth hard against your fantasy of concomitance, seeing by your corporal being of Christ in the sacrament, you draw the presence of his Godhead to the same place where the sacrament is, not as God is in all places, filling them with his majesty, but as the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth in Christ by union of person. For although the godhead dwelleth in the body of Christ, as in a temple not made with hands, yet he dwelled not in the temple of Jerusalem, when Christ was present in it, nor in any other house or place into which his body came. For it is one thing to say, the Godhead filleth all places, another thing to say he dwelleth here or there. For public prayer, places appointed are most convenient, yet all places are consecrated unto God for prayer. *1 Tim. 2. 8.* and Churches are not more convenient for public prayers, in respect of their holiness, but for order and comeliness sake.

54. Such narrations we may read good store in the *legenda aurea, Sermones discipuli*, the festival, and such other Popish books, stuffed with fables and babbles, like to to the counterfeit Augustin, the author of these sermons. There was too much counterfeit stuff printed before under the name of Augustin. You needed not to have added more from Paris, but that you hate the truth, and delight in lies, fables, and forgeries.

60. Those homilies that are printed under the name of Eusebius Emisenus, were never written by that ancient Bishop of Emesa, but

by a man of later time, and a Frenchman born, as is manifest, *Hon. de sancta Blaudina*, and other places of those homilies. And yet the author of that homily meaneth none other worshippers, nor any other worship, than he describeth in the beginning thereof, namely such as did celebrate the praises of the Martyrs to the glory of God, and to stir up men to the imitation of them. It followeth not that we must pray to the Saints.

## CHAPTER 8.

2. It was an office of Christian charity, to bury the body of Stephen; what miracles were afterward wrought at the finding of his body, and at the memories of him, the Scriptures telleth not. Augustin reporteth much: yet doth he condemn "worshippers of sepulchres and pictures." *De mor. eccl. cath. lib. I. cap. 31*, and testifieth, that some idle monks in his time, carried about the relics of martyrs, which might be counterfeit, and not relics of martyrs. *De opere Monach. cap. 28*.

14. This sending of Peter, is a good argument to prove that Peter was not their superior, as Christ's vicar. For then he might have sent any of them, or gone of his own accord without sending. Peter was therefore inferior to the rest, and under the authority of the whole college of Apostles, though he were equal to every one, and in primacy of order, first of all. Whereas if Peter had been superior as Christ's vicar, they could no more have sent Peter than they could have sent Christ himself. That the word of sending is not always exactly used in the Scriptures, you have no example to bring, but of the sending of the Son and the Holy Ghost. Whereas all men of mean judgment know, that the mystery of the holy Trinity being ineffable, the words are almost all borrowed, that are used to show the distinct working and effects of the persons thereof. But here, in proper phrase of speaking, the Apostles sent Peter and John: Peter and John therefore were subject to the Apostles. But you add, that the word of sending, "is not always so taken in the common use of the world, seeing the inferior or equal, may entreat his friend to do his business for him." I grant that to be true, but the inferior or equal that hath entreated his friend, cannot truly say, he hath sent his superior or equal. Neither can a corporation, that is under a sovereign head, such as you would have Peter to be, send their head, or choose him to be their foat, to go for them. Neither can the citizens send their mayor, which is the Prince's lieutenant, more than they can send the Prince himself. He may go indeed by his own consent or desire, but he cannot be sent, except he yield unto the authority of the senders. Lastly, you say, belike, for the uttermost refuge, that the college of the Apostles, comprising Peter, was greater than Peter their head alone. This granted, Peter's headship was not the sovereign authority of Christ, neither was Peter head of the Apostles, as Christ's vicar. For the whole Church comprising Christ, the

head thereof, is not of greater authority than Christ himself. Neither may Christ be sent by authority of the whole Church. No more might Peter have been seen by authority of the whole college, if he had had the whole authority and government over the Apostles, as Christ had, and always hath. Neither is this place used only of Protestants, as you say, but also of some Papists, to prove that the Pope ought to be subject to the general council, representing the whole Church. *Epist. Syn. Con. Basil. ad innectivum sub nomine Eugenij Papæ, cont. syn. Basil.*

17. Here you will enforce a sacrament of confirmation with oil, which neither in this place, nor in any other place of the Scripture, hath either word of institution, or outward element of Christ's appointment, which two things must needs concur in any sacrament. The Apostles here prayed, that the Samaritans, for further confirmation of their faith, might receive the visible miraculous graces of the Holy Ghost, as the gifts of tongues, of prophecy, of healing, and such like: out of which it is impossible to conclude any ordinary or perpetual confirmation of all that are baptized, and that with oil, whereof there is no mention in all the Scriptures that it was either appointed or used for such purpose. Now that you are forsaken of the word of God, let us see what testimony you gather out of men. First you bring Beda, who lived 700 years after Christ, and speaketh of the ceremony of anointing with oil by the Bishop, as it was used in his time. Yet doth he not call it a sacrament, nor say that the Apostles used that ceremony, but that it belonged to them to give the Holy Ghost and not to Philip, as in his time bishops used to anoint with oil, and not the Priests, by which unction they were persuaded the Holy Ghost was given. Notwithstanding you are bold to conclude, that this imposition of hands with prayers, was the ministration of confirmation: which with all the logic you have, you can never conclude out of the text, nor out of Bede's words: although they be more than can be proved out of the Scriptures. But you are yet more bold to affirm, for you may say what you will without proof, that "the prayers here specified, were no doubt the very same that the popish Church useth to that purpose." The text is plain what these prayers were, that they might receive the Holy Ghost, which Occumenius out of the consent of all the Greek fathers doth expound, "the power of working miracles." *Acts cap. 10*. The words that your popish bishops use in their confirmation with oil, are, "I mark thee with the sign of the holy cross, and confirm thee with the chrisom of salvation, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Peace be to thee." What affinity have these words with the prayers of the Apostles? But if Beda be too young, Cyprian is an ancient writer, who belike is a patron of popish confirmation with the chrisom of salvation. But that you confess is left out both by the Evangelist, and by Cyprian.

Cyprian indeed showeth, that those that were baptized in the Church were offered to the governors of the Church, and by their prayer and imposition of hands, obtained the Holy Ghost, and were signed or consecrated with the sign of the cross: we see here prayer and imposition of hands, according to the example of the Apostles to obtain the Holy Ghost, but we lack still yet the chiefest matter to make up a sacrament, the chrism of salvation. To supply that want, you say many "things were done and said in the administration of this and other sacraments instituted by Christ, which are not particularly written by the evangelists, or in any other scripture." To admit that all things done and said, be not particularly expressed in the scriptures, shall we therefore admit for sacraments such things as have neither their institution, nor the word, nor the element set forth in the scriptures? Some circumstances not material are omitted, but the chrism of salvation, if it had been of Christ's institution, and the Apostles' practice, should never have been wholly omitted being a matter of so great importance, as the very name you give unto it doth pretend.

But all antiquity, you say, and most general practice of the Church, do evidently prove, that this sacrament was instituted by Christ, and yet not written in the Scriptures. To omit that the testimony of all the world, without the testimony of the Holy Ghost, is too weak a ground for us to build our faith upon. It is utterly false that you say; for neither doth all antiquity testify of it, neither was it ever generally practised of the Church as a sacrament. For in the Greek Church, this confirmation was never received to this day.

But to examine your witnesses of antiquity severally. First, Dionysius is not of such antiquity as you pretend, for if he had been, his writings could not have been unknown to Eusebius, Hieronim, and Gennadius, who continued the catalogue of principal writers of the Church for five hundred years after Christ. But we must take him in such order as you offer him. This Dionysius speaketh of an unction used to them that were baptized, after which they were admitted to the Eucharist: as he doth of many other ceremonies of unction, not used in the Popish Church, all which yet he comprehendeth under the sacrament or mystery of unction.

Tertullian speaketh also of the ceremony of unction, which was used in baptism, to signify that the baptized was consecrated as a champion of Christ, to fight against the devil, the world, and the flesh, which in baptism he hath renounced and defied. Which he declareth plainly in his book *De baptismo*, saying: "As soon as we came out of the laver, we are anointed with the blessed unction, of an ancient discipline, by which they were wont to be anointed with the oil out of the horn in the priesthood: whereof Aaron was anointed by Moses: whereof Christ is called a Chrismate, which is unction," &c. Dehinc, "Afterward the hand is laid on, by blessing,

calling upon and inviting the Holy Ghost," &c. All which declare, and the whole discourse of the book, that he speaketh of ceremonies used about baptism, not of the Popish sacrament of confirmation. Also, that unction was a ceremony distinct from imposition of hands. The same thing also doth Cyprian teach, *ep. 70*, saying, "He that is baptized must needs be anointed, that having received the chrism, that is unction, he may be anointed of God, and have in him the grace of Christ. And afterward he speaketh of prayer for him that is baptized, to receive the Holy Ghost with imposition of hands. Likewise *ep. 72*, where he calleth not unction, but that which is represented by imposition of hand, a sacrament. For in the epistle he certifieth Stephanus B. Rome, that they have concluded in Africa, that they which come from heretics, must be baptized. "Because it is little worth to them to lay the hand upon them, that they may receive the Holy Ghost, except they receive also the baptism of the Church. For then at the length they may be sanctified perfectly, and be the sons of God, if they be born of both the sacraments, seeing it is written, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." You see plainly, he speaketh of the spiritual birth of water and the Spirit, which is testified in baptism, whereof the element of water and the laying on of hands, were signs, not of a several sacrament of unction. The decretal epistles of Melchisedech, as all the rest of that rabble, is a mere counterfeit, in which the author doth not only in barbarous Latin tell the difference of this Popish sacrament from baptism, but also showeth how much more worthy it is than baptism. *August. cont. lit. Pet. lib. 2. cap. 104*, saith, "that Petilian the heretic, in the spiritual ointment spoken of by Psalm 132, will interpret the sacrament of chrism, which truly in the kind of visible signs is holy as baptism itself, but it may be in the worst men, in them that spend their life in the works of the flesh, and shall not possess the kingdom of heaven; and therefore pertain neither to the beard of Aaron, nor to the edge of his garment," &c. How largely Augustin useth the name of sacrament, I have elsewhere declared, *Matt. 1. sect. 2*. although in this place he showeth rather how it was accounted among the Donatists than among the Catholics. For the Donatists accounted all them to be holy brethren, that were baptized, and anointed among them: whereby also it appeareth, that this unction was a ceremony pertaining to baptism. For of imposition of hands to receive the Holy Ghost, he showeth that it was only a prayer; and therefore might be repeated, whereas baptism, that is a sacrament, ministered even by heretics, may not be repeated. Imposition of hands, is not as baptism, that cannot be repeated. For what is imposition of hands, but prayer over a man? Wherefore you do fondly, and contrary to the testimony of antiquity, to join these two ceremonies of

unction and imposition of hands unto one sacrament. Cyril Mystagog, 3, speaketh of unction immediately after baptism, in the forehead, ears, and breast, without which he denieth that men were worthy to be called Christians, or their regeneration perfect: therefore as he attributeth too much to that ceremony, so he showeth it was differing from the Popish sacrament of confirmation, Ambrose, *lib. 3. cap. 2. De Sacrament*, hath never a word either of chrisin, or of imposition of hands, but only of prayer for the seven-fold grace of the Holy Ghost, to be poured upon the baptized; and no more he hath *De iis qui myst. int. cap. 7*, only he putteth the baptized in mind, that they have received the divers gifts of the Holy Ghost. But *cap. 6*, he maketh mention of unction, the ceremony used at baptism. The epistle of Leo doth also plainly distinguish the ceremony of imposition of hands from unction, saying, "that one is by imposition of hands upon the faithful to be baptized, or that are converted from heresy, to deliver the Holy Ghost." Of the other he addeth, "to make chrisin, and with chrisin to anoint the foreheads of them that are baptized;" which thing with many other, he maketh unlawful for Chorepiscopi, which he saith were but priests, yet doth he not call either the one ceremony or the other a sacrament, as baptism and the Lord's Supper are sacraments. The council of Laodicea willeth them that are baptized, to be anointed with chrisin; the council of Carthage forbiddeth the priest to make that chrisin. The Aurifican council speaketh expressly of that anointing which was done by every one that was baptized, and is not to be repeated, therefore cannot speak of the Popish sacrament, which is given only by the bishop, after baptism. The words are these: "None of the ministers that hath received the office of baptizing, ought to go abroad any whither without chrisin, because it is agreed amongst us that chrisin be occupied but once in baptism. But concerning him which in baptism, by any necessity hath not been anointed, the priest shall be admonished thereof in the confirmation. For among us the blessing of the chrisin is but one, we say not this in prejudice of any, but that the anointing may be counted necessary." But contrary to this canon, the Papists hold, that the child must be twice anointed, in baptism and in confirmation. Now for the author of this ceremony, for sacrament we find none, you allege Dionysius and Basil, referring it to tradition of the Apostles. Whereunto if we must give credit, we must acknowledge many of the Apostolic traditions to be abolished, as it is certain of many ceremonies described by that Dionysius, by Tertullian and Basil. Wherefore either we must say it was not ordained of the Apostles, or else it was ordained as a removeable ceremony, as other ceremonies likewise fathered upon the Apostles, are long since worn out of use. The constitutions of Clement be mere forgeries, full of manifest lies, as I have showed elsewhere. The de-

cretal epistles of Fabian, be even as good stuff as the rest of that sort. But you do falsely affirm, that the author of the treatise "De unctione Chrismatis apud Cyprianum," doth say that Christ did instruct his Apostles at that time of the institution of the sacrament, to consecrate this chrisin. For he saith not so, nor any thing to that effect: though he extol the ceremony of making this chrisin, greatly. And if it must be made of balsam, as he and your canon law also saith, you have long deceived the common people with a wrong confection, like false apothecaries, for true balsam is a precious ointment, verily hardly or not at all to be gotten in these parts. As for imposition of hands with prayer, which was the old and pure ceremony of confirmation, we do not speak against it.

To conclude, you say none but known heretics did ever deny or contemn this confirmation or holy chrisin. But as yet you have not proved any such sacrament, acknowledged by the ancient Catholics, though of old time, there was a ceremony of anointing, which was omitted in Novatus, because he was baptized in his bed being very sick, and like to die. Whereupon also his followers neglected that ceremony also, as might seem by Theodoret.

Yet doth not Cornelius say, that he fell into heresy, because he had not received the Holy Ghost, by consignment of a bishop, but only showeth what manner a man he was, and how that being baptized in his bed, after he recovered, he regarded not the rest of the ceremonies, of which he should have been partaker, according to the rule of the church, not so much as to be sealed or confirmed by the bishop, which having not obtained, saith he, how could he obtain the Holy Ghost? By these words, it is not proved, that unction was the ceremony of confirmation, but rather one of the ceremonies of baptism, that were omitted, because he was at the point of death. It was against the discipline of the Church, that such should be admitted into the ministry as received baptism upon such necessity. And the bishop was fain to entreat the clergy and people for him, that he might nevertheless be ordained. That which Optatus writeth of the Donatists, was not a special outrage against the holy oil, but generally against any thing that belonged to the Catholics. For the Donatists also had their holy oil, and did attribute more unto it than the Catholics did to their unction, as is showed before out of Augustin, *cont. lit. Petit. lib. 2. cap. 101*.

Where you complain of the savage disorder of the Calvinists, in contemning your Popish ceremonies, we might make answer of your devilish disorder, in burning and defacing the holy scriptures, yea the bodies of all them that profess the Gospel of Christ. But of all savage parts, that ever were practised since the creation of the world, all circumstances considered, there is none comparable to the Bartholemew Fair of the French Papists at Paris, and other places in France.

17. The ancient ceremony of imposition of hands, which is nothing else, as Augustin saith, "but prayer over a man," to be strengthened and confirmed by the Holy Ghost, or to receive increase of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, as Ambrose saith, we do not in any wise mislike, but use it ourselves. Neither do we charge the Papists, for diminishing the force of Baptism, in saying that men may receive the gifts of the Holy Ghost by faithful prayers with imposition of hands: but for making their unction a Sacrament, whereof, neither the word nor the element is of Christ's institution: and for affirming Baptism to be imperfect without it, for it is to be used say they, "that they may be found perfect Christians." *De Con. dist. 5. cap. omnes.* Again, "And that he shall never be a Christian, which is not anointed with chrism in the Bishop's confirmation." *De Consecrat. dist. 5. cap. Ut. Jeuni.* And in that counterfeit epistle of Melchiades, "Confirmation pertaineth to the perfection of baptism?" Whereof it is inferred that Baptism is imperfect without confirmation. Thirdly, we charge them, because they say that this their sacrament is "To be revered with greater reverence than Baptism," because it can be ministered by none but by a Bishop. *De Consecrat. Dist. 5. cap. 1. De his vero.* To these matters of charge, taken out of your Canon Law, you answer nothing, but cavil of the gifts of the Holy Ghost obtained by prayer and imposition of hands of the Apostles, which we deny not, impudently accusing us of great perversity, and corruption of the plain sense of the Scriptures in this point: First, because "some of us do affirm the Holy Ghost to be none other but the gift of wisdom in the Apostles, and a few others for government." But this is a slander, for none of us doth so affirm. Further, you charge some of us, to affirm that it was no internal grace, but only the gift of divers languages. But this also is a slander; for we neither deny the internal grace, in all, nor restrain the outward grace only to the gift of tongues. But we affirm, that the Holy Ghost, in this place, is taken principally for the visible graces of the Holy Spirit, as is manifest by that saying: The Holy Ghost was not yet come upon any one of them. "What," saith Oecumenius "did not they that were baptized by Philip, receive the Holy Ghost? Yes they received the Holy Ghost unto the remission of sins, but they received him not to the working of miracles." Again, Simon Magus saw that by imposition of hands the Holy Ghost was given, but he could not see the internal grace, therefore it was the grace of working miracles, as of tongues, healing, prophesying, casting out of devils, and such like: and this was virtue from above, in some also that were void of internal grace, Matt. 7. 22. So saith Oecumenius, "We may understand that in the giving of the Holy Ghost, there was some wonderful thing that was sensible, for otherwise Simon would not have made this request, except he had seen it." We say indeed, that this kind of imposition of hands

to this purpose, endured no longer than the miraculous gifts, as the unction with oil to recover bodily health, named by James. But there is another kind of imposition of hands, mentioned, Heb. 6. 2. whereof there may be a perpetual use in the Church, which is the same, which Augustin calleth, "nothing else, but prayer over a man," and whereof he speaketh, *Tract. 6. in Ep. 1 John.* But where you say, we may deny the force of excommunication, because corporal punishment, which was annexed unto it in the Primitive Church ceaseth, it is utterly false. For we have a plain commandment for the use of excommunication, Matt. 18, without any mention of corporal punishment, which was not always joined with excommunication in the Primitive Church, albeit it might be sometimes. Your other slander, that we mean to take away all Christian religion, because it hath not the like operation of miracles, as in the beginning, because it is without colour, I omit as unworthy of any answer, only bewraying the intolerable malice of your lying spirit. Let God be judge in this case betwixt you and us. Last of all, you charge some of us, to make no more of Confirmation, or the Apostle's fact, but as for a doctrine, instruction, or exhortation, to continue in the faith received. But this is also false. For we acknowledge imposition of hands with prayer, that they which were so taught, instructed, and exhorted, might receive strength of God's Spirit so to continue. And yet all gain, where you say, there are among us, which put the baptized coming to years of discretion, to their own choice, whether they will continue Christians or no: it is false, as the rest. For when they are required to make confession themselves, of that faith which other men possessed in their name at their baptism, they are not put to their choice, but put in mind, that they must perform themselves, that by others was promised in their name. Finally that which the Scripture telleth us of prayer, imposition of hands, of the Holy Ghost, of grace and virtue from above, we acknowledge as well as instruction: but oil and balm, and the rest of the Popish doctrine, of this counterfeit Sacrament, because it is not found in the holy Scriptures, we renounce it.

22. This place of Augustin, hath been sufficiently answered before: he speaketh not of satisfaction to God's justice, but of outward signs of inward repentance. And if by your term of doing penance, you meant no more than Augustin, or your vulgar interpreter doth by *agere penitentiam*, it were all one with repentance: for so doth he sometimes translate the word, that you cannot say, do penance, but be penitent. Mark 1. 15. Sometimes you are enforced to translate the word *Penitentia*, repentance, Acts 5. 31. Acts 11. 18. 2 Tim. 2. 25. Therefore if this your translation be true, why do you not always use it? but instead of repentance, give us penance.

22. For great sins, great sorrow and most hearty repentance is requisite. And men

must pray without doubting, for all things that God hath promised, *James* 1. 6. Neither is Simon willed to pray with doubting, but Peter seeing him to be still in the bitterness of gall, doubteth whether he will truly repent, and sincerely pray to God for remission of sins. Oecumenius saith, "For Peter foresaw that he was not to be converted to repentance, therefore he saith, if perhaps it may be remitted." Otherwise, we must not fear only, but be altogether certain, that we are not worthy to be heard, or to obtain mercy, nor to look up to heaven, or to be called God's children of ourselves, and therefore must be assured to be heard and obtain mercy, for the worthiness of Christ our only Mediator and Advocate.

24. When the Pope and the Governors of your Church can cause us to see that the Sorcerer saw, namely, that those whom you confirm, receive the power of miracles, it were some reason to upbraid us by his example. But when you neither work miracles, nor teach the doctrine of the Apostles, but clean contrary unto it, look you that we should desire you to pray for us, whose prayer we know to be abominable, because you refuse to obey the law of God? *Prov.* 28. 9.

27. A lewd slander. Beza, saith, that this desert cannot be understood of the city of Gaza, which at that time, was a populous city, but of the way which led unto it, that was in a desert or waste ground. And so saith Oecumenius out of the consent of the Greek Fathers. "The way was toward the South, and he said it was desert that he should not fear the authority of the Jews." The same in effect saith Chrysostom in *Acts, Homil.* 19. Intolerable both malice and blindness of Popish Rhemists.

27. He came as a proselyte, to worship God in the Temple at Jerusalem, according to the law, not on pilgrimage to worship popish idols. But now the time is, and then was, that the true worshippers should worship God neither in Jerusalem, nor in any other place of greater devotion and sanctification, but in spirit and truth. *John* 4. 21. The Temple and the coming up to Jerusalem to worship, had the express word to warrant them: Popish places of devotion and the pilgrimage to them are superstitious and idolatrous, having no warrant of God's word for their holiness, but manifest prohibition in God's law. *Exod.* 20.

31. All parts of the Scripture are not so written that an interpreter is necessary. "The Holy Ghost hath bountifully and healthfully so moderated the holy Scriptures, that by open or plain places, he might provide against famine, and that by dark places he might wipe away loathsomeness. For nothing almost is found out of those obscurities, which may not be found in other places, to be uttered most plainly." *De Doct. Christ. lib.* 2. *cap.* 16. That many things are hard to be understood in the Scriptures, which need an interpreter, we confess with the Eunuch, and with Hierom.

38. When we read of any Sacrament ministered by the Apostles, though all things be not expressed in particular, yet we believe that all things were done, that by the institution of that Sacrament were necessary to be done: which is the thing that Augustin meaneth, where he saith, "by the order of the delivery or institution" of Baptism, namely, the renouncing of dead works, which is the doctrine of Baptism, saith the Apostle. *Heb.* 6. 2. with the whole confession of Christian faith, mentioned in that place by Augustin, which is expressed in the Scripture. But your Sacrament of Christ we believe not, because we read it no where. Contrariwise your manner is, to find a miserable colour for your horrible sacrilege where you find bread only mentioned in some place of the Scripture, you imagine, or at least would have us to imagine that the Apostles ministered the Supper of our Lord in one kind, directly contrary to the institution thereof, and the express commandment of our Saviour Christ. In which places, you should give credit to this saying of Augustin, for the cup, which is written in the institution of that Sacrament, and not for the Sacrament of Christ, which is no where instituted, or mentioned in the holy Scriptures.

## CHAPTER 9.

4. We conclude not Christ in heaven, otherwise than of his own will he hath appointed to remain there. But your question is easily answered out of the text, that Christ spake from heaven, from whence the glorious light shined, passing the light of the Sun. Oecumenius saith, "They that accompanied Saul heard not the voice that came from above."

36. The force of good works reacheth to the next life to be rewarded of God's mercy, and not of man's merit.

39. The text saith not, that her alms-folk prayed to God for restitution of her life, and if they did, yet the argument followeth not, that they ought to have prayed for release of her punishment in Purgatory. Because the Scripture teacheth no such place of punishment after this life, nor prescribeth any form of prayer, to obtain mercy for them that are departed, and have received their judgment: for immediately after death, followeth every man's particular judgment, *Heb.* 9. 17.

## CHAPTER 10

2. "Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin, without which it is impossible to please God," *Rom.* 14. 23. *Heb.* 11. 6. Therefore it is certain that Cornelius had faith, as a true Proselyte in the Messiah to come, although he knew not that he was come, and so saith Beda. Therefore this place proveth not that good works before faith are preparatives to it, for no works are good, but such as are done in faith. And seeing you affirm, that works before faith, are not meritorious, you falsify Beda, and slander Gregory, by translating the verb *promeruit*, he deserved, which is com-

monly used of the fathers, to obtain without respect of merit or desert. But that the reader may see how impudently you cite this place, to prove that good works are preparatives to faith, I will set down his whole discourse upon this text. "Men attain not to faith by virtues, but to virtues by faith, as Gregory expoundeth it. For Cornelius, whose alms before baptism, as the Angel witnesseth, are praised, came not by works to faith, but by faith to works. For if he had not believed the true God before baptism, unto whom did he pray? or how did Almighty God hear him, if he prayed not to be perfected in good things by him? Therefore he knew God the Creator of all things, but that his Almighty Son was incarnate, he knew not. He had faith, whose prayers and alms could please God. And by good action he obtained to know God perfectly, and to believe the mystery of the incarnation of his only begotten Son, that he might come to the sacrament of baptism. By faith therefore he came to works, but by works he was made strong in faith." Augustin also affirmeth, that he had faith before he believed in Christ, saying, "He did not give alms and prayed without some faith. For how did he call upon him whom he believed not." *De prad. sanct. lib. 1. c. 7.* The same is to be said of the Eunuch. And how are you not ashamed to say, "That good works before faith, are preparatives to the same." When Augustin saith, "Faith goeth before, that good works may follow, neither are there any good works, but those that follow faith going before." *Ps. 67.* Where he saith, "that the ungodly man is justified by faith without the merits of good works."

9. No man denieth but set times of prayers both public and private, are very convenient. But the popish service, hath nothing but the names of these hours, and not the times themselves observed in their prayers, which are all finished in the forenoon, when they are said or sung, for they are not used but at certain solemn times, whereas the sixth hour is the time of high noon, the ninth hour, is the third hour before the sun set.

All godly persons do observe times of prayer, as the morning at their rising up, at noon when they take their repast, likewise at night at their repast, and when they go to their rest. And these prayers both public and private, are made in the true faith of Jesus Christ, and in the unity of his Catholic Church.

15. Before this time God uttered as much to Paul, namely at the time of his conversion, as he testifieth. *Acts 26. 17 and 18.*

25. The Pope refuseth not, but requireth greater adoration of the greatest Princes, so well he followeth Peter's steps. Chrysostom saith, "This doing he showed his humility, and taught other, and giveth God thanks, and declareth that although he was commanded, yet he was very ready of himself. What then saith Peter, Arise, for I also am a man. Thou seest how above other men he teacheth them to think no great matter of him, or to have no great opinion of him." The first words are

of Cornelius showing humility, the latter of Peter, teaching that men may not think too highly of him: Peter said, I am a man. The Pope can admit other to say to him, "Thou art neither God nor man, but as it were a neuter between both." But Chrysostom's opinion pleaseth you not so well, as Hierom's *adv. Vigilan.* Where either you understand not Hierom aright, or else Hierom doth injury to Cornelius, to charge him with error of gentileity, and such gross ignorance, that he thought Peter was God. Of whom what he was, he was instructed by God in a vision. But his error was, that he thought religious honour to be due to Peter, which Peter acknowledgeth to be due only to God, and to no man. For civil adoration could not be prohibited by this reason, that Peter was a man, for it is due to men, and in some measure was due to Peter. Therefore it was religious worship, such as Papists attribute to Saints, that Peter refused. *Athan. cont. Arr. lib. 2.* "Petrus quidem Apostolus, Cornelium volentem se adorare prohibet, ego, iniquens, homo sum." *Euthym. panopl. par. tit. 11.* Basil citeth this text to prove that no Christian man must admit immoderate honour, but reprove them that give it.

30. Peter was not bound to believe the report of the vision of Cornelius, before he was admonished by vision and revelation himself. But the doctrine revealed in the Scriptures concerning the calling of the Gentiles, he should have acknowledged before his vision. If we see any miracle or hear it reported by men of as good credit as Peter was, we will believe it, though it be not written: but if it tend to maintain another gospel than that which is set forth in the Scriptures, we will not be moved by Peter nor Paul, nor any Angel to leave the truth known for any miracles. *Gal. 1.*

35. Such as believe only, as Simon Magus did, and do not fear God, nor work righteousness, are nothing acceptable to God. But such as fear God and work righteousness, are accepted of God, not for their works, but for their faith only. *Rom. 3. 28. Ephes. 2. 8.*

40. Christ teacheth us to receive instruction unto faith, and unto all things necessary to salvation at the hands of his chosen ministers, but not to take faith itself at men's hand, nor to take any instruction of our superiors without examining the same by the word of God, but to search the Scriptures, as the Bereans did. *Acts 17. 11.*

47. The seal is not unprofitable which is of God's appointment, but popish confirmation and penance are not of Christ's institution, nor mentioned in Augustin in the place which you cite. And if confirmation be a sacrament of necessity, as you teach, why did not Peter as well confirm them, as he commanded them to be baptized?

#### CHAPTER II.

4. The Christians acknowledged not Peter to be Pope: for no man may reprehend him, if he carry innumerable souls to hell with him



by his own Canons. *Distinct. 40. cap. Si Papa.*  
 18. Peter was a good shepherd, that disdain not to show his warrants, which the Pope like a proud Pilate refuseth.

24. Understanding visible, for that which may be seen, there is no doubt, but all Christians were always visible. But if you understand visible, for that which is seen and known to all the world, as you say the name of Christians hath been ever since Christ's ascension, it is not true, that the Church was always visible. For persecutions have been so great, that the world saw none of those things. And therefore Dioclesian and Maximian wickedly boasted, that they had utterly abolished the superstition of Christ and name of Christians. *Inscriptio Salmantica in monte Bartholomæi.* The like devilish boasting made Nero in his time; *Inscriptio in ruinis pagi Macanesar,* a place of Spain. But the Catholic Church of Christ, whereof we rejoice to be members, is Jerusalem the heavenly, which is the mother of us all, and being an article of our faith, is therefore invisible. *Heb. 11. 1. Gal. 4. 25.*

26. We acknowledge no names but of Christian Catholics. The names of Calvinists, and Lutherans, &c. are but slanders by you invented, as the names of Athanasians, Alexandrians, Homousians, were by the Arian heretics. Neither do we hold ourselves content with the name of Protestants, though it be not so odious, as to be called of any man, when we are the people of God and Christ. Neither did the only calling of the old heretics prove them to be heretics, but their pernicious opinions contrary to the Holy Scriptures. For Athanasians, Homousians, &c. were true Catholics, though they were nicknamed by heretics. The name of Dominicans, Franciscans, Jesuits, and such like, proveth them to be sectaries, because they be of their own choosing though they all maintain one grand heresy of Popery, having also their divers opinions among them: and each sect envying other, and swelling against the other. The name of Papists you do not greatly mislike, because it is not the name of one man. We might answer you the like, of the name of Protestants. But divers heretics, have the name of their heresy, not of their author, as Patripassians, Collyridians, Apostolici, Cathari, &c. But the name of Papists, is taken both of the author of your heresy, and of the heresy itself. In the saying of Hierom, you omit which is principal. "I following none chief, or first, but Christ, am joined in communion with thy blessedness, that is with Peter's chair." While the Bishop of Rome therefore joined with Christ, as then he did in the matter whereof Hierom speaketh, and in all doctrine necessary to salvation, whosoever gathered not with the Bishop of Rome scattered with Antichrist. But when Liberius Bishop of Rome, did by subscription openly profess Arianism, as the same Hierom testifieth in *Catal. Fortunatian,* would Hierom, think you, or ought any Christian man to have gathered with him? When Honorius taught

heresy, would the council of Constantinople the sixth have joined in communion with him? Did they not justly accuse him, and condemn him, after he was dead? But now the Pope is not accused and convicted of single heresy, but openly revealed to be Antichrist himself. That the name of Catholics was imposed by the Apostles, it is not proved, nor affirmed by Pacianus, but rather the contrary. For these are his words: "But thou wilt say, under the Apostles no man was called a Catholic; admit it was so, yet grant this. When after the Apostles there were heresies, and they endeavoured to rend in pieces and to divide with divers names the dove of God, and Queen, did not the Apostolic people require their surname, whereby they might distinguish the unity of the uncorrupted people," &c. Nevertheless the name of Catholic is very ancient, and yet is not this word Catholic, the proper note in the Creed to discern the true Church, but holy also must be added, except you will expound Catholic as Pacianus doth, "for obedience unto all the commandments of God," which includeth holiness. But if you take the name without the meaning, it is a weak reason to discern the true believers. For though heretics could never obtain to be so called by true Christians, yet have they challenged, and commonly obtained the name of Catholics, when they were more mighty in the world than true Catholics, as the Arians in the days of Constantius, when almost all the Bishops of the East and the West yielded unto them, as Vicentius Lirinensis testifieth. Neither doth Augustin say, the only name of Catholic doth keep him in the Church, but among many other things, that is one: as in the second place, where he joineth the Catholic faith with the name of Catholic, without which as in Papists, the name of Catholic is a vain sound without true sense: and is not given to the Popish Church by her adversaries, as it was to the true Church in Augustin's time, but utterly denied unto her, although she do never so malaperly challenge it. And when she hath not the thing itself meant by the name, yet boasteth that the very name, without the meaning, is a sufficient note of the true Church. Finally, we believing and confessing the Holy Catholic Church, what can we but acknowledge ourselves to be true Catholics, and deny the Papists to be the same? neither doth any of us deride the name of Catholic, when it is rightly applied according to the true meaning thereof, but the vain usurpation of that name, in them that be nothing less than Christian Catholics. Such we may well call Pseudocatholics, Cartholics, Cacofikes, Catholic Apostates, or any thing rather than true or Holy Christian Catholics, which they are not. But it is notoriously known, that the most honourable name of Christians, is in Italy and at Rome, the country and See of Antichrist, a name of reproach, and usually abused to signify a fool, or a dolt, as witnesseth Christ. *Franch. Col. Jesuit. in fine.* That some Lutherans have altered the word of the

creed, and for Catholic put Christian, it is no heresy, though it be not to be allowed. Last of all, the Catholic way of discipline, proceeding from Christ by his Apostles, with Augustin we do gladly follow, protesting that the Papists can never prove that their heresy, which they falsely call the Catholic way, did ever proceed from Christ by the Apostles, or that it prevailed in the Church, for many hundred years after Christ.

#### CHAPTER 12.

3. Peter was not chief pastor of the church of Jerusalem, where prayer was made for him, but James: whom you confess to be Bishop of Jerusalem.

4. It cannot be gathered out of the text that Peter's person was better guarded than the person of James, and least of all, in respect that he was a more notorious person, but because he was to be kept longer, by reason of the solemn feast.

5. The Church of Jerusalem prayed for Peter as a principal member of the Catholic Church, and a great Apostle of Christ, but not as chief pastor of the whole Church, for that is Christ only. *1 Pet. 5. 4.*

6. It is a marvel, how they were known from all the other prisoner's chains that were at Jerusalem and Rome, for three or four hundred years, until Eudoxia found them. Besides this, the lessons read upon Lammaday, in your Matins, say, that Alexander bishop of Rome, after he had been imprisoned by Quirinus a Roman, and was delivered, instituted this feast, and builded this Church, where that only chain is wherewith he was bound by Nero, knowing nothing of this translation, and building of Eudoxia.

12. As in Rheims, Paris, Antwerp, Spain, Italy, &c. For Christian religion and a prince that maintaineth the same, God be praised, reigneth in England, as in many other kingdoms and seignories of the world.

17. The Church of Jerusalem prayed for Peter, but not as for their head, for James was now their Bishop, as you affirm yourself.

#### CHAPTER 13.

2. This is a lewd slander, "that we do boldly turn what text we list, and flee from one language to another for our advantage." For we translate out of the original tongues, though we may borrow light of other translations, where any thing is ambiguous. But here the Greek word used by the Evangelist, signifieth to minister or serve in any public function, either of the Church or of the commonwealth. So doth Paul call the civil magistrates by a name derived of this verb, or from whence this verb is derived  *λειτουργοι* , ministers. *Rom. 13. 6.* Therefore your vulgar translator hath better translated the participle in this place, generally ministering, than Erasmus doth, by a special kind of ministering, that is sacrificing. You must first prove, that the Apostles said mass, before you can translate this word, which signifieth generally their ministry in their public office, to be

saying of mass: which by the text appeareth to have been teaching and preaching, for that is the proper ministry of Prophets and teachers: and so doth Chrysostom expound the place himself. "What is ministering? preaching." *Acts hom. 37.*

2. Paul was an Apostle neither of men nor by men, but immediately from and by Jesus Christ. *Gal. 1. 1.* Therefore was he not ordered, consecrated, and admitted by men, but sent by the Holy Ghost, with the prayers of the Church, to execute his office of Apostleship, far abroad among the Gentiles. Yet are they to be condemned, which in these days usurp the office of preaching and other sacred functions as from heaven, without the Church's admission.

3. Paul and Barnabas were not consecrated Bishops, for they neither had diocess nor province assigned them, but were sent of the Holy Ghost, and were commended by the Church of Antioch, with fasting, prayer, and imposition of hands, to the work which God had appointed them, that is, to preach abroad in many nations, and not to remain at Antioch.

3. Fasting and prayer are convenient to be used at such times as ministers of the Church are ordained, and that may be rightly referred to Apostolic tradition, because we find it written in the Acts of the Apostles. But your imber day's fasting is but a mockery of the ancient discipline of the Church. For you observe those days of necessity, although there be none that take orders in the diocess, and at other times, when your bishops are disposed to give orders, you use no such preparatives. Again you slander us, when you say, we do ridiculously affirm the fasting here spoken of, to be fasting from sin, or moral and Christian temperance, which are always to be observed. For we affirm, that fasting here signifieth abstinence from all meat and drink, and not from flesh only, as you do ridiculously and devilishly practise it; and when you abstain from fish also, yet wine, fruits, and spices, and also confections made of them, are a solemn Good-Friday fast among you.

At times appointed by the Church to fast for special purpose, we acknowledge it meet, that all men, that for infirmity of body may, ought to abstain, and not to contemn those times, as Arius taught. But again we say, that to appoint ordinary times of necessary and religious fasting without special cause, it was of the ancient Church accounted heresy in Montanus. *Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 18.* Leo joineth always the Wednesday fast to Friday and Saturday watching. Epiphanius leaveth out the Saturday, and saith, that Wednesday and Friday were appointed by the Apostles to fast on. How truly, let your Church define, which doth not observe that tradition. As for sacrifice, Epiphanius speaketh of none, but Leo of the sacrifice of alms only.

3. There are no sacraments named of imposition of hands, neither do we see here any ordering or consecrating of Bishops, Priests, Deacons, or Subdeacons, neither any ordering of subdeacons, any where else in the

Scriptures. And although in the ordaining of ministers of the Church, which was with the ceremony of imposition of hands, there were used longer forms of prayer than be expressed in the Scriptures, yet the substance and matter of them is contained and expressed in the Scriptures. Neither must we imagine, that all those popish ceremonies which they used in ordaining their clerks, have been used by the Apostles, because all the words of their prayer is not expressed. For they are such as were never universally observed in all Churches; yea, many of them were never heard of in the Primitive Church for many hundred years after Christ. That the sacrament is called fraction of bread, you have not yet proved, but if it be granted unto you, there is no reason you should exclude the cup, which is commanded by Christ, because bread only is named, seeing you allege it now to prove that such things were used in ordering of ministers as the Scripture never mentioneth, although only imposing of hands be named. And seeing the sacred words and actions of baptism and the Lord's Supper are published by the Apostles in their open writings, it is a vain excuse to say, "they kept any such things close from the hands or ears of infidels." And if it were a good reason, that the Apostles should keep such things close, by what authority did Dionysius disclose them? Although in truth the words of Dionysius import not so much, but that the signs were left by the Apostles, partly in writing, and partly without writing, "not only in respect of profane men, which may not meddle with them: but also because our Hierarchy is contained in signs, having need of sensible things to bring us to a more divine understanding of things intelligible." So that in truth he giveth no reason why the Apostles would not write these things, but for what cause they delivered them, either by writing or without writing. Ambrose speaketh not of offering Christ in sacrifice at the mass, for then he would not have said, "In our Lord's place or stead," but that he may be bold to offer up Christ himself in sacrifice to his Father. But aluding to the manner of sacrificing in the old Law, he nameth all parts of his office, as prayer, preaching, and ministrations of the sacraments, sacrifice. For he useth the name of sacrifice for any service that we offer to God, as *De virgin. lib. 1.* "A virgin is the best or oblation of her mother, by whose daily sacrifice God is pleased." But of the offering of Christ in the celebration of the supper, how it was he declareth *offic. lib. 1. cap. 48.* "Before a lamb was offered, a calf was offered, now Christ is offered, but he was offered as a man, receiving passion, and he offereth himself as a priest, that he may forgive our sins: here in an image, there in truth: where he maketh intercession for us, as an advocate with the Father." Therefore he meaneth that Christ, is not truly offered, but in an image or commemoration. Hierom saith the ordination of clerks is accomplished not only by words of prayer, but also by imposition of

hands: but that you say is in some inferior orders, "where Paul and Barnabas were ordained to be bishops throughout all nations." This is new doctrine without all testimony of antiquity, that the Apostles were made bishops, and that throughout all nations, and ordered by their inferiors, Simon, Lucius, and Manahen, whereof you are not able to prove that any of them was bishop. For by your own stories and report, Peter was a bishop now of Antioch. Wherefore, as Chrysostom and Oecumenius write, these Apostles were sent out "to exercise their function of Apostleship," and not ordained bishops. For all authority of inferior ministers of the Church was in the Apostles by their Apostleship, so that they needed not to be made bishops or priests by other that were of inferior place and degree in the Church.

47. Their will bound to sin before, was by the grace of God enlarged and made free to believe.

#### CHAPTER 14.

12. Not only sacrifice, but all religious service is due only to God. *Matt. 4. 10.* Cornelius would not have worshipped Peter as God, nor John the Angel as God. Yet the religious worship of both is forbidden: of Peter, because he was a man, to whom no religious honour is due: of the Angel, because he was a fellow servant, to whom no religious worship appertaineth but unto God, to whom only the Angel willeth John to bow with religious affection. *Acts 10. 26. Apoc. 2. 9.* And seeing you confess sacrifice to be due only to God, and prayer is a sacrifice, *Ps. 14. 1. 2.* and a contrite heart is a sacrifice to God. *Ps. 51. 19.* And praise and thanksgiving is more acceptable to God, than the sacrifice of a bullock, that hath horns and hoofs, *Psal. 69. 33. 33.* it followeth, that none of these is to be offered to any creature. And it is most brutish ignorance to think that spiritual or internal sacrifice of men's souls, may be offered to creatures, to whom it is unlawful to offer external sacrifice of oxen and garlands. But the only external sacrifice of the Church, you say, is the sacrifice of the Mass, of which you have not one word in the Holy Scriptures. The worship or honour due to creatures for God's sake, is civil, not religious, of charity, not of religion. "The Saints and Martyrs," saith Augustin, "are to be honoured for imitation, not to be worshipped for religion. We honour them with charity, non servitute, not with service." which in Greek is called *Dovlia*. "Neither do we build temples unto them, for they will not be so honoured of us, because they know, that we, when we are good, are temples of the highest God." *De vera religione cap. 55.* And therefore if Papists had any fear of God, or shame of the world, they would not defend such gross idolatry as they do, even for all their distinction, giving the service which they call *Latria*, not only to God, but to images, and to the cross, as it is manifest, by *Conc. Nic. 2. Act. 4. Thomas in 3. sent. Dist. 2. Marcel. arch. Corcuy*, beside many other of their late writers, Sanders himself defending it,

rather than improving it, but in the end confessing, that it is a controversy of Papists, not determined by the Church. *Sand. of Images, Cap. 18. or 17.*

22. Every one of the Apostles had the chief authority in the government of the Church, but the perpetual order of the Church for external government and difference of governors, is better learned out of other places than this, *1 Cor. 12. 28.*

22. Our translation is true, ordained by election, and answereth the Greek word, which we translate: not excluding the imposition of hands by the Apostles as you do vainly charge us, but comprehending both that election by the Church, and the ordination by imposition of hands of the Apostles. And although the ministers of the Church were chosen in ancient time, by voices of the Christian people, concurring with the election of the clergy, and governors of the Church, yet we do not hold, that it is of the substance of their calling to be chosen by voices of the people, but only, as the Apostle saith, that they must have a good testimony of all men, at the least, that they cannot be justly convinced by any man. *1 Tim. 3. 7. Tit. 1. 7.*

22. The cause why we avoid the name of Priests, it is because by common use taken to signify Priests of the law, whose name is never in the New Testament given to ministers of the church: yet is our translation true, and proper to the Greek word, which signifieth Elders, and therefore of your own vulgar interpreter, is often translated, *Seniors* and of you, *Ancients*, not so properly, as of us *Elders*, though both be words of age. For both the Latin and Greek signify with comparison, as we have translated *Elders*, but your term *ancients*, is without comparison, as though the Latin were *Senes*. As for the name *Priest*, as it is derived of the Greek word, we do not refuse it, but rather wish, that the sacrificers by the law, had never been called by it. But seeing we are not lords of men's speech, we yield unto common use, to call them *Priests*, and translate the Greek words according to the true etymology thereof, without all colour of falsehood or corruption. For if you translated it always *Priests*, as you do not, it were a vain argument to prove your *Priests* to be sacrificers, because the sacrificers of the Law are improperly so called *Priests*. Many indeed of the ancient Fathers, confound the names of *Sacerdos* and *Presbyter*, wherein as they are not to be commended, because they observe not that distinction of the names which you confess was always observed of the Apostles: so can you not prove, that they did it as you say, for none other cause, but to show that *Presbyter* in the new law, is the same in sacrificing or in every other respect that *Sacerdos* was in the old law. For there are many things common to both, as public teaching, praying, and administering of the Sacraments: but offering the sacrifice, was peculiar unto them, and received an end in the sacrifice of our Saviour Christ, offered by him once for all. There-

for here is nothing but vain wrangling and contention for words and terms, with impudent slandering us of corruption, for translating as your own vulgar interpreter often doth: which yet is Catholic in him and heretical corruption in us.

#### CHAPTER 15.

2. We acknowledge there is great use of godly Councils for deciding of controversies by the Scriptures, and we do willingly submit ourselves to be ordered by them, so that all controversies may be determined as this was, by the word of God written. But that the Pope and his Clergy, who are the parties accused by us of heresy, should be the only judges, it is against all equity and reason. Not we therefore, but the Pope and the Papists, refuse the trial by a general and free Council, to be gathered of the chief learned Bishops and pastors out of all Christendom, if it might be, or a free national Council out of all Europe, which hath often been required of us, but never yielded unto by the Papists, who will be the only judges in their own cause, as in their late Chapter of Trent, or else they will acknowledge no Council.

6. You slander us, in saying we would have all men give voice in a Council, or that none but the holy or elect should be admitted. That all men should be present at a general or provincial Council, it is impossible, yet more may be present than to debate the matter, as it appeareth by the text, that the whole Church gave their consent to the decree, and joined in the Epistle, though your vulgar interpreter omit the conjunction. Also, more may debate the matter, than are met to define it. And so were ancient Councils celebrated in presence of the Emperors, and many other of the people. Yea, it is memorable, that in the Council of Nice, a learned Philosopher that troubled all the Bishops, was confuted and converted by a simple godly layman, *Ruffin. lib. 1. c. 3. hist. tripar. lib. 2. cap. 31.* Finally, we would not have any Heretic excluded but that he may allege what he can in defence of his errors, that he may be either converted or confounded by the power of truth revealed out of the holy Scriptures, as it appeareth in this example. But the Heresy of the Papists is refuted, that alloweth none to give voices but Bishops, and them of their own sect, whereas it is manifest by the text, and your own interpretation, that the Elders or Priests concurred with the Apostles, not only to consider of the matter, but also in determining thereof. But albeit the ministers of the Church so gathered together, represent the whole Church, yet have they not the promise of God's Spirit to direct them, but so far forth as they do humbly submit themselves to his word, which if the greater part refuse to do, they may err, as many Councils have done, both general and provincial. The Papists themselves do not admit the decree of the Chalcedon Council, which was against the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome: yet all the Council agreed

unto it, except the Bishop of Rome's Legates. And the same decree was made in the first general Council of Constantinople, when neither the Bishop of Rome, nor any man for him did gainsay it. *Const. 1. cap. 2. Chalcedon. Action. 16.* The second Council of Nice, agreed that Angels' and men's souls are "bodily, and circumscribable," *Acts 3*, which the Papists themselves cannot deny to be an error. Neither did Paul come to the Council for the definition of the Church, as though he doubted of the matter. For before this time, he had openly reprehended Peter and Barnabas erring and dissembling in this question. *Gal. 2. 11, &c.* Paul and Barnabas came therefore to seek the definition of the whole Church, for satisfaction of them that were troubled with that doubt in Antioch, and not for their own resolution.

7. Peter striketh no stroke, more than his fellow Apostles, who all agree to the truth revealed out of the Scriptures, and confirmed by God's wonderful works.

7. Peter speaketh not first, for there was great debating before he spake. Neither were his successors, or their substitutes, presidents in any of the four first general Councils, that were after the Apostles' times. For of Nice was president and principal authors of the Canons, Alexander Bishop of Constantinople, of Constantinople Nectarius Bishop of the same See, of Ephesine Cyril of Alexandria, of Chalcedon Anatolius of Constantinople. *Isidorus in præfat. con. to. 1.* Yet Eusebius saith, that Eustathius Bishop of Antioch, was president at Nice. *Johannes Antiochen. Patriuch, opus. suo. in Concil. Basil* saith: "In many ancient Councils, the Pope was not president, as appeareth in those, in which the Bishops of Rome did not make the definitions, but the Council, saying, it hath pleased the Council." And of this Council he saith, "The Council of the Apostles, *Acts 15*, Peter alone did not call together, but the twelve Apostles; neither did Peter pronounce the sentence, but James, and they ordained the decretal Epistle, not in the name of Peter, but of the Apostles and Elders." And where you say, that no Council was ever received into authority and credit, without the Bishop of Rome's confirmation, it is false. For the Councils of Milevit and Africa, that decreed against the Bishop of Rome's authority were received into authority and credit in the Church. So was the Council of Chalcedon even in that point of the Bishop of Rome's primacy, wherein it was not confirmed by the Bishop of Rome, obtained authority and credit in the church as testified Liberatus, *cap. 13.* beside many provincial Councils, whereunto the Bishop of Rome's consent was never required. And the Councils of Arians, and other heretics, did not therefore err, because they wanted "the Pope's assent, assistance, or confirmation," but because they determined contrary to the truth expressed and contained in the holy Scriptures. As those Councils which having the Bishop of Rome's assent deter-

mined truly, were not privileged from error by the Bishop of Rome's assent, but by following the word of God: for the Bishop of Rome's assent, assistance or confirmation cannot make error to be truth. Liberius after he had ascribed to heresy, gave his assent to the Council that Constans held at Rome, with Ursatius and Valens, and other Arians, wherein Felix, a Catholic Bishop, was deprived, and he himself now a heretic, or a dissembler with heretics, was restored: as testified Damasus himself Bishop of Rome in Pontificali. Yet was that Council for all his consent and confirmation wicked, and blasphemous. If Honorius had lived when he was condemned and accursed in the Council of Constantinople the 6th, for a heretic, would he have given his assent, assistance or confirmation? And if he had gathered a Council of Monothelites, such as he was, would he not have confirmed that Council, determining against the Catholic faith?

7. The text saith not, that the first Gentiles were called by Peter's mouth: and the Scripture is evident to the contrary. Paul was sent to the Gentiles, even at his conversion, *Acts 26. 17.* Neither did he slack the time, but immediately preached in Arabia, and saw not Peter until three years after. All which time, it is not like that he neglected his calling. Beside your own vulgar translation saith expressly, that he spake to the Gentiles, and disputed with the Greeks, *cap. 8. 26.* before Peter was sent to Cornelius. Therefore it seemeth that the adverb *πρωτον*, in the speech of James, is not referred to the time of the conversion of Cornelius, but to the order of Peter's speech, which was first of God's visitation of the Gentiles in calling them to be his people: which James confirmeth by authority of Scripture, and then concludeth as Peter did. Therefore you can prove no pre-eminence in this point granted to Peter.

13. Your whole drift in this place, is to deny the primacy of order unto James, whom all antiquity, except Hierom, allowed to be the principal person in this council, as he was at this time the bishop or chief overseer of the Church at Jerusalem, and therefore is named before Peter by Paul. *Gal. 2. 9.* Clement's disposition *lib. 6.* cited by Eusebius, saith, that James was constituted "bishop of the Apostles." Chrysostom upon this place saith. "And see that after Peter, Paul doth speak, and no man stoppeth his mouth, James beareth it, and doth not go back, to him was the principality or chief place committed. At the beginning truly, Peter spake more vehemently, but this man more mildly. So they must always do that are in great authority, that they permit things burdensome to other men, and they themselves deal more gently," in *Acts, Hom. 33.* Thus you see he ascribeth plainly the chief place and power to James. Hierom, indeed, defending Peter's simulation against Paul, endeavoureth to prove out of this place, that Peter was not ignorant of the truth, whereof he had been a principal setter forth in the council. But the matter is

so evident by the circumstances of the text, and the judgment of ancient writers, that the author, *Opusculi tripartiti cont. tom. 2. cap. 9.* saith, that when James gave sentence, it was not yet fully ordained concerning the pre-eminence of Peter above the rest of the Apostles, and of the fulness of his power above all churches. Finally, where Augustin saith, that the former general councils may be amended or corrected by the latter, he speaketh not of alteration in matters of indifference, for then he would not have used the word amending or correcting, but some other word, that signifieth altering or changing: for amending and correcting, is of errors, and so the words going before and after, do make manifest that he meaneth. For before he saith, that only the canonical Scriptures have sovereign authority, so that it is not lawful to doubt, whether any thing written in them be true or right, but that all latter writings of Bishops may be lawfully reprehended, either by other learned writings, or by councils, if they have erred from truth, and that provincial councils must give place to general councils, and that the former general councils may be corrected by the latter. "When by any trial of matters, that is opened which before was shut, and that is known which before was hidden:" so that he speaketh manifestly of correction of errors, not alteration of things indifferent, writing against the Donatists, that maintained the authority of the council of Carthage, holden by Cyprian against the truth.

20. The Church hath no authority to command any thing necessary to salvation, but that which may be proved undoubtedly out of the Holy Scripture: otherwise in matters of indifference, we yield to your observation. To abstain from blood and strangled, was not necessary to salvation, but for charity to bear with the weakness of the Jews for a season.

25. When any of God's creatures are by him appointed to be inferior causes or ministers unto him, it is no fault to join them: as the sword of the Lord, and of Gideon. But where God hath not appointed his creatures to be joined with him in cause, there it is blasphemous to maich them with him in effect: as when you say, God and our Lady hath holpen me, thanks to God and our Lady, our Lord and his saints be praised, &c. These speeches are neither scriptures, nor scripture like, nor warranted by this council. Neither hath this council given the form of the speech here used to all other councils, how lawfully soever called and confirmed with the Bishop of Rome's assent, except their determination may be warranted as this was by the holy scriptures. Cyprian with the fathers of Africa, do declare unto Cornelius Bishop of Rome, upon what authority of scriptures their determination was grounded, and are bold to say, it hath pleased us by the suggestion of the Holy Ghost, before their council received confirmation of the Bishop of Rome, yea before he once heard of it.

Neither do they in that epistle, require his assent, but only report what they had done, and for what causes, and upon what ground.

Secondly, you note, that holy councils have ever the assistance of God's Spirit, and therefore cannot err, where you play the sophisters kindly: for if it be proved that any do err in that point, they are not holy. But if by holy councils you mean lawful councils, as you say in the margin, or as you seem to explain holy councils, such as are "lawfully kept for determination or clearing of doubts," &c., there is no doubt but they may err, if they follow not the direction of God's word, against which, in vain they may boast of the direction of God's Spirit. Cyprian and all the bishops of Africa, gathered a council as lawful as any they did before, no doubt but of good intent for determination and clearing of a doubt that was moved among them, whether such as came from heresy, were to be baptized again: and with a purpose to condemn errors, and heresies, and to appease schism and troubles: yet did they err in their sentence and determination, concerning the same doubt, and all through ignorance of the scriptures, and not of any perverse or heretical affection. Whereupon Augustin, as is before declared, doubteth not to affirm that all men and all councils, both provincial and general may err, and that the certainty of truth is to be found only in the canonical scriptures. "And who can be ignorant, that the holy canonical scripture, as well of the old, as of the new testament, is contained within her certain limits, and that it is so preferred before all later writings of bishops, that it cannot in any wise be doubted or disputed of it, whether it be true, or whether it be right, whatsoever, it is certain to be written in it: but that the writings of the bishops which have been written, or which are now written after the canon is confirmed, may be lawfully reprehended, both by the more wise speech, perhaps of any man that is more skillful in that matter, and also by the more grave authority, and more learned prudence of other bishops, and by councils, if any thing in them perhaps have strayed from the truth. And even councils themselves, which are gathered in every region or province, without all doubt, must give place to the authority of general councils, which are gathered out of all the Christian world: and that oftentimes the former general councils themselves, may be corrected by the later, when by any trial of matters, that is opened which was shut, and that is known which was hidden, without any swelling of sacrilegious pride, without any stiff neck of puffing arroganee, without any contention of cankered envy, with holy humility, with Catholic peace, with Christian charity." Concerning your third observation, there is no doubt but Christ's promise shall be performed unto the end, but the privilege of God's assistance pertaineth only to them which follow the direction of his holy word in councils or other sentences of the Church.

For the Spirit of God, must not be sacrilegiously separated from the word of God. Therefore the determination of the four general councils is to be revered, as the four gospels, because it was taken out of the four gospels, which teach the truth of the divinity and humanity of Christ, and of the divinity of the Holy Ghost: not because it was so agreed by authority of so many bishops gathered in those councils. Neither do we make any such fond difference of the councils as you dream of, but receive the fifth and sixth, as well as the first four, for the matters of faith and doctrine concluded in them, agreeable to the holy scriptures; and further we receive none. You say there be divers things in the first four councils that you find against our heresies, yet are you able to show none. But we show against you the sixth Canon of Nice Council, declaring the Bishop of Alexandria to be equal to the Bishop of Rome, and generally every Metropolitan in his province. We show the twenty-seventh canon of Chalcedon, wherein is declared the determination as well of that council, as of the first of Constantinople, that the see of Constantinople should have equal privileges of dignity and authority with the See of Rome. We show the words of the Council of Ephesus in their Epistle to Nestorius, that "Peter and John were of equal dignity because they were both Apostles and Holy Disciples." By which words the supremacy of the Pope pretended from Peter is overthrowen. So we show the four first general Councils, all against the Pope's supremacy. Likewise the fifth confirming all that was decreed in the fourth and in the sixth of Constantinople, *Can. 36.* we show, confirming the equality of privileges of the Bishop of Constantinople with the Bishop of Rome, according to the former determinations of the Councils of Constantinople the first, and of Chalcedon. When we say that councils may err, and that the Holy Ghost is not tied to the voices of men, nor to the number of sentences, you affirm, "that it is directly to reprove this first council also of the Apostles, and Christ's promise of the Holy Ghost." But by what logic you gather this conclusion, we cannot perceive, except it be this: Councils may err, *ergo*, this council of the Apostles did err. Or else thus: Christ promised the Holy Ghost, *ergo*, he tied the Holy Ghost to the voices of men, or to the number of sentences. If these be good conclusions, I refer me to all that have but one crumb of right reason or natural logic. That you report of Beza is a most detestable slander, for he speaketh not a word against the first general councils, but against the assemblies of proud and unlearned light headed bishops of Greece, which lived in those best times, whereof it is manifest by the church stories, that many of them were heretical and blasphemous, having not the Holy Ghost, but the devil himself to be President of their meetings. This logic is like the former: Beza saith, there were wicked Bishops in the best times, *ergo*, he blasphemeth against the first general coun-

cils. The father of lies and slanderer of the Saints will welcome you for this logic, except you repent in time. What Augustin ascribeth to general councils, you heard before his own words: how he acknowledgeth that they may err, because they may be amended or corrected, that some thing may be shut up and hidden from them, which afterward may be opened and known.

The end of councils is to search out the truth, and therefore you say well, they must not presume of the Holy Ghost, if they neglect ordinary means to come to the knowledge of the truth, and much less if they be not directed by the word of God, which is the rule of truth, and truth itself, as our Saviour Christ saith in his prayer, "sanctify them in thy truth, thy word is the truth," *John 17. 17.* But if the Pope cannot err, it is certain that councils are not necessary. For your first reason proveth them to be only convenient, your second reason numbereth them among human means of searching the truth, by which it may be inferred, that the Pope out of council may err. For if human means of searching the truth be necessary that the Pope doth not err, as you must needs confess, because you say, the assistance of the Holy Ghost promised to Peter's See, presupposeth human means, and calling of councils is a human mean, therefore calling of councils is necessary that the Pope doth not err. Whereby it seemeth you take upon you to decide that question, which though it hath been hitherto decided by two General Councils of Constance and Basil, that the council is above the Pope, which may err out of the council, yet is it not agreed of among all Papists at this time. For the more part hold, and so do you elsewhere, that the Pope is above the council, and that the council may err, if it be not confirmed by the Pope. Yet the council of Constance was confirmed in that point by *John 23.* before his resignation, *Sess. 12.* and in the end thereof, all things concluded in that council. *Conciliariter*, that is, as in form of council, were confirmed by Pope Martin the fifth, *Sess. 45.* That Christ is not present with heretics, and schismatics, it is out of doubt: but seeing in many of the synods and councils, holden in Germany, France, Poland, England, and other places, the truth hath been concluded out of the Holy Scriptures, it is certain that Christ was present in those assemblies by his Holy Spirit, and that in such things as they have determined according to the word of God, they are not to be reputed for heretics or schismatics, but for true Christian Catholics.

31. When the Papists themselves do not acknowledge the authority of the Tridentine assembly, for both the Emperor and the French king protested against it, and it is not at this day received of the Popish Church of France, there is no reason that we should be subject unto it, although we have many other arguments to oppose against it. And where you say, that "all good Christians rest upon the determination of a general council;" you

condemn yourselves to be no good Christians, because you do not trust upon the determination of the General Council of Constance and Basil, in the question of the Pope's supremacy above the council. You condemn the Popish Church of France, which accepteth not your Tridentine chapter, for a general council, in which there were scarce forty Bishops, and they for the most part Italians and Spaniards. That all heretics make exceptions against councils that condemn them, it proveth not all to be heretics that are condemned by councils. The Catholics also condemned by the councils of heretics, took exceptions against those councils. The exceptions that we make are most reasonable. For it is against all equity that they which are parties, that are partial, that are accused, should be the only judges. Neither could the Arians justly say so against the Nicene Council, or other heretics against the councils that condemned them: neither can all thieves justly say so against their punishers. For their judges are never parties, seldom partial, never accused in that offence, whereupon they sit as judges. That we would be tried only by God's word, it is true, but that we will expound it as we list, it is false. For we will and do by God's grace expound it sufficiently to confute your heresies, according to the plain and natural sense thereof, and in doubtful places, according to plain places, and according to the exposition of the most ancient and best approved Fathers of the Primitive Church, in the most and chief of the controversies that are between you and us.

36. It is to be feared, and it hath been often complained of, among Papists themselves, that Popish Bishops have visited oftener for a fleece, than for the benefit of their flock. And when their meaning was best, they were far from the doctrine, and therefore from the example of the Apostles.

39. It cannot be alleged to justify any dissension, but to show that for dissension's sake in matters of external policy, and discipline of the church, specially, as this of the Apostles was, the substance of the doctrine is not to be misliked, nor the church or teachers thereof to be utterly rejected: it is rightly alleged. The dissension that is among many true Christians in the sacrament of the supper, doth no more convince either part to be no member of the church, than the like dissension that was between Cyprian and the Bishops of Africa, and Cornelius with the Bishops of Europe, about the sacrament of baptism, doth deny either of them to have been true members of the church, and yet the one party erred from the truth.

41. All things necessary to salvation, are expressed in the holy Scriptures, yet other things not particularly expressed, but agreeable to the general rules of Scriptures, for order, comeliness, and charity's sake, are to be observed and kept, though not as things necessary to salvation. For no mortal men have authority to command any such things, which are not expressed in the holy Scrip-

tures, that are able to make wise unto salvation by faith in Christ, 2 *Tim.* 3 15.

#### CHAPTER 17.

5. This is rather a lively pattern of the dealing of Papists in Queen Mary's time, against the Christian Catholics, and of the godly men, which in that time did receive them.

11. This place is rightly used, to prove that the hearers ought to examine by the Scriptures, whether the teacher's doctrine be true, and to reject whatsoever they find not proved by the Scriptures. Yet are not the sheep made judges of the shepherds, people of the Priests, &c. but the word of God is made judge of all doctrine, whether it be true or false. And these men searched the Scriptures, to try whether those things were so as the Apostle preached. For they having received the Scriptures in credit before, were not bound to believe him, except his doctrine were consonant unto the Holy Scriptures, as he himself testifieth *Gal.* 1. 8. That if he preached any other Gospel than he had preached before, they should hold him accursed. And the Gospel which he preached before, was that which God had promised before by the Prophets in the Holy Scriptures. *Rom.* 1. 2. And although they could not read the Scriptures, yet they heard the Scriptures read, and were brought to understand them by his preaching. Wherefore their searching of the Scriptures, was not only to confirm them being before thoroughly persuaded, but to persuade them being not thoroughly brought to the faith, until they found the Scriptures to be manifestly agreeable to the Apostle's preaching. And yet it followeth not that the sheep must be judges of their Pastors, but that they must hear them, obey them, and be ordered by them, which they will do more cheerfully, when by searching the Scriptures, they find their Pastor's doctrine to be the doctrine of the Holy Ghost: and not the invention or tradition of men.

22. Though Paul in this place, doth not expressly reprove any true devotion, nor a great number of Popish superstitions, that you name, yet are your superstitions manifestly convinced by other testimonies of Holy Scripture. Not as any excess of worship, or religion, as you seem to define superstition, but as a will worship, more than is appointed by the law of God. And so doeth Isidorus give the Etymology of the word: *Orig.* li. 8. c. 3. For in zeal of true religion and worship of God, keeping his law as a rule thereof, we cannot exceed. That you discharge us of superstition, we accept your testimony, as the witness of our adversaries: but where you charge us to be void of religion, the Lord be judge between you and us. The Greek word, which the Apostle useth against the heathen, is abused also by the heathen against the Apostle and Christian religion. *Act.* 25. 19. And therefore superstition is not only worshipping of idols and gods of the heathen. For although heathenish superstition be taken away, as Augustin saith: Yet other as evil



superstition is come in the place among the ungodly, that will not be directed by God's word in religion, but follow their own imaginations. Augustin himself condemneth worshippers of sepulchres and pictures, of superstition. "Now you shall see," saith he, "what difference there is between the Mermaids of superstition, and the haven of religion. Gather not unto me the professors of the name of Christ, neither knowing nor showing the force or virtue of their profession. Follow ye not the multitudes of the unskilful, which even in true religion are superstitious, or so given to their lusts, that they have forgotten what they have promised to God. I know there are many worshippers of sepulchres and pictures." *De moribus eccles. Cath.* c. 31. Ambrose calleth it, "a heathenish" error, to worship the Cross whereon Christ died. *De obitu Theodosij.* Gelasius, Bishop of Rome, calleth it "superstition to abstain from the cup" in the Lord's supper. *De conc. dist.* 2. *C. Comperimus.* Celestinus Bishop of Rome reproveth certain Priests for superstitious apparel, *Ep. 2. ad Gallie Episcopos.* But the superstition of Papists, hath not only all these points but many more, which they would persuade the ignorant to be high points of true religion. You see by these few testimonies we call that superstition, which the ancient Fathers before us have so termed, and that we do not so define superstition, as we would imply all true religion, but only those things that are not prescribed by the word of God. Wherein notwithstanding, Papists do place by these words, all true religion.

23. The authors of this note show themselves to be ignorant in the Greek tongue, for the Greek word doth signify whatsoever men do reverence for religion's sake. The Dictionaries say, it significeth the forms of worship, or devotions, as well as the thing worshipped. Now the word devotion, is indifferent either to true or false devotion, and so is the Greek word. Therefore the devotions of good Christians, is no more touched by this term, than true religion by the term of religion, when it is applied to false religion.

29. In your blasphemous Images of God the Father, and of the Holy Trinity, you do transform the glory of the immortal God, to the image of a mortal man, or feathered fowl. *Rom. 1. 23.* Yea of a monster which is worse. And where you say, they are not made to be adored with godly honour, you say untruly, for all religious honour is due to God only, and it is concluded in that idolatrous council of Nice 2. and defended by Thomas and other Papists, that the Image of God is to be worshipped, with the same worship that is due to God himself. Your other excuse, that they are not made to bear any resemblance of the Divinity, or of the three persons in the Godhead, it is also false; for to what end else should any image of the Trinity be made? The Gentiles said as much of their Idols, that they knew they were not gods, nor like to gods, being void of sense and life, neither did they worship them as

gods, but they worshipped the invisible godhead, and the same that we call angels, the virtues and ministries of the great God, but all in vain as August. sheweth in *Psal. 96.* Because they worshipped as you do, those that have eyes and see not, mouths and speak not, hands and handle not, &c. Neither can you make the image of Christ, as he was in form of man: for you can make no image but of his bodily shape, and not as he was God in the form of man. And that image which you make of his bodily shape, is no more the image of Christ, than of any other man. When Epiphanius saw in a Church at Anablath, an image painted in a veil, as it were of Christ, or some Saint, he affirmeth that it was contrary to the authority of the Scriptures, that any image of a man should hang in the Church of Christ. *Epiph. ep. ad Joan.* How much more the image of the Holy Trinity, and of the Holy Ghost? But you say boldly, "to paint or grave any of the three persons, or the three persons, as they appeared visibly and corporally, is no more inconvenient or unlawful, than it was indecent for them to appear in such forms." Thus these senseless Idolaters control the Law of God, which expressly forbiddeth any such image, of any similitude or shape of any thing in heaven, in earth, in the waters to be made. *Exo. 20.* Accusing the majesty of God of indecency, if he hath appeared in any visible shape, which he hath forbidden to be made of him. And yet in giving the law, God would not appear in any visible shape, lest the people should abuse that shape, to make an image of God after it, as the Lord himself declareth expressly, *Deut. 4. 15. &c.* Therefore, though it be not simply unlawful, to express in painting the visible shapes that were showed in visions to the Prophets, yet to make those shapes for any use of religion, or service of God, it is abominable idolatry. You strain very much to find the image of God the Father, when you say, he showed himself to Daniel as an old man. For although Daniel in vision saw an old man, how prove you that the said shape of an old man represented the person of the Father, rather than of the Son, who is as old as his Father, or than the whole godhead? As for the Cherubim over the propitiatory, when you can show as good warrant for your images, as we find in the Scripture for them, namely an express commandment to make them, we will yield them unto you to be lawfully made. "Thou shalt not make to thyself," saith the Lord, that is of thy private authority or motion, reserving to himself power to command what images he thought necessary to be made for the use of his religion. Where you talk of the images of angels with their wings, you might have alleged the authority of the 2. Nicene council, which defineth, that they "have bodies and are circumscribable," *Acts 5.* but that you are ashamed of the gross error of that idolatrous council. The image of God the Father with the world in his hand, you commend highly, "to signify his creation

and government in the same, whereof the people being well instructed, may take much good and no harm in the world." But first, you must remember that these images have been and are where the people are not instructed at all. Secondly, that if they be truly instructed of the creation and government of the world, "This is a lying image, and doctrine of vanity," as the Prophet calleth all images, *Abac. 2. 18.* Because it maketh the creation and government of the world to seem proper to the person of the Father, which is common to the whole godhead. Finally, where you say the people through their faith in Christ, are far from all fond imagination of false gods, it is most untrue. For your Popish ignorant people, be as fond in their imaginations as the heathen were. Augustin saith, worshippers of pictures, though they profess the name of Christ, neither know, nor show forth the virtue or force of their profession. And of all worshippers of images, or before images, Augustin saith, "And who doth worship, or pray beholding an image, which is not so affected, that he thinketh he is heard of it, and hopeth that to be performed by it, which he desireth." In *Psal. 113.* Gregory indeed, contrary to the saying of the Prophet, *Ab. 2.* alloweth images to be laymen's books, but he forbiddeth all kind of worshipping of them. And as for the antiquity of them, it was not long before his time that they were tolerated in Churches. Epiphanius rent the Image that he found in the Church, because it was there, as he saith, "contrary to the authority of the Scriptures." *Ep. ad Joan. &c.* The council of Eliberis before him decreed "that pictures should not be in the Church, lest that which is worshipped or adored, should be painted on the walls." Behold, the council feared that which afterwards by the negligence of the Bishops came to pass, lest the Image of God who only is to be worshipped, should be painted on the walls; and esteemed that to be most detestable, which you defend to be convenient and lawful. So well you agree with the doctrine of the ancient fathers and councils.

34. That Dionysius Areopagita was author of those books which now bear his name, you bring no proof at all. We allege that Eusebius, Hierom, Gennadius never heard of his writings, for if they had heard, Dionysius Areopagita should have been registered by them among ecclesiastical writers. And further whosoever shall read those books of his, shall find indeed many ceremonies, but as unlike to the ceremonies of the Popish Church, as they are to ours. The rest, of the slight of Heretics, and that we see all antiquity against us, is but vain jangling without proof, and contrary to manifest proof in all our writings against the papists, and namely, in confutation of these Popish notes.

#### CHAPTER 19.

3. 4. There is nothing in this chapter to prove John's baptism insufficient. The sense

is, if it were truly translated, they that heard John's doctrine, were baptized in the name of our Lord Jesus.

6. Paul ministered no Confirmation, but by prayer and imposition of hands procured unto them the miraculous gifts of tongues and prophecy.

12. There was no virtue in the napkins by touching of Paul's body: the text saith plainly, the miracles were wrought of God by the hand of Paul. The napkins and handkerchiefs were but outward tokens, to confirm the faith of them that were to be healed in the absence of the Apostle, that they might know that the gift of healing which he had received of God, was not tied to the presence of his body, but that he could, when it pleased God, dispense it being absent: not that whosoever touched those napkins was by and by healed. The miracles whereof Chrysostom speaketh, do indeed commend the grace of Christ their Master, whose faithful witnesses they were. But thereof it followeth not, that all things which have touched holy men must be honoured superstitiously as their relics, or that we must look for miracles at the tombs of every saint. Finally, whatsoever Hierom in heat wrote against Vigilantius, who reproved the superstition that began to grow in honouring of saint's relics, is nothing to defend the cart-loads of your counterfeit relics, which are such gross impostures and cozenages of the world, as the like impudency in feigning of superstitious fables to deceive men with idolatry, was never found in the Pagans. He that hath not observed of his own knowledge and experience, may read in Calvin's admonition concerning relics. Which admonition if it had been, or yet might be followed, that an inventory were made of all the saints' relics that were said to be in every Church and Abbey, the monasteries of popish relics would exceed Lucian's true narrations. Where you say that relics do yet wonders among you, they be none other but the lying signs of Antichrist, and if they were rightly examined, they would prove to be nothing else but forgeries. But if any wonders be wrought to maintain idolatry and superstition, as Augustin saith of the miracles of the Donatists, we have more need to beware of them. *De unit. ecclie. cap. 16.* For miracles are not sufficient to commend any religion to be true, but true religion commendeth true miracles. The Montanists had miracles, as witnesseth Tertullian. *Lib. De animo cap. Nihil animo.* Marcus the heretic wrought wonders about the sacrament of the eap. *Vireneus lib. 1. cap. 9.* Vigilantius was not condemned of heresy by the Church, although Hierom did write so bitterly against him, who did write also against Augustin, and against Rufinus, which yet were counted as good catholics as he. As for Vigilantius, neither by Epiphanius, Philastrius, Augustin, Theodoret, Isidorus, Damascen, Antiochus or any other ancient writer that gathered the catalogue of heretics and heresies that were before their time is once touched, or his opi-

nion against the immoderate estimation of relics condemned.

15. The devil in this place obeyed neither the name of Paul nor of Jesus, therefore neither of both names uttered by conjurers were able to expel devils. And therefore I marvel whereupon you dreamed, when you gathered this note upon these words, Paul I know. In Hieron we read that many by Hilarion were delivered from devils, but that any other did cast out devils in his name we read not. Of the miracles done at the tombs of Martyrs I have spoken before. That Luther and Calvin attempted to cast out devils, and sped as these Jewish conjurers, it is a popish slander invented by a lying spirit, which possesseth many papists.

18. Not all that believed, but many of them, the text saith, came voluntarily, not of necessity, and confessed openly some of their deeds, namely such as exercised sorcery, and such curious arts, not all their sins in thoughts, words, and deeds, therefore they came not to popish auricular confession.

19. If heretical books be confuted as most of the popish books are, it is not necessary to burn them. For by reading them with their confutations, the true Christians shall learn more and more to detest their heresies: as in the books confuted by Augustin, Cyril, and others is manifest. But Papists which know they cannot prevail against the truth, will have all books of true doctrine, which they call heresy, to be burned and defaced: yea even the holy scriptures if they be not of their own translation.

21. The Gospel was not taken away from Jerusalem when Paul came thither, for many ten thousand Jews believed c. 21. 20. And the Gospel was received in Rome long before Paul saw Rome.

24. The Greek word in this place doth properly signify certain pieces of coin, in which was stricken the temple and image of Diana, more like to your popish broches and other tokens of Idolatry that are sold and given in places of your pilgrimages, than unto your superstitious shrines. Yet Chrysostom interpreteth the word to signify little arks or shrines, or such like superstitious toys. *Act. Hom. 42.*

35. Our translators add but the substantive, which must needs be understood, to the adjective, and so doth Chrysostom understand the word, so doth Oecumenius expound it. And your interpreter doth add that which is neither in the word nor meaning of the text. We need not add the word image against popish images, we have places enough to condemn your foul idolatry, plain and evident. Which if the curse of God pronounced by the prophet were not upon you, you could not but see. But seeing by God's judgment you are made like those things which you make and worship you have eyes and see not. *Psal. 115. 8.*

#### CHAPTER 20.

7 Paul ministered in both kinds, accord-

ing to his own doctrine, and Christ's institution. *1 Corinthians, 11.*

16. The Pasche and Pentecost now observed do differ from the Jews' feasts: therefore the Apostles could not celebrate them both together. And the diversity of celebration that was immediately after the Apostles, argueth that the Apostles, as in a thing indifferent, decreed nothing certainly, which appeareth in the controversy between Polycarp and Anicetus' *Irenus apud Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 26.*

21. The doctrine of Justification by faith only, doth not exclude, but require repentance from dead works, and renovation unto good works.

29. Calvin and Luther were no ravening wolves, nor bloodsuckers, but faithful and diligent Pastors.

35. This helpeth nothing your Popish unwritten traditions, for this doctrine, though not in such form of words, yet in substance of matter, is written in the Gospel, yea in the law and the prophets.

#### CHAPTER 21.

9. That Peter used his wife after his calling, *Matth. 8.* Of Philip you may say what you will, but you are never able to prove, that he used not his wife after his calling. And Clemens Alexandrinus saith plainly against you: that "Peter and Philip begat sons." *Stromat. lib. 3.*

9. Clemens Alexandrinus saith, doubtless out of some very ancient tradition, that "Philip gave his daughters in marriage to husbands," *Stomat. lib. 3.* which is contrary to the profession of perpetual virginity. Many also that were married, were endued with the gift of prophecy.

#### CHAPTER 22.

17. The text joineth with the Sacrament, invocation of the name of the Lord, whereunto salvation is promised, *Rom. 10. 13. Joel. 2. 22.* to wash away his sins. Therefore this place maketh nothing for your Heresy, that the Sacraments give grace, *ex opere operato*, of the work wrought.

#### CHAPTER 23.

8. Of truth, nothing but truth can be concluded, but of falsehood, not only falsehood, but sometime truth. As this truth, that the dead are not to be prayed for, doth follow of the false opinion of the Sadducees, that the soul is mortal supposed to be true, and so do many other truths. As for example, the souls of the righteous be not in torment after their death, the souls of the wicked be not in heaven after their death, &c. Not only Ananias was a Sadducee, but also Ananias and Caiaphas, before Christ's death. Caiaphas doth prove himself to be a Sadducee by his saying, *John 11. 50.* wherein he spake the truth against his meaning. Ananias is shewed to be a Sadducee. *Act. 4. 1. & 6.* And Josephus testifieth, that the Sadducees were chief in dignity, and had the government many times among the Jews, therefore it is

not unlike, but many of that vile sect by bribery aspired to the high priest's office. *Antiqui. lib. 18. cap. 2.*

12. He that voweth that which he is not able to perform, doth likewise sin, and doth of necessity break that vow, which he is not able to keep. And if any man take an oath, to discover true Catholics, he is bound to perform it. For it is no sin absolutely to discover them, that may without sin discover themselves. And many vows and oaths, are unlawful to be made, which when they are made, it is lawful to keep, as the oath made to the Gibeonites, the breach whereof was punished in Saul's posterity, *2 Sam. 21.* And if it were sin absolutely to discover them, yet it is not lawful to lie in denying or concealing of them. Wherefore your doctrine savoureth strongly of the sect of the Priscilianists which said: "Swear and forswear, but betray no secrets." Although obstinate Papists, be indeed rank heretics and traitors.

#### CHAPTER 24.

25. The right way to teach justification by faith only in Christ, is begun with man's condemnation by the law, which requireth justice, temperance and all virtues, most perfectly, in pain of damnation; and after men are justified, to teach them also that all virtues are necessary fruits of faith. And therefore you may go look what heretics do say, that virtues make hypocrites. For we say no such thing. But they that teach justification before God, by works, or by keeping the law, do rather make men hypocrites than truly just, because that of works of the law, no man is justified before God. *Gal. 3. 10, 11.*

#### CHAPTER 25.

19. Jesus Christ never gave the city of Rome, the seat of Cæsar to Peter, and much less to the Pope, but the Pope hath usurped it against Cæsar, contrary to the express commandment of Christ: Give unto Cæsar, that which is Cæsar's. *Matt. 22. 21.*

#### CHAPTER 26.

20. Paul preached repentance, but never Popish penance; whereof if he had spoken, none of that honourable audience could have understood him. Therefore he useth that word in the same sense it was commonly understood both of the Jews and of the Gentiles of whom this assembly did consist.

#### CHAPTER 27.

23. God's providence was great to plant and increase his Church at Rome, but not to set up the Pope's authority there, above all other bishops, yea above kings and princes. Whether Peter preached or died at Rome, we find nothing in the Scriptures, which should not have been omitted, if it had been so necessary a matter to be known for the Pope's supremacy as you make it.

24. Whom have I in heaven saith David, but thee? speaking to the Lord *Psa. 73. 25.* And we having an advocate with the Father, Jesus

Christ, have no need of Paul's intercession, *1 John 2. 1.* Augustin saith, "That Christ our high Priest having entered into the innermost part of the vail, that is, heaven, he only of all them that have tasted flesh, doth make intercession for us." *Psal. 64.*

31. God appointeth before hand not only the end, but also the means by which men come to that end. So in predestination of the Saints to salvation, he hath appointed that they shall repent, believe, and work their salvation with fear and trembling, which means if men do always and finally despise, we may not say, "they cannot be saved though they be predestinate," which is blasphemy to think, but out of doubt they were not predestinated to salvation. Because the Holy Ghost hath said, whom he hath predestinated, he hath called, justified, and glorified. *Rom. 8. 30.* The will of man is free from coercion in all things, but not from slavery to sin, but so far forth as it is made free by the grace of Christ.

#### CHAPTER 28.

1. If the inhabitants of Malta do show Paul's prison, they show a fable: for it is manifest by the text, that although he were a prisoner, he was not shut up in a prison.

5. Our merchants and other that have travelled into Malta can find no such miracle of that land. But if God have given any such grace to that island, it is not to maintain superstition or idolatry, but to show the glory of his truth that his Apostle preached. We doubt not of the power of God in working miracles, but where we have not his word to assure us, we must have good proof before we are bound to give credit. "Christ show eth," saith Tertullian, "that the faith of signs and wonders which are easy to be done by false Christs, is rash and uncertain." *Advers. Marc. lib. 3.*

20. Chrysostom in the same homily, *De patientia, Job 5,* saith, "If any would reward me with all heaven, or with that chain where-with Paul's hand was bound, I would prefer it in honour." By which saying it appeareth that the fathers in amplifications sometime exceed measure. Gregory learned not of the Scriptures to send the filings of a chain which he knew not whether it were Paul's or no, to the empress. Paul himself sent no such vain presents.

22. As Paul proved that way which they called heresy to be the true religion, we have been always ready to prove that which you call heresy in us, to be the true religion of God, namely by the holy Scriptures, *Acts 24. 14,* which we are sure was the faith of Adam and all the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and of all true Christians unto this time. That Papists are able to deduce their faith from Adam &c., it is a most monstrous fable, seeing they cannot deduce it out of the holy Scriptures, which they hold to be insufficient to teach all things necessary to be believed unto salvation. What testimony can they have of the faith of Adam with all the rest of the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles, when

they refuse the holy Scripture as insufficient?

The name of sect and heresy doth as truly agree to you that falsely object it to us, as it did to the Pharisees, Sadducees, and obstinate blind Jews, that falsely did charge the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles with it.

27. The execration of the Jews is to be attributed to themselves that obstinately refused to see: and to God, who justly punisheth them with that blindness that they could not see.

#### ANSWER TO END OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

We do not think it impossible that Peter might be at Rome, and die there, but we say it is not like to be so, because there is no mention thereof in the Acts of the Apostles. And if he were at Rome, because the Scripture doth not make mention of it, we affirm that it is not necessary to be known that he was there. Moreover, whereas Hierom affirmeth that he came to Rome the second year of Claudius, and held the priestly chair 25 years, we say it is impossible to be true, because it is confuted by the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of Paul, and the Greek writers, which affirm that he was 7 years at Antioch before he came to Rome.

The Church of Rome, had been happy still if she had continued in the doctrine of Peter and Paul, wherein she was first instructed, Augustin writeth against some that feigned, that Christ did write magic books to Peter and Paul, supposing Paul to have lived with Christ. "For that they had seen Christ painted with Peter and Paul, in divers places of Rome. Because Rome doth more notably and solemnly commend the worthiness of Peter and Paul, even because of the same day of their passion. So by all means they were worthy to be deceived, which sought Christ and his Apostles, not in their holy books, but in painted walls."

It sufficeth us to know, that the articles of the Creed are all and every one proved to be true, by the writings of the Apostles, although we know not, when, or by whom, that symbol was first compiled. But where you say, that all of age and capacity are bound to know and believe every article of the same, you condemn the opinion of your forefathers, which thought it not convenient, that they should learn them in their mother tongue, and that it was sufficient for them, to say their creed in Latin, though they understood never a word of it.

### ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT OF THE EPISTLES IN GENERAL.

In this Argument, beside that it doth not express sufficiently the sum of the Epistles, the reader must be admonished, that it is no where written in the Epistles, nor in the whole Scripture: that every member of the Catholic Church, hath strength sufficient to make him able to fulfil the commandments of God's Law, in such perfection as God requireth in his Law, or that his works are made meritorious of eternal life. The contrary doctrine is manifested in Paul, Rom. 7. 18, to the end, Rom. 6. 23, neither doth he ever ascribe such virtue to works, as the Papists do, that they are meritorious. He that will not err in reading these Epistles, must learn to know that Church to be the pillar of truth, which hold-

eth the doctrine of truth taught in these Epistles, and in the whole Scripture, out of which only, the true Church must be known from the false, *Chrysostom in Matthew, oper. imperf. homily 49 in John, homily 58. in Genesis, homily 12 and 13. Augustin, de unitat. Eccl. cap. 2 and 3. and 16. De pastoribus cap. 14.* Finally, those hard places to understand, whereof Peter speaketh, are only concerning the second coming of Christ, and not generally all the matter of his Epistles: yet are there other things hard also, but Augustin teacheth us, that "nothing is contained in those difficulties, which is not elsewhere found uttered most plainly." *De doctrin. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 6.*

### ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

Epiphanius saith, the Epistle to the Romans is counted the first among Catholic Christians, but he saith not, it was so accounted for the primacy of the Church of Rome. By the same reason you might prove the Church of the Jews to be the chief, because the Epistle of James is placed before the rest. Augustin joineth to the words by you set down, "Taking from both, that is, Jews and Gentiles, all pride of merits, and joining them both together to be justified by the discipline of humility." Whereby we see, that Augustin calleth the opinion of merits' pride, and the

doctrine of justification by faith, the discipline of humility, as indeed it is. For the Apostle never saith, that men shall have strength to do meritorious works afterward, which were not to take away the pride of merits, but to change the matter of pride, the pride of merits still remaining. Finally, Luther and Calvin make no dissensions, or scandals against the doctrine of the Roman Church taught in this Epistle, but discover the heresies and blasphemies of the Antichrist in Church of Rome, which are contrary to the doctrine of this Epistle, and to the ancient faith of the Church of Rome.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE ROMANS.

## CHAPTER I.

7. This form of salutation or blessing was not proper to the Apostle, for it is not used of them all, but may with humility and reverence, as a prayer, blessing, or Christian salutation, be used of all Christians, especially of ministers of the Church. And although Manicheus in a certain Epistle to Marcellus, did wish "grace, mercy, and peace," yet was that never accounted heresy in him, but that he called himself, as Epiphanius recordeth, "an Apostle of Jesus Christ," and as Augustin reporteth in *Epist. fundamenti*, "an Apostle of Jesus Christ by the providence of God the Father," without any further salutation there. So these two doctors are quoted in vain, to prove it unlawful to use this salutation.

8. So long as the faith which the Apostle praised, did continue in the Church of Rome, the fathers had cause to praise God, and to commend it likewise. But none of them said or thought that it could not fail, or that the Church of Rome could never depart from that faith. The word which you translate in Cyprian *misbelief*, is *Perfidia*, *falschood*, or *false dealing*: for he speaketh of discipline, and not of faith, against which discipline the Romans while they continued in the faith that was commended by the Apostle, would do nothing, as they profess in their epistle to Cyprian, acknowledging that it were the greatest shame for them that could be, to degenerate or go out of kind, from those commendations and that glory. "For it is less shame," say they, "never to have come to the commendation of praise, than to have fallen down from the high top of praise. It is less fault not to have been honoured with a good testimony, than to have lost the honour of good testimonies. It is less crime for a man to have laid basely without praise or commendation of virtues, than being disinherited from faith, to have lost his own praises. For those things which are uttered to the glory of any person, do swell up into the envy of a most grievous crime, unless they be kept with diligent and careful labour," *Epist. 31*. For Cyprian, though in error himself, yet chargeth Stephanus bishop of Rome with error. Hierom showeth, that Liberius bishop of Rome fell into heresy, in *catal. Fortunat*. Also he reproveh the custom of the church of Rome, *Ep. Evagri*, and preferreth the custom of the Catholic church in all the world. Ambrose professeth, that he desired to follow the church of Rome in all things. "But yet we also are men, and have understanding. And therefore that which is better observed in other places, we do rightly observe." *De sacram. lib. 3. c. 1*. Wherefore you gain nothing by these commendations but greater shame, except you prove the Romish religion that now is Papistry, to be the same faith that was praised by the Apostle and the ancient fathers.

9. To serve God in spirit, doth not exclude outward works of obedience, but requireth them to be done, not with the outward man only, as hypocrites do them, but in true affection of mind. Ceremonies other than such as be necessary, as those of Christ's institution, or such as be convenient for order, decency, and edification: are excluded by the worship in spirit and truth: which God requireth, John 4, and Paul practised in the gospel.

15. Paul did preach the gospel also by writing, and the people did hear by reading. For if it had not been in his commission to preach the gospel by writing, he would not have declared in the beginning, that he is an Apostle of Jesus Christ, whereby he procurerth attention and obedience unto his doctrine which he teacheth by writing. Peter neither in writing, nor in general preaching, showed himself chief of the commission, yet faithfully discharged of the Apostleship the circumcision, that was committed unto him, *Gal. 2. 7*.

17. These are the words of Augustin. "He said not the justice of man, or the justice of a man's own will, but the justice of God, not by which God is just, but wherewith he doth clothe man, when he justifieth the ungodly." For man is clothed with the justice of Christ, when justice is imputed to him without works, Rom. 4. 6. And the ungodly man is not justified by justice that is in him, for there can be none in an ungodly man, but by justice imputed unto him for the merits of Christ. Wherefore this place of Augustin, maketh directly against justification by inherent justice, as every man might have seen, if you had not of heretical malice suppressed the rest of the words, and falsely translated the word *induit*, which signifieth, hath clothed, and not endowed.

17. The faith of the Catholic church is not the Popish faith, but the faith that apprehendeth the mercy of God in the merits of Christ: which faith worketh by love, and obtaineth remission of sins committed of infirmity, whereof we are truly penitent. This is that faith whereby the just man liveth. "And without it," saith Augustin, "those that seem to be good works are turned into sins. For all that is not of faith is sin. Therefore there is but one hope of all the godly, which groan under his burden of corruptible flesh, and infirmity of this life, that we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins." *Cont. duas. Ep. Pel. lib. 3. cap. 5*. Of supplying a man's faults by penance, he hath no word, but contrariwise he saith, "Seeing all the just, both of the elder time, and the Apostles, lived by right faith, which is in our Lord Jesus Christ, and had such holy manners with faith, that although they could not be of so perfect virtue in this life, as in the life to come, yet

what sin soever hath crept upon them of human frailty, it is immediately wiped away through the piety of the same faith." Our sins, therefore, through faith, are freely remitted. And this saying doth prove invincibly, that a man is justified wholly by faith, and not partly by works. For if a man were justified partly by works, as the scripture saith, "the just shall live by faith," we might as truly say, the just shall live by works, which all Christian ears abhor to hear.

18. The Law which is a schoolmaster unto Christ, teacheth us how to live after we be incorporate to Christ. Therefore it must be preached, that men seeing their damnation by the Law, may be saved by faith in Christ, and being justified by faith, may walk as obedient children in holiness and righteousness, and not after the former lusts in ignorance, 1 Pet. 1. 14. &c. Lack of faith is the root of all sins. And all breach of God's commandments, in the regenerate which know them, cometh through weakness of faith.

23. Such be your images of God the Father, and of the blessed Trinity: the rest of your images also, made and set up to be worshipped, or had in any use of religion, are expressly forbidden by the second commandment.

24. Both is true, that God hath delivered them, and not barely suffered them, as a just Judge, and they have delivered themselves, as following their abominable lusts.

26. God as a righteous Judge delivereth up the wicked, who willingly deliver up themselves, not driving nor forcing them to sin, nor barely permitting, but willingly punishing them, in withholding his grace from them, and giving them over to their own destruction. The wickedness of unnatural lust is nowhere more common, than in the maintainers of such idolatry, as the Apostle here condemneth, and whereof he showeth that it is a just vengeance and punishment.

32. The scripture neither here nor any where else doth teach, that any sins are so venial, that is, "pardonable of their own nature and not worthy of damnation." For the wages and worthily deserved reward of all sin in general, is death, *Rom. 6. 23.* though some sins are more heinous, and deserve greater damnation. And to say, that some sins are pardonable of their own nature, is to say, that Christ died not for such sins, or that in vain he died for them, seeing they are pardonable, and do not deserve damnation of their own nature. But the Scripture telleth us, that all "transgression of God's law is sin," and deserveth the curse of God, and therefore damnable. *1 John 3. 4. Gal. 3. 10.*

#### CHAPTER 2.

6. Augustin's words are these, "Good men also shall not receive reward according to the merits of their good will only, but also have received even the same good will by the grace of God." So that he ascribeth the reward wholly to the grace of God, and not to the merits or worthiness of men's good

will. "For the ungodly man is justified without the merits of good works by faith," *Ps. 67.* "Thou art nothing by thyself, call upon God, the sins are thine, the merits are God's, punishment is to thee: and when the reward shall come, he will crown his gifts, not thy merits." *Ps. 70. Con. 2.*

6. The Apostle neither here nor any where teacheth, that Christian men's works are meritorious, or the cause of salvation. Neither doth he say expressly, as you most falsely affirm, that he giveth everlasting life to men for their good works, although he say, God shall render to every man according to his works: "Glory, honour, and incorruption to every one that worketh good." And you do as falsely slander Augustin, to say, "life everlasting to be rendered for good works, according to this manifest scripture." For thus he moveth the question. "If life eternal be rendered to good works, as the scripture saith most manifestly, that God shall render to every one according to his works, how is life eternal grace? seeing grace is not rendered to works." Behold, he saith to good works, not for good works: and so concludeth the question, that he excludeth the merit of good works: Therefore most dearly beloved, our good life is nothing else but the grace of God: and without doubt life everlasting which is rendered to good life, is the grace of God: and this is freely given, because that is freely given, to which it is given. But that to which it is given, is only grace, but this which is given to it, because it is the reward of it, is grace for grace, as reward for righteousness, that it may be true, because it is true, that God shall render to every one according to his works." And in the next chapter he writeth, "The Apostle saith, eternal life is the grace of God, that we might understand hereof, that God bringeth us to eternal life, not by our merits, but for his own mercy." Although the purpose of the Apostle in this place be not to show how men may attain to eternal life, but that none can by their own justice attain to it, because no man bringeth such works as God's justice requireth, to deserve eternal life, namely a perfect observation of the law without any transgression.

13. This sentence is not the ground of James' disputation, that faith void of good works doth not justice, and that good works also justly or declare a man to be just. For the Apostle here speaketh not of faith, but of the Law. The law justifieth only the doers and perfect observers thereof, faith justifieth the believers. Neither doth Paul speak here of any means, whereby a man is justified, but showeth that no transgressor of the law can be justified by the law, because the law justifieth none but the doers thereof, which seeing no man doth perfectly, no man is justified by the works of the law, as he saith expressly. *Rom. 3. 20. Gal. 3. 11.* As for your distinction of the first and second justification before God, it is but a new devise, not threescore years old, utterly unheard of among the ancient fa-

thers. For whom God justifieth by faith without works, he also glorifieth. *Rom.* 8. 30. And that which you call the second justification, or increase of justice, is but the effect and fruits of justification before God: and a declaration before men, that we are just. And so meaneth James, that Abraham who was justified or made just before God through faith, was also justified, or declared to be just, before men, by works: when he offered his son Isaac. So that this diversity of justifications, ariseth of divers significations of the word justifying, which signifieth sometimes to make just, sometimes to show or declare to be just: as where the Prophet saith to God, *Ps.* 51. "That thou mayest be justified in thy sayings," meaning, that thou mayest be declared and approved just. "So wisdom is justified of her children," that is declared, and approved to be just. *Matt.* 11. 19. "The Publicans justified God." *Luke* 7. 29. "Christ was justified in the spirit," *1 Tim.* 3. 16. That is, declared to be just, in which sense James saith, that a "man is justified of works." Therefore where as you quote Augustin, for your distinction of the first and second justification, there is no word in him thereof. Finally, where you say, we condemn all Christian men's works, as unclean, sinful, hypocritical, pharisaical, it is a most impudent slander, for we acknowledge all good works of Christian men, to be the gifts of God, the fruits of justification, the notes of election, the way wherein all Christians must walk unto salvation: but seeing they are imperfect, they are not able to make us just in the sight of God.

13. You deal not only deceitfully, but most falsely and impudently, to say we make the word *justify*, in this place to signify, acquitting him that is worthy to be condemned, or to have the justice of Christ imputed to him without works. For we say, that he which observeth the law shall be justified and made just by merit of his works, if any man can perfectly observe it. But he that is a transgressor of the law, is no doer of the law, to be justified thereby. But when we speak of justice by imputation, as the Apostle hath taught us in the 4th chapter, we affirm that God justifieth us, when he imputeth justice unto us without works, by which imputation of justice, we are not falsely accounted, but are indeed by God truly made just, by the righteousness of Christ which is given unto us, and which we apprehend by faith: so that although we be unjust in ourselves, we are truly just in Christ, because Christ is truly given unto us, "to be justice, sanctification and redemption," *1 Cor.* 1. 30. and we are truly made "the justice of God in him," *2 Cor.* 5. 21. "When we are found in Christ, not having our own justice which is of the law, but that which is by the faith of Christ," the "justice which is of God through faith." *Phil.* 3. 9. So the whole glory of our justification, is referred only to the mercy of God in Christ. As for that you call justice inherent, is sanctification, following justification.

no cause, but a necessary effect thereof. And therefore you wrestle in vain, out of this place to prove justification of a Christian man by works, where the Apostle proveth, that no man can be just by works, because no man fulfilleth the law. Augustin gathereth not hereof, that any man shall be just by fulfilling the law, but that "the Jews the hearers of the law, had need of the grace of the justifier, that they may be doers. Or else it is so said," saith he, "they shall be justified, as if it were said, they shall be accounted just, they shall be reputed just." For thus he handleth the matter. "The doers of the law shall be justified, is for to be understood, that we may know they cannot otherwise be doers of the law, except they be justified, that justification doth not come to the doers, but justification goeth before the doers of the law. For what other thing is this word justified, but being made just, verily by him which justifieth the ungodly man, that of an ungodly man, he may be made just? For if we should speak so, that we should say men shall be delivered, this verily should be so understood, that liberty should come to them that are already men. But if we should say, men shall be created, it should not be understood, that they should be created, which were men already, but by the very creation they should be made men. So if it were said, the doers of the law shall be honoured, we should not take it rightly, but that honour should come to them, which were already doers of the law. But when it is said, the doers of the law shall be justified, what other thing is said than the just shall be justified, for the doers of the law, verily are just, and by this it is as much, as if it were said, the doers of the law shall be created not because they were, but that they may be: that the Jews which are hearers of the law, might so understand, that they have need of the justifier, that they may be doers." Thus without all shame of obstinate blindness, you allege, Augustin for you, where he reasoneth purposely against you: and slander us to think, that it is more to God's glory, to call and count an ill man so continuing for just, than by his mercy to make an ill one just indeed. For we think and say, that God of a wicked man, by his grace and mercy doth make one just indeed by the justice of Christ, neither calling nor accounting him just, that continueth wicked, as he was before, but giving him also the spirit of sanctification, whereby after he is made just by grace, he doth the works of justice, and keepeth God's commandments though not perfectly in this life, but labouring toward perfection until he come to the estate of happiness, which is perfect in the life to come.

26. The Apostle saith not, that any Gentile fulfilleth the justice of the law, but if he keep the justice of the law, which none doth, the want of circumeision doth not hinder him from being just. Therefore he doth "not insinuate, that true justice is not in faith only but in doing of good works, and keeping the law by God's grace," for as yet, he speaketh



not of God's grace, nor of keeping the law by his grace, but confuteth the Jews which gloried in carnal circumcision, and kept not the law.

29. God endueth no man with sufficient strength to keep his commandments in this life, in such perfection as his law doth require, yet his grace in the merits of Christ, is sufficient for us, seeing his strength is made perfect in infirmity, *2 Cor. 12. 9.*

#### CHAPTER 3.

4. God preserveth men from error that neglect not to follow his word, which is the rule of truth. Against which, if governors of the Church, councils, or any other men, will presume any thing of their own wisdom, they are leit unto error.

5. All sin is manifestly against the will of God revealed in his word, although nothing come to pass, contrary to the determination and secret will of God, which is often unknown but never unjust. Neither can sin come of God, which is perfectly good. But as it is a demonstration of his justice, in the punishment thereof, and of his mercy in the pardoning thereof, it is not against the secret will, that there is sin, for we must as well take heed of the blasphemy of the Manichees that feigned an evil God, because evil could not proceed from the good God, as of the impudence and blasphemy of the libertines, that make God the author of their sins, which they commit of their own wicked corruption to serve their own lusts, and not to serve the glory of God.

10. These general speeches declare that none was ever void of sin, or good of his own strength, but only by the grace of God, as Job, Zachary, Elizabeth, and all the elect of God, after they are called and justified. And even the Virgin Mary, and John Baptist, were not just in God's sight but by faith in Christ. For not only in the *13th Psalm*: but also in the *Ps. 143. 2.* the Prophet saith, that "none living shall be found just in God's sight." Therefore he speaketh of that corruption of all mankind, considered without the grace of God justifying them, and not of the multitude of the wicked only. For how could all the world be made guilty before God, and every mouth stopped, if only the wicked were understood? therefore of necessity it pertaineth to all, and so doth Chrysostom expound it in *ep. ad Rom. Hom. 7. Theodoret. apud Occum.* and the text is plain. *Albinus in Psal. 142.*

20. Augustin also often sheweth, that good works done of faith, do "follow him that is justified, and do not go before to justify," and therefore cannot join with faith in justification. Paul to the Galatians speaketh expressly against them that joined any works either ceremonial or moral, with faith in the act of justification. *Galat. 3. 10. 11. 12.*

21. Against this proud and scornful slander, what we hold of the justice of Christ imputed to us through faith, is declared before, *cap. 2. ver. 13.* and need not be repeated again: that we are justified in God's sight, by the justice

and merits of Christ, which is given to us of God, and we by his spirit being made lively members of his body, are truly accounted just by his righteousness. And that virtue of justice, wherewith God, by the spirit of regeneration, endued man at his conversion, is an effect or fruit, not a cause of our justification before him. Neither doth Augustin say any thing to the contrary, but to the confirmation hereof. For we acknowledge, that God doth work our illumination and justification inwardly, who by his grace, doth ingraft even infants, into his body. "For he in whom all shall be quickened, giveth the most secret grace of his spirit to the faithful, and poureth it even into infants, which cannot follow his justice in works, but by the secret communication and inspiration of spiritual grace, by which whosoever cleaveth to the Lord, is one spirit," saith Augustin. And therefore to be justified in Christ, is to be truly justified by the justice of Christ, as all have truly sinned in the sin of Adam, and are justly condemned in Adam, not only in imitation of Adam. For by the discourse of Augustin, the justice of Christ is no more inherent in us, than the sin of Adam, whereby yet we are condemned, through propagation of Adam's corruption, as we are justified by communication and participation of the grace of Christ by his spirit.

22. Hope and charity do of necessity follow true faith, by which we apprehend the justice of God, but they are not comprised in the word of faith, to join in apprehending God's justice. Paul to the Galatians saith, that faith which worketh by charity, availeth with God, he saith not, that charity with faith apprehendeth God's justice, or justifieth before God, but showeth that a lively faith which worketh by charity, doth justify before him.

24. Paul acknowledgeth but this one justification by faith without works, before God: in which there is nothing given to merits, either of faith or works. Nor any disposition or preparation to justification by faith and works proceeding of grace, but as Chrysostom saith, "so soon as a man hath believed, he is immediately withal justified." *In 3. ad Rom. Hom. 7.* "He showeth here the power of God, that he hath not only saved, but also justified, and brought into glorification, using no works hereunto, but requiring faith only." You see that he ascribeth salvation to this justification wherein God useth no preparation of works, but faith only.

28. Faith here excludeth all merit of works, from justifying a man: yet the sacraments have their place, as seals of justification: and good works as necessary fruits and effects of justification. And whereas you say, we foist in the term only, you were best charge all the ancient fathers, which view this term, of whom we have received it, to be foisters, and excluders of the sacraments and good works. Chrysostom saith, "That God had both saved and justified us, using thereto no works, but requires faith only." Ambrose saith, "All that are justified, are freely justified, because

working nothing, nor recompensing, they are justified by faith only, through the gift of God," in 3. *ad Rom.* Origen saith, "God justifieth by contemplation of faith only." *Com. in Ep. ad Rom. lib. 3. cap. 3.* Theodoret upon the text, being justified freely, saith, "for having brought faith only, we have received remission of sins." In *Rom. 3.* Hierom, or what ancient writer soever, is author of the commentaries in *Ep. ad Rom. 4.* saith, "God justifieth the ungodly man by faith only, not by works which he had not." And in other places very often useth the same term, as Chrysostom and Ambrose also. Likewise Cyprian hath the same term, saying, "That faith only availeth, and that so much as we believe, so much we obtain." Hilary in *Matt. can. 8. and can. 21.* saith, "That faith only justifieth." Gregory Nazianzen saith, "To believe only is justice," *Orat. 22.* Basil saith, "This is perfect and full rejoicing in God, when a man doth not boast of his own righteousness, but knoweth himself to be void of true righteousness, and to be justified by faith only in Christ." *De humil. Hom. 51.* Rufinus saith, "Only belief ought to suffice for remission of sins." *Expos. symb.* Augustin saith, "It may be rightly said, that the commandments of God pertain to faith only, if not a dead faith, but that lively faith be understood, which worketh by love." *De fide. et oper. c. 22.* Only faith in Christ doth make clean." *Ps. 38. Paulinus ep. 58.* Augustin saith, "Salvation is to be sought by faith only."

#### CHAPTER 4.

1. The Apostle proveth by the example of Abraham, that no man hath estimation of justice before God, for the merit of any works done before faith, or after faith. And so his arguments do prove evidently. For if Abraham be justified by any works, he hath to glory, but no man hath to glory, *ergo*, he was not justified by any works. If Abraham were justified by any works, the reward should be imputed, not according to grace, but according to debt: but the reward is not imputed according to grace. *Ergo*, Abraham was not justified by any works of his. *Anselm. De Excell. Virg. Mariæ.*

Abraham was justified, as David termeth the blessedness of man, to whom God repeth justice without works. But David termeth this blessedness of every one whose sins are forgiven: therefore of faithful men to whom God repeth justice without works. As it is manifest by the Psalm, where he applieth the comfort of this blessedness to himself, that had obtained remission of his sins. *Psal. 32. 3, 4, 5.* and afterward saith: That every holy man shall pray for it, *ver. 6.* The Holy Ghost therefore, speaketh not of your fancy, of the first justification, wherein a man cannot stand one minute of an hour, but of God's justification, whereby he continueth us in justice by his only mercy, in the merits of Christ apprehended by faith, until he bring us to eternal glory. *Rom. 8. 30.*

2. If Abraham were justified before God, by works either done before faith or after, he hath to glory with God, but glorying with God, is excluded by justification by faith. He also to whom God oweth a reward of debt, may glory with God, therefore if Abraham could claim justification by works, though proceeding of faith, he might glory with God. But the reward is imputed according to grace, and not according to debt: Therefore Abraham was not justified before God, by works proceeding of faith.

4. He also that presumeth of his own works to be justified, though he acknowledge that he hath done them by the grace and help of God, challengeth justification as debt, and shall not be justified before God. As it is manifest in the parable, that Christ told against them that trusted in themselves, that they were just, where the Pharisee ascribeth to the grace and help of God, all those virtues and works of his, by which he trusted in himself that he was just: saying, God I thank thee, that I am not as other men, &c. *Luke 18. 9.* Therefore not only Pelagians, but Papists rather be in the same case that the Pharisee was.

5. The word reputed, signifieth no false account or estimation, but yet it signifieth that faith is accounted for justice without our merit, for the merits of Christ which are not inherent in us, but are communicated unto his spirit, whereby we are made members of his body and partakers of his justice. In this chapter the Apostle useth the term of imputation ten times, wherefore in this place it were convenient, if you had any thing, to plead it against imputative justice, as you do scornfully call it. Whereof we have none other doctrine than the Apostle in this chapter and elsewhere most plainly teacheth. But here the light was so clear, that you durst not for shame once mention it.

6. Your word of terming is more near a perfect definition, than our word of describing. For a description may be imperfect, a definition is concluded in proper bonds or terms. This is therefore no heretical translation of ours, but a malicious cavillation of yours. But to the matter, we would not have men believe that justification is nothing but remission of sins, for the text addeth, imputation of justice without works: and therefore no quality of grace or justice inherent in us. And seeing you acknowledge that in the first justification, God findeth no merits, and the scriptures teach none other justification before God unto reward of eternal life and glorification; we conclude, that in justification unto salvation which David termeth the blessedness of man, God findeth no merits to reward, but only sins to forgive unto such as have faith in him, whereby once justified, they bring forth good works, as the fruits of faith, not as the meritorious cause of their justification. *Remig. Psal. 32. Fulgent. de remiss. peccat. lib. 7. cap. 4.*

7. God's curse light upon those heretics, that say our sins are never truly forgiven, but only hidden. For to be covered and hidden from God's justice by the redemption of Christ,

and not to be imputed unto us, is to have them truly forgiven for Christ's sake, so that even our conscience is purged and clearly discharged of them, because Christ hath satisfied the justice of God perfectly for them. But let those heretics take heed, that they derogate not much from the force of Christ's blood, and the grace of God which affirm that Christ's blood purgeth us from the guilt, but not from the punishment due to our sins, which is as much to say, that our sins are not truly forgiven: "For where there is forgiveness," saith, Chrysostom, "there shall be no punishment." *Hom. 8. in ep. ad Rom.*

11. Our sacraments of the New Testament, are seals of the same grace and justice of faith, which is here commended, as circumcision was, which was not a bare sign and mark thereof, as you say, but a seal of God for confirmation of faith, as the text saith.

11. We say not that the sacraments be notes, marks, and badges only of remission of sins, but, as the Apostle saith, seals of God, to assure our faith of justification by remission of sins. And where you say, it followeth not in all, because it was so in Abraham, you bid open battle to the Apostle, who bringeth forth the example of Abraham to show how all men are justified before God and what is the use of the sacraments in all men: because Abraham was justified before he was circumcised, therefore not by circumcision, but by faith only. And although Isaac, and many thousands were first circumcised, and after justified, yet this is perpetual, they were not justified by circumcision more than Abraham, who was justified before he was circumcised, but by faith, as Abraham was. So saith Augustin in the place by you quoted: "In Isaac which was circumcised the eighth day from his birth: the seal of justice went before, and because he followed the faith of his father as he grew, justice itself followed, the seal whereof went before in his infancy: so in infants that are baptized, the sacrament of regeneration goeth before, and if they hold the Christian piety, conversion also doth follow in the heart, the mystery whereof went before in the body." Here you see plain, the sacraments give not grace or justice of the work wrought, but are seals of the justice of faith, though they be received before the justice of faith. The objection of infants baptized that die before they have faith, Augustin doth answer in the same place, showing that God supplieth by his grace the want of faith and confession in them, as he did in the thief, and doth in them that are martyred before they be baptized, the want of the sacrament.

24. This place is most plain, that Abraham's faith was not only an historical faith, that God's speeches were true, but a sure confidence and trust in God that his promises pertained to him, that he also should be blessed. And so faith shall be imputed to us for justice, which believe in him, which raised up Jesus Christ from the dead, "who was delivered for our sins, and rose again for our justification:" that is, which put our trust in God

who hath justified us by remission of our sins, through the merits of the death and resurrection of Christ. And here I would wish the simple deceived, to consider for what justification did Christ die, and rise again: even for that by which we are made just unto salvation, and that is it whereby justice is imputed to us by faith without works. Therefore the Apostle speaketh in all this chapter of that only justification by which we are saved, and not of that fantastical first justification newly invented of the Papists, which is lost as soon as we fall into any sin. But where you say, to establish our fiction of confidence we make none account of the articles of the Catholic faith, it is an impudent fiction, for we affirm, that we are justified by none other faith, but even by that faith which is declared in those articles, not by a bare knowledge of them which the devil hath and many reprobates, but by steadfast believing of them, and sure confidence that every Christian hath in God the Father, and in Christ his Son, conceived, born, suffered, dead, buried, risen again, ascended, and sitting at God's right hand, which also shall come to judgment, and in the Holy Ghost, by whom he is sanctified and made a member of the Catholic church of Christ, which is the body of Christ, the communion of Saints, whereby he is made partaker of the merits of Christ, and assured thereby of remission of his sins, resurrection of his body, and life everlasting. *Venantius in symbolum, remissionem peccatorum.* This is that faith, and none other, by which we look to be justified before God: neither do we call it in contempt an historical faith, but when it is so confessed, as the devil doth believe it. The distinction of faith historical and temporal, from faith spiritual and eternal, is not of our invention, but learned of Augustin, *De vera religione, cap. 50.* And whereas you say, we may term Abraham's faith and the blessed Virgin's faith an historical faith, it is false: for Abraham and the Virgin did not only believe the word of God to be true, but to their justification believed in God, and did put their whole trust and confidence in him. So the Virgin Mary rejoiceth in God her Saviour. Cyprian saith, "But he believeth not in God, which placeth not in him only the confidence of all his felicity. *De duplici martyrio.*"

#### CHAPTER 5.

1. Christian men do not vaunt in themselves, but glory in God, in the hope of salvation which confoundeth not, therefore glory in the certainty of their salvation. But the hope of Papists is in uncertainty: therefore it is not Christian hope which confoundeth not.

1. It is not vain security, but infallible certainty that we ought to have by our justification by faith. For that sincere rest, tranquility, and comfort of mind and conscience, upon hope that he is reconciled to God, which you confess to be peace toward God, is an infallible certainty, seeing hope confoundeth not, as it is in the text. *Vers. 5.* As for vain security, it is that which is placed in merits of

men, in Pope's pardons, masses of *Requiem*, and such like.

And whereas you say your faith, which we call *Fiducia*, "Trust or confidence," is quite out of the compass of the creed and scriptures: you do wilfully blaspheme the truth. For it is comprised in the very first words of the creed, *Credo in Deum*, "I believe in God," which is, I repose my whole trust and confidence in God. So doth Rufinus in *exposit. symboli*, expound the verb *Credo*, as is manifest by his examples of him that committeth himself to a ship, of the husbandman, of him that is married, of him that taketh the charge of the empire, all which trust to receive fruit of their belief. But specially by the testimony of the Apostle, which saith, "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that believe in him: the text is of them that seek him." *Heb.* 11, 6. Where we see plainly, not only an historical faith, that God is, but a trust and confidence, that he is a rewarder of them that seek him. But that our trust and confidence is within the compass of the scripture whereupon the creed is grounded, it is manifest by these testimonies, a few of a great number. "Blessed are all they that trust or have confidence in him." *Ps.* 2, 12. "I have trust or confidence in the Lord, I shall not be confounded for ever." *Ps.* 24, 1. "They that have trust or confidence in the Lord, shall be as the mount Sion which shall never be moved." *Ps.* 125, 1. "Blessed is that man whose trust is in the Lord, and whose *Fiducia*, confidence is the Lord." *Jer.* 17, 7. Christ saith, "be of good confidence, I have overcome the world." *John* 16, 33. And for the very word *fiducia*, confidence in God, which you do scornfully object unto us, as Senacherib by the mouth of Rabsacke objected to Ezechias; *2 Reg.* 18, 22. It is found even in your own translation in many places, "Have confidence in the Lord with all thy heart." *Pro.* 3, 5. "That thy confidence may be in the Lord." *Pro.* 22, 19. "He that hath trust or confidence of me, shall inherit the land, and possess my holy hill." *Isa.* 58, 13. "Thy life or soul shall be saved, because thou hast confidence in me saith the Lord." *Jer.* 39, 18. "In our Lord Jesus Christ we have trust and access with confidence through his faith." *Eph.* 3, 12. "Let us go unto the throne of grace, with confidence that we may obtain mercy." *Heb.* 4, 16. Finally saith John, "This is the confidence or trust that we have in God, that whatsoever we ask according to his will, he heareth us." *1 John* 5, 14.

2 Grace signifieth the favour of God, by which we are not justified for a moment according to the new device of the Papists, but wherein we stand and glory in the assured hope of eternal life: and from this faith proceed all virtues and fruits of obedience, not to our justification, but to God's glory, and our greater reward of his mercy, not of the merit of our works.

4. You confessed in the first section, that

hope is given in justification, and confirmed by probation and tribulation, therefore it is not grounded upon our doings, for probation and tribulation do not properly cause hope, but declare it; as tribulation doth not cause patience, therefore our hope is grounded only upon God's promises. For our faith and hope are in God, and not in our own doings. *1 Pet.* 1, 2, 1.

5. The text is plain, that he speaketh of the love of God, wherewith he loveth us, as it is manifest in the eighth verse. So doth Chrysostom expound it. *Rom.* 5, *hom.* 9. "God showeth the heat of his love towards us, chiefly that he hath not honoured us a little at once or slenderly, but at once hath poured forth his love, as a fountain of all good things." So doth Photius and Oecumenius understand it. Ambrose also upon this place. Therefore Augustin's exposition must give place to the truth. And yet he saith not that it is the love wherewith we love God, but whereby God maketh us lovers of him. In the other place, "the love of God is secretly given by imposition of hands:" but he is so far from calling it confirmation, that he saith, "imposition of hands may be repeated, though baptism cannot. For what is imposition of hands but prayer over a man?"

6. The Greek word signifieth privation of strength, and sometime of all strength, as *1 Cor.* 13, 43, so doth it here. For what strength hath the impious, or what freedom of will unto good? which is dead in sin. *Ephes.* 2, 5.

12. We do none otherwise affirm Christian men's children to be holy from their mother's womb, than Paul, *1 Cor.* 7, 14, saith, "they are holy," because they be comprised in God's covenant, and have right to be baptized, but that they are guilty of original sin, we confess and teach more soundly and substantially than you do.

14. This place doth manifestly convince, that the Virgin Mary also was conceived in original sin: because only Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost of a virgin. But why do you not boldly affirm it as an undoubted truth, that the blessed virgin was not conceived in sin? Seeing that Pope Sixtus the fourth hath clearly determined that it was so, and instituted the feast of her conception to confirm that opinion, and added to the salvation of the Virgin Mary these words "And blessed be Anne, thy mother, of whom thy virgin's flesh hath proceeded without spot." And condemned the Dominican Friars, charging them not to preach nor publish the contrary opinion, by his bull bearing date 1483. Here you must either confess the Pope's error, or else hold this opinion absolutely against the master of the sentences. *Lib.* 3, *dist.* 3. Thomas Aquinas and other schoolmen upon him, yea and Bernard, *Epist.* 171, *ad Canonicos Lugdunens.* Anselmus, *Cur Deus homo.* *lib.* 2, *cap.* 16. And Augustin, *De Genes. ad liter.* *lib.* 10, *cap.* 18.

19. To be justified by imputation, is to be constituted and made just indeed, yet not by justice inherent in us but by the justice of

Christ: as many are made sinners indeed by Adam's sin, which so justly imputed to them that be his heirs: and they be unjust and sinners in truth, and worthy of condemnation, even by the sin which Adam committed, for which they are justly plagued with that corruption of original sin, that descendeth from him by propagation.

#### CHAPTER 6.

3. Paul ascribeth our justification before, to faith without works, therefore he doth not now make Baptism a cause thereof: but of the ends and effects of Baptism, he proveth that sanctification and renovation are necessary, for all that are justified freely by the grace of God, through faith in Christ. The same argument may be drawn from circumcision, to prove, that the Jews before Christ ought to bring forth the fruits of sanctification and renovation. Yet the Apostle by express words, excludeth circumcision, from being a cause of justification, because Abraham was justified before he was circumcised, "who is the form of justification of all men," as Ambrose saith, *Com. in. ep. ad Gal. cap. 3.* And Baptism succeeding in the place of Circumcision, is a seal of justification by faith, in all Christians, as circumcision was in Abraham, not a cause thereof. Neither can justification before God by Baptism, or any works of Christian religion, be concluded out of this text.

4. Baptism is a seal of the justification by faith, and therefore assureth us of remission of sin, renovation and sanctification, that God giveth unto us being justified. The application of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection, is the proper work of the Holy Spirit, by whom we are regenerate, which is resembled and ratified by the external seal of Baptism, which testifieth that we are ingrafted into the similitude of his death and resurrection.

12. This is to draw the Scripture to your own private opinions: not to ground your opinions upon the Scripture. Paul saith, it is sin, and afterward, Chap. 6. 7. he saith it is forbidden by the Commandment, "thou shalt not covet," and verse 17. "though it do not reign," &c. he calleth it sin dwelling in us. Augustin, *De nupt. &c. conc. lib. 1. ca. 23.* denieth it to be sin in the regenerate, because in them it is forgiven, and not imputed, as he showeth plainly cap. 25. of the same book, where he saith: answering the question, how it can be sin in the child unregenerate, that was not sin in the father being regenerate, when he begot the child. "To these things it is answered, that concupiscence of the flesh, is forgiven in Baptism, not so that it is not, but so, that it is not imputed for sin. And albeit the guilt thereof be loosed, or taken away, yet it remaineth till all our infirmities be healed, the renewing of the inward man profiting from day to day, when the outward man shall have put on incorruption, for it remaineth not substantially, as a body or a spirit, but it is a certain affection of ill quality, as a disease or sickness." By this place it is

plain, how he denieth it to be sin, namely, as it is not imputed, yet remaineth sin by nature, and therefore passeth by generation, from the parents to the children. In the second place by you quoted, he saith, that "the guilt of concupiscence is consumed in the laver of regeneration, so that for it, the baptized say not in their prayer, forgive us our debts:?" which is all one in effect, as though he said, it is sin, whereof the regenerate are assured of the forgiveness or remission thereof. And *Contr. Jul. Pel. li. 5. ca. 3.* he saith plainly: "concupiscence of the flesh, against which the good spirit doth lust, is sin, because there is in it disobedience, against the government of the mind." The authority of the Tridentine Council alleged by Papists, is as good, as ask my fellow if I be a thief.

14. There is nothing in the text to prove that grace giveth us strength to avoid all sin: for if we had sufficient strength, we should never sin of infirmity.

17. Obedience from the heart, unto the form of doctrine, is faith, by which we are discharged from sin, and have professed to lead a new life, not to continue servants unto sin. Therefore remission of sins, is not ascribed to works of obedience, that follow justification.

17. They that are converted to the Christian faith by the true Apostles, and have received a form of doctrine or Analogy of faith, which also is Paul's words, *Rom. 12. 6.* according to the truth of the Holy Scriptures, ought by no means to be removed from it. But such as have been converted to the Christian profession by false Apostles, Heretics, or men infected with any error, must not continue in the form of doctrine which they have first received, if it contain any thing repugnant to the word of God. But must reform their faith, and form of doctrine also, according to the truth.

19. We may and ought to increase the virtues of justice and holiness, that are given us by God's grace, with daily exercising ourselves in practice of them, by strength of his spirit, without whom we can do nothing. But hereof we gain not a new justification before God, neither add unto the justification by faith, whereby we are made the children of God. But declare the same to the glory of God, the benefit of our brethren, and to the increase of our reward, according to his promise.

23. This place doth most plainly declare, that eternal life is not due to the merit of works, but is the free gift of God. Augustin in the place quoted, meaneth not by the word merit, desert of men's good works, but good works themselves, to which God giveth reward freely, as to his own gifts and graces in us, proceeding of faith, which is also the gift of God. And so reasoning against the Pelagian in his own terms, by this sentence of Paul, doth clearly overthrow him. "When we find life eternal to be called grace," saith he, "we have in the same Apostle Paul, a magnificent defender of grace, this saying, The

wages of sin is death, but eternal life is the grace of God, in Christ Jesus our Lord. See I pray thee in how great beauty, how carefully he hath placed his words, which being diligently considered, the obscurity of this question may be somewhat cleared. For when he had said, the wages of sin is death, who would not judge, that most agreeably and consequently, he should add: but the wages of justice, is life everlasting. And it is true, that as to the merit of sin death is rendered as wages, so to the merit of justice, eternal life as wages. Or if he would not say to justice, he might have said to faith, because the just liveth by faith, whereof also, it is called in many places of Holy Scripture, a reward: but justice or faith is no where called a reward because the reward is rendered to justice or faith. And that which a reward is to him that worketh, that is as wages or stipend, to the warrior. But the blessed Apostle against presumption, which so much assayeth to creep upon great persons, that he saith, for it, the Angel of Satan was given unto him, by whom he was buffeted, that he should not be lifted up in presumption: therefore fighting most watchfully against this pestilence of presumption: he saith, the wages of sin is death. He calleth it rightly wages, because it is due, because it is worthily paid, because it is rendered to merit. Afterward, lest justice should lift up itself, of man's good merit, as man's ill merit is not doubted to be sin: he hath not said contrariwise: eternal life is the wages of justice, but eternal life, saith he, is the grace of God. And lest it should be sought any other way, than by the Mediator, he addeth, in Christ Jesus our Lord, as though he should say: Hearing that death is the wages of sin, what goest thou about to advance thyself, O thou not justice of man, but plain pride, under the name of justice, why goest thou about to lift up thyself, and to demand life eternal, which is contrary to death, as a wages that is due? It is true justice, whereunto eternal life is due. It is true justice, it is not of thee, it descendeth from above, from the Father of lights, that thou mightest have it, verily thou hast received it. For what hast thou, which thou hast not received? Wherefore, O man, if thou shalt receive eternal life, it is indeed the wages of justice, but to thee, it is grace, to whom even justice itself is grace. For it should be rendered to thee, as due, if thou haddest of thyself justice whereto it is due. But now, we have received of his fulness, not only grace, by which we now live justly in labours, unto the end, but also grace for this grace, that we may live hereafter in rest, without end. Our faith believeth nothing more wholesomely than this, because our understanding findeth nothing more true.

This saying at large, declareth, that albeit he use the term of merit yet he acknowledgeth that there is no desert of good works unto eternal life, which is the free grace of God, by which we have true and perfect justice in Christ through faith, according to

which free gift of faith, when we labour in the works of justice, which is his grace, even for this grace, we receive not the wages, but the grace of eternal life. Therefore Augustin acknowledgeth no merit or desert of good works, understanding the word merit properly, for desert, because grace is not given to merit, but freely. Wherefore it is nothing but heretical wrestling against the truth, to abuse his terms, clean contrary to the purpose of his meaning.

Chrysostom upon this place, saith thus: "He saith not, eternal life is the reward of your good works, but eternal life is the gift of God, that he might show, that they are delivered not by their own strength, or virtues, and that it is not a debt or a wages, or a retribution of labours, but that they have received all those things freely of the gift of God." Ambrose saith: "As they that follow sin, gain death, so they that follow the grace of Christ, that is faith which forgiveth sins, shall have life eternal." Theodoret likewise upon this place: "He saith not here reward, but grace, for eternal life is the gift of God. For although a man could perform the highest and absolute justice, yet eternal joys being weighed with temporal labours, are not answerable." Photius upon the same place, saith: "He said not, the reward of good works, but the gift of God, showing that they are not delivered from sin, by works, but by grace." The Author of the Commentaries under Hierom's name, saith also: "He said not likewise, the wages or reward of justice: because it is not in us before it is rewarded. For it is not gotten by our labour, but granted by the gift of God. Wherefore you see, that not only the manifest words of the text, but also the consent of the ancient fathers is against the Popish doctrine, of the merit of good works.

#### CHAPTER 7.

2. Paul saith not, that nothing dissolveth the bond of matrimony but death, but that although the bond of marriage continue for both their lives: yet it is dissolved by the death of her husband.

4. The Apostle speaketh not one word of Baptism, in all this chapter.

4. Baptism in the elect, is a seal of their incorporation and conformity unto the death, and resurrection of Christ, but not a cause thereof. For all are not incorporate to Christ's mystical body, but only the true members thereof.

6. By faith we have Christ's justice imputed unto us, whereof Baptism is a seal; and the newness of spirit which is resident in us, is the work of the Holy Ghost, not of the external act of Baptism: for then it should be in all that are baptized, but it is only in the elect of God. For the reprobate, though they have the external seal of Baptism; yet they have not renovation of the spirit, neither are they regenerate to be God's children, for if they were his children, they should be his heirs, *Rom.* 8. 17.

7. All concupiscence that hindereth the perfect love of our neighbour, is forbidden in this precept. For Paul could never be ignorant, since he had the use of reason, that concupiscence with consent, is sin, which the heathen men did know and confess. Tully counteth it a moral virtue, "To restrain not only the hands, and eyes, but even the mind from that which belongeth to other men." *De oratore, lib. 1.* therefore the contrary must needs be a vice. And that actual concupiscence which you speak of, is forbidden in the 6, 7, and 8, commandments of the Law, according to the interpretation of our Saviour Christ, *Matth. 5. 22. 28.* Therefore the ten commandments forbid even habitual concupiscence, and sensual desire, and inclination to evil, and the evil fruits thereof, that is injurious thoughts, though by the spirit we resist them, and give not place unto them. *Fulgent. de incarn. and grat. cap. 16.*

15. Those sudden involuntary motions, are sin in their own nature, though pardoned to the elect, and so the plain words of the text are: for else how should the Apostle by this verse prove, that which he said in the verse going immediately before, that he was sold under sin, if that which he so doth unwillingly in that case, be not sin. *Anselm de Concord. grat. and lib. arbit.*

15. Concupiscence showeth that the will even of the best, is not altogether free from the captivity and bondage of sin, although in the regenerate, it hath some freedom and strength against sin, which it hath not at all in them which be not regenerate.

19. There can be no force or rage of concupiscence in the inferior part, but the will of the outward man consenteth unto it, although the will of the inward man do resist it. For the desires of the flesh are contrary to the desires of the spirit, and the will of the one to the will of the other. Therefore the Apostle saith not only, "I do not that good which I will, but I do not that evil which I will not." Augustin speaketh not of such enforcement, or rage of concupiscence, but of the disease of original sin, if we did never give consent unto it. "A man beginneth to be renewed, according to grace in the inward man, that with his mind he doth that which he loveth, neither consenteth to the flesh, doing that which he hateth, that is not so, that he doth not covet at all, but that goeth not after his concupiscence, which truly is so great a matter, that if it were brought to pass altogether, although the desires of sin be in us, while we be in this mortal body, yet if we did give consent to none of them, there should not be whereof we should say to our Father which is in heaven, forgive us our debts." He saith not that a just man need never say to God for these motions, forgive us our sins, but if any man were thoroughly renewed, so that he never consented to the desires of sin, but were as Adam was in Paradise before he fell, he had no debts to be forgiven. But seeing renovation is not perfect, and we give often consent, though sometime we have

the victory: it followeth of his words, that we have need daily to desire pardon, even of those sinful desires: which though they be not so voluntary as other sins, whereunto we give consent, yet are they voluntary in the original, because original sin in Adam was voluntary. *Aug. Ret. lib. 1. cap. 13. and 15.*

19. The will of man is always free from force or constraint, but not from thralldom or bondage of sin, as this place manifestly declareth, that it is not perfectly set at liberty, no not in the regenerate. That those things which are done without the consent of the inward man, are not imputed, it is true, but that is to be understood only of the regenerate, in whom there is a new man born of the spirit of God, not generally of all men.

25. Nothing done by infirmity of concupiscence, without consent of the inward man, can make the regenerate man guilty before God, because the grace of God in Jesus Christ doth discharge him in God's sight: without the which he were a miserable and unhappy man, as the Apostle confesseth of himself, and therefore guilty in God's sight. So likewise they defile the operations of a just man which are according to the spirit, because they hinder them from such perfection, as God's justice requireth, whereby we ought to love God with all our heart, and our neighbour as ourselves, which by means of concupiscence we cannot. For though the operations of the flesh and the spirit do not always concur in one act, yet do the operations of the flesh always hinder the operation of the spirit from perfection. And therefore it is so far off, that they make the works of the spirit meritorious, that for want of perfection always, and most often with intermeddling corruption, they make them unable to stand before God's justice, if he should not in mercy behold them.

#### CHAPTER 8.

1. The Apostle speaketh not of the state of all men after Baptism, but only of the justified and regenerate, who are able to keep the law in part, but not perfectly.

4. The Apostle saith not that the justice of the Law is fulfilled by us but in us by Christ, which is made justice unto us, which by faith are in Christ Jesus. And that inherent justice which is begun in us by Christ, is a testimony that we are in Christ, in whom we have obtained all things needful unto our salvation. "How is the justification of the law fulfilled in us," saith Ambrose, "but when forgiveness of all our sins is given us, that sins being taken away, the justified man may appear serving the Law of God with his mind," *In Rom. 8.* Therefore this place proveth not that the commandments of the Law may be kept of us in this state of infirmity, clean contrary to the scope of the Apostle. For the Law remaineth still impossible to be kept, through the weakness of our flesh and therefore Christ hath satisfied the Law for us, not giving us ability to keep it. For then some should be void of sin: but if we say we have

no sin, saith the Apostle, we deceive ourselves, and there is no truth in us, 1 *Joan.* 1. 8. *Fulg. de incarnat. et gratia. cap. 16.*

16. This place sheweth that God's children have every one the testimony of God's Spirit, whereby they know they are God's children, therefore in his favour, and assured of eternal life, which is the inheritance promised to his children. And this is no presumption, but true humility, seeing they acknowledge they have this dignity, only of his grace without their merits or worthiness. Which it is no marvel that Papists know not, because they do not feel it, but turn it into good motions, comfort and contentment, grounded upon their own works: and therefore have the spirit of servitude, and not the spirit of adoption. And even that comfort and contentment that they have in their serving God according to men's traditions, is mere vain and wicked presumption, and no true comfort nor peace of conscience.

17. Horrible blasphemy against the effect of Christ's Passion, who satisfied for all, so that Christian men are discharged of all that they have deserved to suffer, as due to the justice of God for punishment of their sins. Yet must they suffer willingly to be made conformable, or like to him in suffering as they look to be in glory. Our sufferings therefore are a condition required to our glorification, not a cause thereof, or satisfaction for our sins.

18. What mean you by condign, but worthy, or comparable in respect of worthiness? The glory that shall be revealed in God's children, is a matter of much more excellence than all their sufferings can deserve to be worthy of: not only in respect of the shortness of the time in which we suffer or continue in suffering, but also in the greatness of the reward. And it is marvellous impudence to deny that the Apostle saith no such thing, when not only the words of the Apostle are so evident, and his purpose so plain, to comfort and encourage the faithful in their afflictions, by the excellent worthiness of the reward, which is far above the value of the labour. You say that "Christ's pains were of no account of their own nature compared with his glory, but yet meritorious, and so are ours." What monstrous blasphemy is this? If there were no comparison between Christ's sufferings, and the glory that he purchased by them, then his sufferings were no satisfaction to God's justice, who required a full and perfect recompense, both for our sins and for the reward of justice, which by his Passion he procured for us. But his Passion being the Passion of the Son of God, was a full satisfaction and worthy desert of the glory, which he purchased for us, and hath given to us. Therefore it is not merited nor deserved by our suffering. Your cavil of worthy to the glory, and worthy of the glory, is but a vain brabble of words: for worthy being a *relative*, must have his *correlative*, whether it be whereof, or whereto he is worthy. And the comparison of inequality, is not only in

time, but also in excellency. But our translation, and this quarrel is at large discussed in my defence against *Gr. Martin cap. 9.* from the first section to the seventh. Wherefore a good argument may be drawn out of this place against the merit of our sufferings, because there must be an equality or equal proportion between the labour and the reward, where the labour deserveth the reward: but there is no equality or equal proportion between our sufferings of this life, and the reward of eternal glory: therefore the sufferings of this life do not merit or deserve the reward of eternal glory. "But when the Apostle," say you, "will express that they are condign, worthy, or meritorious of the glory, he saith; that our tribulation which presently is momentary and light, worketh above measure exceedingly, an eternal weight of glory in us." Thus you say; but all the Logic of Rheims cannot conclude in lawful form of syllogism out of this text, that our sufferings are condign, worthy, or meritorious of that glory. The contrary may well be proved: where there is so great excellency of the reward above the sufferings, there is no equality, and consequently no merit of the reward. For condign, worthy or meritorious, will never be proved out of the verb, worketh. The tribulations of the godly, are a cause working this reward, as they be the way by which God hath appointed that they must pass to glory, not as condign, worthy or meritorious of the glory. A man hath a troublesome way to pass, that he may come to the possession of his inheritance which his father hath given him. This journey worketh or procureth to him the possession of the inheritance which is far more worthy than his labour, therefore this travel is not the cause meritorious of his inheritance. Chrysostom upon this text, *Hom. 14.* allegeth this authority of *2 Cor. 4.* to beat down the pride of desert. "For when he showeth that the rewards to come are greater than the labours, he doth both exhort them more, and doth not suffer them to be high minded, and proud as conquerors are, when they have obtained the reward of Crowns. For the momentary lightness of our tribulation, doth work an eternal weight of glory in us, exceeding measure." Ambrose saith, "that God being as a good or prodigal giver, seeketh occasions how he may give to us being unworthy." Theodoret saith upon this text, "The crowns do excel the battles, the rewards are not compared with the labours, for the labour is small, but great gain is hoped for. And therefore he called those things that are looked for, not an hire or reward, but glory." The author of the Commentaries in Hierom's name, saith: "In this place the Apostle will set forth the glory to come, that we may more easily tolerate the present afflictions. And in truth a man could suffer nothing worthy of the heavenly glory, although it were such as our life is now. For whatsoever he should suffer from death, is no more than he deserved before for his sins. But now both his sins are forgiven, and then also eternal life, fellowship



with the Angels, brightness of the Sun, and the rest which we read to have been promised shall be performed." *Cyrrillus apud Oecumenium* saith, "He showeth that the whole is in a manner of grace, because God is more abundant in rewards, neither can we suffer any thing worthy of rewards that shall be, or confer any thing toward it."

Thus the ancient Fathers gather out of the inequality of the labours unto the reward, that the labours are not worthy of the reward, and the reward is of the free grace and mercy of God. But "the value of our labours" you say, "ariseth of the grace of our adoption, which maketh them meritorious." The reward indeed is freely given by the grace of our adoption, but that grace maketh not our works meritorious and worthy of heaven, but freely giveth reward unto our works, which they deserve not. For nothing can be more contrary to grace, than merit or desert. Sin doth deserve eternal damnation, because it is a transgression of the law of the eternal God, whether men take any pleasure therein, or no, but eternal life is the free gift of God, for Jesus Christ's sake, and not for the merit of our works, by what fantasy soever you go about to foist it in.

24. Justification is never attributed to hope, but to faith which goeth before hope: and to faith without works, but we are here said to be saved by hope, because our salvation is not in present, but in hope or expectation of that which is promised. Not that by the merit or worthiness of hope, we are saved. For hope hath relation to faith by which we are justified freely, by the grace and mercy of God in Christ. Thereupon Augustin saith, "My whole hope is nothing, but thy exceeding great mercy," *Conf. li. 10. cap. 29.* "The only hope of all the godly, groaning under this burden of corruptible flesh, and in the infirmity of this life is, that we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation or exoration for our sakes, *Cont. 2. Ep. Pel. lib. 3. cap. 5.* Neither doth the Scripture ascribe our justification before God, to any thing in us, but only to faith. For when it is said, that every one that believeth is born of God, and every one that loveth is born of God, there is no contrariety, for both faith and love are the fruits of our regeneration by the Spirit of God, yet their offices remain several and distinct: faith to justify us before God, love to declare us to be justified, or to justify declaratively. But where it is said, that faith purifieth man's heart, it is never said that love purifieth his heart, no nor "that charity remiteth sins," and therefore you falsify the words of Scripture, which are, *1 Pet. 4. 8.* "Love shall cover the multitude of sins:" which saying declareth the nature of love, which is to hide the sins of our brother, and not to utter them to his defamation, as is the nature of hatred expressed by Solomon, *Pro. 10. 11.* out of whom Peter borroweth these words. And whereas it is said, "The just shall live by his faith," it is never said, the

just shall live by his charity. But we know by charity, which is a fruit of that faith by which we are justified, that we are translated from death to life, as the cause is known by his effects.

27. A simple quarrel to make us resemble heretics, because heretics abuse the scripture, until you can prove that we abuse the scripture as they did, and as we prove that you do, and not only abuse it, but plainly falsify it, to make it serve your heretical purpose.

30. The eternal predestination of God, excludeth the merits of man, and the power of his will, thereby to attain to eternal life: yet foreth not a man's will to good or ill, but altereth the will of him, that is ordained to life, from evil to good, and giveth power to choose that which is good, and all means which he hath appointed unto salvation. And this is the doctrine of Augustin in all his books against the Pelagians, wherein he declareth the effect of God's Predestination: as he that will read them may easily perceive. Let one example suffice to show how he defendeth, proveth, &c. that man's free will standeth, speaking of the reprobate, which are justly condemned either for original sin only, or also for other sins which they have added by free will. "I say free will, but not made free, free from justice, but slave of sin." *De corrupt. and gratia, cap. 13.*

38. The knowledge that we have by hope grounded upon God's promises is so sure, that it cannot be deceived, as it is plain, *Rom. 5. 5.* The persuasion that the Apostle hath in other places, is also grounded upon good arguments: but here, upon the immutable decree of God. And it is a good reason to prove that every Christian man which is endued with faith and hope, may and ought to be infallibly assured, that he is justified and shall be saved, because the word of God and his promise to all that believe in him, and in faith call upon him, cannot fail, but be most infallibly true. But that any man can be sure never to sin, it is devilish and false presumption. For we have no promise that we shall be preserved from all sin, but only from that which is irremissible. But that we shall always persevere in the favour of God, and so consequently that we are predestinated to eternal life, the Apostle doth most plainly prove in this Chapter: wherefore by the spirit of adoption, and the effects of God's grace agreeable, we may have certain knowledge that we shall inherit God's kingdom, which none shall do, but they that continue unto the end, and were appointed unto it before the beginning of this world. And this is true humility, when we presume nothing on our own strength or worthiness, but depend wholly upon the truth of God's promises; wherefore it was a damnable presumption of the Popish Prelates of Trent, to condemn that for a false illusion, which the word of truth doth so manifestly lead us unto, and by all means persuade us to acknowledge.

## CHAPTER 9.

11. God's election and reprobation are most free, of his own will, not upon the foresight of the merits, of either of them, for he hath mercy on whom he will, and he hardeneth whom he will, *verse 18*. Yet he condemneth none, but for sin, either original only, or else both original and actual.

14. The elect work willingly toward their salvation, their will by grace being made free in part, from the slavery of sin, whereunto all are subject by Adam's fall, but they do not thereby deserve their salvation. For salvation dependeth upon their election, which you confess to be without all respect of merits, or works done or foreseen, as Augustin showeth most plainly, *Epist. 105, ad Sicutum*. Yet they must work their salvation, walking in that way by God's grace, which he hath appointed for all them that attain to salvation. And they must make sure their election unto themselves, which is most sure in God's knowledge, by good works which proceeding from faith, are the undoubted fruits of God's election.

16. Our election, calling, and first coming to God, lieth wholly in God's mercy, and not either wholly or principally, or any thing at all in our own will or works. But whom God elected before time, he calleth in time by him appointed, and of unwilling by his grace maketh them willing, to come to him: and to walk in good works, unto which he hath elected them. So that man hath no free will, until it be freed, man's will worketh nothing in our conversion until it be converted, man hath no power to change his will unto better, except it be given of God. *August. retract. lib. 1. cap. 22. Fulg. de incarn. et grat. cap. 19.*

17. The purpose for which God set up Pharaoh, is manifest in the text, "that in him he might show his power, &c., God made all things for himself, even the wicked man unto the evil day." Therefore was Pharaoh, a vessel of wrath ordained to destruction, *verse 22*. His reprobation therefore was for the glory of God, his condemnation most just, for his obstinate contempt of God, and his word.

20. What books you mean, forced with blasphemous and erroneous doctrine I know not. But I know divers books of predestination, written by learned men in this time, that open the truth of this mystery, as far forth as it is revealed in the scriptures, to the glory of God, and great comfort of his children: upon the same principles for the most part, that you do acknowledge in these notes, wherein you confess in effect, the substance of the doctrine, though you show not the most comfortable use thereof, to the glory of God, and the humbling of all flesh before him, but fly from it, as much as you can, and seek to obscure it.

21. I suppose there was never man so mad, to say, that a man hath no more free will, than a piece of clay. But this example teach-

eth, that God's election and reprobation dependeth no more of man's will, than the form which the potter giveth to the clay, dependeth upon the will of the clay, which it hath not. Neither had man any more will, before he was. But being now created he hath a will, free from coercion. And the first man, had will free from servitude of sin, which by sinning he lost, as witnesseth Augustin, *En. ad Lau. cap. 30*. "For free will, being made captive, availeth to nothing but to sin; but to justice except it be made free and holpen by God, it availeth not," *cont. duos Ep. Pel. lib. 3. cap. 8*. There is no doubt, therefore, but Pharaoh had his will free from constraint, but yet slave to sin. Neither doth the Apostle say, *2 Tim. 2. 21*. that a man may cleanse himself from the filthy, and so become a vessel of honour: but if a man do or shall cleanse himself, which he cannot do by the strength of free will, but by the grace of God, converting his will and giving him strength to perform that he willeth.

22. God reprobateh justly whom he will, and condemneth the reprobate justly for sin, but hereof it followeth not, that the reprobate have their will free, but from coercion, for to sin it is thrall, and slave, as Augustin saith *De cor. et gr. cap. 13*

## CHAPTER 10.

5. The justice of the Law of Moses, if any man could keep it perfectly, was able to justify him to eternal life, as the transgressor thereof deserved the curse of God unto eternal death. So saith Chrysostom upon this text, *Hom. 17*. "For a man cannot otherwise be justified in the Law, but he that hath fulfilled all things. But that as yet hath not been possible for any man. Therefore that justice is lost." The author of the commentaries under the name of Hierom saith: "Some of this place think that the Jews deserved this present life only by the works of the Law, which the words of our Lord declare not to be true, which being asked of eternal life, setteth forth the commandments of the Law, saying: If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments, whereof we understand, that he which in his time hath kept the Law, had life everlasting." Of the same judgment are Theodoret, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, and those ancient fathers, that seem to say otherwise, mean of the ceremonial Law, not of the moral Law, as it is plain by Ambrose, *cap. 3. ad Gal.*

8. The word of faith is the doctrine of justification by faith, without the works of the Law, as it is manifest by the sixth verse, out of which faith, proceedeth hope, love, and confession, and all good works, but the root of all is faith only, by which we are accounted just in the sight of God. Ambrose upon these words of the text; "This is the word of faith which we preach," giveth this only interpretation, "He saith that no work of the Law, but faith only, is to be given in the cause of Christ." Theodoret giveth this exposition,

"That which Moses said of the precepts of the Law, the same say we of faith." Wherefore faith which justifieth before God, is not the whole Law of Christ which containeth both faith and works, but faith only, that is faith considered without works, yet as the root of all good works.

14. We cannot call upon any, whom we do not know out of God's word, and believe to be both able and willing to help us. Therefore Papists may have a vain persuasion, of the ability of Saints to help them: but testimony of the holy Scripture to assure their conscience they have none. And further seeing we can invoke none, but him in whom we believe, and we ought to believe in God only; we cannot without sacrilege, invoke any creatures. Howbeit, you defend that you may believe also in creatures. And that the Scripture useth this speech, Exod. 14. 31, "They believed in God and in Moses," where your own translation hath, they gave the credit to the Lord, and to Moses his servant. In the next text, 2 Paral. 20. 20, your own translation hath, "Believe in the Lord your God, and you shall be sure, believe his Prophets, or give credit to his Prophets, and all shall fall out prosperously." But here you must forsake your own translation though it be true, and fly to the Hebrew text, where the preposition or servile letter, is in both alike. Whereunto I answer you, that the Hebrew phrase ought not in Greek, or Latin, to be translated with the preposition that ruleth an accusative or ablative case, but with a dative case, as your vulgar Latin interpreter hath well observed: and so hath the Greek text, in the first place, but in the second a preposition before the dative. But in the Epistle to Philemon, the text is, "Hearing of thy love and faith which thou hast toward our Lord Jesus, and unto all the Saints," where every man that is not obstinately blind, doth see, that faith is referred to Christ, and love to the Saints, which distinction and divers relations is observed even by your own Latin interpreter, and by ourselves. Therefore the Scripture useth no such speech, that can be translated in English, whereby it should appear, that we may believe in creatures, that is, put our whole trust in creatures. For as Cyprian saith: "He doth not believe in God which doth not place in him alone, the trust of his whole felicity." *De duplici martyrio. Greg. Beticus ad Gallam et Placidiam.* But the fathers, you say further, did read in the creed indifferently, "I believe in the Catholic Church, and I believe the Catholic Church." I grant some did so, but in the same sense: namely, that to believe in the church, was no more but to believe that there is a Catholic Church, as they said also, I believe in one baptism, I believe in the resurrection of the dead, and in the life to come. For that distinction in sense, must be observed which Ruffinus sheweth, to be also in the words: "He said not, I believe in the holy Catholic Church, nor in the remission of sins, nor in the resurrection of the body for if he had ad-

ded the preposition *In*, there should have been the same force of meaning, with that which went before. But now in these words in which is set forth our faith of the Godhead, it is said, In God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his Son, and in the Holy Ghost. But in the rest where the speech is not of the Godhead, but of creatures and mysteries, the preposition *In*, is not added, that it should be said, In the holy church, but that we should believe that there is a holy church, not as God, but as a church gathered to God. And men should believe that there is remission of sins, not in the remission of sins, and they should believe the resurrection of the body, not in the resurrection of the body. Therefore by this syllable of preposition, the Creator is distinguished from the creatures, and things pertaining to God, from things belonging to men," *Ruff. in Symbolum.* Agreeable to him writeth Eusebius Emisenus, *de Symbol. hom. 2.* "It is one thing to believe God, or to give credit to God, another thing to believe in God. We ought of right to believe both Paul and Peter, but to believe in Peter and Paul, that is, to bestow upon the servants the honour of the Lord, we ought not. To believe him that is, to give credit to him, every one may to a man: but to believe in him, know that thou owest only to the Divine Majesty. But this also is to be marked. It is one thing *Crederet Deum*, to believe that there is a God, another thing, to believe in God: for the devil is found to believe that there is a God. But to believe in God, none is proved, but he which hath devoutly trusted in him. And therefore to believe God, is to know naturally; but to believe in God, that is faithfully to seek him, and with our whole love, to pass into him." So likewise of the articles of the Catholic Church, remission of sins, resurrection, &c. he saith, "Let us believe in God, these things we do rehearse, we do not believe in them, but we do believe them in God, these things I say we confess, not as God, but as the benefits of God." *Primasius also observeth this difference, Com. in Gal. cap. 3.* "It is perfect faith not only to believe that Christ is, but to believe in Christ." Seeing therefore it is proper to the Divinity to believe, that is, says Cyprian, to put our whole trust in God, to believe in creatures is sacrilegious, and consequently to call upon them.

15. The Apostle speaketh not of the ordinary calling or sending by the church, nor of the testimony of conscience, that every one which is called ought to have, that he is called and sent of God, but of the providence of God, by which the preachers of the Gospel are sent, whether they have lawful calling by men or no, to preach the Gospel to any nation, which is an argument of God's love unto that people, to whom the message of salvation is offered. But that no men ought to intrude themselves into the office of preaching, without lawful calling, it is proved sufficiently by other places of scripture. And we, God be thanked have lawful calling, howsoever you slander the confession of the

French ministers, which do not require an exception to be made in them, because they found the state of the church interrupted, but show that the ordinary calling is not always necessary, where the state of the church is so corrupted, that it cannot be had of them that are counted to hold the church, but are indeed professed enemies of the true church. But that the ordinary calling or sending is not necessary, where either there is no church, or the church is so corrupted with heresy that it ceaseth to be a member of Christ: we may learn by examples of nations converted to the faith by them that had no calling at all of the church. As a great nation of the Indians was by *Ædesius* and *Frumentius*. *Ruff. hist. lib. 1, cap. 9. Theod. lib. 1, cap. 24.* And the nation of the Iberians by a captive woman, which after she had converted the King and the Queen, they both became teachers of the gospel to the people. *Ruff. lib. 1, cap. 10.* The nation of the *Immeres*, a most warlike people of Persia, received the faith before they had any bishop, as testifieth *Niceph. lib. 17, cap. 37.* And who doubteth that the same may be done in a nation infected by heresy? when even in a Catholic and sound church, *Alexander Bishop of Jerusalem*, and *Theoctistus of Cesarea*, defend themselves against *Demetrius Bishop of Alexandria*, who reprehended them for suffering *Origen*, before he was ordained by the church, to teach in the church, and to interpret the scriptures in the presence of bishops. Yea, they charge *Demetrius* with a lie, because he had written that it was never heard of or done before, that laymen should teach in presence of a bishop, and bring forth notable examples of the contrary custom: namely, that *Evclpius* was required to teach by *Neon Bishop of Larindi*, *Paulinus* by *Celsus* at *Iconium*, *Theodorus* by *Atticus* at *Synadotum*, and divers other in other places. Yea *Demetrius* himself which reprehended them, seemeth to allow, that when no Bishop was present, some other layman might teach, seeing he taketh occasion to reprove them, because they suffered *Origen* to teach in presence of the ordinary bishop, *Euseb. lib. 6, cap. 20.* *Ruffinus* concludeth hereof, in his translation of *Eusebius*, that there is no doubt, "but many other laymen in other places, if there be any which can set forth the work of God in word and doctrine, are provoked by the bishops to do it. *Lib. 6, cap. 11.* How much more are they bound in charity, where there is no ordinary Catholic teachers, to endeavour to convert heretics to the Catholic faith. And yet this is vainly objected against *Luther*, *Calvin*, and others, that they lacked sending or calling, of which some, as they had baptism, so they had calling of the Popish Church, to preach therein, other had ordinary calling of the Catholic Churches, separated from the Popish heresy, to be preachers and pastors of them.

16. We see no such thing in the text, for it is of grace and mercy that we believe and obey, not of the power of free will, which

availeth to nothing, but to sin, except it be made free by the grace of God. *Aug. con. 2, cp. pel. ad Boni. lib. 3, cap. 8.* "We read in the Apostle, I obtained mercy that I might be faithful: not because I was faithful." *Retract. lib. 1, cap. 23.*

20. The first grace and justification being without merits by only faith, is sufficient to glorification, as the Apostle saith: "Whom God justifieth he glorifieth." Neither doth the scripture teach any grace or justification by merits. It hath been often answered that man's will is free from coercion, but yet thrall to sin, until by grace it be enlarged.

#### CHAPTER 11.

4. The Greek text which we translate, hath the article of the feminine gender, the Relative or Substantive of which can be none other but image: wherfore we add nothing but that which is necessary to the understanding of the text, and is contained in it.

4. You may as well say, that *Paul* allegeth this example impertinently, to prove that a remnant may be saved, which is unknown to men. But that the Church at other times hath been so hidden, that there was no public exercise of religion in *Judah* and *Jerusalem*, the story of Scripture is full of examples. As in the days of *Ahaz*, when the altar of God was removed, and an idolatrous altar by the High Priest's consent was set up. *2 Reg. 16.* And *cap. 17. 19.* it is said, that neither *Judah* did keep the Lord's commandments, but walked in the errors of *Israel*: where was then the visible church? Likewise when *Manasseh* built idolatrous altars in the temple *2 Reg. 21. 4. and 5.* Also in the days of *Amon* which walked in all the ways of *Manasseh*, *2 Reg. 21. 22.* But you have another help, to say that the Church of Christ resteth upon better promises than the Church of the Jews. I pray you where is there any promise that the Church of Christ shall never be hidden? we find a prophecy that she shall fly into the wilderness. *Apoc. 12.* But for the perpetual continuance of the Church of the Jews until the first coming of Christ, there be as many and as good promises, as for the Church of the Gentiles to continue until the second coming of Christ. Howbeit, you will not put us to prove that there were seven thousand, but seven, or any one of our belief, when *Luther* began, whereas it is certain there were many thousands, beside them that were scattered and hidden in *England*, *France* and other nations, in *Calabria*, *Piedmont*, *Moravia*, *Bohemia*, and other places, which many hundred years before *Luther*, professed the same doctrine of Christ which *Luther* taught in *Saxony*, and were called of the *Papists* *Waldenses*, *Pauperes de Lugduno*, *Leonista*, *Lollardi*, *Picardi*, and by such other opprobrious names: whose doctrine in all the chief points to be the same, witnesseth *Reimerius* an inquisitor, more than three hundred years ago. And their apology against *Rochezana*, and other that submitted themselves to the Council of *Basil*, set out *Anno 1431.* Also by the

treaties of Claudius Cousord a Doctor of Divinity of Paris, which professeth to confute the errors of the Waldenses, Wickliffites, and other ancient heretics, as he calleth them, because they contained in a manner, as he saith, all the heresies of this time long ago by the Popish Church condemned. Therefore it is a fond and ridiculous evasion, to say; there was not any that did believe in all points as Luther did, when there is no ancient writer but hath some private opinions, and perhaps peculiar to himself; yet they that consent in the chief and necessary Articles of Faith, notwithstanding they agree not in all points, have been always accounted members of one true Church: as Anicetus and Polycarp, Victor and Irenus, Cornelius and Cyprian, Epiphanius and Chrysostom, Hierom and Augustin, Hierom and Rufinus, Theodoret and Cyril, Leo and the Council of Chalcedon, and such other. You yourselves will not refuse the Thomists and Scotists, Dominicans, and Franciscans, Jesuits, and other Papists, though they agree not in all points of doctrine.

6. The Apostle speaketh of the election by grace by which all are saved, therefore he excludeth the merit of all works as well of the circumcised Jews and baptized Christians, as of the unbelieving Gentiles: yet are Christian men bound of necessity to do good works, not as causes meriting salvation, but as the end of their election, *Ephes. 1. 4. Ephes. 2. 8, 9, 10.* where the Apostle sayeth, "We were chosen before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and unblameable before him in love." And "you are saved by grace through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created unto good works in Christ Jesus, which God hath prepared that we should walk in them." Wherefore the Papists be not like ill apothecaries, that for lack of one medicine take another as good, or at least not hurtful, but like most venomous serpents that poison all things that they touch or come near unto.

8. God worketh not as an evil author of sin, but as a just judge, in giving the spirit of compunction, and sending the spirit of error to them that have deserved to be deceived.

20. We see that he which of vain presumption thinketh he standeth, may fall, but he that standeth by the grace of God, whereof he is assured by a lively faith, cannot fall, though he must always continue in the fear of God.

33. Not only our election, first calling, and conversion unto Christ, are to be referred unto God's only mercy, but also "our perseverance unto the end, and the reward of eternal life in the end without end," as Augustin saith, "is of the only grace and mercy of God, and not of the merit of our works. For whence have I so great merit, when mercy is my crown." *Ambros. exhort. ad virginas.*

33. All true Christians may with humility search so far into the doctrine of predestina-

tion, as the Scripture hath revealed to our comfort. But out of the compass of God's word, all curious searching is dangerous and damnable. The books of Calvin, Beza, and Jerome keep themselves within the compass of the Holy Scriptures, and hold no blasphemous or other erroneous opinions, that derogate any thing from the glory of God, or be hurtful to the salvation of men, as your slanderous and malicious pen supposeth, beside your presumptuous judgment, that they be reprobates, whereof some be yet living, of whom it is hard to pronounce, although they were now blasphemous heretics, and you the Catholic Church, the contrary of which is true, because God might give them repentance.

## CHAPTER 12.

6. First you translate boldly, "the rule of faith," which is not the proper signification of the word *Ratio*. Secondly, where all the ancient writers, that comment upon the text in a manner, understand the word *Analogia*, for the measure of every man's faith, whereunto God giveth a gift agreeable, and not one understandeth it, for such "a rule of faith," as you suppose: what credit shall your interpretation have, with any man of mean judgment? But specially where you affirm, that it was such, "as being delivered without writing, all the writings of the New Testament were tried and approved by it." it is horrible blasphemy against the Holy Scriptures. That a rule of faith might be concluded of by the Apostles, to direct all teachers and believers by it, we deny not: but that this rule was drawn out of all the Holy Scriptures, and contained nothing but that which is grounded upon them, it is manifestly proved, because the Gospel which they preached, was grounded wholly upon the Holy Scriptures, as testifieth Paul, *Rom. 1. 2. Act. 26, 22.* and by many other places of Scripture. And therefore all your wrangling is in vain, to persuade men without argument of Scripture, that there was such a rule unwritten that contained more than the Scripture. The faith which Paul commended in the Romans, was the faith of the Gospel, "which God had promised before by the Prophets, in the Scriptures." That form of doctrine, which was committed to Timothy, was contained in the Holy Scriptures, wherein he had been trained up from a child, and which were able to make him wise unto salvation, and perfectly instructed, to all parts of his office, *2 Tim. 2. 15, 16, 17.* It was the Gospel which he preached to the Galatians set forth in the Scriptures, and not a secret tradition, but the public doctrine of justification by faith, without all ceremonies and works of the law. But that "he feared to miss the rule of truth," when he went up to Jerusalem, after he had preached the Gospel fourteen years, what is it but blasphemous impudence, to affirm? when he saith, he did declare to the rest of the Apostles privately, the doctrine that he preached publicly, not for fear lest he had missed himself, but that the rest of the Apostles might give public testimony

of his doctrine, to be the same that theirs was, against them, that to hinder the profit of his preaching, reported that he taught otherwise than the rest of the Apostles, *Gal. 2*. Finally, the Scriptures inspired of God, were written to be the rule of truth, for certainty of faith: and not to maintain such an unwritten tradition, but to defend the truth and faith, from all heretical pretences of secret tradition. Therefore the Apostle either speaketh not at all, of any rule of truth in this place, or else he speaketh of the articles of the Creed, which being taken out of the Scriptures, and containing a brief sum of Christian faith, may be called that rule of faith, according to which all prophesying, and interpretation of the Scripture, is to be framed. Where you say, that we have several rules of faith amongst us, it is true in form of words, but not in substance of matter. For as when heresies arose, the most ancient rule of faith, called the Apostles' Creed, was not sufficient, but another form was devised in the Nicene Council, so, as Epiphanius testifieth, when other heresies sprung up, the Catholics were driven to set out other confessions, or rules of faith, to defend the ignorant from their devilish subtleties, and to sift out dissemblers, that would hide their heresies under the forms of words, used in the former confessions, after the same manner, are our confessions now diverse, yet all agreeing in the substance of faith, as the book of the Harmony of Confessions, doth evidently declare. The form of conference, or prophecy used in the primitive Church, and in divers Churches at this day, observeth even the same rule of faith, that Paul speaketh of, and that was observed in the primitive Church, howsoever you scorn it, and slander it.

#### CHAPTER 13.

1. Chrysostom upon this place saith, *Hom. 23*. "he showeth that these things are commanded to all men, both Priests and Monks, and not to temporal men only which he declareth in the beginning, when he said, Let every soul be subject to the highest powers: although thou be an Apostle, although thou be an Evangelist, although thou be a Prophet, although thou be whatsoever thou art: for this subjection doth not overthrow religion." And if Heathen Princes are to be obeyed of all men, in all things that are not against the Christian religion, how much more Christian Princes, in matters that are agreeable to Christian faith and religion. Seeing that, as Augustin saith, they "serve God as Kings, making just laws, and destroying idolatry as Hezekiah did." The same father counteth him "not sober, that would say to Christian Kings: Take no care in your Kingdom, of whom the Church of your Lord is defended or oppugned: it pertaineth not to you, who in your dominion will be religious or sacrilegious, to whom it may not be said it pertaineth not unto you, who in your dominion will be chaste or unchaste." *Epist. 50. Bonifacio*. Therefore it standeth with God's holy will and ordinance, that Princes should make laws

to maintain true religion, and to suppress false religion, whereunto all men are commanded to be obedient.

2. If Heathen Princes command any thing in matters of religion that is agreeable to true religion, they are to be obeyed, even in matters of religion. As Cyrus in the law which he made for building the Temple. *Ezra 1*. Darius, as well for building, as for offering of sacrifice. *Ezra 6*. Artaxerxes, for reformation of the Church, by the discretion and wisdom of Ezra. *Ezra 7*. Darius the Median, for worshipping of the true God. *Dan. 6. 27*.

4. We give no more to the secular power, than is due by the word of God. Wickliff was slandered to deny obedience to Princes, and spiritual Pastors, for he denied neither of both. But proved that the Pope was Antichrist, and his Clergy were no Pastors of the Church, but wolves. The Protestants at this day, as always, are obedient even to wicked Princes unto death and martyrdom. The Papists conspire most horrible treason to murder Christian Princes, and to invade their land with strangers, as it is manifest, to the reproach and shame of that murdering heresy.

6. The old Popish divinity, was, that the Popish Clergy were exempt from tribute, by the law of God, whereby they may claim, as well to be exempt from obedience, by the law of God, to civil Magistrates. And Antichrist their head, doth yet claim, not only to be exempt from obedience to any Prince, but also to be superior to all Princes, and to have right of both the swords, spiritual and temporal: and to depose and deprive civil Princes of their government, as we have a familiar example in the Bull of Pius 5. against our Sovereign.

8. Here we learn, that he which loveth his neighbour as himself, hath fulfilled the law of the second Table. But we never saw the man, nor ever shall, that loved his neighbour as himself. Therefore imperfect love doth not perfectly fulfil the law: and it is still impossible to keep the commandments, in such perfection, as the justice of the law requireth.

#### CHAPTER 14.

2. We never went about to prove by this place, or by any other, that Christians are free from fasting, or from obeying the Church's commandment, or Christ's example in fasting without superstition. But we condemn your Antichristian forbidding of meats to some men at all times, and to all men at some times for religion's sake, and for greater holiness, which is no fasting, but a change of diet. And where you say, you forbid no meat, but for chastising of men's bodies, it is false: for you leave them all things that may inflame the body to lust, beside flesh, as wine, spices, fruits, and all dainty fishes in which of ancient time, was counted the greatest delicacy. And Durand saith plainly, that fish is eaten in fasting days, "because God hath not cursed the waters, because remission of sins should be by the water of baptism: for this element is

most worthy, which washeth away filthiness, and upon which the Spirit of the Lord before the constitution of the world was carried: but he cursed the earth in the works of man, hereof it is, that it is not lawful to eat in the fasting days, any kind of flesh that liveth in the land: whereby it is plain, howsoever you would cloak the matter, your prohibition of flesh is, because it was hypocritically deemed, not only unclean, but also cursed. *Dur. lib. 6. cap. de alijs Jejunijs.*

5. We use no deceit, but show the Christian liberty in respecting all days alike, that are not discerned by the commandment of God. As for the doing of your festivities, we condemn as open idolatry, by manifest texts of Scripture, forbidding God's honour to be given to creatures: and yet the days appointed by the Church for exercise of religion, we observe, and that without superstition.

5. In things of their own nature indifferent, the Apostle requireth, that every man certainly be persuaded, how far Christian liberty extendeth, and how it is to be used.

23. Augustin applieth this text, to prove that all the actions of infidels are sin, even those that seem to be virtues, and good works, saying that "virtue must be defined not by the actions but by the ends." *Contra Juli. lib. 4. cap. 3.* where he handleth the question at large, and saith, "When a man doth any thing, wherein he seemeth not to sin, if he doth it not to that end, for which he ought to do it, he is convicted to sin." Therefore though honouring of parents, and such like actions be not sin of themselves, yet are they sin in an infidel, because he honoureth not his parents for that end he ought to do. "Of all things which infidels do, it is said, all that is not of faith is sin." To the Pelagian he saith, as we may say to the Papists. "All the rest of theirs, that seem among men to have some praise, let them seem to thee to be true virtues, let them seem to be good works, and to be done without all sin. For my part I know this, that a good will doth them not: but an unfaithful and ungodly will is not good." *Contra duas epist. Pel. ad Bonifacium li. 3. ca. 5.* he saith, "Without faith even those which seem to be good works, are turned into sins: for all that is not of faith is sin." *Fulgent. de remiss. peccat. li. 2. c. 19. Leo, sermo 2. de jejunio. Pentecost. Hesych. in Levit. li. 1. ca. 2. Prosper. cont. Cass. ca. 22. De vita contemplat. li. 3. ca. 1.* That which Luther saith of Christian men's good deeds, is true in his meaning: namely in respect of the perfection of justice, which God's Law requireth, whereunto no man can attain in any good deed that he doth. Therefore good deeds are rewarded according to grace, and not according to merit.

#### CHAPTER 15.

8. Christ did execute his office principally toward the Jews, but not only. He preached to the Samaritans. *John 4.* In the parts of Tyre and Sidon, he healed the woman of Canaan's daughter. *Matt. 15.* He died and rose again, as well for the Gentiles, as the Jews.

25. He meaneth all "the poor Christians at Jerusalem:" so doth Chrysostom interpret the word, and not of any special men, such as had forsaken their goods. *Hom. 30.* Theodoret also "of all the poor faithful, according as he was required by Peter, James, and John, to be mindful of the poor:" and so the text is plain.

#### CHAPTER 16.

3. The words going before, declare Chrysostom's meaning: "They had no small comfort of this salutation, for it declared tokens of honour and love, and great fellowship of grace." The comfort therefore they took in the honour and love that was showed to them by the Apostle's salutation, was a great grace to persuade them that they were partakers with him of the common grace of God.

14. The Protestants reason not so fondly as you do falsely report them, but thus. Peter is not bere saluted, *Ergo*, it is not like, that he was at this time at Rome.

16. In both these points concerning Peter, you pass yourselves in impudency, either when you say that he hold he was not preferred before the other Apostles, for we acknowledge that he was in primacy of confession the first: or when you defend that he was so preferred above the rest of the Apostles, that they were not equal with him in honour and authority, but he made their head and pope, and they but his inferior bishops or chaplains. In the second, whereas you affirm us to hold that he was never at Rome, which none did but only one *Ulricus Vellenus*, whose reasons you have not yet satisfied; whereas we only affirm, that he could not come thither so soon, nor tarry there so long, as some of the ancient Fathers affirm: because the testimony of the scripture doth prove the contrary. But whereas you go about to convince us by very sense and sight of the monuments of his seat, and sepulchre, it is a ridiculous matter. For how are you able to prove that Peter sat in such a chair, as is showed at Rome? As for his sepulchre, what mockeries have you made of it, when half his body is at Peter's in Rome, the other half at Paul's: and yet he hath another head at *John Lateran*. And his nether jaw with the beard upon it, is in France at *Poitiers*. At *Triers* many of his bones. At *Genoa* was part of his brain, which was found to be a *Pumice* stone: like as Anthony's arm, was found to be a hart's pissel. And but lately at *Tours* in an *Agate*, which was worshipped as the image of the Virgin Mary, was graven the image of *Venus*, lamenting the death of her minion *Adonis* that was slain with a boar. Within a silver arm was found none other relic, but a bawdy song, written in paper, and a card called the knave of pick-ques, wrapped in many foldings of silk. These and ten thousand such other monuments of saints' relics, will make us never to doubt, but Peter was buried, wheresoever you say his sepulchre is. But touching Peter's

preaching at Rome, although the consent of the most ancient writers which you heap up without need, argueth that there was a common opinion thereof : yet seeing it is not set forth in the scripture, it is no article of our belief. Many false things were reported immediately after the Apostle's death, and of many believed as true. Ireneus saith, that it was affirmed by all the ancients of Asia, that John the Evangelist told them that our Saviour Christ was between forty and fifty years old when he suffered; yea, some of them that had seen other of the apostles, affirmed, that they heard the same of their mouths. *Ireneus lib. 2. cap. 39.* Yet this is proved to be most false, by the story of the gospel. And why might not the report of Peter's preaching at Rome, come first from such a beginning? which being once received, as a story, by all that come after, is taken for a truth: as in matters of histories many fables are. But Peter himself, you say, testifieth that he was at Rome, calling it Babylon, as divers ancient fathers do judge: a simple testimony for the credit of Rome, that Peter writing to the Jews that were dispersed in so many nations, defamed the see of his bishopric, by the name of Babylon. Why should we not rather think, that Peter being the chief Apostle of the circumcision, was then at Babylon in Egypt: the rather, for that Mark which was Bishop of Alexandria, near unto him, was then with him, or else at Babylon in Assyria? Concerning the time of his coming to Rome, the ancient writers do not agree. Eusebius saith it was in the time of Claudius. But by Hierom, who saith he sat there 25 years until the last year of Nero, it must follow, that he came thither the second or third of Claudius. Yet Damasus saith, he came to Rome in the beginning of Nero's empire, and sat there 25 years, whereas Nero reigned but 14 years. He saith also, that his disputation with Simon Magus, was in the presence of Nero the emperor. Eusebius reporteth it under Claudius. Anterius Bishop of Rome, as Nicephorus testifieth, did write, that Peter was translated from Antioch to Rome, and from thence he passed to Alexandria because he might more profit the church there. *Niceph. lib. 14. cap. 39.* Damasus saith, he consecrated Clemens Bishop in his place. Ireneus saith, that Linus was made bishop by Peter and Paul, and after him Anacletus, and the third was Clemens, *lib. 3. cap. 3.* Tertullian saith, Clemens was the first after Peter. So that although most of the ancient writers do make mention of Peter's being at Rome, yet there is great variety of their reports, as in a matter whereof they had no certain ground. Notwithstanding, for the consent of so many writers, and the ancient received opinion, we are content to acknowledge that he was there as a matter of story, not as an article of faith. As for the fond imaginations and devices that you have, how he might be at Rome, and not to be saluted by the Apostle, are to no purpose. Seeing it is manifest, that this epistle needeth not to have been written unto them

if Peter had been so long resident with them. Beside that, when Paul did write his epistles from Rome, he was not there, as appeareth not only by no salutations sent from him, as there are from other: but also, that Paul writeth, that at his first appearance, all men forsook him, which Peter would not have done, *2 Tim. 4. 16:* All men sought their own, when he wrote to the Philippians, *Phil. 2. 21,* where he would have excepted Peter, if he had then been at Rome. Finally, when Paul was brought prisoner to Rome, Peter was not there, for he would have given him entertainment, as the rest of the brethren did, *Acts 28.* Where you say, that we might as well say, that John was never at Epheesus, because Paul saluteth him not: I answer, we use not so to conclude. But we take it to be very unlike, that John was there at that time, when Paul did write. To conclude, the chair of Peter is Peter's doctrine, which we do most gladly embrace. The church of Rome when it was the church of Christ, was unjustly condemned by the Donatists. But now that the pope sitteth in Babylon, as Antichrist, because he reacheth not Peter's doctrine, but in Simon Magus' seat, where all things are to be sold for money, the See of Rome is justly called the chair of pestilence, and not the chair of the Apostles.

16. Your Popish Pax is scarce as good as an apish imitation of the Apostle's kiss: who doth not institute a ceremony of a superstitious toy to be kissed at the mass, but willett that the manner of salutation, which was then usual, to be performed with a kiss, should be reverently used, in holiness and sincerity. And of such a kiss speaketh Origin used in the church, after prayers, not of the Pax at Mass.

17. The common opinion was that Peter the chief of the Apostles did first preach to the Romans, which peradventure was so, peradventure not so. And more like it was not so, because neither Luke in the Acts showeth it, nor the Apostle putteth them in mind of the credit and authority of Peter by whom they were converted.

17. The form of doctrine that was delivered to the Romans, was taken out of the holy scriptures, although there had been never a book of the New Testament written at that time, as you say: yet Eusebius saith that Mark's Gospel was written immediately after their conversion. And about the same time, as Ireneus testifieth, Matthew's Gospel was written, *lib. 3. cap. 1.* Yea by Eusebius, who citeth it out of Clemens, it appears that the Romans, not satisfied with the preaching only without writing, entreated Mark to put it in writing for their perpetual instruction of those things, which when he had performed, Peter approved their devotion, confirmed the writing, and by his authority delivered it to be read in the church. *Euseb. lib. 2. cap. 14.* citing Clemens in *Hyp. 6. Hierom in cat.* Which testimony, if it be true, declareth manifestly, that Mark's Gospel containeth the form of doctrine which Peter delivered, and is that



doctrine whereby Paul willeth them to examine all sects that rise up among them. But if that were a perpetual and general mark which you say he giveth, that men should admit nothing but that which they have learned at their conversion; those nations which were converted by the Arians, should never have become true Catholics. The nations of the Russians, Bulgarians, and others converted by the Grecians since their schism, should never be brought to the unity of the Church of Rome. And such as from Judaism, Paganism, Mahometism, and ignorance, are converted by us to Christianity, might never

become Papists, if your own mark be a good and perpetual rule, as you say it is, being given by the Apostle. But we must first know by whom, and unto what religion, men were first converted into Christianity, and if it be certain they were converted to pure and sincere religion at the first they must always hold it. Otherwise it is no constancy, but devilish obstinacy to continue in any error that is contrary to the holy scriptures, upon any pretence whatsoever.

18. This note agreeth to no heretics that ever were more aptly than to the pope and his clergy.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.

### CHAPTER I.

5. The ordinary way of attaining to faith, is by hearing the word of God preached, yet many have been converted by reading only. The Bereans at their first conversion, joined reading of the scriptures, with the Apostles' preaching. *Acts 17, 11.* Timothy was not only taught by his grandmother and mother, but even from a young child, brought up in the reading of the scriptures. *2 Tim. 3, 15.* And this is the right order of bringing up of children in Christian religion. That they be not only taught by their parents, or masters, and pastors, but also trained up in reading of the scriptures. But if they that have the charge to see children catechised, do neglect their duties, children coming to the years of discretion, being stirred up by God's spirit to read the scriptures, may learn their faith out of the scriptures only, which are able to make them wise unto salvation, as the Apostle teacheth, through faith in Christ Jesus. And a wiser work may be made of only reading the scriptures, than is usually made among Papists, where the children are brought up in ignorance and idolatry, instead of Christian faith and religion.

30. If we have justice, sapience, or sanctity of our own, we may glory in our own, and not in the Lord. But Christ is made to us from God, not only the beginning, but the perfection of wisdom, justice, and sanctification, as he is of redemption. For as rightly you may say, we have redemption in us of our own, as that we have justice, wisdom, holiness. *2 Cor. 5, 21.* The Apostle saith: That we are made the justice of God in Christ, as Christ was made sin for us, which was none otherwise, than by imputing our sins to him, as his justice is imputed to us. And for the gifts of wisdom, justice, holiness, which we have of God's grace, they are in us, but not sufficient to make us wise, holy, just before God, that we may deserve eternal salvation, but of his mere grace, we are washed, justified, and sanctified, in the name of our Lord Jesus, by the working of God's spirit

Chrysostom understandeth Christ to be so the author of wisdom, holiness, and justice, as he is apprehended by faith: That Christ is made unto us wisdom, justice and holiness. "It is not," saith he, "of essence or substance, but of faith. Therefore he saith in another place, that we are made the justice of God in him. *In 1 Cor. hom. 3.* Theodoret upon this text saith: "You are not named by him, or by him, but you are accounted worthy of regeneration in Christ, he hath given you true wisdom, he hath given you remission of sins, and vouchsafed you of justice, and hath made you holy, being delivered from the tyranny of the devil. It is meet therefore to rejoice, not because of men, but of God which hath saved you." Oecumenius saith, "He hath done all these things, that no man should think himself to be anything, neither should glory in himself, but in God." Bede saith upon this text: "Christ the highest God, is the true justice, or else he being the true God is the highest justice, which truly we ought to hunger and thirst for, the same is our justice in this peregrination, and wherewith we hope to be satisfied hereafter, the same is our full justice in eternity." The same also be the words of Augustin. *Ep. 85.* The author of the Commentary in Hieron's name saith, "Whereas Christ is the wisdom of God, yet when one believeth in him, Christ is made wisdom to him." These ancient fathers, join with us in the exposition of this place.

### CHAPTER 2.

11. You quote *Luke 15, 7,* to prove that God giveth extraordinary grace to all Angels and Saints, to understand, not only our vocal prayers, but also our inward repentance and desires, so far as is convenient to our necessity. But first, there is no mention of Saints, in that place, but generally, that there shall be joy in heaven, which is expounded in that tenth verse, to be before the Angels. Secondly, there is no mention of any prayers, vocal or mental, but of the repentance of a sinner, when God, whose only work it is, to

convert a sinner, doth reveal it. Thirdly, neither in that place, nor in any other of the scripture, it can be proved, that God useth the ministry of saints departed, for our necessities. Therefore that place maketh nothing to show how saints hear our prayers.

12. We challenge no particular spirit, but the spirit of adoption, by which every one of us doth cry Abba, father, and is assured of the inheritance of God's children, which Papists understand not, because they are void of it. Yet the whole discourse of the Apostle, proveth that he speaketh thereof, and not only of the revelation of knowledge to the Apostles, by whom, without testimony of the same spirit, Christian men know the same. But if any man hath not the spirit of Christ, saith the Apostle, he is none of his. *Rom. 8, 9.* Augustin so understandeth this place, that it pertaineth to the special revelation of God's spirit in every true Christian that is made just. "We beloved," saith he, "that we may be our Lord's friends: let us know what our Lord doth, for he himself maketh us not only men, but also just men, and not we ourselves. And that we may know this, who maketh but he himself? For we have not received the spirit of this world, but the spirit which is of God, that we may know those things which are given to us of God. *John Tract. 85.*"

14. The spiritual man is he that judgeth and discerneth the truth of spiritual things, by the spirit of Christ bearing witness to his word, and by the same discerneth the true church from the false, the church of God from the congregation of Heretics. For the church hath not a spirit, teaching otherwise than the Holy Ghost hath taught in the Scriptures, but agreeable thereunto, and confirming the doctrine taught in the Scriptures, which Irenæus doth in part declare, in the next chapter, but more at large, cap. 65, of the same book: showing by what means a member of the church which is a spiritual man, attaineth to such knowledge, namely by diligent reading and studying of the Scriptures. "He that is a spiritual man indeed, shall interpret every one of these things that are spoken, whatsoever we have showed, that the Prophets have spoken in the whole course of the Scripture, in what form of our Lord's disposition, it is spoken, and showing the holy body of the work of the Son of God knowing always the same God, and acknowledging always the same word of God, although he be now made manifest unto us, and always acknowledging the same spirit of God, although in these last times he is newly poured forth upon us, and from the creation of the world, to the end, upon mankind itself, by whom, they that believe God and follow his word, obtain that salvation, which is of him. But they which depart from him, and despise his commandments, and by their works do dishonour him that hath made them, and by their opinion do blaspheme him that feedeth them, do heap unto themselves most just judgment. This man therefore trieth all men, he himself is tried of no man, neither

blaspheming his Father, nor making void his dispositions, nor accusing the fathers, nor dishonouring the Prophets, either saying that they are of another God, or again, that the prophecies have been of divers substances. And we say against all Hereties, and first against those that be of Marcion's side, and against those that are like to them, saying, that the prophets are of another God: Read ye more diligently the gospel which is given us by the Apostles, and read more diligently the prophets, and you shall find all the doing, and all the doctrine, and all the passion of our Lord preached or set forth in them." If all the doctrine of Christ be set forth in the Scriptures, and so plainly that it may by diligent reading be found even of Heretics, the spirit of the church teaching nothing but that which is set forth in the Scriptures.

#### CHAPTER 3.

8. Every man shall receive reward according to his labours, but not according to the merit of his labours. Neither doth the Scripture in the original tongues, ever use the words of meriting and deserving, in the case of reward, nor any words that are correlative unto it. For the word *Merces*, or *μισθος*, or reward, hath relation unto God's promise, and not to the merit, worthiness, or desert of the work. And where you say in the end, that we have a frivolous evasion, to say that the reward is not due to our works, but to God's promise, we say not so, but that the reward is due to our works, not in respect of their merit or worthiness, but in respect of God's promise. As if a king should make a proclamation, that every one which laboureth one day in his building, shall receive a thousand pound, we say the reward is here due to the work, but not in respect of the merit, worthiness, or desert of the labour, but in respect of the king's promise. Much more in the reward of eternal life, which is God's free gift, and is infinitely more worth than our labour, yet due to his promise, who also giveth will and ability, to work that whereunto he repayeth reward. But you add, that the sense of merit, is contained in the Scripture, though the word be not, because "the joy of heaven is called retribution, repayment, hire, wages, works, then the works can be none other but the value, desert, price, worth, and merit of the same." First, I answer, that the joy of heaven is never called in Scripture by the slavish name of hire or wages. For *μισθος*, signifieth a reward of mere grace, as well as a hire or wages. And so the Apostle useth it plainly, *Rom. 4. 4.* saying, To him that worketh, *μισθος*, reward, is not reckoned according to grace, but according to debt. Therefore the word reward, doth signify as well that which is given according to grace, as that which is due in respect of desert. And so it is always taken, when the joy of heaven is called a reward, because as the Apostle saith, we are saved of grace, and not of works, *Ephes. 2. 8. 9.* And lest you should fly to your distinction of the first grace and justification, the Apostle saith, we are so saved by

grace, that when we were dead in sin, God hath quickened us with Christ, and raised us up with him, and placed us in heaven with Christ, and in Christ Jesus. Wherein is comprehended grace of final perseverance and glorification. For who shall bring us down, being once placed in heaven with Christ, and in Christ: he may as soon pull Christ out of heaven, *Rom. 10. 6.* Therefore, when the scripture useth that word, reward, for hire and wages due to the work, it speaketh not of the reward of eternal life. As when it saith: The workman is worthy of his hire: he meaneth the preacher is worthy of his maintenance of them to whom he preacheth, which his labour doth thoroughly deserve. In the second place, *Apoc. 22.* where Christ saith, his reward is with him, to render to every man according to his work: the reward is of grace, and not of merit, and so of the like places. But where David saith, *Ps. 17.* The Lord will render to him according to his work, the reward is of grace, and not of merit, and so of the like places. But where David saith, *Ps. 17.* The Lord will render to him according to his justice, he meaneth the justice of his cause against his persecutors. For when he hath to do only with God, he saith: Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for no flesh shall be just in thy sight, *Ps. 142. 2.* The Ecclesiasticus, beside that it is no canonical scripture, is falsely translated or corrupted in your vulgar Latin edition. For according to the Greek it is thus: "Make a place to all kind of mercy, for every man shall find according to his works." In which sentence, there is neither word nor meaning of merit. Finally, the reward due to alms is of the mercy of the rewarder, not of the merit of the alms, *Matt. 6.* The word is alms, which your translation calleth justice. Our Saviour Christ showeth, *Matt. 25. 34.* that the reward for alms is the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven which was prepared for the giver, before the beginning of the world: Therefore it is not the hire or wages due to the merit of alms, but a reward of the free grace and election of God, prepared and promised to the givers of alms. So there is no place in the scriptures, whereupon to ground your heretical doctrine, of the value, merit, or worthiness of works to deserve the joys of heaven.

12. The text speaketh not of any preaching, or other work that is meritorious.

12. The building of precious matter upon the foundation, which the Apostle speaketh of, is manifestly to be understood of pure doctrine sincerely delivered. The building of combustible matter is vain affectation of eloquence, and other like trifling matter, not taking away the foundation, but handling it unworthily. *Hesych. lib. 1. cap. 1.* But admitting your interpretation, the Apostle speaketh not of more or less punishment or purgation, at the day of our death. And yet if that also were granted, he Apostle's words will allow no purging by penance, or other means of the church. For he saith, the fire shall try every man's work, he saith not, the

fire shall purge every man. So that if this fire here should signify purgatory, as Augustin saith expressly, it cannot, and if every man should follow his work, no man should escape purgatory.

13. The true text is, the day, and not the day of our Lord, and so doth Augustin read, so the sense is: Time will declare, for God hath appointed a time to examine, as it were by fire, every man's doctrine, as Ambrose doth expound it. But of purgatory fire after this life, here is no mention.

13. That word, our Lord, is not of the Greek text, nor in all copies of your vulgar Latin, but in Plantin's print, is marked with a note of superfluity. Secondly the text speaketh not one word of purging, but of trying, and that not of the persons, but of the works. And where you say the Apostle's precise specifying of fire, declareth a place of justice after this life, it is a vain and unlearned collection. For fire is here taken allegorically, as all the rest of the words, foundation, gold, silver, &c. wood, hay, stubble, &c. The text that you quote for the day of our Lord, pertain not to this place: where the day of the Lord is not named, but generally, a day. And yet in all those places, the day of the Lord, or the day of Christ, signifieth the day of judgment, when Christ shall come to judge the quick and the dead, and not any particular judgment before that day. Finally, let the article be taken demonstratively, as sometimes it is, yet you can make none other day of it, but domesday.

16. To the authority of Augustin I oppose his own judgment upon better advice and examination of the text. "The fire whereof the Apostle speaketh in this place, must be understood to be such, that both do pass through it, that is, both he which buildeth upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones: and he which buildeth wood, hay, stubble. For when he had said this, he added, the fire shall try every man's work of what quality it is. If any man's work shall remain which he hath built upon the foundation, he shall receive reward: if any man's work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be safe, yet so as it were by fire. Therefore the fire shall try not the work of one of them, but of them both. And the fire truly is the temptation of tribulation, of which in another place it is written plainly, the furnace doth prove the potter's vessels, and temptation of tribulation of just men. This fire doth the same in this life, which the Apostle said," &c. *Enchir. ad Laurent. cap. 68.* And as concerning purgatory, which opinion in his days began to be hearkened unto, he doubteth of it, saying, "It is not incredible, that some such thing also is done after this life, and it may be inquired of whether it be so: and either be found or be hidden still, that some faithful men are saved by a certain purging fire, so much sooner or later, by how much they have loved corruptible goods more or less. *Ibid. et de Dulc. Quæst. 9. l.* But afterward writing against the Pelagians, he utterly denieth any third place beside heaven and hell. "The

faith of the Catholics upon divine authority hath believed the first place to be the kingdom of heaven, from whence, as I said, he that is not baptized, is excepted. The second place, hell, where every one that falleth from Christ, or is a stranger from Christ, shall find eternal punishment. The third place we are utterly ignorant of, yea and we find in the Holy Scriptures, that there is none." *Cont. Pelag. hypogn. lib. 5.* Likewise he denieth all third or middle place, *de verbis Apost. Ser. 14.*

Ambrose upon this text, understanding it of doctrine that is to be tried by fire, saith, that he whose evil doctrine shall perish, shall suffer the pains of fire, that being purged by fire he may be purged. But expounding what he meaneth by the pains of fire, he saith: "For he must always be ashamed, which seeth that he hath defended falsehood instead of truth;" which cannot be understood of Popish purgatory, but of other judgments of God in this life, wherein he shall be ashamed when he seeth his error convinced. Thereupon also, *Ser. 20, in Ps. 1. 18.* he saith, after he hath cited this text, "Knowing therefore that there be many judgments, let us examine all our works, for a just man the loss is grievous, the burning of any work is grievous." So he understandeth the trial of all God's judgments in this life, and not purgatory after this life. For he praiseth the death of all the faithful. "Because it maketh not their state worse, but such as shall find in every one, such it reserveth unto the judgment to come, and cherisheth them in quiet rest." *De bono mortis cap. 4.* Likewise in *Ps. 40.* he saith, "The Prophet hath well added, in the earth, for except he be here cleansed, he cannot be clean there." You see therefore by these testimonies, that all the faithful are in rest after this life, and can have no purging after they are gone from hence. Therefore he cannot be understood of Popish purgatory where there is so little rest, and so great necessity of purging pretended. Hierom hath nothing that soundeth for purgatory, whose words are these: "If he whose work is burnt and lost and hath sustained loss of his labour, shall lose indeed the reward of his labour, but shall himself be saved yet not without trial of fire, therefore he whose work hath remained, which he hath built upon, shall be saved without trial of fire, so verily there shall be some diversity between salvation and salvation." Here is trial by fire according to the text, but no purging by fire after this life. Nay, that this trial is by temptation in this life, he showeth in the same book: "In evil works and sins our seeds are the incentives and perfection of the devil. For when he shall see us build upon the foundation of Christ, hay, wood, stubble, then he putteth fire to it. Let us therefore build gold, silver, precious stones, and he shall not be bold to tempt us." *Fulgent. de rem. peccato. lib. 2. cap. 8.*

In the days of Gregory which was six hundred years after Christ, the opinion of purgatory had gotten ground some in the Latin Church, though it was never received in the

Greek Church, yet in the place by you quoted, he granteth it, but for very small offences. For after he had cited certain testimonies of Scripture he addeth. "Of which sentences it is manifest, that such as every man departeth hence, such he is presented in judgment, but yet of certain light faults it is to be deemed, that the purging fire is before the judgment. Because the truth saith, that if any man speak blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him in this world, nor in the world to come. In which sentence it is given to be understood, that some faults may be released in this world, some in the world to come. For that which is denied of one consequent, understanding is open, that it is granted of some. But yet, as is said before, that must be thought to be possible to be done, of little, and of the least sins. As daily idle talk, immoderate laughter, or the sin of household care, which is scarce done without fault, even of them which know how to decline from fault, or the error of ignorance in no weighty matters, all which do weigh down after death, if they be not released to men while they continue in this life. For when Paul saith that Christ is the foundation, and addeth if any man shall build upon it, &c. although this may be understood of the fire of tribulation left to us in this life, yet if any man take it of the fire of purgation that shall be, we must carefully consider that he said: that man may be saved by fire, not which buildeth upon this foundation, iron, brass, or lead, that is the greater sins, and therefore harder, and which then are insoluble, but wood, hay, stubble, that is, small and most light sins, which the fire may easily consume." If Gregory's opinion had continued, or yet might be admitted among the Papists, purgatory would not be very gainful unto them. Yet he confesseth also that this place may be otherwise understood than of purgatory, which is contrary to your note. *In Psalm. 3. pœnit.* he acknowledgeth grievous purgatory flames, but he groundeth them not on this text. Remigius, who lived 200 years after Gregory, understandeth this fire to be God himself, *Ps. 5.* Origen allegorizing of the text after his manner, yet speaketh nothing of Popish purgatory. For in the former place he saith: "As the furnace trieth gold, so temptation doth just men: therefore all men must come to the fire, they must come to the melting pot." This you understand of purgatory, whither you confess that all do not come. In the second place nothing can be concluded of purgatory, but that there be divers kinds of sins, so there be divers qualities of punishments, all which the faithful man may avoid. But that there was no purgatory pain known in his time he testifieth in these words: "Men of former time did celebrate the day of birth, as they which loved this life only, and hoped not for another after this. But now we do not celebrate the day of nativity, seeing it is the entrance into sorrows and temptations, but we celebrate the day of death, as that which is the putting away of all sorrows, and the es-

caping of all temptations: we celebrate the day of death, because they do not die which seem to die. Therefore we keep memories of the Saints, and of our parents, or of our friends dying in the faith, we hold a memory devoutly, as well rejoicing of their refreshing, as also praying for a godly consummation in the faith of ourselves. So therefore we do not celebrate the day of nativity, because they that die shall live forever. And thus we celebrate it, we call together the devout people with the priests, the faithful with the clergy. Moreover we invite the poor and needy, and feed the fatherless and widows, that our festivity may be made in remembrance of the rest, which is unto the souls departed, whose memory we celebrate, and may be unto us a savour of sweetness in the sight of the eternal God." Here you see that Origen acknowledged the souls of all the faithful departed to be in rest, in refreshing, and discharging of all sorrows, therefore not in purgatory.

## CHAPTER 4.

4. Paul was most sure of God's grace, and his justification thereby through faith. *Rom. 8. 30.* But he doth acknowledge that he is not justified by his faithful service and labour in the Gospel, therefore no man can be justified by his works done of grace, in as great perfection as can be done of mortal men, which yet is far unable to stand before the justice of God.

15. That Augustin whom you speak of was no Apostle of Christ but of Gregory, neither did he beget the nation of the Englishmen to Christ by the pure Gospel, as Paul did the Corinthians, but with mixture of men's traditions. And that Christian religion which he found in the Britons, he laboured to corrupt with Romish inventions.

## CHAPTER 5.

3. Paul sendeth no *mandatum*, but useth his apostolic power in decreeing the incestuous person to be excommunicate, and requiring the same to be executed by the Church.

4. The authority of excommunication pertaineth to the whole church, although the judgment and execution thereof is to be referred to the governors of the church which exercise that authority as in the name of Christ, so in the name of the whole church whereof they are appointed governors, to avoid confusion.

5. Without such bodily tormenting by the devil, we are sufficiently assured, that whosoever is divided from the church of Christ, is in the power of Satan. That Christ did excommunicate Judas we find not in the scripture, nor that Peter did excommunicate Ananias and Sapphira. The punishment indeed of excommunication is exceeding great, when it is justly executed by the ministers of the true church. But the banning of heretics is no more to be feared, than their blessing is to be desired. And if they also that be true members of the church will take upon

them to excommunicate such as be not under their jurisdiction, their excommunication is not to be regarded. As when Victor Bishop of Rome took upon him to denounce all the churches of Asia to be excommunicate, which did not keep the feast of Easter as the church of Rome did. The churches of Asia did justly despise his unjust censure. And the bishops of Asia, saith Eusebius, did countermand him against his usurped excommunication, willing him to be better affected to peace and unity with his brethren. Beside this, many godly bishops by their letters did sharply rebuke him for his doing, yea some of them that joined with him in the use of the ceremony: as Irenaeus bishop of Lyons in the name of the brethren of France. *Hist. lib. 5. c. 25.*

8. Augustin referreth this fasting not to the celebration of Easter, nor to the receiving of the communion, whereunto we ought to be prepared with all sincerity, but to our whole life. "Christ our Passover," saith he, "is slain or offered, that they might learn by example of so great humility, to purge out the old leaven, that is what pride soever had remained in them of the old man. Therefore let us keep holyday, not for one day only, but for our whole life, not in the old leaven, nor in the leaven of malice and malignity, but in the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." *Cont. ep. Parm. lib. 3. c. 2.*

11. Nay rather a manifest example that our translator meaneth that an idolater and worshipper of images, is all one. As in the proper sense of the word there is no difference. Therefore another translation useth the term idolaters in both places, the third hath a worshipper of idols in the latter place.

11. I know not any Lutherans that hold that every man straight after he hath committed any deadly sin is excommunicated. But among Papists there is for some offences excommunication, *ipso facto*, and *de jure*, and a canon, without any sentence or denunciation. *Extra. de sent. Excom. cum desideres.* And further I find in your canon law, this title. "The life and not the sentence doth cast any man out of the church, or receiveth them unto it." Which is thus expounded, "When any man goeth out from the truth, from the fear of God, from faith, from charity, he goeth out of the camp of the church although he be not cast out by the voice of the bishop. As on the contrary side, some is cast out by no right judgment, but if he went not out before, that is, if he did not that whereby he deserved to go out, he is nothing hurt. For sometimes, he that is cast out, is within, and he that is without, seemeth to be kept within, *Decret. causa. 25. qu. 3. c. Cum aliquis, &c.* By this judge whether some Lutherans be justly charged with that which is affirmed by many Papists, as the canon law is.

## CHAPTER 6.

9. All worshipping of images is idolatry, though there be spiritual idolatry which is not worshipping of images.

## CHAPTER 7.

2. The Apostles words are general, that to avoid fornication, every man and woman ought to live chastely in holy matrimony. Hierom indeed more injurious to matrimony, than a Catholic doctor ought to have been, saith thus: "He said not, let every man marry a wife, to avoid fornication: for then by this excuse he should have let loose the bridle to lust, that as often as the wife dieth, so often another wife must be married, that we do not commit fornication: but let every man have his own wife." You see plainly, if Hierom's authority be good in this place, it is good to condemn second or third marriages, after a man's wife be dead, which is little better than heresy, and therefore Hierom revoked his opinion therein. Chrysostom saith nothing to restrain the words only to married men, but saith, that this saying: "It is good for a man," &c., is not restrained to priests, but extendeth to all men. "For he would not universally have admonished only priests, if he had written these things for them, but have said, it is good for a teacher not to touch a woman: but now he hath spoken universally, when he saith, it is good for a man. Therefore this is not said only to a priest. And again, art thou loose from a wife, seek not a wife: he saith not, thou priest or teacher, but generally, and so throughout all the epistles, his speech goeth generally: but when he saith, for fornication let every man have his wife, by the very cause of indulgence, he bringeth into continency.

5. Hierom was an immoderate extoller of virginity, to the reproach and dishonour of matrimony, as appeareth by his sayings in the same book. "If it be a good thing not to touch a woman," *ergo*, "it is an evil thing to touch a woman: for nothing is contrary to good but evil." This was Hierom's logic in his heat against Jovinian. To touch a woman and not to touch a woman, be contraries, which every child knoweth to be otherwise. Again he saith in depraving the goodness of matrimony, "I pray you what good thing is that which forbideth to pray? which permiteth not the body of Christ to be received. So long as I fulfil the duty of a husband, I fulfil not the office of a Christian. The same Apostle commandeth in another place, that we should pray always. If we must always pray, *ergo*, we must never serve marriage: for so often as I render debt to my wife I cannot pray." I omit what he writeth against second and third marriages, which afterward he was driven to retract. You see, if we must stand to his authority, all men must abstain from marriage, as from an evil thing: as that forbideth to pray or to communicate with the Lord's body: as in doing the duty whereof, they cannot do the duty of Christian men. And seeing that married men also ought always to pray, even married men must never yield to the duty of marriage, which causeth that they cannot pray. These opinions are far worse than

that Jovinian held, of the equal worthiness of virginity with marriage. Thereof leaving his authority, let us examine his reason. If the layman cannot pray unless he abstain from his wife, then the priest must always abstain from marriage. This antecedent is false, for a layman may not only pray, but ought to pray always, as Hierom also confesseth, though he do not always abstain from his wife. Paul willeth married men not to defraud one another, except it be for a time with consent, that they may give themselves to fasting and prayer, which kind of prayer with fasting, is not always necessary, but sometimes convenient, upon some special occasion, that requireth most fervent prayers, with humiliation by fasting, and abstinence from all worldly delights: and yet in such occasion, consent is necessary for abstinence from matrimonial company, as it is plain by the text. Yet it is so far off, that the layman cannot pray, unless he abstain from his wife, that oftentimes he prayeth more quietly and purely, than he that hath no wife, or abstaineth from her, if he hath not dominion over bodily lust. Wherefore matrimony shall no more hinder the priest to offer sacrifice and prayer, than it doth the layman, who is bound always to offer sacrifice and prayers as much as the priest. And therefore we must oppose against Hierom's authority, the authority of Paphnutius, and the whole Council of Nice that condescended unto his reason, alleging that the company of priests and deacons, as well as of all other Christian men with their lawful wives, is chastity. *Socrates, lib. 1, cap. 11.*

5. These words do not restrain the universality of the Apostle's former words, seeing avoiding of fornication is the same cause in them that are unmarried to take wives, and in them that are married, to use the company of their wives.

5. We have none other estimation of the matrimonial act, than the Apostle doth teach. And it may well be thought, that many of our ministers use more continency in lawful marriage, than Popish priests do that are not lawfully married, yet use other wicked means to satisfy their unlawful lusts, as the world knew too well, when they lived at ease amongst us. That it is lawful for a Bishop to be married, the authority of the Scripture is more to be regarded than of any mortal man. Paul, as even Hierom confesseth, describeth a Bishop, the husband of one wife, and having children in all chastity, as Samuel, who was brought up in the tabernacle, and as many priests in his time were married. *cont. Jovin. lib. 1.* That you cite for the contrary out of Augustin, *lib. quest.* &c. is neither of Augustin's, neither of any learned man's writing, but of a late babbler, as his barbarous phrases do declare in many places also, confuting that which Augustin doth earnestly defend, as in the censure of Erasmus before that treatise, every man may see. Ambrose for such purity as is required of the minister saith, "Of chastity what should I speak,

when one only marriage is permitted, and not repeated? Even in marriage itself, there is a law not to marry again, nor to have the conjunction of a second wife." You see therefore, that marriage with one wife in his time was counted chastity, and lawful for a minister of the church: yea he addeth moreover, that the second wife was not forbidden as a fault, but as against a law, which was, that he which had one wife before baptism, and another after, was not admitted into the ministry. "In the marriage there is no fault but a law." Finally by the counsel of Gangra, "If any man make difference of a married priest, as though through occasion of his marriage he ought not to offer, and therefore doth refrain himself from his oblation, he is accursed, *Cap. 4.*

7. It cannot be called a proper gift, if every one that labour for it, may have it. Our Saviour Christ teacheth, that all men cannot take it, but let him, saith he, that can take it, take it and use it, *Matt. 19. 11, 12.* They that bind themselves by a rash and unadvised vow, before they were sure of the gift, have no promise to be heard in their prayer for continency. But where there is such necessity, as they neither are cause of themselves, nor can otherwise avoid, as in long or perpetual sickness, it is certain, that God will give the gift, being sought for by such means as it is convenient, because he hath promised all things necessary for our salvation, as for imprisonment, banishment, war, &c. I do not take to be such necessity, but the husband is bound to follow his wife in them, and the wife her husband. As for absence by lawful divorce, which is only for fornication, doth not restrain matrimony, seeing that case is excepted by our Saviour Christ, and there is no reason but that the exception should extend as well to the second marriage, as to the divorce. There is no cause therefore to detest the Protestants' doctrine, when they say they have not the gift of continency, but rather to detest both the doctrine and the doings of the Papists, which say they have the gift, and teach that all men may have it if they will, and yet lead a filthy and abominable life out of marriage. Whether we use prayer and fasting, to try whether it will please God to give that gift, it is unknown to you. Some I am sure have used it, and many among us, both in the ministry, and out of it, have the gift of continency, though they make no rash vows of it, nor despise them that have it not. How well you keep your vows that live abroad, we know not, but your forefathers the Popish Clergy, that lived here among us, we know, that as few of them lived chastely, as of us do live out of marriage continently.

9. He speaketh generally, and therefore his precept extendeth also to them that have made rash vows of continency, if they do not contain: and if they may contain if they list, the fault of many Popish Priests is the greater, that they do not contain. Augustin *de bono viduitatis*, although he count it a sin to forsake continency in them that have vowed it, yet

he condemneth not the marriage of such as have vowed. "Not that the marriage itself, even of such persons, is judged to be condemned, *cap. 9.* and in the next chapter he proveth, that such marriages are not to be dissolved: for though he condemn the breaking of that vow to be evil, yet he affirmeth the marriage to be good. Ambrose in the place quoted, although he affirmeth, that such as have vowed ought not to marry, yet he counteth it more intolerable for such to commit fornication. Epiphanius testifieth what the judgment of the Church was in his time. *Contra apostolicos, Har. 61.* "It is better to have one sin, and not many. It is better for him that is fallen from his course, openly to take unto him a wife according to the law, and to repent a long time from his virginity, and so to be brought again unto the church, as he that hath wrought evil, as he that is fallen and broken, and hath need to be bound up, and not to be daily wounded with secret darts of that improbity, which is offered to him by the devil: so knoweth the church to preach. These are the medicines of healing," &c. Contrary to this doctrine, some Papists have preached, that it is less sin for a vowed Priest to keep many concubines, than to marry a wife: as you affirm in the next note.

9. By Epiphanius' judgment, it is better for vowed persons to marry, than to burn: which is not only to be tempted, as you falsely slander us to think, but to be so continually inflamed with lust, that the will doth consent, and desire quenching, which cannot be avoided in them that have not the gift of continency, whether they be vowed, or free from vows. That you affirm the marriage of vowed Priests to be but pretended, and to be the worst sort of incontinency, and fornication, and burning, you are contrary to Augustin *de bono viduitatis, cap. 9.* who saith, "That the marriage even of such is not to be condemned. Such are condemned, not because they have entered into the faith of marriage afterward, but because they have made void the first faith of continency, which thing that the Apostle might briefly insinuate, he would not say, that those widows have damnation which marry after the purpose of greater holiness, not because they are not condemned, but lest the marriage itself in them might be thought to be condemned." And in the 10th chapter he saith, "Therefore they which say, that the marriage of such is no marriage, but rather adulteries, seem to me, not to consider thoroughly and diligently what they say: for a similitude of truth doth deceive them. There cometh to pass by this inconsiderate opinion, whereby they think that the marriage of women that are fallen from their holy purpose, if they be married, to be no marriage, small evil, that wives are separated from their husbands, as though they were adulteresses, and not wives. And when they will restore them to continency after they be separated, they make their husbands adulterers, when they marry other women, while their own wives are alive. Wherefore I cannot say,

that if women that are fallen from a better purpose do marry, that they are no marriages but adulteries. But plainly I would not doubt to say, that their fallings and ruins, from more holy chastity, which is vowed unto God, are worse than adulteries.

You see therefore by his hard judgment, that the marriage is true and not pretended, such as cannot be dissolved, though the breach of the vow be a grievous sin, and more grievous than adultery.

Epiphanius also is clean contrary to your filthy censure against marrying, as is showed before: and further he saith against those apostolic Heretics, that professed continency and kept it not, as many Popish priests do and have done. "He that hath corrupted virginity, is rejected out of that course, and deprived of crown and reward: but yet judgment is better than condemnation. For they that commit fornication privily, lest they should be ashamed before men, and exercise filthy lust under show of solitariness and continency, have not confession before men, but with God, which knoweth all secrets, and reproveth all flesh at his coming, as every man hath sinned. Therefore it is better to have one sin, and not many," &c. And in the end concludeth: "These be the medicines of healing, these be the spices for confection of the ointment, this is the preparation of the holy oil in the law, this is good faith giving smell of sweet odours, binding indeed the champion to his battle, and preaching unto him to continue his course that he may be crowned. This is God's merchandise, gathering all men to his royal ordinance, both purple out of the sea, and wool from the sheep, and flax from the earth, and fine linen, and silk, and skins died red, and the precious Emerald, and the pearl, and the agate, stones differing in colours, but equal in price: but yet not rejecting gold, and silver, wood that rotteth not, brass and iron, no nor goats' hair. And this was then the tabernacle, but now the building of the tabernacle is established in God, and the foundation in truth. And let all heresy cease, which is raised up against the truth, or rather which chaseth itself from the truth." Thus it is manifest by the judgment of the church in Epiphanius' time, that that was accounted heresy which you deliver for wholesome doctrine.

11. It is manifest, that the Apostle speaketh of such departings as were not lawful divorces, and so doth Ambrose understand the place saying, "You must understand except this departure be for the cause of fornications. Because it is lawful for the husband to marry a wife, if he have put away his wife offending." In which place although he thinketh the woman have not the like right, if she forsake her husband for adultery, yet indeed the case is all one. Chrysostom understandeth the text of such departings as are not for the cause of fornication, and so doth Theodoret.

12. The Apostles had not particular precepts for every case, but they had general rules in Christ's doctrine, which they were bound

to follow in their precepts and counsels.

14. It is an impudent slander, that the Calvinists hold Christian men's children to be so holy from their mother's womb, that they need not baptism. For Calvin clean contrariwise doth argue against the Anabaptists upon Paul's words: 'They are holy, ergo, they are to be baptized. And the sacrament is not to be denied unto them that are therefore called holy, because they are comprehended in God's covenant: where he saith, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed after thee. *Gen. 17. 7.*

28. If a virgin, or any other that is vowed marry, she sinneth not in marriage, as Augustin saith, *De bono vid. cap. 9. 10.* but in breaking her vow. So mean the rest of the doctors; but if she be not able to contain, then that hath place which I cited before out of Epiphanius, *Hæres. 61.* And that which Hierom writeth *ad Demetr.* "The name of certain women, which behave not themselves well, doth defame the holy purpose of virgins, and the glory of the heavenly and angelic family: to whom it must be said openly, that either they should marry, if they cannot contain, or contain if they will not marry."

29. Augustin's words, if they were granted to be as true as the gospel, yet prove not that virginity is counselled as more meritorious.

32. Hereof it followeth not, that marriage which God hath permitted to all ministers of the church, should be forbidden them by the Popish Church, as clogs and profanation of sacred orders. This is not with the Apostle to counsel virginity as convenient, but to command it as necessary, and to forbid marriage as profane, which is the doctrine of devils, and a right badge of the Antichristian apostacy. *1 Tim. 4.*

#### CHAPTER 8.

7. Your popish fasts, which are abstinence from flesh as accursed, and for religion's sake, we condemn as antichristian apostacy, by the plain testimony of the Apostle, *1 Tim. 4.* and not as meat offered to idols, although there is in your superstitious fasting, that which in some cases hath resemblance to the Apostle's words in this place.

10. Thanks be to God, our temples are purged from popish idols, wherewith by you they were stuffed. Our table is the Lord's table, and our communion his holy Supper, according to his own institution. And therefore your blasphemous railing is meet for your own idol service and sacrifice, and sacrilege which hath no word of holy Scripture to warrant it, but hath been lately devised, to overthrow the only and singular sacrifice of Christ's death, which is the price of our full redemption.

#### CHAPTER 9.

1. Paul abstained not to live by the Gospel, because it was more meritorious, but to avoid offence, and to declare that he did it freely, and not as a hireling.

1. The Protestants do not charge the fathers, for using of any such speech of the Saints and Sacraments as do signify no more,



but that they be appointed ministers and instruments of God's working to our benefit.

5. Our translation is according to the plain words and meaning of the Apostle. For first, the word is not a woman sister, but a sister a wife, for no man would say, a sister a woman, because the word sister implieth a woman. Therefore of necessity, the latter word signifieth a wife specially, and not a sister generally. Chrysostom whom you cite impudently, saith never a word of the matter in controversy, only rehearsing the words of the text. Theodoret saith: "Some do interpret it so that, as certain faithful women followed our Lord, ministering necessary food to his disciples, so some showing more fervent faith, followed some of the Apostles, depending of their doctrine, and helping their divine preaching." This interpretation he doth neither allow, nor disallow, and therefore you say falsely, that he among the rest doth take it so. But Occumenius, indeed, doth so take it. Augustin although he allow this interpretation, yet he showeth that some did interpret the word a wife, and rehearsing the text he saith, not as your vulgar Latin hath a woman a sister, but a sister a woman, which if he had observed, he had not been so lightly deceived, to reprehend the true interpretation of them that did translate it a sister a wife. Ambrose leaveth out the word sister, and readeth *mulieres*, in the plural number, women. By which corrupt reading he might more easily be deceived in the true meaning. As Hierom, who also readeth, *mulieres*, being ready to take any thing that soundeth never so little against marriage. And yet against Helvidius he citeth this text, *Nunquid non habemus potestatem uxores circumducendi sicut et ceteri apostoli?* Add hereunto, that Tertullian to defend his heresy of *Monogamy*, doth so take it, against the Catholic doctors of his time. And yet he confesseth according to this text, *Exhort. ad cast. Licebat et Apostolis nubere et uxores circumducere. Licebat et de evangelis vivere.* But Clemens Alexandrinus, before him, by this text, doth prove that the Apostles had wives, and did lead them about, in these words. "Do they also reject the Apostles? For Peter and Philip did beget children, Philip also did give his daughters in marriage, and Paul feareth not in a certain Epistle, to speak to his yoke-fellow, which he did not lead about with him, because he had no need of great service. Therefore he saith in a certain Epistle: Have we not power to lead about a sister a wife, as the rest of the Apostles? But they truly as it was meet, because they could not spare their Ministry, attending to preaching, led them not about as wives, but as sisters, which should minister together with them among the women, which kept the houses, by whom also without any reprehension or evil suspicion, the doctrine of our Lord might enter into the closet of women." *Strom. lib. 3.* And who would not think it agreeable to reason, that the Apostles which had wives, would not lead them about, rather

than strange women, at leastwise in the company of strange women?

Again, the word of leading about, declareth that they were their wives that were led about, for the Apostles had no authority to lead other women about with them. We read that certain women did follow our Saviour Christ, we read not that he did lead them about. The word signifying the authority of the husband over his wife, or of the master over his maid. Finally, the scope of the text, is against the exposition of rich women, which should minister of their substance to the Apostles' necessity, for by them the Church should not have been charged, but their dutiful charge relieved. Whereas by the Apostles' wives that were poor as their husbands, the church was charged. But it is a pithy reason that is contained in that your question, "What should he talk of burdening the Corinthians with finding his wife, when himself clearly saith, he was single?" As though he might not declare what was lawful for him to do, namely, to have a wife as well as other Apostles, and to charge the Church with finding of her, although he meant not to use that liberty. Our interpretation therefore is not so heretical as yours in the next verse is ridiculous, "who playeth the soldier," as though to go a warfare were a play.

13. This was no corruption of the translators, but a fault of the printers. For the translator, as in the Bible printed in King Henry's time, is to be seen, did say altars, not temple. And why should we not suffer the Jewish altar to stand, as well in this place, as in an hundred places of the Bible beside. Therefore it is a vain and ridiculous slander to say, we corrupted the text, because Popish altars were in digging down when the Bible was in printing.

16. Augustin hath no such words as you feign, neither doth he name a reward of supererogation, but he saith, "Paul did bestow more than was necessary for him to do, when he warred at his own finding, according to the saying of the Samaritan to the Inn keeper, whatsoever thou shalt bestow more." But that Paul's abstinence of his liberty was his duty in this case, though generally he might use that liberty, his own words are manifest, when he showeth. He abstained that he should give no offence, which was necessary for him to avoid, that he should not abuse his power in the gospel. Therefore this refraining of his liberty in this case, was of duty and not of supererogation, more than duty. And of supererogation of more than we have received grounded upon the words of the Samaritan, Augustin saith in his confessions to God: "There is given more to thee, that thou mayest be a debtor, and who hath any thing, which is not thy own." By which he showeth that God is not properly brought in debt by any supererogation, when no man hath any thing but that which is God's own, and therefore is due to him.

23 This place doth rather prove, that the Apostle did willingly abstain from using his

liberty, because it was his duty in this case, for otherwise he could have no part of the gospel. Although you slander the Protestants, "that they will not have men work well in respect of reward at God's hand," for they would have men work well, not only in respect of reward, but also for fear of punishment, due to them that work not well, yet not only for these respects, nor chiefly, but principally of loving obedience, and duty as becometh children to the glory of God their father, and not only for reward, as hirelings, nor only for fear, as slaves.

27. This impudent rotten slander cometh so often, that it would make a man cast his gorge, to hear it so loathsomely repeated. We cry out as loud as we can: that faith which only justifieth, is not alone, but accompanied with good works, is not idle, but worketh by love. But that the "goal of everlasting glory, is merited by chastising the body," &c. the Apostle doth not teach it is a reward infinitely above the value of all men's works, therefore given of grace, not deserved of merit. Another impudent slander it is, to say, that we condemn voluntary chastising of the body to such end, and in such manner, as the Apostle speaketh, as superfluous and superstitious. As though the Apostle spake, of the counterfeit chastising of Popish hypocrites to merit, or satisfy God's justice by them, which we condemn as injurious to Christ's death, and not watching to prayer, fasting, labouring in good exercises to subdue the lusts of the flesh, and to serve God in the gospel.

27. Paul did not presume of the end, without the means and ways by which God bringeth us unto it. Yet did he not doubt of his salvation, which had been to doubt of God's promises. Our security of salvation is no vain presumption, but an assurance upon the word of God, that through faith in God, and walking in the way that God hath appointed us, we shall undoubtedly come to the end of eternal life.

#### CHAPTER 10.

3. The Red Sea, the Cloud, and Manna, were not only figures of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but baptism indeed, and the sacramental communication of the body and blood of Christ, indeed. Therefore the Apostle saith, they were all baptized, they drank of the spiritual rock, which was Christ. And the argument of the Apostle were of no force to prove his purpose, if the Israelites were not in the sacraments equal unto us, both in signs, and in the things signified. Cyprian *Ep.* 76. saith, "That the Sea was the Sacrament of Baptism, the Apostle declareth, saying: I would not," &c. Where you say it is an impudent forgery of the Calvinists, to write, that the Jews received no less the truth and substance of Christ and his benefits in their Sacraments, than we do in ours, and that they and we eat and drink of the self-same meat and drink, it is impudent malice against the truth, to deny it: which the Apostle doth so plainly affirm. For what do we eat and drink

but Christ? so did they: for the Apostle saith, they drank of the spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ. But you have a shift to say, they among themselves did feed of one bread, and drink of one rock, which was a figure of Christ: that is true, and so do we, but they did eat the same spiritual meat, and drink the same spiritual cup that we do. And so saith Augustin expressly, "The same spiritual meat," saith the Apostle, "what meaneth the same? but the same which we do eat." Again, "They did eat the same spiritual meat," saith he. "It had sufficed to have said, they did eat a spiritual meat, but he saith the same, I cannot find how I should understand the same, but the same that we do eat?" *De utilitate Pœnitent. Cap.* 1. Why do you not say, it is an impudent forgery of Augustin so to write? yet he is bold to write it more at large, *cap.* 2. of the same book. "Whosoever in Manna understood Christ, did eat the same spiritual meat that we do. But whosoever sought only to fill their bellies of Manna, which were the fathers of the unfaithful, they have eaten and are dead: so also the same drink, for the rock was Christ. Therefore they drank the same drink that we do, but spiritual drink, that is, which was received by faith, not which was drawn in with the body." The same judgment he declareth in *Psal.* 77. in *Joan. Tract.* 26. and in many other places of his works, by which the gross manner of eating of the natural body of Christ, defended by the Papists, is utterly overthrown: and consequently, the sacrifice for which you fight so stoutly in this chapter, is declared to be none such as you would have it, but a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

12. Seeing you cite Augustin at large, we must answer you at large, that Augustin hath no such meaning against the certainty of our final perseverance, which he proveth plentifully in his book *De bono perseverantia.*

15. The Apostle speaketh not one word of the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, but showeth, that it is the nature of all ceremonies, to declare them that use them, to be partakers of that Religion, whereof they be ceremonies: as the Sacrifices of the Jews, the Sacraments of christians, and the execrable Sacrifices and ceremonies of the Gentiles, declared the several users of them to be partakers of these several Religions. Therefore the christians, which were consecrated to Christ, ought to have nothing to do with the wicked ceremonies of the Gentiles, whereby they should partake with devils, and not with Christ. Because no man can be partaker of Christ, that is partaker of the devils. The fathers in their admonition, The faithful know, &c. speak not of the Sacrifice of the Mass, but of the mystery of the Lord's Supper, which they called a Sacrifice, because therein is offered a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving not of the natural body of Christ. "This is," saith Augustin, "the sacrifice of the christians, we being many are one body in Christ: which

thing also in the Sacrament of the Altar, known unto the faithful, the church doth frequent, where it is showed unto her, that in that oblation which she offereth, she herself is offered." *De Civit. lib. 10. cap. 6.* In the same chapter he treateth of spiritual sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving, which are the works of mercy and mortification of our bodies, unto which he referreth this sacrifice of the christians, wherein the church is offered. In the 20th chapter of the same book, he writeth, speaking of the sacrifice of Christ's death and of the Sacrament thereof. "By this he himself is the Priest that offereth, and he himself is the oblation. A sacrament of which thing he would have the daily sacrifice of the church to be, seeing he is the head of his own body, and she is the body of her own head, as well she by him, as he by her, being accustomed to be offered." Here we see, the sacrifice of the church is a sacrament of the death of Christ, in which Christ is none otherwise offered by the church, than the church is offered by Christ, that is, spiritually and figuratively, in praise and thanksgiving, not properly or propitiatorily. So saith Chrysostom. "We offer the same sacrifice always, or rather, we celebrate the remembrance of that sacrifice," *In Ep. ad Heb. cap. 10. Hom. 17.* "Again, Jesus died. If Jesus did not die, whereof or of whom is this sacrifice a sign or token?" *In Matth. Ho. 83.* As for Origen, he doth not so much as name the sacrament a sacrifice, but speaketh of it, as a memorial of the death of Christ, by which we are redeemed, like as the sacrifices of the law were figures of the death of Christ before he suffered.

16. We confess, that to bless signifieth here, to sanctify or to consecrate, and that the cup is blessed or consecrated by us, to be a sacrament of the blood of Christ, not by magical murmuration of words over it, but by the whole action according to Christ's institution, in which receiving is a necessary part. Therefore Chrysostom saith, "He called it the cup of blessing, because, when we have it in our hands, with admiration and a certain horror of that unspeakable gift, we praise and bless him, because he hath shed his blood, that we should not remain in error and hath not only shed it, but made us all partakers of it." So did Photinus and Oecumenius expound this word: "Which we bless, which having in our hands, we bless him, which hath graciously given us his blood, that is we give him thanks, or which we prepare when we bless or give thanks." You see therefore, by the judgment of the ancient fathers, how the Apostle referreth the benediction to the cup and to God also, when they show that by giving praise and thanks to God, and receiving it accordingly, the cup is blessed, and not by saying the words of consecration, as you term them, over it. Where you say, the Calvinists use no consecration of the cup at all, it is an impudent slander, which is true of you, when you minister the cup to the lay people.

16. The Sacrament worthily received by faith, joineth us with Christ, in soul and body, and engrafteth us unto him, after a spiritual manner of conjunction. Therefore the words of Chrysostom be these: "But that not only by love, but in very deed, we be turned into that flesh, it is brought to pass, by that meat which he hath given us. For when he would declare his love towards us, he hath mingled himself unto us by his body, and brought himself into one with us, that the body might be united with the head." These words must needs be understood of a spiritual conjunction, whereby we are made members of Christ's body, for we are not corporally turned into the substance of Christ's flesh, neither doth Christ corporally mingle himself to us by his body, but spiritually after an unspeakable manner. So meaneth Cyril, that Christ dwelleth in us corporally by participation of the flesh of Christ, that is, by the mean that Christ hath given his flesh to be indeed our nourishment unto eternal life, whereof we are made partakers in the holy Sacrament, not after a carnal manner, but after a divine and spiritual manner of participation.

17. Our mystical union with Christ, and with his church is testified and sealed unto us by this Sacrament, not first made or wrought by receiving this Sacrament, but by the Spirit of God, whereby also in Baptism, we are made one with CHRIST, and do verily eat and drink the flesh and blood of CHRIST, and are incorporated into his mystical body the church. And this place showeth plainly, that the manner of our communication with the natural body of CHRIST, is spiritual, as it is of our participation with the mystical body of Christ. Augustin in the place by you quoted, proveth and plainly affirmeth, that wicked men, although they receive the Sacrament, yet receive not the body and blood of CHRIST. Because they be not members of his body. "Neither are these two sorts of men to be said to eat the body of Christ, because they are not to be accounted the members of Christ. For that I speak not of other things, they cannot at once be both the members of Christ, and the members of a harlot. Finally he himself saying: He which eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him, showeth, what it is not only in a Sacrament, but in very deed, to eat the body of Christ, and to drink his blood, that is, that he may dwell in Christ, and Christ may dwell in him. For so he spake it, as though he had said, he that dwelleth not in me, and in whom I dwell not, let him not say or think, that he eateth my body or drinketh my blood." This saying of Augustin, being contrary to your heresy which affirmeth that wicked men eat the body of Christ, and drink his blood, doth also overthrow your doctrine of Transubstantiation, by which you are driven to this absurd error.

To the same effect saith Hilary, *De Trinit. lib. 8.* "That we do truly receive the flesh of Christ's body under a mystery, and thereby we shall be one with him:" but the wicked

shall never be one with him, therefore they never truly eat the flesh of Christ under a mystery.

20. The Apostle saith not, that the Sacrament is the Sacrifice or Host of the new Law, for then he would have said; The cup which we offer, and the bread which we offer, but now he saith, which we bless, which we break. And although some of the Fathers call it an Oblation of the bread and cup, yet they speak figuratively, and improperly, meaning an Oblation of praise and thanksgiving, in remembrance of the only Sacrifice of Christ's body and blood once offered on the Cross, and never to be repeated: seeing by that one Oblation once offered, he hath made perfect for ever, them that are sanctified, *Heb. 10. 14.*

21. The Apostle speaketh not of refusing the Sacrifice of Christ's body and blood in the church, but of the cup of the Lord, and of the Table of the Lord. Neither doth he in all this discourse, speak of our Altar, Host, or Oblation, or compare our Sacrament in any point, effect, condition, or property, to the Altars, Hosts, Sacrifices, or immolations of the Jews or Gentiles, which is proper or peculiar to Altar, Host, Sacrifice, or immolation, but only in that there is a feast in those sacrifices of the Jews and Gentiles, as there is in our Sacrament: and in that point which is common to all ceremonies, to declare them that use them, to be partakers of that Religion, whereof they be ceremonies. And therefore the Apostle might in this respect have used the example of our other Sacrament, which is Baptism, by which also we have participation with Christ and his church, but he did rather choose the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, because it being a spiritual feast of our Religion, doth more resemble the cursed feasts of the Gentiles, from which he doth dissuade them. Whereas if this Sacrament had been also a Sacrifice, he would not have spared to enforce the comparison also in that respect, which thing seeing he hath not done, there is no reason to gather a Sacrifice out of this discourse. Indeed many of the Fathers do call it by the name of a Sacrifice or Oblation figuratively, as I have said before. But where you say all the Fathers do acknowledge it, calling it only and continually almost by such names as signify a Sacrifice, it is false. For *Justin, Clemens, Alexand. Origen, Tertullian, Epiphanius, Hilary, Basil*, and divers other do not at all, or else very seldom call it a Sacrifice. That the Fathers call this Sacrament, as they do, none other Sacrament or Ceremony of Christian Religion, what marvel is it? seeing it hath a proper difference, as every thing hath, whereby it is distinguished from all other things.

The Council of Nice saith not, that the very natural body of Christ is offered upon the Altar, but that the Sacrament which is figuratively called the Lamb of God, as it is called the body of Christ, is laid on the Table. And therefore they say also, that "Christ is sacri-

ficed, without sacrifice," because Christ is not properly sacrificed, but the remembrance of his Sacrifice celebrated in the Sacrament. The Council of Ephesus saith: "We celebrate in the churches the unbloody service of Sacrifice." But how, they declare in the words going immediately before, "Showing or preaching the death according to the flesh, of the only begotten Son of God, that is, of Jesus Christ, and likewise confessing his resurrection and ascension into heaven." By which words, they show plainly that the service of the Sacrifice, which they did celebrate, was only a memorial of the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ. Dionysius calleth it *τελειων τελετη* that is, the mystery of mysteries, or the chief mystery, or the chief ceremony, for so doth the word signify any mystery or ceremony of Religion, and not Sacrifice properly.

So doth *Pachimere* expound it, comparing this Sacrament with Baptism, which he calleth also *τελετη*. Therefore this term is unlearnedly alleged out of a partial translation, to prove the Sacrament to be called a Sacrifice. That which you cite out of Cyril, *Anath. 11.* is an impudent forgery: For there is no word of quickening holy Sacrifice, unbloody Host, or victim. But when you have so notably past the bounds of modesty, what marvel, if you pass yourselves in greater impudence? As when you say it is called the propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and the dead, by *Tertullian, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Augustin*, which is so monstrous a lie, as none but such as had sold themselves to maintain falsehood, durst for shame affirm unto the world. First, *Tertullian De corona mil.* hath nothing that soundeth toward such a matter, but to make oblations for the departed, for the birth day on the yearly day. He saith not, that the Sacrament, or Christ in the Sacrament was offered. But what Oblations were offered, it is easy to gather, by that he saith, They were offered for men's birth days, which could be none other but praise and thanksgiving, both for the departure of men out of the world, and for their birth into the world.

*Chrysostom* in the first place saith, That prayer was made for all that sleep in Christ, at the celebration of the mysteries, which was the error of his time, but that the Sacrament is a Sacrifice propitiatory, he saith not, one word. He saith that some comfort may come to them that sleep, if we offer for them. But how he would have us to offer for them, he expresseth, saying: "Offering prayers for them, prayers are the common sacrifice of the whole world." In the second place he nameth the Sacrament a Sacrifice, and speaketh of prayer for the dead, used at the celebration thereof, but a Sacrifice propitiatory, or offered for the dead he calleth it not. In the third place, he doth not once speak of the Sacrament or Sacrifice. But how he doth understand the term of Sacrifice, which he useth divers times, he declareth in *Epist. Hebr. Homil. 17.* saying: "This Sacrifice is an exemplar of that Sacrifice." And again, "This

that we do, is in remembrance of that which was done. For, do ye this, saith he, in remembrance of me. We offer not another Sacrifice, as the High Priest, but the same we do always, but rather we celebrate the remembrance of a Sacrifice." Cyprian *Epist.* 66. speaketh not a word of the Sacrament, but saith that for as much as Geminus Victor, had made a Priest his executor, contrary to the decree of a Council, there should be no Oblation celebrated for his falling asleep, which is meant of praise and thanksgiving. For if they had held the Popish opinion of Purgatory, it had been too extreme punishment, to deny him Prayers, or the Sacrifice of the Mass. But in what sense he called the Sacrament a Sacrifice, he doth best expound himself. "Because we make mention of his Passion in all our Sacrifices, for the Sacrifice which we offer, is the Passion of our Lord, we ought to do nothing but that which he did." The Sacrament is called a Sacrifice, as it is called the Passion of Christ, which it is not properly, but figuratively: because we celebrate a memory of his Passion and Sacrifice in it. And because the Sacrament being received worthily, is a sure seal and pledge of the virtue of Christ's Sacrifice, once offered to be continually applied unto us by faith for remission of our sins. Therefore saith Cyprian, "when we do these things, we do not prepare our teeth to bite, but with sincere faith we break and divide the Holy bread." *De cæna Dom.*

Augustin, *Enchir. cap.* 110. calleth the Sacrament the sacrifice of our mediator, and saith that it was offered for the dead, as alms were, meaning only prayers and thanksgiving that were offered at the celebration of the Sacrament, and at the gathering of alms, and that he declareth in few lines after, when he saith, "when sacrifices either of the altar, or of any alms are offered for all the departed that are baptized, for very good persons they be thanksgiving, for not very evil persons, they be propitiations or prayings of mercy: for very evil persons, although they be no help of the dead, yet are they some comfort of the living." You see that he matcheth the sacrifices of alms, with the sacrifices of the altar, both in name and in effect. Therefore he meaneth not that the body of Christ is a sacrifice propitiatory offered in the Sacrament: which were no ways to be matched with alms, *Qu. 2. ad Dulcit.* he hath the same words that are before set down out of *Enchir.* and in the sermon *De verbis Apost.* The like of prayer for the dead in the celebration of the sacrifice. What you mean by *lib. 9. cap. 13.* I know not, but *lib. 3. c. 19. De Baptism.* Augustin saith, "That our Saviour Christ, did send those whom he cleansed of leprosy, to the sacraments of the old law, that they should offer a sacrifice for them, to the priests, because as yet there had not come in their place, that sacrifice, which afterward he would have to be offered for them all."

In these words, he speaketh doubtless of a sacrifice of thanksgiving, as that was, which

the lepers by the law were bound to offer for their cleansing. But to make this matter most clear, that he meant not a sacrifice propitiatory, but a Sacrament of remembrance for praise and thanksgiving, he writeth thus *Cont. Faust. Manichæum, lib. 20. c. 21.* "But what shall I do, and when shall I show to so great blindness of these Heretics, what force that hath which is sung in the Psalms? The sacrifice of praise shall glorify me, and there is the way where I shall show my salvation, the flesh and blood of this sacrifice was promised before the coming of Christ by sacrifices of similitudes, in the passion of Christ it was given by the very truth itself, after the ascension of Christ it is celebrated by a Sacrament of remembrance, *Epist. 23.* he saith, "was not Christ offered once in himself? and yet in a Sacrament, not only at every solemnity of Easter, but also every day he is offered to the people. And he that being asked, doth answer that he is sacrificed, doth not lie. For if Sacraments had not a certain likeness of those things whereof they be Sacraments, they should be no Sacraments at all." These places are sufficient to satisfy any reasonable man, that the ancient Fathers in calling the Sacrament a sacrifice, did not mean that Christ was properly and really sacrificed: but in a figurative speech: as Sacraments are called by the names of those things whereof they be Sacraments.

And therefore Gratian doth well conclude this matter out of Augustin, as he saith, "Therefore as the heavenly bread, which is the flesh of Christ, is called after the proper manner thereof, the body of Christ, when indeed and truth it is the Sacrament of the body of Christ, of that body, I say, which being visible, which being palpable and mortal, was put on the cross, and the same oblation of the flesh, which is made by the hands of the Priest, is called the passion, death, and crucifying of Christ, not in truth of the thing, but in a signifying mystery, so the Sacrament of faith, which is understood to be baptism, is faith." *De con. dist. 2. c. Hoc est.*

*Cyprian de cæn. Num. 2.* doth not call this Sacrament, "The only inconsumptible victim, without which there is no religion," but speaketh of the gross imagination of the Cappharnaites, who thought, "That if the flesh of Christ's person, were cut in pieces, it could not suffice all mankind, which being once consumed, it might seem that religion were lost, to whom remained no more any sacrifice. But in such cogitations, flesh and blood profiteth nothing, for as the master himself hath expounded, these words are spirit and truth, neither doth carnal sense pierce to the understanding of so great depth except faith come to it." In these words is nothing for your propitiatory sacrifice, but rather against it. How Chrysostom understandeth the Sacrament to be a sacrifice, *Homil. 17. ad Heb.* I have showed before by his own words out of the same homily. Now we come to the sacrifice prefigured by Melchisedec, and prophesied by Malachi: which the fathers doubt-

less do understand of a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and not of the natural body of Christ. Cyprian saith, *Epist.* 63. "That Christ offered the same thing which Melchisedec had offered, that is bread and wine, that is to say, his body and blood." If Christ offered bread and wine, which is the same thing that Melchisedec offered, he offered not his natural body and blood, but a type thereof in bread and wine. But according to your heresy he offered not bread and wine, but his body and blood.

In the same epistle Cyprian saith, "The sacrifice which we offer is the passion of Christ. He speaketh against them which thought that only water was to be offered in the Lord's cup. We find that the cup was mixed which our Lord offered, and that it was wine which he called his blood. That the cup which is offered in remembrance of him, he offered mixt with wine. For when Christ saith, I am the true vine, the blood of Christ, is not water but wine." What can be more evident, to declare? that he useth the term offering figuratively, in respect of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving which is offered in the celebration of the supper, in remembrance of the only sacrifice of Christ. And when he saith so often, that Christ offered wine, and that his blood is wine, it is manifest that the Sacrament is called by the name of that whereof it is a sign, not properly but figuratively.

*Justin dial. cum Tryphon.* speaketh yet more plainly to prove that the church in his time knew no sacrifice, but the sacrifice of thanksgiving, which he saith was offered by all Christians, that are spiritual priests in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. "So we, which by the name of Jesus, as all shall be one man in God the worker of all things, being stript out of our filthy garments, that is our sins, by the name of his first begotten Son, and being set on fire by the word of his calling, are a right kind of high Priests of God, as God himself doth witness. That in all places among the Gentiles, acceptable and pure sacrifices, are offered to him. But God receiveth no sacrifice of any, but of his Priests. Wherefore God showeth beforehand, that he doth accept all them that offer by this name, the sacrifices which Jesus Christ hath delivered to be made, that is in the Eucharist or thanksgiving of the bread and the cup, which are done in every place of christians. As concerning those sacrifices which are offered to him by us Gentiles in every place, that is, of the bread of thanksgiving, and likewise of the cup of thanksgiving, he foreshoweth, them saying: that we do glorify his name, and that you do profane it. For I myself do affirm, that prayers and thanksgiving, made by worthy persons, are the only perfect and acceptable sacrifices to God. For these are the only sacrifices that christians have received to make, to be put in mind by their dry and moist nourishment, of the passion which God, the of Son God, is recorded to have suffered for them." Thus Justin by

these words, hath acquitted himself and all the catholic fathers, that call the Sacrament by the name of a sacrifice, of the sacrifice propitiatory wherewith you unjustly burden them. Irenaeus also, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 32. speaketh manifestly of a sacrifice of thanksgiving, wherein the bread and wine are dedicated to God, to become the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, his words are these: "Giving counsel to his Disciples, to offer to God the first fruits of his creatures, not as though he had need, but that they themselves should neither be unfruitful nor unthankful, he took that bread which is of the creature, and gave thanks, saying, this is my body. And the cup likewise which is of the creature, that is with us, he confessed to be his blood, and taught the new oblation of the New Testament, which the church receiving from the Apostles, offereth in all the world to God the first fruits of his gifts in the New Testament, even to him which giveth nourishment unto us, of which in the twelve Prophets, Malachi foreshowed, &c. Seeing therefore the name of the son pertaineth to the father, and the church offereth in God Almighty by Jesus Christ, he said well in respect of both: in every place incense is offered to my name and a pure sacrifice. But the incense, saith John in the Apocalypse, is the prayers of the saints." *Chap.* 34. he saith, "that these sacrifices do not sanctify a man, because God hath no need of sacrifice, but the conscience of him that offered, being pure, doth sanctify the sacrifice and causeth God to accept it, as of a friend." You see therefore most clearly, he speaketh not of the body of Christ sacrificed, but of prayers and thanksgiving, and of bread and wine offered to be the Sacrament of thanksgiving. Augustin as we have showed already, understandeth the name of sacrifice, for a Sacrament of remembrance, when he calleth the celebration of the Lord's Supper a sacrifice of the New Testament, after the order of Melchisedec, that succeeded the sacrifices of the old law, as he doth, *lib.* 17. *cap.* 20. *De Civitate et lib.* 10. *cap.* 5. he saith: "The visible sacrifice is a Sacrament, that is a holy sign of the invisible sacrifice." That which he writeth, *lib.* 1. *cont. adver. leg. et Proph.* *cap.* 18. of the only true and singular sacrifice, signified by many figures of sacrifices in the Law, is the sacrifice of Christ's death: but that which followeth, of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving out of the 50. Psalm, he referreth to the Sacrament, as appeareth in these words: "Of the salvation of God, that it is Christ himself, I have made mention and showed before, but what sacrifice of praise is more holy than in thanksgiving? And for what are greater thanks to be given to God, than for his grace by Jesus Christ our Lord. All which matter, the faithful do know in the sacrifice of the church, whereof all those former kinds of sacrifices were shadows." See you not plainly, that the sacrifice of the church, is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for the salvation of God by Christ? who offered that

only true and singular sacrifice, whereby he redeemed us from our sins. Thus without judgment, you quote as well that which is directly against you, as that which seemeth to have some show for you. The next place *lib. 3. De bap. cap. 19.* We have declared already what it is, *Leo ser. 8. de pass.* speaketh of the sacrifice of Christ his body and blood upon the cross, as I have showed plainly upon *Luke 22. Sect. 25.*

Now for the name of *Missæ*, although it be not greatly material what it was called when we know what was meant by that name: first you quote Ambrose in the margin, *epist. 33.* where he writeth, that as he was instructing certain persons that desired baptism in the baptizing place of the church, word was brought him that a certain church in the city was taken by the heretics, for which he had had great strife: whereupon he saith: "Yet I tarried in my office, I began to let it go," for that signifieth *Missam facere*: or else you must say, to make mass, which is absurd. Therefore the name of mass is not so ancient as Ambrose. Next to him you quote two counterfeit sermons under the name of Augustin, which the phrase showeth to be of much later time, and the matter also, as that *Serm. 251.* he saith: that the mighty men of the world, when they come to church, compel the Priest to make short his mass, which manner agreeth not with Augustin's age. In the 91. sermon, the author speaketh of a lesson that was to be read *ad Missas*, in the plural number, masses. Nevertheless, about Augustin's time, the name of *Missæ* began to be in use as it seemeth by *Concil. Milevitan. Can. 12.* signifying rather prayers than sacrifices. But howsoever the name was afterward received and used for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the ancient fathers knew no sacrifice of Christ's natural body and blood, offered really in the Sacrament, but only a sacrifice of prayer, of praise, and thanksgiving, in remembrance of the sacrifice of Christ's death, which is the only true singular and unsacrificeable sacrifice, as it is called by Augustin, *contr. ad vers. leg. et Prophet. lib. 1. cap. 18.* and by *Gregor. Nazianz. in sanct. pasc. orat. 4. Luc. 22. ver. 19.* Therefore in all your quotations, you have gained nothing but a little dross out of Chrysostom and Augustin, touching prayer for the dead: which error being first brought in by the Montanists, although it had gotten some liking in those times, yet was it far from the superstition and blasphemy of purgatory, which in all latter times as Antichrist drew nearer to his full manifestation, prevailed in the Romish church, without all ground or warrant out of the Holy Scriptures.

21. In the popish sacrifice of the mass consisteth no union of Christian men, neither doth the most proper and substantial union or difference consist in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But there is as proper and as substantial difference of true Christians from other sects, and union with Christ and his church in baptism: or else they that are baptized should not be properly and substan-

tially christians. For although baptism as the other sacrament may be received out of the church, yet have they no virtue but in the church. Where you blasphemeth the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which we keep after the institution of Christ most purely, saying it is an altar erected against Christ's altar, priesthood and sacrifice, besides that it is most impious, it is most ridiculous that you say. For we have none altar, sacrificing priesthood, or sacrifice propitiary, but only the altar of the cross, the eternal priesthood of Christ, the only sacrifice of his death once offered by himself, and impossible to be repeated by any other. Whereas you, to overthrow that altar, have erected many thousands of Popish altars, consecrated infinite priests after the order of Melchisedec, which is proper only to Christ: and blasphemously affirm that every priest may daily offer up Christ to his father. Further, where you say we have a table and cup of devils, wherein the devil is properly served: what colour of truth hath this blasphemous slander? seeing there is nothing done about our table and cup, that is the table and cup of the Lord, but that which Christ himself commanded to be done, and to that end he appointed it to be done: whereas your mass neither observeth the form nor the end of his institution but perverteth both, not only by your idol of transubstantiation, but also by robbing the people of the cup of the Lord's blood, and by turning the sacrament of remembrance to a sacrifice of propitiation. And how can it be said that we serve the devil properly in our celebration? when all things are done according to the word and commandment of Christ, without adding or detracting any thing from his holy institution. What resemblance have we with Jeroboam's calves and altars, or any heathenish idolatry which are expressly forbidden by God's commandment? which do square all our form of celebration and worship of God according to the straight line of God's word and commandment. Where you say that now in the Christian times you have none other idols but heresies, nor idolothites but their false service, it is to make your ignorant adherents believe, that your gross worshipping of Images, contrary to the express commandment of God, is no idolatry. And how impudently you do quote the fathers, to prove that there can be none other idols nor idolothites but heresies and their services, it may be manifest to your own consciences, when in Cyprian's time the world was full even of these idols and idolothites of the Gentiles that were in the Apostles' time, besides heresies and their heretical services. Augustin also condemneth professors of the Christian name, that were worshippers of pictures, of the superstition and idolatry, and void of true religion. *De mor. eccles. cath. lib. 1. c. 34.* Ambrose saith, it is heathenish error and vanity of the ungodly to worship the cross where on Christ died: *De obitu Theodos.* What would he have said if he had seen creeping to an idol of the cross? Epiphanius saith, it is a devilish attempt to

make images of the virgin Mary or other Saints departed, and to worship them as the Collyridian heretics did their image of the virgin Mary. *Her.* 79.

#### CHAPTER II.

2. Paul's traditions which he delivered, were either concerning matters of doctrine and faith, which are perpetual, and they be all expressed in the Scriptures, or else of ceremonies which are mutable by authority of the church, according to time, places, and persons, observing the general rules prescribed by the Apostle, that all things be done in order and comeliness, and to edification.

2. In things that be of the substance of religion, the governors of the church may command nothing but that which hath warrant of God's word. In matters of ceremony, which be not of the substance of religion, they must also have respect that they be agreeable to order, decency, and edification, and so they are to be obeyed. And though they do somewhat decline from these rules, yet so long as the substance of religion remaineth whole, no schism must be made for matters of ceremony and external rites.

16. Paul saith, the Apostles and church have no such custom to be contentious. *Crys. hom. 27. in ep. x. Cor.* for matters of external order, yet doth he give reasons for that order of covering women's heads. By whose example the preachers are likewise to endeavour to satisfy by reason both men and women, that humbly desire their resolution for quiet of their conscience, and not to beat them down with the club of custom only. For so the Apostle doth not. As for the prescription of fifteen hundred years that you brag of, for your Popish ceremonies and customs it is vain and false. For either you have nothing of that antiquity, or if you have, you have clean perverted the use of it.

19. Though God be not author of heresies, which are contrary to his revealed will, yet they are according to his secret ordinance and appointment, for the use and end mentioned in the text. And seeing the Apostle not only foreshowed that there should be heresies concerning the Sacrament, but also hath showed the means how they should be confuted and beatdown, namely, by the pure and sincere institution of Christ, as he doth the schism and abuse of the Corinthians: we marvel not that Papists continue so obstinate, because there must be heresies, but we marvel they are so impudent to defend them against so plain and manifest institution of Christ.

20. The feasts of love, that were used after the celebration of the Lord's Supper, were abused to matter of schism, and to the profanation of the Lord's Supper, which ought to be celebrated of all the church together, according to Christ's institution. As for church houses, porches, or bodies of churches, there was no such distinction in the Apostle's time, nor long after, before churches were builded, but they were kept in the same place, where

the Lord's Supper was celebrated, but yet after the celebration where they were rightly kept, as Chrysostom affirmeth, *Hom. 27. in 1 Cor.* And it may be gathered out of Tertullian, *Apologetico*, where he showeth, that the christians were defamed, after the murdering of an infant to keep a riotous feast. By murdering of the infant, they meant the celebration of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. Photius also saith, they were after the participation of the holy mysteries. Neither doth Paul call those feasts, the Lord's Supper, but saith, that their coming together in that schismatical manner, was not to eat the Lord's Supper, which was no feast of the belly, but of the soul, as he proveth by the institution. Therefore Paul calleth the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as we do. Neither doth Ambrose say, that the Sacrament is not called the Lord's Supper, but upon the institution, he saith, the Apostle "showeth that the mystery of the Eucharist, which was celebrated at supper, is not a supper, but a spiritual medicine." That is, it is not a profane supper to feed the body, but the Lord's Supper, to heal the soul.

Chrysostom upon this place, understandeth the Lord's Supper to be spoken of the holy Sacrament, saying: "The Apostle teacheth them far more terribly, in these words: This is not to eat the Lord's Supper, referring them to that night in which our Lord delivered those wonderful mysteries. Therefore he called it by the name of the best Supper, for that Supper comprehended all in general." Theodoret saith: "He calleth the Lord's Sacrament the Lord's Supper." Photius *apud Oecumenium*, agreeth hereunto, saying: "He calleth it the Lord's Supper, according to the imitation of that fearful and mystical Supper, when our Lord did eat together with his Disciples: as if he should say, that which was instituted and ordained by our Lord. You come together to eat our Lord's Supper, but you do it not." *Hesych. lib. 2. cap. 8.* The like writeth Theophylact: "He calleth the Lord's Supper, a common feast, where many eat together, as an imitation of that fearful and wonderful Supper, in which our Lord did eat together with his Disciples." Hierom, or the author of the Comment under his name, saith: "The Lord's Supper ought to be common to all, because he delivered the Sacraments equally, to all his Disciples, that were present." Beda upon this text, saith: "He calleth the receiving of the Eucharist the Lord's Supper." So doth Augustin *Ep. 118. Et. de ser. Dom. in mont. lib. 2. Eligius Homil. 8.* Cyprian, or the author of that work, in time not much inferior to Cyprian, by entitling his book of the Sacrament, *De Cæna Domini*, of the Supper of the Lord, declareth, that it was so taken and called in his time. And therefore you see what newfangled vanity occupieth the Papists' heads at this time, to quarrel with us for using that term, and to say we have small reason, to name the blessed Sacrament, the Lord's Supper, when we have both the authority of the Apostle, and the con-



sent of the ancient Fathers, which so called it. As for the names of Eucharist and Liturgy, because they be Greek, and not understood of the people, we use not in English speech. And your horrible sacrifice of the Mass, is the cause why we use not that term, which also but lately in a manner, came into the church.

23. The Apostle's drift being against unworthy receiving, and to teach men how to receive worthily, he could not otherwise attain to his drift and purpose, except he did set down whatsoever is necessary to be observed in the administration of this Sacrament, according to Christ's institution, after which he reformeth their abuse, and teacheth how all abuses may likewise be reformed. Augustin noting that the Apostle teacheth in this place who receiveth unworthily doth not deny but that he setteth forth the whole order of ministrations in all necessary and substantial parts of Christ's institution. Chrysostom saith: "How doth he say that he received it of the Lord? for he was not then present, but he persecuted Christ, that thou mayest understand that this table had nothing more afterward, for even at this day it is he that worketh all things and delivereth as he did then." Cyprian reproveheth the error of them that used only water in the cup by the institution of Christ: saying, that in the celebration of this mystery, "we ought to do nothing else, but that which he did. For the scripture saith, as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink this cup, you shall show the Lord's death until he come. Therefore so often as we offer the cup in remembrance of our Lord and his passion, let us do that which it is certain that our Lord did." Our Lord by his example and institution hath taught us what to do, *ep. 63. Cæcilio*. saith, "That they might correct their error, and know that to be true which they learned at the first, he repeated the form which was given by our Saviour in this matter." Therefore the whole order of ministrations for the substance of the Sacrament, is expressed in the institution of Christ, described by three Evangelists, and the Apostle Paul. As for matters of ceremony and circumstance, which are not material or essential parts of the Sacrament, they are neither all expressed, nor all that be expressed are necessary to be observed.

23. The Apostles did not deliver their doctrine only by word of mouth, but delivered the holy Scriptures also, of the Old Testament, and added their own writings, containing that which they had preached. So doth Paul in this place by your own confession, deliver the sum and substance of Christ's institution; as for other variable orders and circumstances, so the sum and substance be retained, and so there be observed in those orders, the rule of edification and decency, we would not greatly contend, but in your Mass there is neither of both observed, for the end and use, which is of the sum and substance, is altogether perverted, and your form of celebration utterly void of edifying.

23. We were never so mad, to think, that all circumstances of Christ's action were necessary to be followed, or convenient to be used at all times, and in all places. And yet by this example we learn that the Sacrament may be ministered at night, if just occasion require, and after supper and to men alone, if no women be present, &c. Although you cannot prove, that only twelve were present, or that no women were present: seeing it was ministered in such a house, wherein were other men and women, which were doubtless partakers of the Paschal Lamb. For a sheep of a year old, could not be eaten of thirteen persons and another supper also, as appeareth by the broth, wherein the sop was dipped, whom there is no reason to exclude from the institution of the Sacrament, seeing they were Christ's disciples. Where you say, we seem to incline, by calling it Supper, to have it at night, and after meat, it is a vain conceit, when you see our usual and ordinary practice to the contrary. Where you say, we abandon other names, saving this, you declare what conscience you have to lie, when we do commonly use the name of communion of the body and blood of Christ, which the Apostle also teacheth us, *1 Cor. 10. 16.* and in our sermons and writings, the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, the Eucharist, and such like. What just cause we have to call it the Lord's Supper, I have showed before. And it is a vain argument, to prove, that it is not called the Lord's supper, because it was instituted after supper: seeing there were three suppers that night: the first of the Paschal Lamb, the second, for a free supper to satisfy the body, and the third, the Lord's Supper, which was the holy Sacrament to feed the soul, instituted after that supper, wherein the body was fed. Now what is to be followed of necessity, and what not, the church knoweth by the spirit of Christ, and by his word. For to challenge his spirit without his word, is plain Antichristian arrogance.

23. Christ took bread into his hands, and did bless or consecrate the same element to the use of this holy mystery. So do we. But you say, "we let the bread and cup stand aloof," whereas we take it and deliver it as Christ did: You say, "we occupy Christ's words by way of report and narration, applying them not at all to the matter proposed to be occupied," which is utterly false: for we pray, that we receiving these creatures of bread and wine, according to Christ's holy institution, which is rehearsed in these words of the Evangelist, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood: which is a manifest applying of them, to the matter proposed to be occupied. Again, it is a monstrous lie, when you say we "profess that we make no consecration, benediction, or sanctification of the bread and wine at all," for we profess the contrary: that by praise and thanksgiving for the death of Christ, and by prayer unto God, that we may be partakers of the body

and blood of Christ, we consecrate, bless, and sanctify the bread and wine, to be the holy and blessed Sacraments of the body and blood of Christ. Neither had the first alteration, any other meaning, though there was a cross used, and a rubric appointed the Minister, to take the bread into his hand when the words of institution were read, which needless ceremonies are altered, seeing Christ used not the one, and the other is sufficiently imitated, when we take bread, break it, and deliver it, as Christ did.

23. Christ used unleavened bread, because it was the usual bread at that time: so do we use that, which is the usual bread in our time. Paul speaketh of that bread, which was usual among the Gentiles, when he saith: The bread which we break, and in this chapter: As often as you eat of this bread, &c. which seeing it was the same bread, which was used in the feasts of love, it was doubtless leavened bread. And although you say, all the Latin church imitateth Christ in unleavened bread, it is true perhaps of the Popish church, but not of all the west church, nor of the Latin church of old time, who in their celebration did not use such thin wafer cakes, as you do. *Greg. lib. Dial. 4. cap. 55.* showeth, that they were loaves or cakes of great quantity, seeing two of them were given to a poor man, as it was supposed by the Priest that gave them, in alms, and for reward of his service in divers days. Epiphanius *in anchorato*, testifieth, that they were of a long shape, as it were rolls of bread, that were used in the Greek church. And the Greek church hath always used leavened bread, as doubtless the Apostles did, out of the time of unleavened bread prescribed by the law, and when they were among Gentiles. But it is a greater matter, wherein you say, we do impudently and damnably contemn Christ and his church, in that we mix no water with the wine. Whereto I answer, we find no such mixture used by Christ, and therefore as not necessary, we use it not. In the primitive church it appeareth by Justin, Ireneus and Cyprian, that they used to mingle water with their wine: because they used commonly so to drink it, especially in hot countries, where their wines are strong. Cyprian also maketh a mystery of the water, to signify the people united to the blood of Christ: But that is beside the word of God, and therefore we are not to receive it upon his authority. Chrysostom saith: "That when Christ delivered this mystery, he delivered wine, and after his resurrection in the bare table of the mystery, he used wine, which truly bringeth forth wine, and not water." By which words, it seemeth because of those heretics, which in Cyprian's time used only water, in Chrysostom's time the church ordained, that water should no more be mixed with the wine: and so the Armenians which of ancient time ministered without water, did understand him, as appeareth by a canon of the sixth council of Constantinople, *Can. 32.* Theodorus Balsamon testifieth also that the church of the Iberians, being sound in all points of religion,

used not to put water into the cup in their ministrations. The Master of the sentences thinketh, that the water is not of necessity of the Sacrament, for if any man of forgetfulness, or ignorance, do omit it, the Sacrament is not frustrate. For the church of the Greeks, doth not put water into the cup, *li. 4. dist. 11.* before the sanctification, but after, and then they put hot water, as Balsamon testifieth, *in Can. 31. Concil. Const. 6.* And so the Doctors of the canon law hold, *De consec. Dist. 2. in glossa*, That water is to be mingled in the cup, *De honestate tantum*, of decency only, and not of necessity. The same opinion holdeth Scotus *in 4. sent. Dist. 11. quest. 6.* That to put water to the wine, is not simply necessary of the necessity of the Sacrament. Whereas you allege all the Greek Liturgies of James, Basil, Chrysostom, the council of Const. 6. doth the same. But Balsamon Patriarch of Antioch, saith, that the Liturgy of James was not extant in his time, but utterly worn away. These that we have at this day, under the names of Chrysostom, and Basil, bewray themselves not to be of such antiquity, as those Fathers. In the Liturgy that beareth the name of Chrysostom, as it was set forth by Claudius *Du Sanctes*, there is a prayer for Pope Nicholas, and the Emperor of Alexius, whereof the one was near 500 years, the other 700 years, after Chrysostom. The Liturgy bearing the name of Basil, showeth itself to be none of his, because it observeth not that form of Doxology, that is, giving praise to the Holy Ghost, with the Preposition *cum* which Basil doth so earnestly defend to have come from the Apostle's tradition, and to have been the form used in the church in his time, *De spirit. sanct. cap. 27. 28. 29.* Petrus Diaconus, and the rest that were sent from the East to Rome, in their book to Fulgentius and other Bishops of Africa, *cap. 8.* do rehearse a prayer of Basil's Liturgy which they say almost the whole East frequented, that is not found in that which now beareth the name of Basil's Liturgy. And whereas they say that the whole East church in a manner doth use Basil's Liturgy, it is not like that Chrysostom would abrogate a Liturgy so late made by so reverend a father, so universally observed to set up a new one of his own. Wherefore in not mingling water, which we neither read that Christ did, and divers churches of ancient time did not use, we depart not from Christ's institution, but come nearer to it than they which mingle water, and are not able to prove, that it was mingled by Christ. Although, so the opinion of necessity be taken away, we count it an indifferent thing to mingle water or to minister with wine alone.

24. We rehearse these words, which Christ uttered when he instituted this Sacrament, not as a magical charm, to be said over the bread and wine to convert their substances, but as they import indeed, to declare what the bread and wine are made to us by Christ's institution of this Sacrament, namely, his body and blood. Neither doth Augustin mean

your fantasy of the words of consecration, when he saith: "The word must come to the element, that it may be a Sacrament;" but that the element must have the word of God, for the institution of it, which maketh it a Sacrament, as appeareth plainly by his whole discourse in that place, "Why doth he not say you are clean for Baptism, wherewith you are washed? but he saith, for the word which I have spoken unto you, but that even in the water, the word doth cleanse. Take away the word, and what is water but water? The word cometh to the element, and it is made a Sacrament, even itself being a visible word. For this verily he said, when he washed his disciples' feet, he that is washed hath no need, but that he wash his feet, but is all clean. Where is this so great virtue of the water, that it toucheth the body, and washeth the heart, but by the word which causeth it? Not because it is said, but because it is believed, for even in the word itself the sound that passeth away is one thing, the virtue which remaineth is another thing. This is the word of faith, saith the Apostle," &c. In this saying, Augustin is directly against you, that the word said over the element, is the form of the Sacrament, and word of consecration. Where you say, we never apply the words to the elements, it is false, though we apply them not, after your magical fantasy, for we so apply the words of Christ's institution, to confirm our faith, that we following the commandment of Christ, given us in his institution, are assured that the elements of bread and wine, which are before us, shall be the same to us, that they were to the Apostles, and that our Saviour Christ by those words declareth, that they were. And therefore, as we apply the words of Baptism to the child, so do we apply the words of the supper, to the communicants. But if the words should be so applied to the elements, as the words of Baptism are to the child, we should not say, This is my body, this is my blood, but this is the body of Christ, this is the blood of Christ. But that the words of the text, be "the only form of this Sacrament, and to be spoken over, or upon the bread," you will bear us down, with a multitude of quotations. Ambrose *De sacr. lib. 4. cap. 4.* saith no such thing, but that the Sacrament is made by the word of Christ, which we confess "By what words then, and by whose speeches is the consecration? of our Lord Jesus. For all the rest that is said, praise is given to God, prayer is made for the people, for Kings, for the rest when we come to that, the reverend sacrament is to be made: now the Priest useth not his own words, but the words of Christ. Therefore the word of Christ, doth make this sacrament, which word? namely, that whereby all things were made. The Lord commanded, and the heaven was made. The Lord commanded, and the earth was made, The Lord commanded, and the sea was made. The Lord commanded, and every creature was brought forth. Dost thou see therefore, how effectual the

word of Christ is? If therefore there was so great force in the words of our Lord Jesus, that those things should begin to be which were not, how much more effectual is it, that those things which were should be, and be changed into another thing." How can it be proved, out of this saying? that these words only this is my body, this is my blood, should be the only form of the sacrament and to be said over the bread and wine: when the words of Christ are more than these: namely, take, eat, drink ye all of this, Do this in remembrance of me, This cup is the New Testament in my blood. Ambrose therefore was ignorant of your form of consecration, but showeth, that by the commandment of Christ, which is expressed in the words of the institution, whereby all things were made, when they were not; the bread and wine are the same that they were before in substance, and yet are changed into another thing, namely into the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. In the second place, *De is qui myst. cap. 9.* he hath no more but that. "This sacrament is made by the word of Christ, and therefore is verily a sacrament of his flesh. Our Lord Jesus himself crieth out, this is my body, before the blessing of the heavenly words, it is named another kind, after consecration, the body of Christ is signified. He himself saith, it is his blood, before consecration it is called another thing, after consecration, it is called blood." Thus Ambrose proveth not your purpose, for saying of the words over the creatures, nor, that those only words are the form of consecration, but showeth what force the words of Christ have, to make of common bread and wine, the sacraments or mystical tokens and signs, of his body and blood.

*Justin apoc. 2.* hath as little, or less, for your purpose. His words are these. "The food for which thanks are given by the word of prayer, which is from him, by which food our flesh and blood by change are nourished, we are taught to be the flesh and blood of Jesus, which was incarnate:" you see here, that by the word of prayer, the consecration is made, and not by saying the words of Christ only, over the bread and wine. And describing the very form of their administration, he speaketh of nothing, but prayer and thanksgiving. *Cyprian De Cæna Domini,* is directly against you, saying: "Before those words: that common meat was profitable only to nourish the body, and did minister aid of corporal life, but after it was said of our Lord, Do this in my remembrance, this is my flesh, and this is my blood, so often as it is done, with these words, and with this faith, that substantial bread and cup being consecrated with solemn benediction, doth profit to the life and salvation of the whole man."

Cyprian therefore, requireth all the words of Christ, and that to be done which Christ commanded, and with that faith: therefore, he is clean contrary to your Popish form of consecration. Augustin saith little to the matter, *Ser. 23. De re b. Don. sec. Matth*

"Before the words of Christ, that which is offered is called bread, after the words of Christ are uttered, now it is not called bread, but his body." Why should we not think, that he meaneth as Cyprian saith? after the words of Christ: Do this in remembrance of me, &c. ? and yet here is neither the form of consecration described, nor the words said over the bread and cup. Tertullian *cont. Marcion. Lib. 4.* saith that "Christ made the bread which he took and distributed to his Disciples his body, saying: This is my body, that is to say, a figure of my body." Here you see, he rehearseth briefly the whole actions of Christ, and not those words only, then he doth so interpret those words, as they can make little for Popish consecration.

Chrysostom in *2 Tim. Hom. 2.* hath these words. "The holy oblation, whether Peter or Paul do offer it, or any other Priest of what worthiness soever he be, is the same which Christ gave to his Disciples, and which the Priests do now make. This hath nothing less, than that: why so? Because men do not sanctify this, but Christ, which did consecrate that before. For as the words which Christ spake, are the same which the Priests do now pronounce, so the oblation is the same, and the same reason is of Baptism, so all things consist of faith." By these words of Chrysostom, you can never conclude your purpose, but contrary to your doctrine, he saith that the Priest doth not consecrate now, but Christ, as he did at the first: and by the words which then he uttered. As also in the *Hom. de prod. Jud.* "And now Christ is also present, which garnished that table, he also doth consecrate this table. For it is not man, which doth make these things, that are set forth of the consecration of the Lord's table, the body and blood of Christ, but even the same Christ that was crucified for us. Words are uttered by the mouth of the Priest, and by the power of God and grace they are consecrated. This, saith he, is my body, by this word, the things set forth, are consecrated. And as that voice which saith: Grow and multiply, and till the earth, was spoken but once, but hath always effect, nature working to generation, so that voice was once spoken, but it performeth continuance to the sacrifice, throughout all tables of the church, unto this day, and unto his coming again." By these words of Chrysostom, Christ did consecrate by pronouncing those words once for all, and not the Priest so often as he uttereth them over the bread. Although we must understand a Synecdoche, in Chrysostom's speech, whereby naming a part, he meaneth the whole: or else we may as well exclude the consecration of the cup, as the rest of the words of Christ's institution. The oration of Greg. Nyss. hath many things foisted in, by heretics, as Nyecephorus writeth, *Lib. 11. Cap. 19.* Among which, we may number that: which in the thirty-seventh chapter is so often repeated of the transmutation of the bread, which is not found in many ancient copies, and yet he saith, "it is sanctified by the word

of God, and by prayer." *Damasen. lib. 4. cap. 14.* hath these words clean contrary to your position, "God said in the beginning, let the earth bring forth green herbs, and even till this time, being watered with rain, it bringeth forth branches, being aided and strengthened by God's commandment, God said, this is my body, and this is my blood, and do ye this in my remembrance: and by his Almighty commandment, it is brought to pass until he come. For so he said, until I come; and the overshadowing virtue, by invocation of the holy spirit, is made rain to this new husbandry: for as all things which God hath made, he hath made by operation of the Holy Ghost: so he worketh these things, by operation of the Holy Ghost, above nature, which faith only can conceive." Again he saith: "The bread, wine, and water, that are set forth, by invocation and coming to of the Holy Ghost, are supernaturally changed into the body and blood of Christ." Thus not one of the Fathers whom you have quoted saith, that the words are to be spoken over, or upon the bread or wine, not one of them saith, that those only words that you mean, are the only form of this sacrament, I know not also how you agree with the elder sort of your sect, which define not these words to be the only form of the sacrament, except they be pronounced by a priest, with one breath, and with intention of consecration, which if it be lacking, though he say the words never so often, he maketh no consecration. Inasmuch that if a priest intending to consecrate only twelve singing cakes, there chance to be a thirteenth, they determine that none of them all be consecrated, because none can be consecrated without his intention, and seeing his intention extendeth not to one, and it is not known which that is, seeing any one of the thirteen is no more consecrated than another of them, they are all unconsecrated. The intention being therefore so necessary to the being, it is marvel how you leave it out of the form, but with your own inventions, you may do what you list, and every day have a new device, as the manner of Heretics is.

24. This note contains nothing but impudent slanders, for we retain the words of Christ, the name of the sacrament, the due elements, the right form of consecration, and therefore are partakers of the very body and blood of Christ after a spiritual manner of eating and drinking, to assure us of our perpetual dwelling in Christ, and Christ in us.

24. Popish priests are ordained to sacrifice for the quick and the dead, which order is not of Christ's institution, but we by lawful calling are ordained to be ministers of Christ, and dispensers of the mysteries of God, whereby we do as lawfully administer the sacraments, as the Apostles that were of Christ's only election and ordaining.

24. The receiving is as necessary, as the washing in Baptism to the essence of the sacrament: for not the water, although it be consecrated by prayer, nor the pronouncing of the words, I baptize thee, &c. doth make

the sacrament of Baptism, except there be one that is baptized. Therefore it is not rightly compared to the sacrifices that were offered to God, which consisted both of oblation to God, and of participation of that which was offered. But in Christ's institution, he did not offer the sacrament to God, but to his disciples: therefore your argument of comparison concludeth nothing. And although there be difference betwixt the making of a medicine, and the taking of it, yet can it not be truly called a medicine, but when it being received doth heal: for of healing it is called a medicine. And yet this similitude is insufficient to declare your purpose: for except it be by petition of principle, you cannot prove that the elements of the sacrament have virtue of healing in them, although they be not received, as medicine hath though it be never taken: for to the participation of the body and blood of Christ, faith of the receiver is necessary, which is not required in a medicine. Therefore your similitude holdeth not in the very point for which it is brought. Where you say, we do unlearnedly make the receiving, all and some, you do unshamefacedly belie us: for as we count it necessary for the perfection of the sacrament, so we do acknowledge other things also, as necessary unto it. As for learning whereof you brag so much, condemning us so often of unlearnedness, thanks be to God, we shall be found in trial nothing inferior to the best of you in any kind of knowledge, that ever was taken for good learning; whereas a great number of you, that make a great sound of learning like empty vessels, when you are gaged, will be found to have more wind of vain boasting, than substance of good literature within you. One high point of your learning you show, when you say, we improperly name the whole sacrament and ministrations thereof, by calling it the communion. And why do we call the sacrament improperly the communion of the body and blood of Christ, when the Apostle calleth it so? But we call it so you say, to make the ignorant believe that many must communicate together. Verily Paul doth give that reason, why it is called communion: because we being many, are made one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of one bread, 1 Cor. 10. 17. and that excludeth both your sole receiving, and reservation. But you have a more learned exposition of communion, that it is so called in your Mass, because you communicate with all that eat it, and not with them only which eat with you at one time. If this be granted, yet only they that eat it, do so communicate: for how are they partakers of the body of Christ, which do not eat it? And if the Priest only do eat it, as it is usual among you, where is the communion that Paul speaketh of? when he saith: for we being many are one bread, one body, for we are all partakers of one bread, after he had said, the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ, declaring plainly that he speaketh of sacramental communion, which is only of them that par-

take the sacrament, and not of the general communion, which all the members of the church have one with another, by the Spirit of Christ: yea many that never receive the sacrament, and they also that have received it not only while they receive it, but always communicate with the whole church. Which spiritual communion, whether you do ignorantly, or maliciously confound, with the sacramental communion, let God judge, and all good men learn to beware of you. The saying of Damascene, maketh nothing for your vain confusion, but against it, if you rightly weigh him, for he admonisheth us, neither to receive the sacrament of heretics, nor to give the sacrament to heretics, which he saith, is voluntarily to communicate with them, therefore he speaketh manifestly of sacramental communion, and so do all the ancient fathers understand the text of all them that communicate at one time. Theodoret upon that text saith: "We which receive the holy mysteries, do we not communicate with our Lord himself, whose body and blood we say that they are; seeing we all are partakers of one bread." Chrysostom saith, "What is the bread? the body of Christ. And what are they made, which receive the body of Christ? not many bodies, but one body." You see then, these fathers understand the text of sacramental communion, whereof they only are partakers which receive the sacrament, having a spiritual communion beside with all the church, whereof the sacramental is a seal. Occumenius and the rest of the Greek fathers with him, consent in the same matter and words; so doth Theophylact. Bede out of Augustin, understandeth the communion here spoken of, to be of them that receive the sacrament together, &c. In the sacrament it is so done, and the faithful know how they eat the flesh of Christ. Every one receiveth his part." Augustin saith, *ser. ad infant. apud Bedam*. Let us hear the Apostle himself. "Therefore when he spake of this sacrament he saith, we being many are one bread, one body, understand ye, and rejoice ye. By his mercy, we are that which we receive." Therefore they only which receive together, do communicate in sacramental communion at that time, and not all other that communicate with the body of Christ in spiritual communion. And this difference of sacramental communion, and spiritual communion of the body of Christ, Augustin in the same sermon *ad infantas*, doth plainly set forth in these words. "He that receiveth the mystery of unity, and keepeth not the bond of peace, receiveth not the mystery for himself, but a testimony against himself. No man ought to doubt any thing, that every man is then made partaker of our Lord's body and blood when in Baptism he is made a member of Christ, and that he is no stranger from that bread and cup, although before he eat of that bread and drink of that cup, he depart out of the world in the unity of the body of Christ. For he is not deprived of the participation and benefit of that sacrament, when

he hath found the same thing, which the sacrament doth signify." Cyprian *de cena dom.* "So often as we do these things, we do not whet our teeth to bite, but with sincere faith we break and divide the holy bread, while we distinguish and separate that which is divine and that which is human, and likewise joining together that we have distinguished, we confess one God and man. And we ourselves being made his body, are knit and united to our head, both by the sacrament, and by the matter of the sacrament, being every one the members of another, showing forth the ministry of love one for another, we communicate in charity, we partake in mutual carefulness, eating the same meat, and drinking the same cup, which issueth and floweth from the spiritual rock, which is meat and drink, our Lord Jesus Christ." We see therefore most clearly, that the fathers making a difference of communion in sacrament, from communion in spirit, that is in the matter of the sacrament, did understand communion in sacrament, to be of all them that received the sacrament together, of whom some perhaps did not communicate in spirit. And spiritual communion to be general of all them, that by the spirit of Christ, were united together, although they never received this sacrament. Dionysius also, after he hath showed that this sacrament is called communion, because it doth most specially testify our participation with Christ and his Church, doth very often call it communion, of the common distribution thereof to all that are present. *Hierarch. Eccles. cap. 3.* in that part which is called the mystery of the collection or communion. "The Bishop, after he hath praised the holy works of God, he consecrateth those things that are most divine, and bringeth into sight, those things that have been praised, by the signs which are set forth after an holy manner. And after he hath showed forth the gifts of the divine works, he himself cometh to the holy communion of them, and exhorteth the rest thereunto. And after he hath received and distributed the divine communion, he endeth in holy thanksgiving." This was the form of celebration of the holy communion in the ancient time, and thus that ancient father useth the name of communion. The same author in that part of the chapter which is called the contemplation near the beginning, hath these words: "That divine, common, and peaceable distribution of one and the same bread and cup, doth prescribe and decree a divine agreement of manners, to them that are so fed together, and bringeth to holy remembrance, that most divine supper and first pattern of those things which are done: in which the author himself of those signs, most justly depriveth him of his portion, which at the supper received with him, the holy things, not holily, nor charitably teaching purely and divinely, that the coming to the divine things which is true indeed, doth give the communion to them that come to it, like unto themselves." Georgius Pachymer, the Greek in-

terpreter of Dionysius, in the very beginning of the exposition of this chapter saith. "He calleth this sacrament the communion, because at that time, all that were worthy, did communicate, or were partakers of the mysteries." Therefore whether we do ignorantly and unlearnedly use the names of the communion, and the Lord's Supper, let them that be learned judge, when we use them as the ancient fathers used them, and understand them according to the Holy Scriptures.

26. We hold no such supposition, that this Sacrament cannot be rightly ministered without a sermon of the death of Christ, as you understand a sermon, but we do rightly conclude out of this place, that the Sacrament cannot be rightly ministered, except there be a declaration of the Lord's death, until he come again. Not only in the visible action of breaking and distributing of the elements, but also in showing the end of Christ's death out of the word of God, to stir up the remembrance of his benefits to confirm the faith of the receivers, in the participation of the same, and to exhort to thankfulness to God, and unity and agreement with our fellow members. For which causes principally the sacrament was ordained, as is manifest by the very words of the institution, where it is not only said, that Christ took bread and brake it, and gave it, &c. but that he gave thanks and said, take, eat, this is my body which is broken for you, drink you all of this: this is the cup of the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you, and for many, to the remission of sins, do this in remembrance of me. Therefore we must not separate the preaching of the word, from the sacrament which is a seal of the doctrine, which were as absurd, as if a man should deliver a seal without any writing: for the word may be preached without the sacrament, but the sacrament may not be administered without the word. Wherefore though there be not a long sermon always preached, when the sacrament is ministered, yet there ought to be showing of the Lord's death, at the leastwise briefly and summarily declaring the institution and use of the sacrament, and that is always observed in our church, though there be not always large explication thereof. Where you say we might as wisely say, that neither Abel's sacrifice, nor the paschal lamb could signify Christ's death without a sermon, we answer, that the clear sacraments of the new testament in this point, of clear declaration of Christ's death are falsely compared with the obscure figures of the old testament: and yet they had according to their institution not only a divine action, or silent ceremony, but also a preaching or declaration of Christ's death and the benefit thereof. For although there be no express mention of the form of Abel's sacrifice, yet seeing the Scripture testifieth that Abel's sacrifice was offered and accepted by faith: and faith hath always relation to the word and promise of God, there is no doubt but Abel presented his sacrifice with such words,

as declared his faith in word, whereby he was taught to sacrifice, and in the seed which was promised to break the serpent's head, and to destroy the works of the devil. As for the paschal lamb, it hath an express commandment, that the Israelites should declare to their children, the institution and use of the sacrifice, whereby, though obscurely, yet according to the institution thereof, the Lord's death was preached, before he came in the flesh. And therefore according to Christ's institution and express commandment, his death ought to be preached most clearly and plainly, to all that partake this sacrament to their edification, which cannot be in a strange tongue, which they understand not: therefore this sacrament ought not to be ministered in a strange language, nor any thing else ought to be done in the congregation, but to edifying. Chrysostom upon this text saith, there must be commemoration of the death of Christ, according to his commandment, who declared the cause why he gave this mystery. "For when thou shalt understand," saith he, "what our Lord suffered for thee, thou shalt be made wiser. He that showeth the Lord's death," saith Oecumenius, upon this text, "showeth all his gift, all the gentleness and kindness, and all our salvation together." Hierom on the same text saith, "When we receive this sacrament, we are admonished by the Priests, that it is the body and blood of Christ, that we should not be unthankful for his benefits." Primasius saith, "God our Saviour gave example, that so often as we do this, we should have in mind, that Christ died for us all. Therefore it is said unto us, The body of Christ, that when we remember this thing, we should not be unthankful to his grace. Again, you shall show the Lord's death in your hearts when you bear the body of Christ." Therefore according to the judgment of the fathers, the Lord's death must be showed, not only by the action, but also by words that may be understood, and stir us up to the remembrance of Christ's death, and the benefits thereof, and to thankfulness in the same. To that effect speaketh Basil, gathering upon this text *De Baptismo*. "What then do these words profit us? that eating and drinking, we should always call to remembrance him that died and rose again for us, and so should be instructed of necessity, to observe before God and his Christ, that lesson which is delivered by the Apostle, where he saith: For the love of Christ doth constrain us, judging this, that if one have died for all, then all are dead," &c. Wherefore instruction is needful as well as the action.

27. It followeth not of the text, that wicked men receive the body and blood of Christ, which unworthily eat of his bread, and drink of this cup. He that contumeliously receiveth the prince's seal, is guilty of the majesty of the prince, not which he receiveth, but which he despiseth. And we see how heinous an offence it is to receive a prince's seal contemptuously, although in substance, it be but printed wax: so we may see, that he

which eateth this bread, and drinketh this cup unworthily, being the seal of Christ's passion, committeth an heinous offence although in earthly substance, they be but bread and wine. And is not he guilty of the blood of Christ, which despiseth Baptism, that he hath received as a seal of his washing in the blood of Christ, although he were washed with water? Doth not the Apostle say of wicked men that fall from the christian religion, that they crucify again unto themselves the son of God, and make a scorn of him? Heb. 6. 6. That they tread under their feet the son of God, and account his blood wherewith they have been sanctified as unclean? Heb. 10. 29. Can this be said only for receiving the sacrament unworthily? yet do those villainy to Christ's own person, as the Jews or Gentiles did that crucified him. Not that his person suffereth any thing of them indeed, for he is now impassible, but that their malice is as great, and their wickedness as heinous in offence against him, as that the Jews or Gentiles did to his body when he suffered. And therefore this doth nothing in the world make for the popish real presence. Neither doth Chrysostom in any place of his writings affirm that wicked men receive the body of Christ really, as you mean: yet he saith expressly, *Hom. 60 ad pop. Antioch.* "Let no Judas stand to, no covetous person, if any be a disciple, let him be present: for this table receiveth not such persons: for Christ saith, I keep my passover with my disciples." Now it is certain, that the Lord's table receiveth many wicked men to the participation of the outward sacrament, but not to the matter or heavenly substance of the sacrament, which is the body and blood of Christ. And because the outward sacrament is called the body of Christ, even the wicked in some sense, may be said to eat the body of Christ, but in proper speech and according to your meaning, Chrysostom doth no where say, that infidels do eat the body of Christ. Chrysostom in *Matt. hom. 83*, saith, that the wicked which receive unworthily, according to the saying of the Apostle do tread Christ under feet, and esteem the blood of the covenant unclean: yet he meaneth not that the natural body of Christ is trodden under the feet of men: no more doth he mean, that it entereth into the mouth and body of wicked men, that receiveth the sacrament thereof. Again in the same homily he saith: "Let none communicate, except he be of the Disciples, let no man with impure mind as Judas take the bread, lest he suffer the like punishment. Even this multitude also is the body of Christ: wherefore thou that dost minister these mysteries, must take heed, that thou provoke not the Lord by not purging this body, lest thou deliver a sharp sword instead of meat." You see Chrysostom chargeth the negligent minister, to be guilty of the body and blood of Christ, that purgeth not the multitude committed to him, which are the body of Christ, delivering not the body of Christ, which is

the spiritual meat of our souls, but a sword for their destruction. *Origen in 15 Matt.* saith expressly, that "No evil man can eat the word made flesh." Augustin in many places is most plain in this case, that wicked men receive not the body of Christ, and that no man receiveth the body of Christ to his damnation. *Ep. 50 ad Bonifac.* he saith of the wicked: "They have the sacrament of the body of Christ outwardly, but the thing itself, whereof that is a sacrament, they hold not within, and therefore they eat and drink their own judgment, *Joan. 1.* 26. He that abideth not in Christ, and in whom Christ abideth not, out of doubt eateth not spiritually his flesh, nor drinketh his blood, although carnally and visibly he press with his teeth, the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ: but rather he eateth and drinketh the sacrament of so great a thing unto his judgment. The sacrament of this thing is prepared on the Lord's table, and is received from the Lord's table of some unto life, of some unto destruction, but the thing itself, whereof it is a sacrament, is received of every man to life, and of no man to destruction, whosoever shall be partaker of it, *De Civit. Dei lib. 21. cap. 25.* It is not to be said that he receiveth the body of Christ, which is not in the body of Christ. They are not to be said to eat the body of Christ, because they are not to be counted among his members. To omit other things they cannot be at one time the members of Christ, and the members of a harlot. Finally, he himself saying, he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him, sheweth what it is, not as in a sacrament only, but in very deed to eat the body of Christ, and to drink his blood." This is Augustin's judgment uttered expressly, distinctly, and dogmatically, not in rhetorical amplifications or figurative forms of speaking: that infidels and wicked men receive not the body of Christ, much less brute beasts, as many Papists do hold.

28. Augustin willeth every man to examine himself, he biddeth him not to show himself to the Priest. Neither is the necessity of confession laid upon every man by the Apostle's doctrine, or the practice of the primitive church, for many hundred years after Christ. Cyprian *de lapsis*, speaketh manifestly of them that were to make open confession, because they had openly fallen in time of persecution, or else of them that of their own accord, un-compelled, accused their own purpose of shrinking, though they did not fall indeed. The book *de Dogmat. Eccles.* is none of Augustin's, and yet in the place quoted, the author speaketh of public confession, and not of private or auricular shrift. Chrysostom upon this text saith, "He doth not command that one should be examined of another, but every man of himself, not making a public judgment, but an action without witness." To the same effect writeth Theodoret: but of confession, *Matt. 2.*

29. Augustin speaketh not of adoration of the Sacrament, such as is used in Popery,

with kneeling and holding up of hands to it, as though Christ were contained within the compass of that which is seen, but of a reverent estimation, especially due to the Sacrament above all other meats, because it is a seal and pledge of our spiritual nourishment by the body and blood of Christ. The like reverent estimation is to be had of Baptism, above all other washings, because it is a seal and pledge of our spiritual washing by the blood of Christ, and of our regeneration by the Spirit of God. Augustin therefore speaking of two, whereof one, according to the custom of the church where he lived, received the Sacrament every day; another following likewise the custom of his church, received only at certain times in the year. "Neither of both, saith he, dishonoureth the body and blood of our Lord, if they strive which of them may most honour the most wholesome Sacrament. For Zaccheus and the Centurion did not contend one with the other, or the one of them prefer himself before the other, when the one with joy received the Lord into his house, the other said, I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof. Both of them honouring our Saviour after a diverse, and as it were contrary manner, both being miserable through sins, both obtained mercy. It availeth also unto this similitude, that in the first people Manna did taste in every man's mouth according to his own will; so in the mouth of every Christian man, that Sacrament is to be esteemed as it is taken. For the one in honouring it, dare not take it every day, and the other in honouring it, dare not pretermit any day. Only contempt that meat cannot abide, as Manna loathsomeness. For hereof the Apostle saith, that it is unworthy received of them, which did not discern it from other meats, *veneratione singulariter debita*, by reverence specially due unto it. For immediately after he had said: he eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, he addeth and saith, not discerning the body," &c. The Sacrament therefore is to be honoured, revered, and highly esteemed, as a certain and undoubted pledge of the body and blood of Christ given and shed for us, and to us, but not to be adored or worshipped as Christ were personally present in it. But by this verse it is invincibly proved, that wicked men eat not the body of Christ. For the Apostle saith: that which they eat and drink is judgment to themselves. The body of Christ is not judgment to any, but life to all that receive it. Therefore that which they eat and drink, is not the body and blood of Christ. The same Augustin, *Psal. 98.* plainly sheweth, that the natural body of Christ is not in the Sacrament, and therefore the Sacrament is not to be adored as if Christ were present there; but the flesh of Christ, that is the humanity of Christ, is to be adored and acknowledged, as joined in personal union with the Son of God, of every christian man before he can eat the flesh of Christ, either in the Sacrament or otherwise by faith. "I inquire what is his footstool, and the Scripture saith



unto me, the earth is my footstool. Wavering, I convert myself to Christ, because I seek him here, and I find how without impiety earth may be adored, his footstool may be adored without impiety. For of the earth he took earth, because flesh is of the earth, and of the flesh of Mary he took flesh. And because he walked here in the same flesh, and gave us the same flesh to be eaten unto salvation, and no man eateth that flesh, except he first adore it, it is found out how such a footstool of the Lord may be adored, and we do not only not sin in adoring, but we sin in not adoring it." In these words he showeth that the natural body of Christ is to be adored. Now that the same is not really present in the Sacrament, he showeth in these words; after he had showed how unjustly the Capernaïtes were offended, he declareth how Christ instructed his disciples that remained with him, when he said, "It is the Spirit which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. The words which I have spoken to you, be spirit and life. Understand ye spiritually, that which I have spoken. You shall not eat this body which you see, and drink this blood, which they shall shed which shall crucify me, I have commended to you a certain sacrament, which being spiritually understood shall quicken you. And albeit it be necessary that the same be celebrated visibly, yet it must be understood invisibly." There can nothing be spoken more plainly and directly against the gross and carnal manner of presence, which they call the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, than that which Augustin here affirmeth, as in the person of Christ. We eat not that body which his disciples saw, nor drink that blood which the Jews did pour out, but that was the natural body and blood of Christ, therefore we do not eat the natural body and blood of Christ really, but sacramentally, spiritually, in a mystery by faith, not corporally with our mouth. Wherefore it followeth, we ought not to worship the sacrament, but Christ which is signified and represented by the sacrament. Ambrose saith in effect, as Augustin of adoring the footstool, "we adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries," which he speaketh not only of this sacrament, but of all the mysteries of the christian religion, as it appeareth plainly within three lines after, where he gathereth of that he said before, "therefore seeing the sacrament of his incarnation is to be adored," &c. Therefore Ambrose speaketh not of adoration of the sacrament, as Christ and God, no more than the mystery of the incarnation is God and Christ in proper speech, but of worshipping Christ in the mysteries of his supper, of Baptism, of his incarnation, of his death and resurrection, &c. Chrysostom's words, *Hom. 24. in Cor. 10.* are both falsified and wrested clean from his meaning, for he exhorteth his hearers to come reverently and worthily to the participation of the body and blood of Christ, by example of the Sages, and not to adore the sacrament, but Christ himself in heaven. "As we receive the greater

benefit, saith he, so much more we shall be punished, when we shall appear unworthy. This body the wise men did reverence in the manger, being both ungodly men and barbarous men, after they had taken a long journey, they adore him with fear and trembling. Therefore at least let us which are citizens of Heaven, follow these barbarous men. For they when they saw that manger and cottage only, and saw none of those things which thou dost now behold, came to him with great reverence and trembling. But thou seest it not in the manger but in the altar, not a woman which holdeth him in her arms, but the Priest present, and the spirit most abundantly poured out upon the sacrifice, which is set forth. Neither dost thou behold his simple body as they did, but also his power, and knowest all his administration, and art ignorant of none of those things which were done by him, and art diligently instructed in all things. Let us be stirred up therefore and tremble, and show greater piety than those barbarous men, that we come not barely and coldly, and so offer our head to a more vehement fire.

These words, as every man may see plainly, make nothing for adoration of the sacrament, but for spiritual reverence to be given to Christ, of them that come to receive the sacrament, by which we are assured, if we come worthily, that we are made partakers of the very body and blood of Christ, after a spiritual manner, by faith on our behalf, and by the working of the Holy Ghost, on the behalf of Christ. I omit other emphatical speeches which Chrysostom useth, of ascending up to the gates of heaven, and of showing Christ himself to be seen, handled, eaten, &c. Which declareth manifestly, that he speaketh of a spiritual and mystical beholding, handling, eating by faith, not of a carnal sight, handling, eating with the eyes, hands, and mouth. Gregory Nazianzen's words are likewise falsified, and racked out of joint, for he saith: "when his sister had any respite from her sickness in the night, she fell down before the altar with faith, calling upon him which is honoured at it." He saith not that she prayed to the sacrament, but to God which was worshipped at the altar or communion table. For such one it was, made of boards, and so placed, as men might stand round about it. And concerning the sacrament, he showeth further how she behaved herself toward it. "And if her hand had laid up any where any part of the figures of the precious body, or of the blood, that she mingled with tears, O marvellous thing! And immediately departed feeling health." You see she came not to the altar to worship the sacrament hanging over it, or lying on it, but she brought these fragments of the sacrament with her, and she used them to stir up her zeal in prayer: superstitiously. For it is certain that you will not suffer women to touch your Calice with their hands, much less the sacrament itself, and to blubber it with their tears, which behaviour of hers was nothing

like popish adoration. To omit, that Gregory calleth the sacrament not the very body and blood of Christ, but the figures and tokens thereof.

Theodoret saith: "the mystical signs after sanctification, do not depart from their nature. For they remain in their former substance, form and shape, they may both be seen and touched as before. But they are understood to be those things which they are made to be, and are believed and revered, as those which are the same things that they are believed to be. Compare therefore the image with the exemplar or pattern. For the figure ought to be like the truth." In these words Theodoret denieth both transubstantiation and the real presence. Therefore you may easily understand what kind of reverence or estimation, he would have to be given to the outward sacrament, namely spiritual and by faith. Not that the substance of bread and wine which is the image not the pattern, the figure not the truth of Christ, should be adored as Christ himself.

Denis, an ancient writer, though no immediate scholar of Paul, is impudently slandered to have made solemn invocation of the sacrament after consecration. For if you read the whole Chapter, in which he showeth all the form of celebration of the communion in his time, you shall never find that the symbols or tokens were adored as Christ, but according to Christ's institution distributed and received. That which hath any show of your slander, is neither before nor after consecration, but in the contemplation of the mystery of the Lord's Supper, which he undertaking by the help of Jesus to set forth more at large, breaketh out into a rhetorical exclamation, or if you will so have it, an invocation of the mystery which is Christ himself: saying, "but thou, O most divine and holy mystery, revealing or laying open the coverings of dark speeches, which are compassed about thee by signs, show thyself clearly unto us, and fill the eyes of our mind with that singular light which cannot be hid." You see he doth manifestly distinguish the most divine mystery, which is Christ himself, from the signs which are the outward elements, to whom he maketh no prayer, but to Christ himself: so doth Pachymeres expound him saying: "He speaketh to the mystery itself, as to a living thing, and worthily. Even as the great divine Gregory. But thou O great and holy Passover. For our Passover, and so such an holy mystery, is Jesus Christ our Lord himself, and to him the holy man maketh his speech, that he would uncover the coverings, and fill him with singular light." Therefore this speech of Dionyse doth no more prove that he prayed to the sacrament, than the like of Gregory, that he prayed to the Paschal lamb. And although the popish church do commit most detestable idolatry in praying to it, yet the church of Christ did never make any such prayer to the sacrament, but only to God through Jesus Christ, whose sacrament it is. Where you add further, that for discerning

of Christ's body, you are called from profane houses to churches, from tables to altars, from vulgar apparel to holy vestments, to corporals and chalice, from marriage to chastity, &c. You offer heinous injury to our Saviour Christ himself, and to his Apostles, and to the primitive church for many hundred years after Christ, who knew none of these means, to discern the Lord's body, nor any such prescribed or used. But let us examine them particularly. "For better discerning of this divine meat, you say, you are called from common profane houses, to God's church." Who hath called you for such end? or who hath taught you to call those, common and profane houses, in which Christ ministered, and his Apostles, and to the primitive church for many hundred years, and where Christ himself is present? *Matt. 18. 20* Who hath taught you to discern the Lord's body better than Christ, than his Apostles, than the primitive church? We are called by Paul from private houses, to the place of public assembly, for order, comeliness, and more convenience to edifying, but for better discerning of the Lord's body, or for any greater holiness of the place, we are never called by Christ, nor his spirit in his Apostles and Evangelists. You add further, "that for this, you are forbidden to make it in the vulgar apparel, and are appointed sacred, solemn vestments." From whom came this prohibition? By whom are you appointed? You quote *Hiero. in ep. Nepot.* where there is no such matter, nor any thing sounding toward such a matter, except you mean those words, which Nepotianus spake immediately before his death to his Uncle, saying, "send this coat which I did wear in the service of Christ, to my best beloved father by age," &c. Which coat by the circumstance of the place could be no other, than such as he then wore at that instant, or had present before him, peradventure his hearen coat, whereof Hierom spake before, that he wore it under his cloak and white linen, while he was a courtier. What garment soever it was, you shall never prove that it was your masking vestments, except you can prove that Tunica signifieth an Albe, a Cheseble, and such like trumpery, and moreover that there is none other ministry or service of Christ, but saying of Mass. In the second place: Hierom saith, "the Priests of the mystical temple, which is interpreted the church, the sons of Sadoch go not forth unto the people with the garments of their ministry, lest being sanctified, they should be defiled with human conversation. And thou in the midst of the common people, and one of the people, dost thou believe that thou art clean?" Who is so blind not to see that all true Christians are Priests of the mystical temple, which is the church, and must have care not to defile their garments? Therefore Hierom speaketh nothing of apparel worn by the Ministers of the church, in the celebration of this sacrament, but showeth by the charge given to the Priest, *Ezech. 44.* that no man living in this world can be clean. In the

Epistle of Paulinus, I know not what you imagine should make for your purpose, except it be two verses written over a certain closet, that was in the church of Nola. "Thus is the place where the venerable store is laid up, and from whence the reverent pomp of the holy ministry is brought forth." This you imagine to be the vestry where all popish vestments are kept. But Paulinus meaneth, that all such things as were occupied about the holy ministry, except books, for they were in another closet, were kept and brought out of this place: as bread and wine, and vessels for both, and such other things as they occupied in their ceremonies, among which if there were any garments appointed for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, it followeth not that they were so many, and such manner of vestments as you use in your Mass. By Chrysostom it may be gathered, they had none other apparel in his church but a white vesture, in *Matt. Hom.* 85. nor in the church of Rome, by Hierom *cont. Pelag. lib.* 1. But it will never be proved that they used any garments to discern the Lord's body by them, as you pretend. The fables of John Diaconus, that wrote the life of Gregory almost 900 years after Christ, deserve small credit with wise men, to prove what garments and for what end, were worn in the primitive church, five hundred years before he was born.

But you proceed and tell us, that for this, namely, for discerning our Lord's body, is the hallowing of corporals and chalices calling to witness Ambrose *Off.* 2. c. 23. who speaketh never a word of corporals, but of golden vessels dedicated to the ministry of the sacrament, which as he himself had broken and melted to redeem captives, so he judgeth that it is the best use that they can be put to: if they be given to the poor, if they be employed for redeeming of captives, or for building of churches and enlarging the burial places. "In these three kinds, saith he, it is lawful to break, melt, and sell the vessels of the church, even after they be dedicated. It is needful that the form of the mystical cup go not out of the church, lest the ministry of the holy cup be transferred to wicked uses." Therefore within the church first there were sought out vessels that were not dedicated: then being broken, and last of all melted, they were dispensed to the poor by small portions, also they helped for the redemption of captives. But although there want new vessels, and such as seem not to be dedicated, I think they may be all converted with piety to such uses, as I have said before." The church in his time therefore had golden vessels dedicated for the holy use of the sacrament, but not to discern the Lord's body which might be discerned sufficiently without them, and never a whit by them. Exuperius bishop of Tholosa, is commended by Hierom to be so rich, as no man was richer than he, which carried the Lord's body in a wicker basket, and his blood in a glass, because he bestowed all upon relief of the poor: yet there is no

doubt, but he discerned the Lord's body better with his wicker basket and brittle glass, than Papists do with their golden corporals and chalices.

Nazianzen purging himself of profaning the mysteries of christian religion, allegorically alludeth to the profanation of the vessels of the Jewish temples by Nabuzardan and Balthasar, as his words do plainly declare, saying, "what ministering vessels not to be touched of many, or the multitude, have I delivered to the hands of the wicked, either to Nabuzardan or to Balthasar, which rioted wickedly in holy things, and suffered punishment worthy of his madness?" Where is hallowing of corporals and chalices for discerning of the Lord's body? *Optatus lib.* 1. speaking against the rage of the Donatists, saith, that beside their breaking and scraping of the communion tables or altars, which were tables of wood: "You have doubled your wickedness, while you have broken also the cups, the carriers of the blood of Christ." What hallowing of cups or corporals, to such end as you affirm, can be concluded out of these words? We know they had cups specially appointed, or if you will, consecrated, as we have, to the use of the holy sacrament, but without any popish hallowing, or as necessary to discern the Lord's body and blood by them. The author of the imperfect work under the name of Chrysostom, *Hom.* 11. saith: "If it be a sin, and danger to transfer the sanctified vessels unto private uses, as Balthasar doth teach us, who drinking in the hallowed cups, was deposed out of his kingdom and his life. If therefore it be so dangerous to transfer to private uses, these sanctified vessels, in which is not the true body of Christ but a mystery of his body is contained, how much more the vessels of our body, which God hath prepared for an habitation for himself, we ought not to give as a place for the devil, to do what he will with them." You see they had sanctified vessels, and yet confessed that the true body of Christ was not in them. But you proceed, and say, "for this profane tables are removed, and altars consecrated." Christ and his Apostles were to blame, if it be as you say, to minister upon profane tables, without consecrating of altars. But who shall bear witness for consecration of altars? Who but Augustin, *Sermo.* 255. *de tempore*? And who shall warrant us that this Sermon is not falsely intitled to Augustin, as a great number of those sermons are? But admit it be Augustin's own authority, yet he speaketh only of consecrating of altars, not for this end to discern the Lord's body and blood. For that their tables and altars were dedicated to the holy use of ministration, it is not the matter we stand upon, but whether they were consecrated for this end. They were called altars improperly, as the sacrament was called a sacrifice, the ministers sacrificing Priests and Levites, yet were they neither in matter, form, nor use, like unto your popish altars of stone, that were set against a wall. For they were tables of

wood, and so commonly were called, as it is manifest by Augustin, *Ep. 50. Bonifacio*. And *Oplatus lib. 6.* both speaking of the rage of the Donatists, which brake, or shaved, or scraped the boards of the altar or table. It stood in the midst, that the people might stand round about it. *Euseb. lib. 10. c. 4. ad Paulin. Tyr. ep. August. de verb. Tom. secund. Joan. ser. 46.* It was removeable and carried by the clerks. *Aug. Quæst. vet. et nov. test. Qu. 101.* Or otherwise, as appeareth by *Oplatus lib. 6.* Therefore it was nothing like popish altars. But you go on, and say: "that for this, the very Priests themselves, are honourable, chaste, sacred." The Lord's body may be discerned of the receivers, though the priest be a very varlet, unchaste, and unholy. For the dignity of the sacrament dependeth not upon the worthiness of the minister. We confess that the minister ought to be chaste, and holy, that in respect of himself, he may discern the Lord's body, and that his ministry is honourable, both in this sacrament and in the other. And so saith Hierom *ad Heliodorum*. "Far be it from me, that I should speak any thing amiss of them, which succeeding the order of the Apostles, do make the body of Christ with their holy mouth, by whom also we are made christians." By making the body of Christ, he meaneth the celebration of the sacrament of his body, as by making us christians, the sacrament of Baptism. For otherwise in proper speech, they neither make the body of Christ, nor us christians, but only minister the sacraments, whereby the body of Christ is represented unto us, and by use of them we are assured that we are by God's grace and spiritual regeneration, become God's children, that is, christians. In the other place against Jovinian, Hierom indeed and Ambrose in *1 Tim. 3.* thinketh it most convenient, that ministers of the sacraments should be continent, either unmarried or abstaining from their wives. But the council of Nice that decreed the contrary, is of greater authority. *Socrat. l. 1. cap. 11.* and *Athanasius ad Dracontium*. Yet Ambrose denieth not, but that it is lawful to have wife and children, as the Apostle saith: "For these are the signs, saith he, of Bishoplike dignity. But if any man following better things, and hath dedicated both his body and soul to God, that he couple not himself in matrimony, he shall be made so much the more worthy." And in the *2 Corinth. 11.* he saith, that "all the Apostles except John and Paul had wives." Yet you proceed, and say, "for this the people are forbidden to touch it with their common hands," *Nazianzen. Or. ad Arianos*. What Gregory saith of the vessels of the Jewish temple, I have showed before. But that the people were not forbidden to touch the sacraments, is manifest by that which he writeth of his sister Gorgonia, which did not only touch it with her hands, but also bewet it with her tears: and by that which Basil of the same time writeth unto Cesarea Patricia of the very case of the people handling the sacrament, and putting it to their own mouths.

And Cyril *Hier. Mystag. 5.* biddeth them take it in the hollow of their hand. That care is had that no part fall to the ground, it is of reverence to the holy mysteries, not as though the sacrament were the natural body and blood of Christ, for no part can fall to the ground from his body and blood, though crumbs of bread and drops of wine may fall. Cyril Hieros. saith: "Take heed lest any part of it fall from thee. For whatsoever thou shouldst lose, as it were a part of thine own member, thou shouldst lose it. For if any man should give thee grains of gold, wouldst thou not hold them with great diligence, taking heed lest any part of them should be lost, and thou shouldst suffer damage? And wilt thou not provide much more diligently for this which is more precious than gold or precious stones, that no crumb of it do fall away."

These words declare, that although the sacrament was highly esteemed by him, yet not taken to be the very body and blood of Christ, for then he would have said, that every crumb is a part of his body, or his whole body. The like is to be said of that superstitious consecrating of their eyes, forehead, and organs of their senses, with the moisture that remaineth on their lips, after they have drunk of the cup, which he proscribeth, declaring that he took it not for the natural blood of Christ, as you persuade men.

Origen also saith: In *27. Ex.* "I will admonish you by examples of your religion, you know that are accustomed to be present at the divine mysteries, how when you receive the Lord's body, with all heed and reverence you keep it, that never so small a piece fall from it, lest any part of the consecrated gift do fall away. For you think you are blame-worthy, and you think rightly if any part fall from it by negligence. And if you use, and worthily use so great heed to keep his body, how do you think it is a matter of less heinous offence, to neglect his word than his body?" Thus the neglect of the word, by Origen's judgment, is as great an offence, as the neglect of the sacrament. But that he esteemed not those parts that by negligence might fall to be the natural body of Christ, although he called it the body of Christ, which is a sacrament thereof, he declareth most plainly in his Commentary upon *Matthew, chap. 15.* Where he affirmeth, that the material part of the sacrament, goeth into the belly, and is cast forth into the draught: "If whatsoever enter into the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught, even the meat also which is sanctified by the word of God and by prayer, according to that which it hath material, goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught: but according to prayer which is added unto it, according to the portion of faith it is made profitable, causing that the mind is made of clear sight, looking to that which is profitable. Neither doth the matter of bread, but the word that is said upon it, profit him which receiveth it not unworthily. And these words are said of the

figurative or significative body. Many things also may be said of the word himself which was made flesh and very meat, whom whosoever shall eat, he shall doubtless live for ever, whom no evil man can eat. For it could be that he which continueth still an evil man, might eat the word made flesh, seeing he is the word and bread of life, it should not have been written, whosoever shall eat this bread shall live for ever." You see therefore how Origen and other fathers mean, when they call the sacrament the body of Christ, as our Saviour himself doth, namely, that is the typical, symbolical, that is, figurative and significative body of Christ, not his true and natural body indeed, but only by faith to the worthy receiver.

But still you go on and say; "For this sacred provision is made, that if any hosts or parts of the sacrament do remain unreceived, they be most religiously reserved, with all honour and diligence possible." Here come in all cautions and provisions of the Mass, if it be eaten by a mouse, a dog, a hog, if a spider or a fly fall into the cup, if it be poisoned, if it be vomited up by a Priest, or a lay man, if it be mouldy and corrupt, so that worms breed of it, with a hundred like cases, which Christ and his Apostles did not provide for, nor the Primitive Church did know, there is provision made by the church of Antichrist, who as in all things advanceth himself above Christ, so in wise and holy provision, far exceedeth Christ and his spirit in the Gospel. As for examination of consciences, confession of sins, continence from unclean lusts, we confess they ought to be preparations, for men to receive worthily, but no Popish excommunication of consciences, auricular confession, and a more scrupulous prescription of continence in married persons, than the scripture doth require. As for receiving fasting, is a thing indifferent, of convenience according to the order of the church, but not of necessity, neither doth Augustin teach otherwise, *Ep.* 118. For even in his time, on the day of the institution of the supper, the custom of the church was to receive after dinner, as he showeth in that Epistle, and it appeareth by the council of Carthage, 3. *C.* 29. *Matiscon.* 2. *C.* 6.

But now after you have showed, how you Papists discern the Lord's body you will prove, that we discern it not, because after the order of our book, if any thing remain after our communion, the Curate or clerk may take it home to his own use. A substantial argument, I promise you. But we discern the Lord's body, as the Apostle hath there taught us. Let a man therefore examine himself, &c. not by making superstitious provisions, for the bread and wine, which remaineth after the communion; whereof there is no greater account to be made, than of the water after baptism, for the consecration extendeth to no more bread and wine, than is bestowed according to Christ's institution. Therefore Evagrius testifieth, that by an old

custom of the church of Constantinople, that which remained after the communion, was given to young children that went to school. In the Church of France by the Matiscon 2, Council cap. 6. it was decreed that the remnants of the sacrament, on Wednesday or Friday, should be given to young children fasting, sprinkled with wine. And the church of England by as good authority, hath appointed, for avoiding of superstition and all other inconveniences, that the minister, shall have the bread and wine to his private use. As for the ceremony of bread, that was given to the Catechumen in Augustin's time, we have no more to do with it, than you, and less with your superstitious holy bread.

But seeing in our celebration of the Lord's supper, we have all things material and essential, according to the institution of Christ, and the doctrine and practice of his Apostles, and you do manifestly pervert the end of his institution, by your blasphemous sacrifice, and idolatrous worshipping of the creatures, by not showing the Lord's death, by your sacrilegious depriving of the people of the one half of the Sacrament, and other your superstitious profanations, if any of you, that gathered these notes, pertain to God's election, I beseech him in his good time, to call you to his knowledge and acknowledging of his truth. To the rest I say with the Apostle, the Lord reward you according to your works.

30. The body of Christ is not so in the sacrament that it can be defiled by any man's sin, or otherwise be abused, by any act of man or beast. For Christ is now in heaven glorified, and can suffer no more of wicked men. Yet it is an heinous offence, to defile by sin, the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.

31. He that sinneth no more, doth not lightly, but earnestly repent of his sins past. As for Popish satisfaction by punishment of ourselves, otherwise than by hearty sorrow for our sins, which yet is no satisfaction for them, there can none be concluded out of this text. Nor that God doth punish his children, in the next life, although he chastise them with temporal scourges in this life to bring them to repentance and amendment, not to make satisfaction for their sins forgiven. By true and faithful repentance therefore, with prayer, fasting, alms, and other works by God allowed, as the fruits of repentance and faith, we may avoid God's heavy judgment which our sins have deserved, through the merits of Christ, and not by the merit of satisfaction of our works but by mere mercy of God.

33. The words that follow, If any be an hungered, let him eat at home, do declare most manifestly, that this expectation, and tarrying one for another, is to receive the communion of the Lord's supper together, and not to the eating of their love suppers: which were chiefly to relieve the poor, that were hungry. Photius upon these words, saith, "Tarry one for another. Wherefore? lest you be proved to receive the Lord's body

and blood unworthily, lest partaking unworthily, being made guilty of the murder of his body, and the shedding of his blood, you receive judgment unavoidable." Amrose upon this text, saith: "He saith that they must tarry one for another, that the oblation of many be celebrated together, and that all may be served, and if any be impatient, he may be fed with earthly bread at home. That you come not together to judgment, that is, that you keep not the mystery so, as you be worthy to be reprehended, with offence." Hierom, or the author of the Comment in his name, upon this place saith; "Because none tarried for other, that the offering might be made in common, therefore they came together, not unto sanctification but unto judgment." To the same effect writeth Primasius. "Because it was offered to him which came first, and he did eat and went his way, they came together unto judgment and not to sanctification." Chrysostom and Theophylact, refer it, both to the sacrament, and to the love supper. So that a communion can by no means be avoided nor a private mass established.

34. If your last note be true, he speaketh not here of matters pertaining to the celebration of the sacrament, but concerning ordering of the feast of love. Indeed Amrose, Chrysostom, Photius, Theophylact, do understand these matters generally of other things, to be reformed, and which needed his presence rather than words. But admit that he speaketh specially, of the order of celebration of the sacrament, how can you prove any part of your Popish mass to have been set down, by tradition from the Apostles? Gregory confesseth, that it was the custom of the Apostles to consecrate the host of oblation, at the only saying of the Lord's prayer, *Lib. 7. Ep. 63.* Yet you are not ashamed to say, the whole administration of your mass, is agreeable thereto, and ours wholly repugnant unto the same. Yet you say, we do confess, that it doth not agree unto these unwritten traditions. Indeed we acknowledge, that we are not bound to any unwritten traditions, but that the form of your mass cometh from the Apostles' tradition, we do utterly deny, and your own authors do testify, that every patch of it was thrust in, by the Popes of later time than the Apostles. But let us see what you can confirm out of the ancient writers, to have been of the Apostles' tradition, which we observe not. First, to take it only fasting. *August. Ep. 118.* Wherein I have discovered your falsehood before. For it was not in Augustin's time, nor long after, appointed to be taken only of them that were fasting. Secondly, we have taken away consecration, with the sign of the cross, without which Augustin saith, no sacrament is rightly perfected. Indeed, Augustin, *Jo. Tr. 118.* saith, that the sign of the cross, was a ceremony used in all the sacraments, which if it were not used, nothing is performed or done according to custom, but that this sign was necessary unto the consecration, or that it

was of the Apostles' tradition, he saith not. Chrysostom likewise saith that the sign of the cross was used, to put men in mind of the death of Christ, but neither that it was necessary to consecration, or that it was taught by the Apostles to be used in such manner. And the forming of it with the finger in the body, he accounteth little worth, except it be formed in the mind, with great faith. Therefore that which Chrysostom requireth, we have in our administration, the showing of the Lord's death and passion, though we have not that which in his time, was used as a bare sign, to put men in remembrance of it. Thirdly, you say, the Apostles taught to keep a memory or invocation of saints in this sacrifice, which we have not, for which you quote *August. tract. 84. in Joan. et Chryso. Hom. 21. in Act.* of which neither of both saith, that the Apostles taught the church to keep any such memory: and Chrysostom hath never a word of invocation of saints. They both indeed say, that at the celebration of the supper, they kept a memory of Martyrs. Chrysostom saith, they offered for them, and that was no dishonour to them. But what should they offer, but thanksgiving? Augustin saith, "We do not so make mention of them at the very table itself, as we do for others that rest in peace, so that we also pray for them, but rather that they might pray for us, that we may follow their steps." Not that they did properly invoke the saints, but that this commemoration of the martyrs might move them, to pray for them. For the ancient memory or commemoration as appeareth by Epiphanius *Cont. Aetium her. 79.* was both for just men and for sinners, for the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, &c. as he saith to separate or distinguish Christ from the order of men. Augustin saith, to offer thanks for them *Ench. C. 110.* In which, although there were neither express prayers for the dead, nor to the saints, but a memory and rehearsal of their names, yet by little and little the errors of prayer for the dead and invocation of saints, gathered strength and increase.

Last of all you say, the Apostles decreed, that in this sacrifice, there should be special prayers for the dead, we have none. Witness of this decree *Chrys. in Phil. hom. 3. Aug. de cur. pro mort.* Chrysostom indeed saith, "That it was not in vain decreed by the Apostles, that in the celebration of the reverend mysteries, memory or mention should be made of them which are departed from hence." Which he doth interpret, to have been for that end, men should pray for them, to procure some little help for them, for so he saith in his exhortation. "Let us procure them some help, small indeed, but let us help them." Augustin allegeth no decree of the Apostles, but the custom of the church in this time. "That in the prayers of the priest, which are poured forth to the Lord God, at his altar, the commendation of the dead, also hath his place." Thus have you but one witness,

who also without any good ground affirmeth this memory to be of the Apostles' decree. Justin Martyr nearer to the Apostles' times by 200 years, rehearsing the order of celebration according to the Apostles' writings, hath no memory or mention of the dead. Dionysius, of whom it is uncertain in what time he lived, yet certain it is, he is ancient and of some thought to be that Dionyse Bishop of Alexandria, of whom Eusebius maketh often mention in the 6. and 7. books of his histories, declareth that there was none other memory of the dead in his time, but of the saints only, whose commendation was set forth, to the praise of God, and to the imitation of the living. *Ecl. Hier. cap. 3. part. 3.* who if he were the Apostles' immediate scholar, as you contend, giveth sentence flatly against you, touching invocation of saints, and prayer for the dead, to be the doctrine and tradition of the Apostles: when handling the whole form of administration of the Lord's Supper so diligently and particularly, he can tell us nothing either of invocation of the dead, or prayer for the dead, but only of memory or mention, for such ends as I have showed before. Yea, even in the seventh chapter, where he treateth of burial of the dead, and the ceremonies used about that office: he denieth, that any prayers for the dead are profitable to them, but only such as being made by the Bishop or Minister of the church in faith, grounded upon God's promises, as by the interpreter of God's will, do rather declare what God hath already granted to them that depart in the faith of Christ, than desire any thing to be performed, as their censure in pardoning and retaining of sins, in binding and loosing of sinners, is an interpretation and declaration of the judgment of God: not that God is minister of the corrupt judgment of men, but that men which are appointed by God's spirit to interpret God's will, do separate those that are judged of God, according to their worthiness. Therefore in such sort, "The divine Bishop," saith he, "doth ask those things that are promised by God, and are acceptable to God, and shall doubtless be granted, both showing to God which loveth the good, his own disposition resembling the good, and declareth as an interpreter or by way of interpretation, to them that are present, those rewards, which shall be to them that are holy." And this is the resolution of that question which he moveth, whether prayers are available for the dead, and in what respect they may be profitable. Whereby we see, that this error was very young in his time, and had not yet obtained strength, when prayers for the dead were not taken simply for prayers, but rather as declarations of the performance of God's promises, to all his elect after this life, namely that they are pardoned of all their sins committed of frailty, and are placed in rest with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. For these things only were required in those prayers, which were uttered by the Bishop, for them that were buried. Concerning the mixing of water with wine,

I have answered before. That it is neither of Christ's institution, nor of the general practice of the church, but a thing indifferent, so it be used without superstition. Calvin therefore and the reformed churches in these days made no new administration according to the Apostles' unwritten words, but reformed the new administration of the Popish church according to the most ancient institution and practice of Christ and his Apostles, and of the Primitive Church, in all necessary and essential points set forth in the Word written. And as for those things which the Apostle did dispose at his presence, we know, that either they pertained not to the administration of the sacrament, or else they were accidental orders meet for the church of Corinth, which are not necessary to be the same in all times and places. How agreeable our doctrine and practice of this sacrament is to Christ's institution, set forth in the scripture, in name, substance, and all essential points, let the world see and God judge.

## CHAPTER 12.

8. This is an unlearned distinction of the Popish learned, which showeth no difference between things of divers natures. For all God's graces be freely given, as well those that are bestowed upon the elect, as upon the reprobate, neither are men grateful, just, and holy in God's sight by any gifts of justice or holiness inherent, but only by Jesus Christ, *Eph. 1. 6. Eph. 2. 7. 8.* "Dividing to every man as he will," saith Ambrose "He saith as he will, not as it is due." *Exhort. ad virg.*

9. Faith of doing miracles may be in wicked men, as you confess, therefore differeth in substance from justifying faith, which worketh by love. "He calleth faith here, not this common faith, but that whereof he speaketh a little after: If I have all faith, so that I can remove mountains." Theodoret upon this place. Photius and Oecumenius say, "Abusively he calleth the effect by the name of the thing."

29. Augustin saith not, that any miracles are done by any saints at any place of their memories, but by God where it pleaseth him. "Is not Africa," saith he, "full of the bodies of the Holy Martyrs? And yet we know not that any such things are done here in any place. For as that which the Apostle saith: All the saints have not the gifts of healing, neither have all the discerning of spirits: so neither in all memories of the saints it is not his will that these things should be done, which divideth his own to every man as he will." Therefore, when it is certain that God hath or doth work miracles in any place, we must not call him to account, why he doth not the same in all places. But hereof it followeth not, that feigned and lying miracles of Popery be wrought by God or by his saints: but seeing they tend to maintain Heresy and Idolatry, we must say still with Augustin, "Away with these feigned miracles of lying men, or wonders wrought by deceiving devils." *De unit. Ecl. c. 16.*

## CHAPTER 13.

2. That faith which is void of good works, is nothing worth unto salvation. Yet a man is justified by faith without works, but yet by such a faith as worketh by love, *Rom. 3.* for a justifying faith cannot be without charity. "Good life," saith Augustin, "is inseparable from faith, which worketh by love," *De fide et oper. cap. 23.* Ambrose upon this text saith: "To work wonders, and to cast out devils by faith, is nothing worth, except a man be an earnest follower of good conversation." *Leo, Ser. 7. de quadr. Gennadius apud Occumenium*, saith: "He doth not now speak of that faith of the believers which is common and general, but of the gift of faith. For there was a certain kind of gifts, that was called by the same name of faith, which was given to many at that time, for the manifestation of the presence of this spirit. Of this gift also, our Lord saith in the Gospel, If you shall have faith, as a grain of Mustard seed, you shall say to the mountain, remove and be cast into the sea, and it shall be done unto you. For our Lord spake not of the common faith, to them as unbelievers, but his speech was to his disciples that is, if you shall have the gift of faith: and that which our Lord in the Gospel said to be the greatest namely, to remove mountains, the Apostle saith, is nothing without charity."

3. Put in Papists, instead of Calvinists, and this note is true. Add also, that Papists suffering death for treason against their Prince and Country, are no martyrs, though they should repent at their death, and renounce their false faith: much less continuing Antichristian heretics.

10. Augustin speaketh in that place never a word of the saints that are in heaven knowing our affairs here in earth, but of the perfect knowledge that all the saints shall have after the resurrection. If the prophet Elisha being absent in body saw his servant Gehazi taking the gifts which Naaman the Syrian, whom the Prophet had cleansed from his leprosy, gave him, which the wicked servant thought to have done closely, because his master saw him not: "How much more in the spiritual body," saith he, "the saints shall see all things, not only if they shall shut their eyes, but also if they be absent in body. For then shall that be perfect whereof the Apostle speaketh," &c. Therefore either ignorance or impudence was the author of this note.

13. Charity is greatest, because it is of longest continuance. Justification is attributed to faith only, because faith only doth apprehend the mercy of God promised in Christ, and not charity, though it continue, when faith and hope cease, because that is obtained which is believed and hoped. And that in respect of continuance, the Apostle saith, that charity is greatest, the ancient Fathers do consent. Chrysostom saith upon this text. "The greatest of these is charity, namely in this point, because they pass away: Charity continueth." In *1 Cor. Hom. 31.* Primasius saith: "In this

present life there are three, in the life to come only the love of God and his Angels, and of all saints. Therefore that is greater which is always needful, than that which shall once have an end." Augustin *De doct. Christ. lib. 1. cap. 39.* saith upon this text. "The greatest of these is charity, because when every one shall come to eternal life, the other two departing, charity shall continue more increased, and more certain."

13. The gift of faith to do miracles, spoken of in the beginning of the chapter, may be without charity, but a justifying faith which worketh by love, cannot possibly be without love. "A good life, saith Augustin, is inseparable from faith." *De fide. et oper. c. 13.* Bede upon this text, out of Augustin, saith: "A godly faith will not be without hope and without charity." And therefore though all sin be against faith and charity, yet we do not hold that either faith or charity in them that are justified is utterly lost by deadly sin, though both be much weakened and diminished thereby.

## CHAPTER 14.

2. The Apostle by occasion of the abuse of the gift of tongues, showeth that in the congregation, all things that are preached, prayed, or sung, must be uttered in a language known unto the people, that they may understand and be edified by that which is preached, prayed and sung. But where you say, to talk in a strange language, unknown also to himself, profiteth not the hearers, Chrysostom saith, such an one profiteth not himself, nor his hearers, and that the Apostle in this place speaketh of him that understandeth what he saith in a tongue unknown to others.

*In ep. 1 Cor. Hom. 35.* "Thou wilt say then doth the tongue edify no man? not so. For he saith, he that speaketh with tongues edifieth himself, which verily cannot be, except he know what he speaketh. And hitherto he speaketh of them which understand what they speak, they understand themselves, but they are not able to utter them unto others." So saith Photus, when the Apostle saith, he that speaketh with the tongue edifieth himself. "He speaketh of them which understand those things which they speak, but cannot interpret them to other." Ambrose saith upon the same words: "By that he perhaps alone knoweth what he speaketh, he edifieth himself alone." Whereby it is manifest that he which speaketh in a tongue which he understandeth not himself, doth not edify himself, much less others. But if there were any that spake mysteries in a tongue which they themselves understood not, as some of the Fathers think, therefore they speak to God mysteries in the spirit, because they uttered to God their speech according to their spiritual gift, yet was this gift, if any such were, both to themselves and to others unprofitable, without interpretation, and ought not to be used in the Church, where all things are to be done unto edification. Wherefore these words are no protection for him which



hath the spiritual gift of tongues, to pray or sing in a tongue which he understandeth not, whereby he cannot be edified himself, much less ought to be tolerated in the church, where others are not edified by him.

6. What if he read to them the Scriptures, and the interpretation and exhortations of the Doctors upon them, as the Papists do oftentimes in their nine lessons? Is it not all one case, and as little profit to be taken by the one as by the other?

8. Even so, he that readeth the Scriptures of the Old or New Testament, the Homilies of the ancient fathers, containing exhortation to good life, and deboration from sin, except he do it in a speech which his hearers understand, if he mean that his people should profit thereby, cannot attain to his purpose, nor do the people any good at all: such is the reading of popish service which hath any good matter in it, the rest doth less hurt, because it is not understood.

14. If a man pray in a tongue which he himself understandeth not, as I have proved before, it is nothing fruitful to his own instruction, he edifieth not himself: no although he had a miraculous gift to pray in the tongue which he understandeth not: for if such person do utter words of prayer, his spirit, that is, his spiritual gift prayeth, and not he. But if a man have not the gift, neither he nor his spirit prayeth: for the spirit here signifieth the spiritual gift of tongues: as witnesseth Chrysostom upon this text, in *I Cor. hom. 35*. "My spirit prayeth, that is, the gift granted to me, and moving my tongue." The same words hath Theophylact. So saith Theodoret upon this place: "He calleth the gift, the spirit." Photius saith upon these words "my spirit prayeth, that is, my spiritual gift to speak with tongues." Then, what prayeth in them that are void of this gift, if they pray in a tongue that they understand not? not their spirit which they have not. Therefore these words are no approbation of such prayers as are uttered in a tongue unknown to him that uttereth them. But you say, "the Apostle forbiddeth not such praying, confessing that his spirit, heart, and affection prayeth well toward God, though his mind and understanding be not profited to instruction." Verily God himself abhorreth such praying, where men come near him with their lips, when their heart is far from him, and the Apostle forbiddeth in the church all that is not edifying or instructing, both him that prayeth, and the church that is present. And where you say the Apostle confesseth that his spirit, heart, and affection pray well, without his mind and understanding: it is false. For he speaketh not of his spirit, heart, and affection, but of his spiritual gift, as I have proved by the interpretation of the ancient fathers, and the text is plain, that the word spirit in this place so signifieth, and not the heart or affection. *Abbas, Ps. 101*. You add further most impudently, that he doth "not appoint such an one to get his strange prayer translated into his vulgar tongue, to obtain thereby the fore-

said instruction." But yet he willeth such one that hath the gift of tongues, to pray that he may interpret his strange tongue himself, or that some other should interpret what he saith, or if neither he nor any other be present that can interpret it, he willeth him to keep silence in the church, *ver. 13, 28*. And if spirit were to be taken for heart and affection, without mind and understanding, as you do newly and absurdly expound it, the Apostle willeth such to pray not only with spirit, but also with mind and understanding, *ver. 15*. therefore he willeth them to get the interpretation of their prayer. Therefore Chrysostom upon this place showeth, that prayers not understood of him that uttereth them, are altogether unprofitable, although he utter them by a miraculous gift, *Hom. 35*. "Thou seest, saith he, how by little and little, he is come to this point, that he declareth him to be unprofitable, not only to others, but even also to himself, seeing the mind of such a man, saith he, is void of fruit. For if a man speak only in the Persian's language, or in any other strange tongue, and do not understand those things which he speaketh, he shall be even to himself a stranger, as he which understandeth not the meaning of the voice. For there were many of old time which had the gift of praying and of the tongue joined together, and they prayed and sounded, using the tongue of the Persians or the Romans, but with their mind they did not understand what they said. Therefore, saith he, if I pray with the tongue, my spirit, that is, the gift granted to me, and moving my tongue, prayeth, but my mind is void of fruit. What then is best and most profitable to be done? yea what ought he to do, and what things to pray for? he ought to pray both with spirit and mind. I will pray, saith he, with spirit, I will pray with mind, I will sing with spirit, I will sing also with mind. Also he teacheth here, that he ought to speak with the tongue, and that his mind also ought to understand the words. For except that be done, another confusion must needs rise of it." This saith Chrysostom of them that had the gift of tongues, as he supposeth, without understanding of that they spake: what would he have said, if he had heard the unlearned Papists, both men and women, babbling on their Beads and Primers, that which they understand not? and for want of understanding, are not able to utter it, but miserably, shamefully, and ridiculously chop and change, clip and mangle the words, the accents, the quantity, the distinction of those things which they found in their barbarous tongue, so that they have either no sense at all, or sometime contrary or ridiculous sense. The clerk of Michael's is not yet out of remembrance in Cambridge, who sounded a dirge lesson after this manner: *Homo natus de muliere brevis vivens tempore repletur multis miseris. Peccam, peccavi, peccavi, peccavi, peccavi*. Nor of the Priest in Cambridgeshire that read the Gospel *Rundit for Respondit, Bumpizas for Baptizas*. It is not so notorious but as true that an unlearned old woman said her

Ave Mary, after this sound: *Ave Mari gratia plinam dumsticum, benedictatu in mulabs yeth benedictus frictus frentris tuisweet Jesus, Amen.* And although some women hit better upon the sound of the words, you shall hardly hear any one that is unlearned, which readeth, and much less which saith by rote their ordinary prayers aright. Therefore if you were not past all shame, and void of remorse of conscience, you would never say that the Apostle alloweth such lip-labour for prayers.

23. Although it appeareth by the text, that there was some disorder in the church of the Corinthians, yet you do lewdly charge the primitive church generally with this disorder. Also by your black Saints, you charge the Corinthians with greater disorder than you are able to prove them guilty of. But if I ever heard a black Saint in the church, it was in Paul's Church on Paul's day, when in time of procession a great multitude of horns blowing the death of the buck, which the hunters brought into the church with them, and the great Organs playing together with the confused shouting of the people, made a noise meet for the triumph of the popish church. What edifying the unlearned, faithful or unfaithful may have by your Latin service, your own tongue confesseth while you describe the disorder of the Corinthians.

26. Whether the Psalm were new or old, the conclusion is, that all things in the church must be done to edifying. And so were Psalms and Hymns sung in the primitive church, by the whole congregation together. "In old time, saith Chrysost, they sung Psalms together, so do we." *Cor. Hom. 36.* The same testifieth Dionysius, *Hier. cap. 3. par. 2.* "The whole fulness of the church, saith he, sing a general confession of praise. The Bishop beginneth to sing the Psalms, and all the orders of the church sing with him."

27. It was not only against order, but against edifying, that some of them prayed, blessed, sung Psalms in a tongue which the people did not understand. And so much worse it is in the Popish church, where praying, blessing, cursing, singing, saying, reading, and all other rites of the Church are done in a strange language, whereunto the people cannot say Amen by Paul's doctrine, because they know not what is said or sung. But the Papists wiser than the Holy Ghost, have invented how they may not only say Amen where they understand not, but also pray in a tongue that they understand not, namely of intention, proceeding of faith *implicit*, of I cannot tell what spirit, heart, and affection, though his mind and understanding be not profited to instruction.

33. The error of them that did write against the regimen of women, is easily confuted by the fifth Commandment, where civil authority and government is established as well to the Mother, Mistress, Lady, and Queen, as to the Father, Master, Lord, and King, the natural order of sex, nevertheless observed. But the sex of womenkind is not capable of spiritual government, and therefore may not

ordinarily exercise any Ecclesiastical function of authority in the Church, as preaching, ministering the sacraments, excommunication, &c. And yet the Scripture alloweth a ministry or service of women to the Church, namely to comfort and help the poor, as we read *Rom. 16. 1.* Phœbe a minister of the church of Cenchrus: and *1 Tim. 5.* The widows that served the church in the same office. But when you exclude them from all spiritual regimen, Ecclesiastical function, and cure of souls, I marvel whether the office of an Abbess, or Prioress among you, be counted mere civil and temporal functions, and have no cure of souls directly pertaining to them. But howsoever they are accounted with you, in the church of God, to whomsoever God committeth authority and government, he committeth also directly and specially the care of souls, and not of bodies only, yet this cure to be exercised according to the distinct and several limits of Ecclesiastical and civil functions. Therefore the Father and Mother, Master and Mistress, Lord and Lady, King and Queen, have care of the souls of their children, scholars, servants, and subjects, and not of their bodies only. Parents are commanded to bring up their children in the discipline and instruction of the Lord, *Ephes. 6. 4.* Whereby it is manifest they must have care of their souls, and so must all other governors, as Masters, Magistrates, and Princes, every one in his calling, according to his authority. Therefore Princes, be they men or women, ought to have care of their subjects' souls, and to provide for the same by making Ecclesiastical laws and compelling their subjects to serve God according to his laws. Therefore to deny unto women all care of souls, and to say they have no authority to make Ecclesiastical laws, by which their subjects shall be compelled to serve God according to his word, is in effect to deny them all authority and government, and not spiritual government only. Augustin counteth him mad that will deny that Princes ought to have no care of their subjects' souls. *Ep. 50. Bonifacio.* "Who being in his right wits would say to Kings, Take you no care by whom in your kingdom the church of your Lord God is defended or oppugned, let it not pertain unto you who in your kingdom will be religious or sacrilegious, to whom it cannot be said, Let it not pertain unto you, who in your kingdom will be chaste or unchaste."

Concerning their authority and duty in making Ecclesiastical laws, He saith likewise: "The Prince serveth otherwise as a man, and otherwise as he is a King. Because he is a man he serveth God living faithfully, but because he is a King, he serveth God by making laws in convenient strength, which command just things, and forbid the contrary, as Hezekiah served God in destroying the groves and temples of Idols." Therefore Princes without confusion of the functions civil and Ecclesiastical, may command and prescribe Ecclesiastical persons to execute any spiritual function, ac-

ording to the word of God, and punish the neglect of their duties in them. And thus may a queen do by her Sovereign authority, though she may not execute any of those functions in her own person, David, Solomon, Josephat, Hezekiah, &c. commanded the Priests to execute their office according to the Law of God, yet was it not lawful for them to execute any thing that was proper to the Priest's office in their own persons. So did Constantine, Theodosius, Martianus, Justinianus, make Ecclesiastical laws to compel Ecclesiastical persons to do their duties, and called general councils to decide questions of religion, and gave order how to proceed in them according to the Scriptures. Constantinus spake thus in the Nicene council: "The books of the Gospels and Apostles, and the Oracles of the ancient Prophets," saith he, "do plainly instruct us in the understanding of God. Therefore, setting all hateful discord aside, let us take out of the sayings of God the explication of the questions." *Theod. hist. li. 1. cap. 1.* Theodosius in the council of Constantinople the first, elected Nectarius Bishop of that See, *Socom, lib. 7. c. 8.* Also when the council had decreed among other things that the See of Constantinople should be in dignity next to the See of Rome, and in privileges and authority equal. "The Emperor gave his voice of assent and made a law, that the faith of the Nicene council should prevail," *Socom, lib. 7. c. 9.* "Theodosius the younger," saith Evagrius. *lib. 1. c. 12.* "made a law, whereby he condemned the Nestorian heretics, and made other laws accommodated or made fit for our Religion." Valentinianus called the council of Chalcedon, where Martianus himself was present, and appointed Judges and a Senate to order the Council, by whose authority Dioscorus Bishop of Alexandria, was commanded to sit in the council, contrary to the commandment of Leo Bishop of Rome given to his Legates and there uttered, until good cause was showed, why he ought not to sit in the council, *Conc. Chal. Actian 1.* The same Judges with the council decreed, that the Bishop of Constantinople should have the same honour and authority that the Bishop of Rome hath, notwithstanding the contradiction of the Bishop of Rome's Legates. *Act. 16.* And the Emperor confirmed the same, *Liberat. c. 13.* Augustin testifieth, that an Ecclesiastical cause was committed to the hearing of Melchiodus Bishop of Rome, by the commandment of Constantinus the Emperor. *De unico baptismo, c. 16.* Socrates witnesseth that he comprehendeth in his story the Roman Emperors: "Because upon them, since they began to be Christians,

the Ecclesiastical matters do depend, and the greatest councils by their decree have been gathered and are gathered." *Li. 5. in proem.*

Now let us see what substantial reasons you bring, to prove that a woman, being a Prince, may not "prescribe any thing to the Clergy how to minister the Sacraments or give any man right, to rule, preach, or execute any spiritual function, as under her, and by her authority." First you say, "No creature is able to impart that whereof itself is incapable, both by nature and scriptures." I answer, First, a woman being a Prince, hath as great authority as a man. But I have showed before, that godly kings of the Israelites commanded and prescribed the Priests to minister the sacrifices, and sacraments of the Old Testament, which it was not lawful for them to do themselves. And although the authority of ordaining Ecclesiastical Ministers, pertaineth not to civil Magistrates, yet may they command meet persons to be ordained, and being ordained, to execute all parts of their function according to the word of God, under their authority, and by their authority, although the spiritual virtue of their office do depend upon an higher authority of Christ, which is not subject to men. The Prince may command a Bishop or minister to Baptize a person, whom by God's word it is lawful for them to baptize. But the virtue of regeneration is not subject to the Prince's commandment, and so of all other parts of their office.

Your second reason is: "This regimen is expressly given to the Apostles, Bishops and prelates, they only have authority to bind and loose." I answer, The authority of civil Magistrates doth give them nothing that is peculiar to Ecclesiastical ministers, yet is it of power to command them to do and execute all those things, as they ought to do by the word of God, and not after the corrupt affection of the Prince. Thirdly you say: "They only are set by the Holy Ghost to govern the Church," *Act. 20.* I answer, their government doth not exclude the authority of the Christian Magistrate, which is no way contrary to their spiritual government, but is appointed to maintain it, and to see it to be exercised, as it ought to be. Fourthly you say: "They only have cure of souls directly, and must make account to God for the same," *Heb. 13.* The text saith not, That they only have cure of souls, but princes also have cure of souls in their office, and must give account to God for the same, as parents, masters, and all that have any authority committed by God unto them, have it for the benefit of men's souls more specially than for their bodies.

#### DECLARATION OF THE SENSE OF THIS CHAPTER.

What consent you have of antiquity, that prayeth not understood of him that uttereth them, are profitable to edify him, I have showed by the testimony of ancient writers,

whereas you have not so much as one blind and dumb quotation for your assertion. And let the indifferent reader in God's name examine our dealing, in applying the authority

and arguments of the Apostle against popish Latin service, which is not understood of the common peop. c. And where you say it is the approved godly use of the universal church, for the service in the Latin or Greek tongue, you utter many untruths together. For the primitive church for more than six hundred years after Christ, never approved any use of service in a tongue unknown to the common people. Origen *cont. Cels. lib. 8. num. 13.* answering the blasphemer which charged the Christians to call the Angels by barbarous names in their public prayers: "Forgetting, saith he, that he hath to do with christians, which offer their prayers to God only by Jesus, he mingleth strange matter, rather confounding them with the affairs of christians, and saying, whom if a man call by barbarous names they have virtue, if by Greek or Latin names they have not. For whom do we call upon by a barbarous name? wherefore let all men be persuaded, that Celsus doth object these things to us undeserving, and let them know that true christians do not use in their prayers the name of God, which are used in the Holy Scripture, but Greeks do use Greek names, Romans use Latin names, and men of every nation do pray and praise God with all their might in their own mother tongue. And the Lord of all tongues doth hear them praying in all tongues, understanding them that speak so diversely none otherwise than if they were men of one speech or language." This testimony of Origen doth plainly declare what was the approved use of the universal church in his time, that all nations had their public prayers in their mother tongue, and also that their prayers were not made to Angels or Saints, but only to God by Jesus Christ.

Basil *in ep. 62.* to the clergy of Neocæsarea speaking of the vigils and public exercise of prayers and singing of Psalms in true faith, saith: "while it is yet night, the people riseth early with us unto the house of prayer, and in labour and affliction, and continual tears, making their confession to God: at last rising from their prayers, they come to singing of Psalms. And one while being divided into two parts, they sing by course, one side over against another, confirming thereby their meditation of the divine sentences together, and also serving one another for attention, and intention of the heart separated from other things. Then again suffering one to begin the song, the rest do follow, and so in diversity of singing Psalms, and praying between: after they have passed over the night, when the day beginneth to shine, altogether as it were out of one mouth, and one heart do offer to the Lord a Psalm of confession, every one of them making proper, or applying to himself the words of repentance. Therefore, if for these things ye flee from us, you shall fly from the Egyptians, from both the Lybians, the Thebans, the Palestines, the Arabians, the Phœnicians, the Syrians, and those that dwell by Euphrates, and generally from all them that have watchings and prayers, and common singing of Psalms in honour." This

testimony of Basil proveth that all Nations, of what language soever they were, had their common prayers and service in their vulgar tongue: for else they could not apply unto themselves the words of repentance that were in the Psalms, nor meditate upon the divine sentences. And it cannot be thought that all nations understood the Latin or Greek tongues, specially the Arabians, Syrians, Phœnicians, and inhabitants of Euphrates. Of such singing of Psalms by the people through the whole church, testifieth *Victor Uticensis lib. 2.* Hierom testifieth that at the burial of Paula, whereunto "the whole multitude of the cities of Palestine resorted. The Psalms were sung in order, in the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syrian languages." In Epitaph. As there were people of these divers Nations and languages present. So he saith in Epitaph. Nepotiani: "Now both the voices and letters of all Nations do sound the passion of Christ, and his resurrection. I speak not of the Hebrews, Greeks, and Latins, which nations our Lord hath dedicated in the title of his cross. The savage nature of the Besses, and the multitude of people that wear skins, which sometime offered men in sacrifice to the ghosts of the dead, have now broken their harsh language into the sweet song of Christ." So that there was no nation so barbarous which did not in their natural language praise God, and sing Psalms to Christ. Bonfinius testifieth, that there is a nation of the Slavonians inhabiting the region called Lipna, to whom Hierom framed an order of service, wherein they continue to this day, although Ludovicus 2. laboured to bring them from it. *1. rec. 2. lib. 10.* Nicholas the first allowed the Slavonians that were converted to have their service in their mother tongue. *Aene. Syl. hist. Boem. c. 13.*

The Armenians, Russians, Syrians, Ethiopians, at this day have their service in their several languages, as their several churches and stories declare. Yea the Pope alloweth some of them in Rome, to celebrate in their own language. The council of Lateran under Innocentius the third, decreed *cap. 9.* "That for as much as in many places, within the same City and Diocess, there be nations mingled of divers tongues, having divers rites and manners, under one faith, we straightly command, that the Bishops of such Cities or Diocesses, provide meet men, which according to the diversity of their rites and tongues, may celebrate the divine service unto them, and minister the sacraments of the church." It is not long therefore, since even the church of Rome approved service in other languages than the Greek and Latin, and so doth the Pope himself this day at Rome. And this discourse of Paul, touching strange tongues, toucheth also the Greek and Latin tongues, used in such assemblies, where the people do not understand them. But let us hear what reason you have to the contrary. First, you say, we must know, that here is no word written or meant, but only of such tongues as men spake by miracle. That granted, it fol-

loweth more strongly, upon Paul's arguments, that strange tongues not spoken by miracle, nor understood of the people, ought not to be used in the church, when such as were spoken by miracle, might not be used, because they did not edify. Secondly you say, "that nothing is meant of the common languages of the world, or of the faithful, understood of the learned, or civil people in every great city, and in which the Scriptures were written, as Hebrew, Greek, and Latin." Answer, the Apostle's words and meaning are manifest, of all tongues not understood of the unlearned in the congregation, *vers.* 23, 24. Where the vulgar by your own note, signifyeth all rude and unlearned men: which in Corinth understood neither Hebrew, nor Latin, although the Greek language was their mother tongue. The Scriptures also were first written, most in Hebrew and Greek, and some part in Chaldee, but in Latin, no part was first written. But they were translated, as well into the Syrian, Arabic, Ethiopian, and other tongues, as into Latin. Wherefore, even the Latin and Hebrew tongues, were forbidden to be spoken in the Corinthian church, except they were interpreted, that the congregation might be edified. And therefore you say impudently, that only such tongues are spoken "against here, as could not commonly be interpreted, but by the miraculous gift of interpretation." For although some had the miraculous gift of interpretation, yet if any could interpret without that gift, it was sufficient for Paul's purpose, that all things in the church might be done to edification. Therefore he saith, let one interpret, but if there be not an interpreter, let him hold his peace in the church. For what skilleth it, whether he interpret by miraculous gift, or by learning in that tongue, in respect of the edifying and instruction of them that understand not the tongue? Therefore Paul, and the rest of the Evangelists, and Apostles, did write in the Greek tongue, which was most universally understood, not of every Roman, Arabian, Egyptian, &c. but because there were in all those places, either men that had the miraculous gift of interpretation, or that by learning, and common use, understanding the Greek tongue, could expound their writings to men of all languages. And yet even the Greek tongue, to him that understood it not, was barbarous and strange, as the Apostle saith: for all tongues that be in the world, generally, and of every one of them, he saith: "If I understand not the virtue of the voice, I shall be to him to whom I speak barbarous, or strange, and he that speaketh barbarous to me," *vers.* 10, 11. Whereupon Primasius saith: "Every language, that is not understood, is barbarous or strange, to him that heareth it." Therefore even the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin tongues, are barbarous and strange to them which hear them, and understand them not. So Greek service and Latin service, must needs for all your wrangling, be barbarous and strange, to them that understand them not, and therefore for-

bidden by the Apostle. And if Augustin brought in the Latin service, as you say without proof, to the Saxon Nation that understood it, it was not barbarous or strange to them. But to them that understand it not, it is strange and barbarous. And though in study and meditation of the scriptures, as Bede saith, the Latin tongue was made common to all the four tongues of this Island, yet to the Saxons, Britons, Piets, and Scots, which understood it not, it was strange and barbarous, according to the saying of Paul, and Primasius. Therefore as well learned tongues, as barbarous tongues, that are not understood, are forbidden by the Apostle to be used in the Church, not because they were miraculous, but because the church was not edified by them: and such tongues are commanded to be used as serve to edifying. Let all be done to edification, therefore the barbarous tongues of every nation in the church, of that nation where they serve to edifying, are commanded to be used. For this rule is perpetual. Let all things be done unto edification, as well as this: Let all things be done decently, and according to order; and is not to be restrained to miraculous tongues, more than the other. Therefore your vain reasons, of unity and orderly conjunction of all nations in one faith, must give place to the express commandment of the Holy Ghost. Although it is a wretched signification of the conjunction of all nations in one faith, by service in one tongue, seeing you allow service in Greek also, and perhaps in Hebrew, as your conceits do, which by the same logic, must argue, the unity of all nations in two or three faiths, rather than in one faith. And what if the service of the Germans, or Frenchmen, be as barbarous to us, as our English, Welsh, and Irish service is to them? The service of every Nation, is framed to the understanding and edifying of the church of the same nation: and it is sufficient, if it be not barbarous to them, for whom it is ordained. And I pray you, what is Latin service to Grecians, or Greek and Hebrew service, to Papists that understand them not? And if after certain hundred years our English tongue be altered, as it is not so easily altered, when religion is continued in it, example of the Syrian tongue, which is now the same vulgar language, that it was one thousand five hundred years ago, yet I say, if it be altered, our service may easily be reduced, to any dialect or alteration, that our tongue can receive.

That service in a known tongue doth not edify, you go about to prove by the great virtues of our forefathers using Latin Service, and the manifold vices of these times, using prayers and translations in English, as though the vices of these times were the effects of English translations and prayers, and the former virtues were the effects of Latin service or ignorance. Which if it were true, Paul did amiss, to require understanding in prayers and Psalms, that they might serve to edifying, seeing better edification unto faith and

good life, cometh by prayers and Psalms not understood, and all vices proceed of prayers and Psalms, and translations of the scriptures, that are understood. Are not these perilous learned clerks of Rheims, that thus do argue? Although God be thanked, there shineth more virtue in the life and conversation of true Christians that have knowledge, than in the ignorant of former times, who, as they know not God, and his Laws, so they could not truly serve him according to his will, though many of them were superstitiously religious, and civilly honest, as many are among the Turks and Pagans. The vices, errors, and enormities, that are risen since knowledge hath been enlarged, proceed not of knowledge, but of the wickedness of men that abuse knowledge, as they do all other good gifts of God. Where you cite Dionyse and Basil, to prove that the mysteries of the sacraments, were of purpose hid from the vulgar or common people, you do shamefully abuse both their names. For Dionyse chargeth Timothy, not to communicate the mysteries of the christian religion, to unholy persons, that were heathen men, or imperfect Christians, that were not yet baptized. But it appeareth by his whole book, that all perfect christian men of the common people, were present, and did see and hear, whatsoever was said or done, about either of the sacraments, and all rites used in the church in his time. Basil saith, that many things are used in the church, which are not expressed in the scriptures, naming divers ceremonies, that are not necessary, and forms of prayers, confessions of faith, and praises, which yet are grounded on the scripture, but are delivered by use and tradition, in which divers things are not easy to be understood, for what cause they be used, as praying towards the East, praying standing, and not kneeling on Sunday and in Pentecost, &c. But that the mysteries of the sacrament were hidden from the common people, by uttering them in a strange tongue, or otherwise, of purpose that they should not be known, Basil saith not.

This is both a gross illusion, petition of principle and false conjunction of things not to be matched together. For first we acknowledge no such sacrifice, as you usurp. Secondly, the force or efficacy of the Sacrament, and of common prayers, or the form of administration of the sacraments, is unfitly and sophistically matched together. For though the force of the sacraments depends not upon the people's understanding, yet the form of administering them, and of common prayers, requireth the people's understanding, or else it edifieth them not by Paul's doctrine. For although we should yet grant another beggarly principle, that the effect of the sacraments consisteth specially of the work wrought, and the office of the Priest, as it doth not, but of the grace and work of God's spirit: yet it followeth not, that prayers do edify, by the virtue of the work wrought, and the public office of the Priest, though they be not understood. Paul saith, that

prayers and Psalms uttered by himself, in a tongue not understood, should not profit a whit, by virtue of the work wrought, or of his public office, *ver.* 6. 11. 14. 15. 16. for of these fine points of Popish divinity, Paul was ignorant, or else forgetful, by which it might be replied unto him, that his praying, and praising of God, yea his preaching also, might be profitable to edifying, by virtue of the work wrought, and his public office, though never a word that he spake were understood of his hearers. But although the virtue of the Sacraments consisteth not in the people's understanding, yet the Sacraments ought to be ministered in a tongue that the people understand, that they may be taught, what is the virtue of them, and wherein it consisteth, that being edified and instructed in faith, they may be stirred up to be thankful, and bless God with the Minister for those his benefits, and to join in prayer to God with the Minister, that the outward signs, by his grace, may be effectual to the receivers, and so may say Amen, to that which the Minister saith; which Paul saith, they cannot do, except they understand what he saith, *ver.* 16.

You think it not inconvenient, that the people should be well instructed in the meaning of the Sacraments, and service, and yet that which is the chief and most necessary mean to instruct them, you will deny them. Your principles and practice in this case are so monstrous to be heard in christian religion, that you cannot tell which way to turn you. For in the next sentence before, save one, you complained of marvellous inconveniences, that came of divalvation of the mysteries of the sacraments, which you say, were of purpose hidden from the vulgar. And so would you have all profitable knowledge, by your old principle, "Ignorance is the mother of devotion," taken away from the people, that you might exercise your old tyranny over their blind superstition. But because you are half ashamed, even among your own favourites, in this clear light of knowledge, to maintain that hellish principle of darkness, now you gather yourself in again, and say not this, as though it were inconvenient, that the people should be well instructed. And yet you dare not say, it is convenient, it is necessary to salvation, that the people should be well instructed. What Papists, do learn commonly, in other nations, by preaching, catechising, and reading, pardon us, if we believe not your report, for we know you lie without shame. For albeit in some few cities, where the conversion of the people unto the Gospel, is feared, there is more pains taken in teaching the people than hath been accustomed in the days of deep ignorance, and a few in comparison of the multitude, are more instructed in the mysteries of Popish religion, than they were wont to be in times past, yet in most places both of Cities and Country, where the Gospel is not preached, the vulgar people are as blind and ignorant as ever they were, I say not of the truth, but even of the meaning of Popish ceremonies, sacraments, and service. If you were

the only far travelled men in the world, you would tell us of great wonders. But it is well, that others have seen France, Flanders, Spain, and Italy, as well as you. But you say, there be other ways to instruct the people, less subject to danger and disorder, than to turn the Service into vulgar tongues. O that you had lived in the Apostle's time, and could have taught him those other ways! For he commanded the Psalms, Prayers, and Prophecy, which men had even by miracle and gift of the Holy Ghost in strange tongues, to be turned into the vulgar tongue, for instruction of the people, or else to be removed from the public service, *ver.* 26. 27. 28. No marvel, for he knew not what danger and disorder that interpretation was subject unto, as the great profound learned Doctors of the Pope's Seminary of Rheims do. And therefore you say, there be other ways, and this way is subject to danger and disorder. But what saith the scripture? read the text, for it is plain, whatsoever you say, and must have credit in God's church, though you say nay. And yet you proceed to say "that the simple people, and many that think themselves somebody, understand as little of the sense of divers Psalms, Lessons, and Orisons, in the vulgar tongue, as if they were in Latin." What an impudent saying is this? For albeit they understand not the whole sense of some hard and obscure places, by only reading or hearing, yet there is no Psalm, nor Lesson, that is read unto them, in which many things are not plain and manifest to every man's understanding. Whereas to them that are ignorant in the Latin tongue, no word is known, nor any one sentence, of the Psalm or Lesson. And as for Orisons, or Prayers we have none in our service, that are not plain, and easy to be understood, of every one that heareth them. Nay, but "oftentimes, the simple people do take the Psalms and Lessons in a wrong, perverse, and pernicious sense, which lightly they could not have done in Latin." Indeed, this is a learned reason why they should not be in English, even as this is. Many abuse their meat and drink, by surfeiting, drunkenness, gluttony, which they could not lightly do, if they did never eat nor drink, therefore it were good, that to avoid surfeiting, drunkenness, and gluttony, men did never eat nor drink. But I pray you do not learned men also, that understand the scriptures, both in Greek and Latin, often take them in a wrong, perverse and pernicious sense, which they could not lightly do, if they never read them? Therefore it were good, to avoid all heresies and errors, that no man, either learned or unlearned, did read the scriptures. O you civil Papists of England, are you not ashamed to hear these learned conclusions of your learned Fathers of Rheims? If you send your children to them to be instructed, they shall learn such Logic, as they could never have learned in our Universities of Cambridge and Oxford. But as though you had said little yet, as you have proved nothing, you say again, "that such

as would learn in devotion and humility, may and must rather learn the Latin tongue, or use other diligence in hearing Sermons and instructions." A hard piece of work for all men and women, old and young, of the city and of the country, masters and servants, one and other, that know not the Latin tongue, to be now set to school to learn it, rather than the service to be turned into English, which is but one only learned man's easy labour. Yet you say, they both may and must with diligence learn that tongue, which if it be true, you may or must set up at least a thousand more grammar schools than be in England. Beside a great many other cases that you must provide for, while so many hundred thousand people give their diligence to learn the Latin tongue. And if it once be brought to pass, that all men and women be learned in that tongue, as you say they may and must, then will the Latin tongue also be as vulgar unto them, as the French is to many in Flanders, and the English to many in Wales and Ireland. And as for hearing of sermons and instructions, whereunto you remit such as will not learn Latin, for all, you say, may learn, will never bring them to the understanding of all prayers in the service, whereunto they should say, amen. But such knowledge, you say, is not necessary, and there are but few that can have any use of it. For you say, "The holy universal order of God's church must not be altered for a few men's not necessary knowledge." But where was this holy order taken? For the Primitive Church used it not: yea, the Romish Church, in general Councils, as I have proved before, took a contrary order, and thought such knowledge necessary for all men. But ignorance is more for your profit than knowledge. And count you all men and women, that understand not the Latin tongue, to be but a few? or are there but a few Papists, that would in devotion and humility learn? Verily I fear, that if the Gospel be now hidden in England, it is hidden from them that perish, whose eyes the God of this world hath blinded, the understanding of the unbelievers, that the brightness of the glorious Gospel of Christ doth not shine unto them. But to return to your reason, from the less to the more, I say it is both convenient, necessary, and possible, and is already performed, that the service book of England, is accommodated to the sufficient understanding of all the people of England, and so may and ought the service of every nation throughout the whole church of God, to be framed to the understanding of every nation, in such language as the people may be edified by their understanding, although there were ten times as many differences as there are. For this commandment of God, must always stand. Let all things in the church be done to edifying. And therefore you say, most untruly, that the Apostle in all this chapter, doth not appoint any such thing, when it is the whole scope of the chapter. For he that commandeth or appointeth the end, com-

mandeth and appointeth all things that are necessary to bring us to that end. And what other thing doth he mean, "when he admnischeth them to pray for the grace of understanding, and interpretation, or to get others to interpret or expound unto them?" But that you say may be obtained without translating of the service into English, because the Latin tongue is not strangely or miraculously gotten. Very well. Then by Paul's doctrine, the priest that saith it, must either expound it in English himself, if he be able, or some other body for him. But if there be no interpreter, the priest must hold his peace in the church. But why doth the Apostle allow any strange tongue which is not to edifying, to be spoken in the church with interpretation? Verily, because those strange tongues were given of God miraculously. And therefore when they were interpreted, served to the edifying of the people, that saw and heard the wonderful work of God's Spirit speaking in those tongues. But seeing the Latin tongues in these days is no miraculous gift, it were but loss of time, and delusion of the church, to say the service first in Latin, and then in the vulgar tongue. And therefore, if a merchant or other man learned in the tongues, by study and practice, would have offered to pray or sing in a strange tongue, and afterward have expounded it himself, the Apostle would never have suffered such a vain and unprofitable exercise. That you say the Latin service hath been expounded in every house, school, church, pulpit, so that the people know all parts of the service sufficient to salvation, is utterly false and untrue, for although the people in Popery, by long use and custom, have learned to perform certain dumb gestures, and to utter certain speeches not understood, like pies and popinjays, yet if Paul be more to be credited than you, how can they that occupy the place of the unlearned, say amen to the priest's benediction, seeing they know not what he saith? And therefore, though you burst for malice, Paul speaketh against any tongue, used in the church service, which is not understood of the unlearned.

It is certain that he writeth and meaneth, that all things in the church, are to be done to edification, *verse* 26, and that there can be no edification where the tongue is not understood, *verse* 16, 17. Therefore he writeth, and meaneth, that the church's public service, prayers, and ministration of the sacraments, ought to be done unto edification, in a tongue that is understood of the unlearned. And it is intolerable impudency, to restrain that general sentence, "Let all things be done to edifying," to any special exercise, that was peculiar to the church at that time. Seeing the Apostle by necessity of that general rule of edification, convinceth the abuse of that particular exercise of the gift of tongues. And yet where he speaketh expressly of prayers and Psalms, uttered openly in the church, what madness is it to think, he speaketh not of public prayers, service

and administration of sacraments, seeing the people came together specially, for those ends, and for hearing the word of God preached? And you may as well say, that it is lawful to preach unto the people in Latin and Greek, as to have the public prayers and administration of the sacraments in Latin or Greek, seeing preaching is not now as it was then, a miraculous gift, but an exercise gotten by ordinary means of study and learning. But seeing you note in the margin, "that Paul speaketh not of the church's service, it is proved by invincible arguments," let us view these victorious arguments. "First, this exercise was not in the church these fourteen hundred years that you know of, and therefore neither the use, nor abuse, nor Paul's reprehension or redressing thereof, can concern any whit, the service of the church." I deny this invincible argument. For who would grant, that which should be the proposition or major, if this conclusion should stand? What exercise soever is out of use, neither the use, nor abuse, nor any reprehension, or redressing thereof uttered in the scriptures, can concern any whit the service of the church. For hereof I might conclude, the exercise of Jewish sacrifice hath not been in the church this fifteen hundred years, *ergo*, neither the use nor abuse, nor any reprehension or redressing thereof by the prophets, or our Saviour Christ and his Apostles, can any whit concern the church service, although the same use, or like abuse be in the church service, which was in the exercise of sacrifice, which conclusion none but a two-footed ass will affirm. The second invincible argument is, "It is evident that the Corinthians had their service in Greek at this same time, and it was not done in these miraculous tongues. Nothing is meant then of the church service." I deny this misshapen argument. It is evident the Corinthians ought to have their ordinary and public service only in Greek at that time, because their vulgar tongue was Greek: but whether they had any set form of service, it cannot be proved. And it is manifest by the text, that they which abused the gift of miraculous tongues, exercised the same in public prayers, and singing of Psalms, which was a part of the church service, therefore something is spoken and meant of the church service. The third invincible reason, "The public service had but one language, in this exercise they spoke many tongues." First it is not certain, whether they had any set form of liturgy. Secondly if they had any, the same ought to have been in one tongue ordinarily, though extraordinarily, while the gift of tongues continued, for some place might be given to the exercise of that gift, if there were interpretation. And therefore they might speak two or three at the most in the gift of strange tongues, so there were one to interpret, that the church might be edified, and this even in the public service. The fourth invincible argument, "In the public service every man had not his own spe-



cial tongue, his special interpretation, special revelation, proper psalms, but in this they had." I deny first the minor: for every singular man had not all these gifts, every man had not his interpretation, at least, when the Apostle willeth some to pray, that they might interpret, but some had one gift, and some another, and the same they had in the public service, therefore the major also is false. The fifth invincible argument: "the public service had in it the ministrations of the holy sacrament principally, which was not done in this time of conference, because infidels and catechumens were admitted." I deny this argument, which is as good, as if a papist would reason thus: mass is public service principally, ergo, matins and evensong, dirge and compline, prime and hours, and general procession, is no public service at all. The sixth invincible reason: "in this exercise, women, before Paul's order, did speak and prophesy, so did they never in the ministrations of the sacrament." This minor may be doubted of, but admit it be true, and the conclusion also, that this exercise was not the administration of the sacrament, doth it therefore follow, that it was no public service? And if it were no public service in which Paul reprehended and redressed this disorder of women speaking in the church service, then, for any thing that Paul hath said, women may speak in the church service, and at high mass also: for if you said true before, "neither the use nor abuse of that exercise, nor Paul's reprehension or redressing, can concern any whit the service of the church." Shall I say this is ignorance of the papists thus to pervert the scriptures? I would it were not anti-christian impudence and plain atheism, shadowed under the name of popish religion.

The Apostle speaketh of prayers, and yet by your exposition he speaketh neither of public prayers, nor private prayers. Indeed of prayers upon popish primers and beads, he speaketh not: for there were none such in any use or abuse in his time. But against all prayers not understood, specially public prayers, he speaketh expressly, and by consequence against private prayers, not understood of him that writeth them. For he saith, the unlearned cannot say Amen, that is, give his consent to another man's prayer, which he understandeth not, because he knoweth not what it is, because he is not edified by it, therefore much less can he pray himself in such a tongue as he understandeth not, and is not himself edified by his prayer. But let us examine your argument. "The Apostle," say you, "speaketh not of popish private prayers in Latin: for the private prayers here spoken of were psalms, hymns and sonnets newly inspired, these are not newly inspired, but written by the Holy Ghost and prescribed by the church, therefore the Apostle prescribeth nothing of them, condemneth nothing therein, toucheth the same nothing at all." Admitting your minor as true, which is not true of all popish prayers, as of the Ave Mary and creed, which are no prayers,

nor of your Latin matins and liturgy, which are full of idolatrous and superstitious prayers, yet your conclusion is a gross paralogism, because it containeth much more than is in the major or minor. For the Apostle findeth no fault with those hymns, psalms, and sonnets in respect of their inspiration, but because they were not used to the right end, namely, to edification, therefore he prescribeth generally that all prayers should be used to the edifying of the church, and private prayers, to the edifying of him that uttereth them, and condemneth in all private prayers, want of understanding and edifying: therefore toucheth and condemneth popish prayers pronounced in Latin, not understood of him that pronounceth them. Therefore the people have no right to use any such private prayers, as they do not understand: whereby they edify not themselves, they speak no mystery in the spirit which they have not, they cannot bless well, nor speak to God nor themselves. For the babbling in an unknown tongue, is no more to be called speaking, than the prattling of a daw, a pie, or popinjay, which are taught to utter the sound of some words, but yet cannot justly be called speaking: for that speaking is an expressing of the inward conceit of the mind, whether it be true or false. Therefore the popish church, which taketh upon her greater wisdom than the Holy Ghost hath revealed by the Apostle, to like of that which he condemneth, showeth herself plainly to be the church of Antichrist, and not of Christ. But yet you say, she doth not wholly forbid, but sometimes granteth to have them translated. The church of Christ is more constant in her doctrine, and doth not sometimes deny, and sometimes grant the knowledge of faith to her children. But the popish church in the last blind days, as you cannot altogether deny, hath not permitted the articles of the faith, the ten commandments, and the Lord's prayer to be known of the people in their mother tongue. And yet you say, your church would have all faithful men know the contents of their prayers, which is not possible for them, nor meant by you, so long as you will not suffer them to learn them in that tongue which they do understand. But the church, you say, hath commanded in some councils, that they which cannot learn them distinctly in Latin, should be taught them in their vulgar tongue. Indeed when the knowledge of the Latin tongue among the common people began to decay, in the west churches of Germany and France, there was some care to supply that defect by instruction, and therefore it was decreed, *Conc. Tur. 3. cap. 17.* "That every bishop should have homilies, and provide that they be plainly translated into the rustical Latin tongue, or into the Dutch tongue, that all men may more easily understand those things that were said." Also in the Council of Magunce, *cap. 2.* it was decreed, "that there should never want a man on the Lord's days, and on holidays, which should preach the word of God, and so as the common people may understand

them." And in the forty-fifth chapter of the same council it was decreed, that he which cannot otherwise, should learn the creed, and the Lord's prayer in his own tongue. That men were willed to send their children that these may learn in the school, in monasteries, of priests, it was because many did then understand the plain and rude Latin, as appeareth by the canon of Turin, before mentioned, and also by the 43d of this council of Magunce: where it is said, "that no priest as we think, can rightly sing mass alone. For how shall he say, the Lord be with you, or admonish men to lift up their hearts, and many other things like these, when there is none other present with him?" By this canon you see, not only private masses condemned, but also that the people did understand the Latin which was spoken in the masses, or else it was all one to say these words alone, or in the hearing of them that understand them not. As you do in your mass, turn about and say, "pray for me brethren and sisters," when there is none present, but a seely boy that helpeth you to mass, and perhaps at that time is in the church-yard or vestry.

Yea, even in the Council of Rheims, from whence you send the contrary doctrine, it was thus decreed in the year 813, "The first chapter is of the reason of faith, that every man according to the understanding of such his capacity as the Lord giveth, should learn and understand it and in his works fully observe it. The second chapter, that they learn and understand in sense and meaning, the prayer which our Lord Jesus Christ taught his disciples to pray, because it is lawful for no Christian man to be ignorant of it." And that their people all this while understood the Latin tongue, besides these canons, may appear by the Council of Aquisgran, *cap.* 133, "Where such are appointed to read and sing in the church, as more desire in reading and singing, the edifying of the people than most vain popular flattering." For more than 600 years after Christ, the people in France, *rusti et rusticiana*, understood the Latin service, as appeareth by Cæsarius Arelatensis, *lib.* 13. It is manifest also by Raban. Maivr. who lived eight hundred and fifty-five years after Christ, that the public prayers and lessons read in the church were understood of the people. *Just. Cler. lib. 2. cap. 52. Est autem lectio non parva audientium edificatio: unde opoitet, ut quando psallitur, psallatur ab omnibus; cum oratur, oretr ab omnibus; cum lectio legitur factio silentio æque audiatur a cunctis, &c. Pronunciantur autem lectiones in Christi ecclesiis de scripturis sanctis. Cap. 53.* Therefore the people understood that which was sung or said in Latin: for without understanding there could be no edifying. So that although prayer in Latin was allowable when men understood Latin, yet when Latin is not understood, it is not tolerable to pray in Latin, by the elder church's judgment, and specially by the doctrine of the Scriptures. Wherefore they that pray in a tongue unknown, can have no com-

fort of spirit, no true zeal or affection of prayers, though they have never so great superstition, and blind devotion, when it is not possible for the heart to think, that which the tongue soundeth.

If the Holy Ghost did ever consecrate and inspire holy prayers in any language, they are profaned and abused by them that pronounce them, and do not understand them, as these of the Corinthians, which were inspired doubtless by the Holy Ghost, yet were profanely abused, when they were uttered of pride and ambition, and not interpreted for the church's edification. But there is a great reverence you say, in the church's tongue dedicated in our Saviour's cross. But why should there not be as great reverence and majesty in all languages, that were sanctified by the Holy Ghost, to express the great praises of God? *Acts 2.* As for the dedication upon the cross, it is a frivolous reason grounded upon Pilate's authority, who set up that inscription in three most notorious languages. And yet for the Hebrew tongue that is there named, it is most like it was the Syrian tongue, which in the New Testament is often called the Hebrew tongue, because it was the vulgar tongue of the Jews that were Hebrews, *Acts. 22. 2* and twice in the 19th of *John v. 13. 17.* And where you pretend the churches obedience, to give force and value to such prayers, it is vain. For the church hath no power granted of Christ, but to edification, *2 Cor. 10. 8.* Therefore she can require no obedience, where no edification is not sought but hindered. But yet you will not give over the matter so: "for the children cried Hosanna to our Saviour, and were allowed, though they knew not what they said." How dare you affirm they knew not what they said? for first they spake in their own tongue. Secondly, they express plainly, that they did acknowledge our Saviour Christ and his kingdom, and praised God for the same, and prayed to God in the highest to prosper the same. How then are you not ashamed to say, they knew not what they said? because they were children? doth not our Saviour Christ acknowledge that they were inspired of God? what? like parrots to sound those words? or to acknowledge in heart also that which they spake with tongues? Moreover you say, it is well near a thousand years since our people could nothing else but pray barbarously, did sing Alleuia, and not praise ye the Lord. That the Saxons sung Alleuia, it was when they understood it to be, praise ye the Lord, as we understand Amen, to be all one with so be it. If I should stand in contention with you, whether all the Saxons were then altogether ignorant of the Latin tongue and void of Christianity, notwithstanding Gregory's authority, I might trouble you to answer all that I could object, but I will not stand upon that point. But long before that you say, the husbandmen sung the same at the plough in other countries. Hierom telleth you in what country, namely in Palesine, about Bethlehem, where it was in manner the vulgar tongue of the

country. And Gregory telleth you, it was brought from the church of Jerusalem, first by Hierom in the days of Damasus, *lib. 7. epist. 63.* That *sursum corda* and the psalms were sung in Latin in the west church where they were understood, because the Latin tongue was then vulgar to all the nations of Italy, Spain, France, Africa, &c. you need not have brought so many quotations: for we do easily grant it, as also that Hierom's translation was read in Africa, for then the Latin tongue was commonly spoken and understood in all those places as the service was in Latin. Augustin confesseth, that he learned the Latin tongue from his infancy among the flatterings and playing of his nurses, not teaching him, but speaking to him. *Cons. lib. c. 14.* The vulgar people theretore spake Latin in Africa, no marvel then if they had Latin service. And although some bishops and ministers of the church used solecisms, and barbarisms, it was either of purpose, as Augustin himself did, that the people might understand him the better, who though they spake Latin, yet not so finely as Cicero, or other learned Romans, but understood best such barbarous terms and phrases, as they were best acquainted withal, as witnesseth Augustin in *Psal. 123. 128. de Doct. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 13.* Or if they used any solecisms or false Latin of ignorance, so that they did not understand some words which they pronounced, and kept not right distinctions, Augustin saith, "they were to be reformed, that the people may say, Amen, to that which they understood plainly." *De Cat. Rud. cap. 9.*

Now for *Kyrielieson* and *Christelieson*, which are Greek words signifying, Lord have mercy upon us, Christ have mercy upon us, Gregory acknowledgeth that he was the first that brought them into the Latin church, more than six hundred years after Christ, to be said by the clerks only, and not by the people. Yet it is not to be thought but the people did sufficiently understand the meaning of these words, which was easily learned. "But prayers were not made," you say, "to teach or increase knowledge, but their special use is to offer our hearts, desires, and wants to God." Paul requireth in prayers, that they should teach and instruct others, if they be public, and ourselves at least if they be private: for we can no more say Amen, to a prayer pronounced by ourselves, than we can to a prayer pronounced by another, if we understand it not. Neither is it the special use of prayers, to offer up our hearts, desires, and wants to God, who knoweth them before we pray, but to stir up ourselves in true faith and obedience, to depend upon God's promises, and to acknowledge his infinite benefits towards us: which cannot be by any words of prayer that is not understood of us. For as offering our hearts, desires, wants, &c. the spirit maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered. You add moreover, "that the simple sort cannot understand all psalms, nor the learned always in the vulgar tongue. What then? there are psalms enough

that they may use as prayers, and study to understand the rest at more leisure: yet again you press us. "The simple people when they desire any thing of God specially, are not bound to know, neither can they tell to what petition of their pater noster, their demand pertaineth." At the least wise they are bound to know, that all things meet for them to demand, and God to grant are comprehended in that form of prayer, because Christ hath taught them when they pray, to say: our Father, &c. And they can according to their own want and meaning say, Lord grant this or that, although they cannot always tell to which petition their demand pertaineth: for it may pertain to divers petitions. But where you say, "they can tell no more what is, thy kingdom come, than adveniat regnum tuum." I think the simplest papist in England, that hath any love of truth, will say you speak untruly. For though they know not so well as learned men, specially if they be not any thing instructed wherein the kingdom of God doth chiefly consist: yet common sense teacheth them, that there is great glory, power, and majesty wished unto God by the very word of kingdom: whereas they can have no true and certain conceit of the Latin words which they do not understand. Whether the request for their sick children pertain to "thy will be done, or lead us not into temptation:" you would make them very ignorant that know not. Our people, God be thanked, are taught, that all things pertaining to this life, are contained in daily bread, with the condition of God's will in all things, which goeth before. But whereas you say: "there is no more necessary for them to know, but that this orison is appointed to us to call upon God in all our desires," you affirm boldly as your manner is, without all proof or reason. For our Saviour Christ delivered this form of prayer, to teach us what things we should ask at God's hands, and what not. How we should ask them in faith at our heavenly Father's hands, what things chiefly, namely, such things as pertain to God's glory, and what those be: such things as be necessary for ourselves, and what they be. These and such things by Christ's institution, that taught this form of prayer, are necessary to be known, and not only to know, that this orison is appointed us to call upon God in all our desires. For we are not so bound to this form of prayer, that we must always use it, and only, but we may use other forms by the examples of the Apostles, but this is appointed to be the pattern of all other forms of prayers: therefore there is more necessity for all men to know that shall pray aright, or use this principal form of prayer rightly, "than that it is appointed to us to call upon God in all our desires." Further, you say, "the translation of such holy things often breedeth manifold dangers and irreverence in the vulgar, as to think God is author of sin, when they read, lead us not into temptation, and seldom, any edification at all." You may as truly say, the teaching of these holy things by Christ, to

his unlearned disciples, might breed such dangers and irreverence, as the translation of them, and so you should blaspheme directly, as you do now covertly. But neither the teaching, nor the translation, breedeth any such danger, but rather keepeth men from such inconveniences: and breedeth properly edification of God's children, though wicked men both learned and unlearned, pervert all that good is, to their condemnation. Where you say, the people to their right edification must as well know the sense as the words, I agree with you: but first they must know the words and after they must be taught the sense and meaning, if any thing be obscure, or hard to be understood in the words. Paul speaking of the edification of men's minds, will have both the words, and the sense to be understood, but you by your will, would have neither: for it is not possible to understand the sense of words, before the words be understood. But to have the words understood you have no care, nor think it necessary, how should then the sense of those words be understood? Children with us are first taught to speak, and then learn to understand, because the words must needs be known before the sense. And therefore the learning of the scripture even from infancy, is commended by Paul, though you would malignly cavil and say, what? was Timothy, being a child of five or six years old, edified or increased in knowledge, by knowing the holy scriptures? We confess therefore, that the sense is necessary to be had, by teaching of parents and pastors: but the understanding of the words must be had before there can any meaning of them be taught, and both in charity, humility, and faith must be practised, that men may learn to pray rightly.

Your conclusion therefore, is a most beggarly and shameless petition of the whole matter in question. That it is thought by you, which are the wisest and godliest, that prayers private or public in Latin be most expedient and nothing repugnant to Paul. For that the wisest and godliest in the primitive church, yea of the later church for 800 or 900 years after Christ, were of a contrary judgment, I have proved before sufficiently. By the very words of Paul I have showed, that public prayer expressly and principally, and private prayer consequently, in a tongue not understood, is repugnant to Paul. I have also showed, that the Latin tongue is no more holy than any other tongue, seeing God by sending his Spirit in fiery tongues, hath consecrated all tongues to speak the great and worthy praises of God. *Acts 2.* Therefore for God's truth, and the edifying of his church, it is the custom of God's church, to strive even to the death. The saying of Augustin doth nothing touch this case, seeing prayer in an unknown tongue, was never practised nor observed of the whole church through the whole world.

#### CHAPTER 15.

1. The text is plain, which I marvel not, if

your blind eyes cannot see, that Paul delivered the doctrine of Christ's death and resurrection, according to the Scriptures, he delivered no unwritten verities.

10. It hath been often answered, man's will is free from constraint, but not from the thraldom unto sin. Therefore I may say with Augustin, "Why do men presume so much of the possibility of nature? it is wounded, it is maimed, it is vexed, it is lost, it hath need of a true confession, and not of a false defence. *De nat. et grat. cap. 53.* "Free will made captive or thrall availeth nothing but to sin, to justice, except it be delivered and helped by God, it availeth not. *Cont. 2. ep. pel. lib. 3. cap. 8.*

10. We acknowledge the concurrence of man's will, free from constraint, but not free to consent to God, before it be enlarged by Christ. For our translation, beside the right construction, according to the phrase, Hierom is a warrant, who translateth it; the grace of God which is in me, *lib. 2. adv. Jovinianum*, and in *Hier. cap. 13.* which also *Rab. Maur.* followeth in *Hier. cap. 13. lib. 6.* "The grace of God which is with me, *lib. 2. advers. Pelag. et Ep. ad Principium.* The rest of your vain cavils, are already confuted.

15. Our first Apostles were the Apostles of Christ and not of Gregory. But although Gregory and Augustin, in all points did not teach the true faith to the Saxons, yet seeing they taught the true faith in all points necessary to salvation, our country hath not believed in vain, nor all our forefathers are dead in their sins.

32. An impudent slander, we take not away fasting, nor derogate any thing from the due estimation thereof, which Ambrose calleth merit. But that he acknowledgeth no merit, or desert of our works, to stand before God's judgment, his words are plain. *Ezechort. ad. virg.* "Every one is justified by the Lord, not of works, but of faith, for as the event of destiny is not in our power, but such as chance has brought, so the grace of our Lord is given, not as of merit of hire, but as of his will, whence have I so great merit, when mercy is my crown." And in the same *Epistle ad Verceilenses*, he saith, that unto God's judgment, "Only faith shall accompany you. Justice also shall be your companion, if faith go before you." These places are sufficient to declare, that he speaketh of the fruits of faith and repentance, not of the proper causes of justification and salvation, when he saith, "we wash away our sins by fasting," &c.

41. As the stars differ in glory, not according to their merits, but according to God's gift in their creation: so the bodies of Saints shall differ in glory, not according to their merits, but according to God's free gift in the resurrection.

41. We acknowledge the true body and blood of Christ to be eaten and drun of the worthy receiver after a spiritual manner. But your heretical device of the presence of his body carnally and corporally in the Sacrament, destroyeth the truth and the substance

of his natural body, which though it be now since his resurrection a spiritual body, yet it retaineth all essential properties of a true body and so shall our bodies after the resurrection, being made conformable to his glorious body, *Phil.* 3, 21, not to be incircumscribable, insensible, without quantity and dimension, and extension of place or in many places at once, as you are enforced to affirm the body of Christ to be. Therefore as our bodies, being made spiritual, shall notwithstanding be circumscribable, sensible, retaining quantity and dimension, or spaces of place, and be in one only place at once, so is the body of Christ now glorified.

## CHAPTER 16.

8. That the feast of Pentecost was not instituted and kept by the apostles, as it was in the latter time, is manifest by the dissension that arose between Anicetus and Polycarp, Victor and the east churches, about the cele-

bration of Easter: for Whitsuntide followeth the account of Easter. If the apostles had kept and instituted those feasts, they would have been uniformly kept of all, but there was no certain order of keeping these feasts, before the council of Carthage *A. C.* 65. Neither do Ambrose nor Augustin say, that these feasts were instituted by the apostles, as they were observed afterward. By this place it can no more be proved, that Whitsuntide was instituted and observed by the apostles, than that the feast of unleavened bread was instituted and observed by them, of that which is written, *Acts.* 20. 6, or the Jewish fast, *Acts.* 27. 9. But the matter of festivities is not so great, that we will strive one with another for them, as Victor did with the bishops of the east, and was countermanded by them, and sharply rebuked by other bishops of the west, for his contention about matters unnecessary. *Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 25. 26.*

## THE ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.

## CHAPTER 1.

5. The communion between Christ and his members being rightly weighed, proveth not that any force of merit or satisfaction is to be attributed to the works of holy men: it only proveth that such works are accepted of God for the righteousness of Christ, which is imputed to all his members, not that their works merit justice or satisfy.

5. The cause and not the punishment maketh martyrs of God, and therefore the Papists suffering in England for horrible treason and rebellion, or for their heresy, may be brought into a fool's paradise, but never can have the true comfort of spirit, that God's children have, which suffer for the truth and for righteousness.

11. The prayers of the faithful in this life have testimony and warrant of the scripture, and therefore ought of charity to be desired, and granted. So have we not for invocation of Saints, which is a sufficient reason why we ought not to call upon them. And it is injurious to Christ, to make any more mediators in heaven than Christ. For we have but one Mediator, saith Paul, the man Jesus Christ, when he speaketh expressly of prayers and intercession, *1 Tim.* 2. 5. Again, they stand not with our confidence in Christ, seeing we cannot call upon them in whom we believe not, *Rom.* 10. 14. And our faith ought to be only in God by Christ. *1 Pet.* 1. 21. By prayer to Saints in heaven, we should ascribe unto them that which is proper to the Divinity, to know our hearts, and to hear so many men's prayers at once. Whether they pray for us, because the scripture doth not teach us, we cannot define; we know that the mediation, advocacy, and intercession of Christ are sufficient for us.

11. The thanksgiving of many in the church is acceptable to God, but hereof it followeth not, that idolatrous processions, stations and pilgrimage of the Papists be acceptable any more, than the like solemnities of Pagans and Turks.

14. The travail of teachers and the obedience of their hearers give matter of reward, according to God's merciful promise, but not merit of work, or reward in respect of merit.

18. They are not void of the spirit of peace, constancy, and verity, that retract some of their writings, in which they perceive, that they have declined from the truth. But seeing they confess themselves to be men that may be deceived, they are indued with the Spirit of humility, that retract their own writings, and submit them to the truth. So did Augustin write special books of retractions. But concerning the substance of doctrine necessary to salvation, God be praised, the Protestants continue constant without any alteration or change. As for ceremonies and forms of service, they may be changed so often as the church shall see cause. Yet have we made no great alteration these forty years: and therefore our doctrine being always the same, agreeable to the scriptures, the note of false apostles and heretics doth by no means agree to us, but rather to Papists; who as their doctrine is contrary to the scriptures, so are they driven daily to invent new shifts of descent to cover their shame, as their new doctrine of merit of condignity, of the first and second justification, of the shedding of Christ's blood in the sacrifice of the mass, and many other like fantasies, unknown or unallowed of their teachers the school-men, beside the old controversies

of the school-men themselves, and of the divines and canonists, among which, that famous question is not yet decided: whether the council be above the pope, or the pope above the council? And whether of them cannot err, to omit your new poisons, primers, calenders, and alteration of the whole course of the year, whereby it is manifest, that in changes and alterations you go far beyond us.

22. The apostle speaketh manifestly of the spiritual and inward seal of God's Spirit, whereof baptism is an outward seal in our bodies, and giveth not grace of the work wrought: for then the baptism of Heretics out of the church should give the grace of regeneration, before the baptized come into the church, which is a foul absurdity. *Aug. ep. 50.* And although the baptism of Christ is not to be repeated, being given in the church, or out of the church, yet having no virtue but in the church; yet the popish fantasy of the indelible character, hath no ground in the scripture. And it were a monstrous absurdity, to hold that he that hath utterly, maliciously, and advisedly renounced Christianity, blasphemed Christ, and circumsised himself to be a Jew, or Mahometist, should still retain this character of baptism, as a cognizance of his Christendom. Indeed there is a difference of him from one that was never baptized, for his case is more damnable and irrecoverable, *Heb. 6.* And in that he was once consecrated to God, and hath not ignorantly nor of infirmity, but wilfully and maliciously rejected his profession, he hath no interest in the right of the church, neither can he be renewed by repentance.

*Hierom, in 4 ad Ephes.* doth not refer the seal of the Spirit to baptism. In the short comment that goeth under his name, he saith: "You have received the seal of the Holy Ghost, in the day of your baptism you began to have a new seal," but that this seal is indelible, he saith not. Ambrose proveth that we are sealed not only in body by the water, but also in heart by the Holy Ghost, but that the seal of baptism by water is indelible, he saith not, nor any thing to that effect. Cyril hath words sounding to the contrary: "If thou dost counterfeit, nevertheless, men do baptize thee, but the Spirit doth not baptize thee. But if thou comest of faith, men truly do minister that which may be seen, and withal the Holy Ghost doth work great things invisible. Thou shalt receive armour, terrible to the devils, which armour if thou shalt not cast away, thou shalt have a seal upon thy soul, unto which the devil will not come." Dionyse hath nothing to the purpose. Thus you delude your reader commonly with blind quotations.

Augustin indeed doth rightly convince the Donatists, that the sacrament of baptism ought not to be reiterated, because it is the seal or character of regeneration, which being once given, by God's ordinance is not to be repeated: the like he saith of Ordination. But the general Council of Nice decreed contrary to his opinion, of them that

came from the Novatians, that they should be ordained again, and so continue in the clergy, *Cant. 8.* Likewise of them that were clerks among the Paulianists and Cataphryges, if they were found blameless and irrefragable, that they should be ordained again by a bishop of the Catholic church, *Cant. 19.* As for confirmation by imposition of hands, Augustin doubteth not, but it might be reiterated, because it was no sacrament, but prayer over a man. *De baptis. cont. Donatist. lib. 3. cap. 16.* Neither hereof doth follow, nor of any thing that he saith, the indelible character which a man cannot lose by any apostacy and wilful renouncing of Christian religion. For confirmation, you quote the Council of Tarracon, which is of good antiquity, yet not most ancient, for it was holden about five hundred years after Christ, and yet there is no such matter in the acts of that Council. Gratian indeed citeth such a decree, which is not there to be found, therefore it is either forged, or else taken out of some other Council of Tarracon of later time. And therefore as your conceit of indelible character hath no iota in the scriptures to maintain it, so hath it no testimony of the ancient fathers and Councils to avow it.

24. This is nothing else but a lewd and senseless slander of Calvin and us, that we despise lordship, because we will not be subject to the tyranny of Antichrist, that would be lord of our faith, and arrogateth unto himself authority to make new articles of faith, which have no ground or warrant in the word of God. But Calvin did willingly acknowledge all authority of the ministers of the church, which the scripture doth allow unto them, and both practised and submitted himself to the discipline of the church, and the lawful governors thereof, although he would not yield unto the tyrannical yoke of the Pope, who is neither sovereign of the church nor any true member of the same. Yea, Calvin and we submit ourselves not only to the authority of the church, but also of the civil magistrates to be punished, if we shall be found to teach or do any thing contrary to the doctrine of faith, received and approved by the church; whereas the Popish clergy, in causes of religion, will not be subject to the temporal governor's judgment and correction.

#### CHAPTER 25.

6. This Corinthian was excommunicated until his repentance should appear, which, when it was sufficiently declared to the satisfaction of the church, the Apostle taketh order for his absolution and restitution, reversing the band of excommunication wherein he stood bound. And this indeed is a plain example of the power of the Apostles, and of the church, in binding and loosing, retaining and remitting of sin, which is punishing and pardoning, according to the discipline of the church. We acknowledge also, that in such open and notorious sins, whereby the church is offended, inward repentance is not sufficient for reconciliation, but after sharp dis-

ipline, the penitent must in outward behaviour of sorrow and humble confession, make some piece of satisfaction to the church. For bodily punishment or pecuniary mulet, whereby you set the discipline of the church to sale, it may be laid on by the discretion of the Christian magistrate, but it is not proper to the discipline of the church, neither can it be gathered by the word *επιτιμα*, which signifieth rebuke, reprehension, chiding, &c., as the text is plain.

Thirdly, we acknowledge that the governors of the church are to measure the time of correction as it may be most agreeable to the party's good, and the church's edification. But your last collection of the whole handling of this offender's case is an impudent and malicious slander of the Protestants, that all ecclesiastical discipline is superfluous, because Christ hath satisfied enough for all. We affirm indeed, that no punishment laid upon any man's person, either by himself, or by the church, is any satisfaction to the justice of God for his sins, because Christ only hath and was able to make such satisfaction: yet temporal punishment for chastisement, ecclesiastical discipline, for satisfaction of the church, and amendment of open offenders, are necessary by the ordinance of God's word, and in our church are practised by us.

The doctrine of the Prophets, John Baptist, Christ, and the Apostles, of repentance to be showed by every man in his own person, we acknowledge: but not to satisfy the justice of God, which was performed only by Jesus Christ, who in his own person hath purged us from our sins, and is set down at the right hand of magnificence in the highest, *Heb. 1. 3*, and from thence shall come to judge all them, that under hypocritical colour, go about to derogate from the glory of his perfect redemption.

That which the ancient fathers and councils do speak and prescribe of times of repentance, and enjoining of penance, pertaineth to the discipline of the church, which we acknowledge. And the word satisfaction which they use, signifieth the performance of the same to the satisfaction of the church, and not to the justice of God, as though all punishment due for our sins were not satisfied by Christ, who was smitten for our sins, and wounded for our transgressions, and by whose stripes we are healed. *1a. 53. 1 Peter 2. 24.*

9. The Apostle challengeth their obedience in all things that were agreeable to the commandments of God, and not absolutely in any thing that he should command of his own will. For if I myself, saith he, preach another Gospel, let me be accursed. *Gal. 1.*

10. Theodoret's words be these: "Saying more abundant sorrow, he showeth that his repentance was great, yet he calleth the remission grace, showing that his sin was greater than his repentance."

10. All men may worthily marvel at the high pride of Antichrist, that presumeth by his bulls to give pardons of so many thou-

sand years, or else plenary for all sins a *pena et culpa* both from the pain and the fault, which is not so ancient as Gregory's time by many hundred years. For the first institutor of Jubilee pardons was Boniface the Eighth, Anno 1300. And not long after, the Council of Vienna found many abuses in pardons, and made orders for them which took little place, because their occupation was so greatly for the Pope's profit. But because you go about to establish them by authority of scripture: first it is manifest that the authority of binding and loosing, remitting and retaining of sins, pertaineth generally to all the Apostles alike, and to every pastor in his cure: and therefore Allen himself confesseth, that the Pope hath no more power to remit sins than every simple priest. "Yea we attribute a great deal more power," saith he, "to my simple and base priest in this case, and by the force of the sacrament of penance, than we do to the highest Pope or patriarch in the world out of the sacrament," in his book of pardons, cap. 2. Secondly, concerning the power of binding and loosing in discipline, we acknowledge that the church hath power to release or remit and pardon such exercise of humilitation and penance, as is appointed by the same, for trial of the repentance of notorious offenders. So did Cyprian and the churches of Africa with him, when they saw it most convenient for the edifying of the church, and confirming of the parties to endure persecution that was at hand. But this maketh nothing for the Pope's pardons that are bought and sold for money, beside his usurpation of pardoning not only the penalties, but also the sins. But where you say Paul might longer have kept this offender in temporal punishment, when his repentance was sufficiently proved and declared, you speak beside the book. As also, when you say, he was justly holden under correction for some satisfaction of his fault passed during the Apostle's pleasure, you would ascribe unto him a tyrannical power, from which he was most free, to hold men in punishment during his pleasure. But he acknowledgeth that his power was to edify, and not to destroy, and therefore fearing lest he should be prevented by Satan, to the destruction of him whom he desired to save, he showeth that it is high time to reconcile the offender, and saith this rebuke was sufficient that was given of many, therefore the church ought to be satisfied therewith. Wherefore here is not properly any pardon of longer time appointed, but release and loosing of the censure and bond of excommunication. Yet you will say that the Apostle for his pleasure, notwithstanding any doubt of Satan's prevention, notwithstanding this rebuke was sufficient, might still have kept him in temporal affliction, which were as great tyranny as any could be. As for satisfaction to God's justice for his fault past, the scripture knoweth no such; neither doth Theodoret once mention any such matter, but rather the contrary, as appeareth by

his words upon the sixth verse, which I have set down, *ver.* 10. He showeth that his repentance, though it were great, was no satisfaction to God, seeing his reconciliation which was in the name of God is called grace, which must be free and without all respect of merit or satisfaction. Therefore a Christian indulgence and pardon is not a remission and pardon of temporal punishment due to the justice of God for sins by God forgiven: out either a declaration and assurance of God's remission of sins, most freely for Christ's sake, to all them that are truly penitent, or else a release of the censure of the church to them that have showed tokens of repentance and sorrow for their sins, sufficient for the satisfaction of the church, that by the evil example was offended. As for sickness and other temporal scourges, wherewith God chastiseth his children for their reformation, and not for satisfying of his justice, all the Pope's pardons that ever were, are not able to release one fit of an ague, much less any thing due to God's justice not satisfied by Christ. Where you say Christ forgave the adulteress, not only her sins, but also temporal punishment due for the same: first it is unfolly gathered that he forgave the punishment due by the law for adultery, because he did not condemn her, being not appointed to execute such civil and temporal punishment. He forgave the thief upon the cross, but he did not deliver him from execution. Secondly, it is fondly collected of that extraordinary example, what the servants of Christ must do, or may do at their pleasure, having a rule whom to cast out, and whom to receive, whose sins to bind, and whose to loose.

10. That remissions were granted in the Primitive Church sometimes, at the request of the confessors and martyrs, is true; yet so, that they were admonished also, not to be too pitiful in making such requests, whereby the rigour of the discipline without just cause might be weakened, as appeareth by Cyprian, *Ep.* 11, where he writeth to the martyrs and confessors for the same purpose. But where you say those remissions and indulgences were granted "by communicating the satisfactory works of one to another," citing the epistles of Cyprian, it is an impudent forgery, as many others you commit, for there is no such thing in these epistles. And where you say, they "gave their letters to that end to Bishops in the behalf of divers their Christian brethren:" the truth is, they gave their letters of request for the restitution of such as had fallen, but not to communicate the satisfactory works of one to another.

Cyprian writing to the martyrs about their letters, saith, "Whereas you directed your letters unto me, in which you required that your desires might be examined, and that peace might be given to certain that had fallen, when after the persecution should be ended, we should begin to be gathered together with the clergy, they, contrary to the law of the Gospel, and also contrary to your honourable

petition before repentance performed, before confession made of a most grievous and extreme offence, before the hand was laid on by the Bishop and clergy unto repentance, were bold to offer peace to them that were fallen, and to give them the Eucharist, that is, to profane the holy body of our Lord." *Epist.*

11. You see plainly their letters were of petition and desire, and not of communicating their satisfactory works. Or if you will needs say, without warrant, they were of communicating satisfactory works, you cannot be ignorant what Cyprian writeth in these letters in *Epist.* 15, which you cite, "that without discretion and examination of every person, thousands of letters were daily given contrary to the law of the Gospel," by the martyrs and confessors, which were corrupted and drawn to give them by the ambitious and importunate intreaty of such as had polluted themselves with wicked sacrifices. That such communication of satisfactory works, is agreeable to the intercourse of Christ's members, and the justice of God, you cite 2 *Corinth* 8, where the Apostle speaketh of the mutual communication of God's graces and gifts, not of satisfactory works, as we shall declare more at large when we come to that text, and your note upon it. But where the Apostle confesseth the want of such passions as Christ had to suffer in his members, he is far from that blasphemy that Christ should want the satisfactory works of his servants to supply the want of his passion. And therefore you can never in any lawful form or argument infer either that any works of men are satisfactory to God's justice, or that they are communicable or applicable to others, or that the Pope or any other hath the dispensing or application of them. Make your syllogisms when you dare, you blasphemous heretics, and the world shall see how assuredly you infer these things.

10. It is well you confess that Christ hath more vicars on earth than Peter and his successors. But as for our translation, the circumstance of the text doth rather require that the Apostle did pardon, not of any private corrupt affection, but sincerely in the sight of Christ: yet do we neither condemn your translation, or mislike the sense; that the Ministers in the person of Christ do bind and loose, remit and retain sins. But that our translation is not heretical, the ancient Fathers do testify which approve it. Theodoret expounding these words, saith, "I do this," saith he, "Christ beholding and ratifying that which is done." Chrysostom saith in 2 *Corinth.* *Hom.* 3. "What is in the face of Christ? either after God, or unto the glory of Christ." Oecumenius upon this place saith, "Doing this according to Christ, and doing this as it were in the sight of Christ, or unto the glory of Christ, that his name and person may be glorified, seeing the benignity of his disciples is the glory of Christ." These fathers of the Greek Church were as like to understand the Greek phrase as any other,



at leastwise they discharge us of heretical translation. That Pope's pardons release not only temporal punishment, you shall be convicted by the Pope's pardons themselves. Pope Boniface the Eighth, in his grand and first Jubilee pardon that ever was granted, doth grant, "Not only full and large pardon, but a most full pardon of all their sins." And many other pardo's do testify that the Pope doth grant pardon not only of many thousand years and lents of penance, but also remission of the seventh part, or the third part of all their sins, yea the full remission of all their sins: as is to be seen in a printed pardon granted by Pope Leo the Tenth, Anno. 1513, to the hospital of *Spiritus in saxia almae urbis*. In whose name he presumeth those things it is not material, but who gave him the authority? As for the power to remit all sins granted to every priest, by Allen's confession, it pertaineth nothing to the pope's pardons.

11. By the circumstance of the text it is manifest, that the earnest and hearty repentance of the party bound, being sufficiently known, is the cause that should move the Church to release the bond of excommunication. Council of Nice, *Can. 11*. That chiefly their minds and fruits of repentance must be observed, and they that show their repentance, not only in words, but also in truth, the bishop is appointed to deal more gently with them, than that they should tarry the time of trial enjoined them. So by the second *Can.* of the Ancyran council, the bishop being privy to the labour, humility, and mildness of such deacons as had fallen in persecution, may remit somewhat of the severity of the discipline toward them. In the first canon it is said: "That the bishop must have his liberty, that considering the conversation of every one of them that had eaten in the idol's temples, he appoint unto them a form and rule of conversation, that is, that he deal more gently, appointing to some according to the manner of their life, a shorter time of repentance, to others a longer, as shall be necessary for their correction: and let their former conversation, and their latter of all these to be considered, and let the gentleness of the priest moderate itself about them." By these canons it appeareth, that the hearty repentance and speedy reformation of the offenders is the only cause that should move them to deal more gently, and to grant remission.

Therefore the practice of the popish church is preposterous, and contrary to the ancient discipline of the church, which confessing the sins of this time to be far greater, with the fall of devotion, and loathsomeness that men commonly have to do great penance, is so free of her pardons in this time to all that will pay for them, and sometime offereth them when no man will desire them, nor pay for them. Whereas the general council of Nice decreed, "that they which made no great account of their sin, and thought it sufficient for them that they came into the church, should in anywise fulfil the times appointed, and not be received except it were at their

death." *Can. 11 and 12*. It is not therefore the wisdom of the popish church, but the covetousness of the pope, that in latter days have granted such monstrous pardons for thousands and hundred thousands of years, and lents, beside full remission of all sins. Whose insatiable simony, seeing the popish church approveth, she showeth herself to be rather a bayed unto sin than a favourable mother, who, if she spare the rod, by Solomon's judgment, hateth her children. But all this gloss is nothing else but a shameless shift to colour the pride, covetousness, and tyranny of Antichrist, who if he were a bishop, as he is a *butesheep*, should not arrogate more authority in pardoning than his fellow bishops. But he limiting them to their forty days pardons, is lavish himself of his ten thousands of years, by what scripture? by what example of the primitive church doth he either restrain them, or grant such liberty to himself? seeing it was said to all apostles of the discipline of the church, whatsoever you shall bind or loose, shall be bound and loosed in heaven. *Matt. 18*. As for our allowing of ancient rigour, or present lenity, it is according to the scripture, and the practice of the primitive church whatsoever you falsely avow to the contrary. For that moderation must be observed, that neither men by too much remission be emboldened to sin, nor by over much severity be swallowed up of sorrow, and so become a prey for the devil.

17. That you slander us withal, is mo t true of yourselves, in the confutation of these your slanderous and Heretical notes, I have showed abundantly. That we follow, beside the evident words of the text, the interpretation of the ancient writers in all places almost of difference betwixt us, it is a good argument that we do interpret the scriptures by the same spirit by which they were written. When you do nothing else but chop and change, to deceive the ignorant with your vain glosses and heretical annotations, clean contrary both to the words and meaning of the holy scriptures.

### CHAPTER 3.

3. The Corinthians were Christ's testimonial letter of Paul's sincerity and travail, in their conversion unto the faith, which was the word of God's spirit, by his ministry. But may we therefore conclude, that the writings of the Apostles, are not the special and proper book of Christ's truth and gospel? O horrible blasphemy! Verily the doctrine of truth, and the Gospel of Christ, is truly and perfectly contained in them. And although the same doctrine be not effectual to salvation, neither as it is read, nor as it is preached, but when it is believed, yet the truth hereof, is preserved in all ages of the church, in the certain canon of the holy scriptures, and not in the slippery memory of men only. Neither are you ever able to prove, that Paul did write any thing in any man's heart, which is not written in the holy scriptures. And though divers of the apostles did write

no books at all, yet they preached nothing, but that which was and is contained in the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. "For that which they then preached," saith Irenæus "afterward, by the will of God, they delivered to us in the scriptures, which should be the foundation and pillar of our faith, *lib. 3. cap. 1.* Therefore he meaneth not by the other saying, *cap. 4.* that either the scriptures are needless, or that the church had any tradition, beside the scriptures. For although some believed, that knew never a letter of the book, yet they were instructed by them that learned the truth out of the scriptures: and although the creed whereof Hierom speaketh, be not written in that form of words, yet the doctrine of the whole, and of every article, is most clearly contained and expressed in the holy scriptures and writings of the Apostles. Therefore the church of Christ hath no doctrine written in men's hearts by God's Spirit, but that which is written in the scriptures by God's Spirit, by which all that men believe must be examined and tried, whether it be the doctrine of the Spirit of God or no. So did the Bereans daily examine the doctrine of the Apostles by the scriptures, which they could not have done, if the Apostles had taught any doctrine, which was not contained in the scriptures, *Acts 17. 11.*

5. This maketh against the Papists, which defend their preparations, without the grace of God. But against us, it maketh no whit, who refer all to God, as the Apostle doth, and take away all freedom of man's will unto good, until it be enlarged by the Spirit of God. Yet do we acknowledge man's will to be free from compulsion, and his cogitations to be his own, but all goodness in them to be of God's mere gift and grace, *Jan. 1. 17.* Chrysostom upon this text saith: "I speak not this as having confidence, that to think any good, it is partly ours, and partly God's, but I do attribute and ascribe the whole to him." *In 2 Cor. Hom. 6.*

6. Although it be true, that the scripture of the New Testament and the preaching also, to the reprobate is the savour of death, yet the Apostle meaneth not by the letter, the scripture, either of the old or New Testament, but the Law or commandment written, without power to keep it: and by the spirit, the grace of God's Spirit, exhibited in the New Testament, effectual to all, that believe the doctrine of the gospel.

9. That the sacraments of the New Testament, of the work wrought do give the spirit of life and charity, it cannot be concluded out of the text, more than that preaching of the gospel doth give grace or the spirit of life, of the work wrought. But the Spirit of God, by the ministry of preaching and the sacraments, doth most freely give life and grace in God's elect, and in none other. For if this pre-eminence were in the sacraments, *Ex opere operato*, Paul neglected a great part of this pre-eminence, whereof he glorieth, in that he baptized so few among the Corin-

thians, *1 Cor. 1.* Therefore Luke saith, that at the preaching of the Apostles so many believed as were before ordained unto life, *Acts 13. 48.*

14. No marvel, though the Papists can see neither Christ nor his church in the scriptures, because they seek neither of both in the scriptures, but as the Donatists did in their own presumptions, and slander the scriptures of insufficiency and imperfectness, as the Valentinians did, saying, they cannot be understood of them that know not their tradition, *Lib. 3. cap. 2.*

#### CHAPTER 4.

2. Whether you or we adulterate the Scriptures by new expositions, let it be tried by these your notes and my computations, in which I have showed that our expositions are taken out of the ancient Fathers, and yours for the most part, are contrary to them.

17. You are not able to bring one of the ancient fathers interpreting this place, which gathereth of it, that the persecutions of the godly are meritorious. Neither doth Augustin say that tribulation is the meritorious cause of eternal life or rest, when he saith that it is saleable, or to be bought thereby, but clean contrary, as when God by the Prophet calleth men to buy without money. *Isa. 55. 1.* "Thou hearest," saith Augustin, "that thou hast labour here, but hearken what kind of rest he promiseth: canst thou conceive it? If thou couldst conceive it in thy mind, thou shouldst see, that thou labourest nothing unto compensation, or to the value of that which is given thee. Hear him which in part did see it, in part which said, I know now in part, what saith the Apostle? The present temporal lightness of our tribulation," &c. Again, when he talketh of the sale you speak of: that you may know he speaketh not of the merit of condignity, he saith. "What labour is worthy of eternal rest? if thou wilt compare the truth and judge the truth, eternal rest is rightly bought with eternal labour. This is true, but be not afraid, God is merciful. Behold, how great a price we give, as it were one grain, or one shale, to receive eternal treasures. A grain or shale of labour, to incredible rest, as it is said: it worketh an incredible and exceeding great weight of eternal glory." Therefore this working is not of the merit of the labour, but of the infinite mercy of him, that giveth eternal life, to all them whom he justifieth freely by faith. Therefore Augustin saith also in the same treatise of the persecutions of the just. "Let the just tolerate the unjust, let the temporal labour of the just tolerate the temporal impunity of the unjust, yet the just man liveth by faith. For there is none other justice of a man in this life, but to live by faith which worketh by love: for if he live by faith, let him believe also, that he shall have rest after his labour, and they shall have eternal torments after their present joy." What faces have these men to say, that Augustin maketh these tribulations the meritorious cause of

eternal life? when he acknowledgeth none other justice of a man in this life, but to live by faith: whereas if tribulations so suffered, should be the meritorious cause of eternal life, that should be the justice of a man in this life; but they are not, but faith only, which worketh by love, as Augustin judgeth. That which you cite out of *Sup. 10th chap.* though it be no canonical Scripture, yet it is falsely translated. For whether it be God or wisdom that hath rendered to just men the reward of their labours, meaning the deliverance of the children of Israel out of Egypt, he rewarded the labours of his children as of mercy, not of hirelings, as of merit.

## CHAPTER 5.

10. Augustin holding that error without authority of scripture, that prayers were profitable to the dead, is driven to invent a distinction, how they may seem to stand with this text; and not be contrary to the scriptures. But you falsify his words in translating this text: for he saith not, "that every one may receive according to his deserts in the body," but *ut referat unusquisque secundum ea quæ per corpus gessit*, that every man may receive according to those things which he hath done in his body. But even as Augustin in the place by you quoted, *de prædest. sanct. cap. 10.* where he speaketh nothing of prayers for the dead, urgeth the words of this text against the Pelagians, which said, that infants were justified not by mere grace, but by works, which God foreseeth that they should have done, if they had lived longer. "The apostle saith which he hath done, he addeth not which he would have done:" so we may urge the words of the text against prayers, alms, or any other works done for the dead. The apostle saith, every man shall receive according as he himself hath done: he addeth not, as other men shall do for him. But Dionyse, *II. c. Eccl. cap. 7.* proveth by this text, that no prayers for the dead are available, but such as are made by the minister of the church in faith, and do rather declare what God hath done according to his promises, than desire any thing which he hath not done already: as in the sentence of excommunication and absolution, where the minister is but an interpreter of God's judgment. "Therefore the bishop," saith he, "asketh those things which God hath promised, and which are acceptable to him, and which doubtless are to be granted, wherein he both declareth to God the good disposition of his mind, resembling the goodness of God, who loveth them that are good, and to them that are present, declareth as an interpreter, the gifts which shall be unto the holy." So also the bishops have authority of separation, as interpreters of God's judgements, not that the most wise Godhead, that I may use a gentle term, doth follow as a minister thir unreasonable affections, but that they do separate those which according to their worthiness are judged already of God, by that spirit which is the author of the mysteries,

moving them as interpreters." This was his judgment of prayers for the dead in that time, when the error was not yet confirmed. The effect of them is also so set forth by Augustin, that they which should seem to have most need of them, have least help by them: that they avail no further, than a man's good works deserved while he lived: secondly, they avail, saith he, either that there may be full release, or that their damnation may be more tolerable. But whether there be any purgatory pains after this life, Augustin saith it may be doubted, and either be found, or be still hidden. *De octo quæst. dulc. quæst. 1.* But in his latter days, writing against the Pelagians, he utterly denieth any third place to be found in the scripture, *Cont. Pel. Hypog. lib. 5.* So he writeth *de verb. Apost. ser. 14.* "This he calleth the kingdom, thus damnation with the devil: there is no middle place left, where you may set infants. Judgment shall be of the quick and the dead, some shall be at the right hand, some at the left hand, I know none other. Thou that bringest in the middle place, get thee from the midst, let not him offend thee which seeketh the right hand, and admoniseth thee to depart from the midst, but go not to the left hand. If therefore there shall be the right hand and the left hand, and we know no middle place in the gospel, behold in the right hand is the kingdom of heaven." That which he speaketh against the middle place invented by the Pelagians for infants, may as truly be said of Purgatory invented for them, to whom prayers should be profitable. In the scriptures we find no third place: in the gospel we know no middle place, but heaven and hell. Seeing therefore neither the place nor the prayers have any ground in the scriptures, man's authority is insufficient to persuade so great a matter.

10. Heaven is the reward of good works, not due by the merit of them, but by the grace and mercy of God, who hath promised to give it freely to them that believe in him by Christ, and bring forth the fruits of a lively faith. It is the free gift of God in Christ Jesus, saith Paul, *Rom. 6. 23.* You are saved by grace through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast, *Ephes. 2. 8, 9.* But hell is the stipend of ill works, deserved by the merit of sin. That faith void of works, is sufficient to procure salvation, none of us affirmeth. But that only lack of faith is sufficient to damnation, the scripture is plain, because it is not possible to please God without faith, *Heb. 11.* And where faith lacketh, there can be no good works: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin. Therefore though wicked men by ill deeds, deserve damnation, yet the apostles saith not here, nor any where else, that men by good deeds merit salvation, but the contrary, howsoever the enemies of God's grace, of faith and of good works, renewing the old heresy of the Pelagians teach otherwise. For what could Pelagius speak more blasphemously against the grace of God, than to say: "Heaven is as well the reward of

good works, as hell is the stipend of ill works."

18. The apostles and their successors have no word of reconciliation committed to them by ministering the sacrifice, but that is proper to Christ, whose sacrificing priesthood passeth not from himself to any other by succession. *Heb.* 7. 24. He hath offered himself once for ever, and found by that one oblation eternal redemption, *Heb.* 9. 12, and 10. 14. Therefore in offering the sacrifice propitiatory, he hath no vicars, but performed all himself.

21. This text invincibly proveth, that we are not justified in God's sight by justice inherent in us, but by the justice of Christ, imputed to us through faith. And that is the justice whereof Augustin speaketh, wherewith men are just, whom God by his grace doth justify through faith: and therefore he saith expressly in the same chapter, "The apostle saith, that this ministration of justice is not of our merits, but of the mercy of God." He saith upon the Psalm which the same apostle citeth for testification of his grace. "Blessed is he to whom the Lord imputeth not sin, neither is there guile in his heart. This is the confession of humble Saints, which boast not themselves to be that they are not. When the apostle commending the same grace more abundantly in our Lord Jesus Christ, cometh to the same clothing of the justice of faith, wherewith being clothed, we shall not be found naked, &c. see what he addeth, 'He which hath made us,' saith he, 'unto the same end is God, which hath given us the pledge of his Spirit, and after a few words he inferred, that we might be the justice of God in him.' This is that justice of God, not whereby he is just, but whereby we are made just by him." And *ep.* 120. *Honorary*, he expoundeth these words, "That we might be made the justice of God in him, that is, in his body, which is his church whereof he is head. We are the justice of God, which they not knowing, and willing to set up their own, that is as it were glorying of their own works, are not subject to the justice of God. To this justice of God pride is contrary, whereby men have trust, as in their own works: therefore it followeth there, let not the foot of pride come upon me. This is the justice of God, whereby they are just by his faith, which live now of faith." Again, *De verbis Apostoli*, *Ser.* 6, expounding this text, he saith: "See these two things, that is, the justice of God, not our justice, in him, not in us." Therefore Calvin's collection of the manifest words of the text, that a man is just in God's sight, by imputation of the justice of Christ, as Christ was sin, by imputation of our sin, doth plainly agree with Augustin's doctrine. As for the justice whereof John speaketh, is indeed inherent, and is a fruit and effect of justification by faith, not a cause thereof. Therefore Augustin saith, "That good or just works do follow him that is justified, they go not before him that is to be justified." *De fide et operibus cap.* 14. That Christ was made

sin for us, because he was a sacrifice for sin we confess, but therefore he was a sacrifice for sin, because our sin was imputed to him and punished in him. And therefore the sacrifices of the law that were for sin, were called by the name of sin, because the sin of the offender was sacramentally imputed to the sacrifice which was slain, as though it had deserved that which the offender had merited, for whom it was offered. Therefore also Christ was made a curse for us, *Gal.* 3. 13, because the curse which we had deserved, was imputed to him, that the blessing of Abraham might be upon us. And that the ancient fathers confirm this interpretation of Calvin, you shall hear by their own words. First, Chrysostom upon this text, *Hom.* 11. in 2 *Cor.* "That we should be made the justice of God in him," saith he, "what speech, what mind, can set forth these things worthily? For him that was just," saith he, "he made a sinner, that he might make sinners just: but rather he said not so, but that which was much more; for he named not the quality, but the offence, he said not a sinner, but sin itself, not only him which sinned not, but him which knew no sin, that we might be made, he said not just, but justice itself, and the justice of God. For this is the justice of God, when justification cometh not of works, seeing it is necessary that no spot be found but by grace: by this means all sin vanisheth clean away. In the mean time he suffereth them not to be extolled, seeing God performeth all, and showeth the greatness of the giver: that former justice was of the law and of works, but this is the justice of God." Primasius upon this text saith, "God the Father made his Son sin for us that is, a sacrifice for sin for us, The sacrifice offered of sin, was called sin in the law, although it did not sin all, as it is written. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his sin: by the blood of these sacrifices, that blood which was shed for us was prefigured, so Christ being offered for our sins, was called by the name of sin, that we might be made the justice of God, not our justice: in him, not in us." Theodoret upon this text saith, "For when he was free from sin, he suffered the death of sinners, that he might loose the sin of men, and being called that which we were, made us that which he was: for he gave us the riches of his justice." Ambrose upon this text saith, "He which did so sin, was slain as a sinner, that sinners might be justified before God in Christ." Oecumenius saith, "He made him sin, that as a sinner he should be condemned, that we might be made the justice of God in him: he said not, that we might be made just, but that which was more, justice itself, and the justice of God. And that is the justice of God which is not of works, but that we might be justified in him, that is, by him forgiving and pardoning us." Theophylact saith, "What is this that God gave his Son, which knew no sin, that is, which was justice itself, to death for us, and caused him to die as a sinner and wicked man? For cursed is he that hangeth

on the tree, and he was reputed among the unjust." He saith, "Not that that he made him a sinner, but sin itself which is more: why was this done? that we might be justified not of works and the law, but of the grace of God. For this is the justice of God, when a man is justified by grace, so that no blemish or small spot is found in him: for therefore he said not, that he might be made just, but the justice of God, showing the excellency of grace." I will conclude with Augustin, that your impudency in citing him for the contrary sense, may be more manifest. Ezechr. *cap. 41*, expounding this text, he saith, "God made Christ sin for us, to whom we are to be reconciled, that is a sacrifice for sins, by which we might be reconciled. He therefore was made sin, that we might be made justice, not our justice, but God's justice, neither in us, but in him, as he declared sin, not to be his, but ours, not placed in him, but in us by the similitude of sinful flesh in which he was crucified." Therefore you must not abhor Calvin's interpretation, as wicked and unlearned, except you will abhor the judgment of all the ancient fathers, as wicked and unlearned, for his judgment is their judgment upon this text, and none other.

## CHAPTER 6.

2. It lieth not in man's free will to follow the motion of God, except God by his grace of unwilling do frame it to be willing. It is in the power of man to change his will into better, but this power is none at all, except it be given of God. *August. retract. lib. 1, c. 22*. For man using amiss his free will, lost himself and it. *Enchir. c. 30*.

5. The works whereof the Apostle speaketh, are acceptable to God, but not as penance satisfactory for sin, nor as meritorious for salvation which is of grace, and not of works: and these exercises are also needful for the ministers of the church, to make them more apt to do their duty. But where you exact chastity, meaning abstinence from marriage, the word signifieth purity, and by Theodoret is interpreted, contempt of money. Chrysostom, rejecting of gifts, and preaching the gospel freely. Ambrose, either chastity of the body, or of the gospel. Oecumenius, modesty and preaching the gospel freely and sincerely in all things. This place therefore chargeth not the ministers of the church with continency, except they have the gift, and will use it to God's glory.

## CHAPTER 7.

9. Contrition or sorrow for sins past, is necessary unto true repentance, some fruits whereof the apostle rehearseth, neither doth Luther or Calvin teach otherwise: Luther speaketh against the popish heresy of penance, or sorrow to be satisfactory for sin, and not against sorrow which worketh true repentance, and amendment of life through faith in remission of sins.

10. The apostle saith, that sorrow for sin worketh repentance, which is necessary unto

salvation. But every thing that is necessary to salvation, is not a proper efficient cause thereof. We affirm not, that only faith saveth, as though nothing else were necessary to salvation. But we affirm, that only faith is the instrumental cause of our justification before God, apprehending the mercy of God in Christ, whereby we are justified; yet is repentance and the fruits of faith necessary to them that shall be saved, as by the justice of faith.

## CHAPTER 8.

5. Paul neither excludeth nor setteth behind, the respect of the whole church, nor of our princes, nor of our parents. Although great duties to be yielded to our masters, both temporal and spiritual. Yet are we not to prefer them in temporal duty before our prince or our parents, nor in any duty before the whole church.

14. This place proveth not, that one may satisfy or supererogate for himself, much less for any other or that there can be any communication of merits, neither can any such thing be gathered out of the text, neither do any of the ancient Fathers conclude any such thing out of the text. But that as every one aboundeth in the gifts and graces of God, so he should be willing and ready to communicate them unto others, and that God rewardeth this loving and charitable communication of his gifts, bringing all in the end, to an equality, though his gifts be diverse for this present, in that he will reward every man according to his good will, though every man's will be not equal, as he saith in the 12th verse. And the equality of Manna was not made by men's supererogation, but by the wonderful work of God, therefore here is no place for men, to allot or sell their merits spiritual for gifts or rewards temporal, which is the mark you shoot at. Chrysostom saith, *Hom. 16*. "You flourish in riches, they in life, and trust in God, therefore give you them of the riches in which you abound and they have not, that you may receive of the trust according to which they be rich and you are poor." Theodoret saith, "Your reward shall be very great, and giving lesser things, you shall receive greater things, for you shall be partakers with them of commendable patience. And very conveniently he addeth the testimony of scripture. For in the gathering of manna the Lord showeth the same equality, for it did nothing more profit him which gathered more. For God being bountiful, joined a measure to his gift." Primasius saith, "rich men in this world, as an elm bearing up a vine. By help of it, the vine bringeth forth plentiful fruit. And by the fertility of the vine, the elm is seen full of fruit. So the servants of God and poor in spirit are as the vine, which are sustained with the wealth of rich men, and communicate that wherein they abound one to another, and both come full to eternal life." To the same effect write Ambrose, Photius, Oecumenius, Theophylact. Therefore here is no chopping and changing of merits, or satisfactory works, but the holy communion of

saints, which the Spirit of God worketh in all the members of Christ.

#### CHAPTER 9.

6. The greater the alms is, that is given in faith, with a liberal mind, according to the ability of the giver, the greater shall be the reward, but not of merit, for when the reward shall come, saith Augustin, he will crown his gifts, not thy merits, *Is.* 70. *Con.* 2.

9. It is God which increaseth the fruits of justice, not of the merit of alms, but of his abundant grace and mercy, which to small and temporal gifts rendereth infinite and eternal rewards.

#### CHAPTER 10.

6. Calvin never denied the lawful authority of the church in punishment of heretics, according to the Ecclesiastical censures. And they be the lawful successors of the apostles, which succeed them in doctrine, not they that challenge their place in the church, and condemn the apostles' doctrine of heresy. Your seminaries, have manifestly proved that to be true of you, whereof you slander our consistories: namely to be the shops and councils of sedition and conspiracies, as the executions of Campion, Somerville, Parry, Throckmorton, Ballard, Babington, Savage, &c., and other horrible traitors, sent out of those shops of treason and rebellion to murder our Sovereign Queen Elizabeth, and to trouble the peace of her government, do make most manifest. The like examples, you are never able to show, of any that came from our consistories against any lawful Prince, being of the contrary religion.

#### CHAPTER 11.

6. Thanks be to God, that he hath endued the ministers of his church not with vain eloquence, but with sound learning, that they are able even by testimony of the ancient Doctors of the Church, beside the manifest authority of the holy Scriptures, both to justify the doctrine which they teach, and to confute your heresies, in the most necessary points of difference between us. Therefore this is but a heretical brag, to challenge the Doctors to be yours for two or three of the least of your errors, which are sparingly found in some of them, not in all nor in the most ancient of them, nor in any so maintained, as they are holden by you: when in the greatest matters, and them so many, they are all, or most, expressly and directly as it were your professed enemies.

#### CHAPTER 12.

1. Whosoever reporteth any vision tending to maintain any false doctrine contrary to the Scriptures, or to teach us any other Gospel or doctrine of salvation, or any other church, than that which is builded upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles: we must be bold to condemn them, and say as Augustin saith of the visions and miracles of the

Donatists, *De unitate Ec.* cap. 16. Let them not say it is true, because Donatus, or Pontius, or any other man hath done these or those miracles, or because men at the memories of our dead, do pray and are heard, or because these or these things do happen there, or because this our brother or that our sister saw such a vision waking, or dreamed such a vision sleeping. Away with these feigned miracles of living men, or monsters of deceiving spirits. For either these things are not true which are reported, or if heretics have any such miracles, we ought the rather to take heed of them. But whether they hold the church or no, let them show none otherwise but by the canonical books of the holy scriptures. If I myself, saith Paul, or an angel from heaven should preach another Gospel, &c. *Gal.* 1. But if any vision be reported that tendeth to maintain the truth delivered in the scriptures, we do not condemn the author or the book for the vision's sake. And therefore you say untruly, that for the vision's sake, reported by the author of the second book of Maccabees, we refuse the whole book to be canonical. We have other manner of reasons, which if you could confute, you would not forge this.

2. But the report of such men as speak of their visions, must be examined by the word of God: for if they teach us another Gospel, we must hold them accursed, *Gal.* 1. *Deut.* 13.

11. You can see that some of the apostles are greater than other, yet you cannot see that Paul was equal with them that were greatest, and therefore Peter was not greatest of all, but had some fellows even in that pre-eminence wherein he excelled others, as in dignity and authority of apostleship all the rest were equal with him. Therefore Chrysostom saith upon this text, *1 Cor.* 12. "He doth not now compare himself with them, but even with Peter and the rest."

12. Let all men be advised what doctrine they hold, howsoever confirmed by miracles, if it be not confirmed by the word of God. As for the doctrine of Augustin, we are neither certain what miracles he did to confirm it, or if he did any, whether it was to confirm any of that corruption which he brought in. Certain it is, the Catholic Britons would not receive him, with whom Christian Religion had continued in succession since the Apostles' time. As for the doctrine that we teach, seeing it is none other but the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, as we prove manifestly by the holy Scriptures, it is not needful for us to confirm by miracles, which hath so long since been confirmed by all the miracles of Christ and his Apostles. And yet in the chief and most essential points of faith, we teach the same that Gregory and Augustin his Legate taught, as appeareth by many evidences of story and writings of Gregory, Bede, Aelfrike, and others.

21. To repent and amend their lives, is the same that Augustin speaketh of. But there be degrees of sorrow in repentance, as there be degrees of offences. Augustin maketh

three: one, of them that repent before baptism: the second, of them that repent for heinous sins that deserve excommunication, as those named in this text: and the third of repentance for daily transgressions; all which he termeth by the same word *Agere penitentiam*, to repent or to be sorrowful for sin. To all which three kinds of repentance, our translation agreeth better than yours.

## CHAPTER 13.

5. Seeing you confess that we may know certainly that we have faith, it is easy to prove that we may know that we are in grace, and assured of salvation. "For by faith," Paul saith, "we have access unto this grace in which we stand, and glory in the hope of the glory of the sons of God:" which hope shall not deceive us. *Rom.* 5. 2, 5. Again, when the apostle saith we may know that Christ is in us, how should we not know that we are in the grace and favour of God? For Christ is not in the reprobate that are out of the favour of God, but in his elect, in whom after they be called, he dwelleth by faith, *Eph.* 3. 17. If Christ therefore dwell in our hearts by faith, we are assured that our sins are forgiven us for Christ's sake, and therefore are assuredly in the state of grace and salvation. Your reason of the contrary is, that every one that is of the catholic faith is not always of good life agreeable thereunto. Indeed every one that outwardly professeth the Catholic faith, is not of good life agreeably, but he that believeth in heart, confesseth with his mouth, and is of good life agreeably, though not void of all sin. "For a good life," saith Augustin, "is inseparable from faith, which worketh by love." Therefore the popish faith is not the Apostolic Catholic faith, which

worketh by love, and is inseparable from a good life. "Yea it is itself a good life," as Augustin saith, *De fide et oper. cap.* 23. Your second reason is, "that the acts of our will are not so subject to understanding that we can know certainly whether we be good or evil." O miserable and damnable state of papists, which have no certainty of salvation grounded upon God's promises apprehended by faith, but depend upon the acts of their will, and their carnal understanding. Whereby they show themselves void of God's Spirit, which testifieth to our spirits, that we are the sons of God: if sons, then heirs, heirs indeed of God, and joint heirs with Christ, *Rom.* 8. Augustin whom you quote, teacheth no such doctrine. *De perfectione justitie*, he saith: "It is sin, when either there is not love which ought to be, or it is less than it ought to be, whether this may be avoided by our will, or whether it cannot. For if it may, our present will doth it, or if it cannot, our will that is past hath done it. And yet it may be avoided, not when a proud will is praised, but when a humble will is helped. In the other place he showeth, that the number and salvation of the elect is certain; yet no man in this mortality must presume that he is of the number of the predestinate, except he abide in Christ, and bring forth the fruits of election, by the gift of perseverance, which is given to every one of the elect. As for the authority of Thomas Aquinas, it is not to be regarded, though sometime he writeth not far from the truth in this matter. To conclude, our certainty dependeth not upon our will or works, but upon the promise of God through faith, that Christ is in us, and we in him, therefore we shall not miss of the performance of his promises.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS.

## CHAPTER I.

2. The text is here plain, that Paul's calling was not by man, therefore that imposition of hands, *Acts* 13, was not the giving of holy orders, but the commending of his labours unto God. Except you will say that he preached ever since his conversion, until he went from Antioch, without holy orders, which is a shameful absurdity. Yet they that intrude themselves into the ministry without the calling of God, and lawful ordaining of men, are not excused by his example: much less, they that set up a new sacrificing priesthood, to deface the glory of the eternal priesthood of Christ.

8. Luther and Calvin taught not a new gospel, but for the substance of their doctrine, they taught the same which Paul taught unto the Galatians, and which is fully set down in the holy scriptures. For gifts of learning and eloquence all the popish heretics of Rheims,

are not worthy to bear their books after them, and yet they neither desired nor deserved credit by learning or eloquence, but only by demonstration of truth out of the holy scriptures. For good life, though heretics have invented such impudent slanders of them, as their forefathers did against Christ and his apostles, and the Arians against Athanasius, yet the testimony of the churches in which they lived, is sufficient to testify, that in comparison of the best popes that have been these five hundred years, their life was angel-like, and before men irreprouceable. Yet no more for their life, than for their learning, they were to be accepted, but only for the truth which they taught plainly, out of the holy scriptures, confirmed both with learning and holiness of life.

The words are plain, that not only a contrary gospel, but also another gospel is condemned, and therefore all addition of gospels

to the only true gospel, is execrable both by this text, and by the curse that God addeth to them, that add unto his word. Therefore he is void of common sense, that understandeth not Augustin to speak of them which have not received the gospel all at once, whose want must be supplied. But they that once have received the gospel fully, as it is taught in the holy scriptures, must receive no addition, though it be not directly contrary unto that which they have received. Hereupon Chrysostom saith, "That he might show that a very small matter added amiss, doth corrupt the whole, he saith, the gospel is subverted. Let them hear what Paul saith, that they had subverted the gospel, which brought in but a very little new matters." Vincentius Lirinensis upon this text concludeth in these words: "To declare or preach unto Catholic Christians any thing besides that which they have received, it was never lawful, it shall never be lawful. And to accuse them which teach any thing beside that which hath once been received, it was always necessary, it is everywhere necessary, it shall be always necessary." To the gospel therefore fully received from the apostles, according to the holy scriptures, nothing may be added afterward. Cyprian also useth this text, to the same end, saying: "Seeing therefore, neither an apostle, nor any angel from heaven, can preach or teach otherwise, beside that which Christ once taught, and his apostles preached, I marvel how this has been used, that contrary to the rule of the gospel, and the apostle, in some places, water is offered in the Lord's cup, which being alone, cannot express the blood of Christ." *Epist. 63.* Theodoret upon this text saith, "Being incensed by remembrance of contraries, and moved with just indignation, he calleth even him an enemy to piety, which goeth about to preach other things, and crieth out. But if we," &c. and in the end concludeth the apostle's purpose to be, "That he might drive away all novelty of men." Oecumenius, upon this text, saith, "Besides that, signifieth, although it be never so little differing from that which he had preached." Chrysostom upon this text, *Gal. Hom. 1.* hath these words, "He said not, if they preach contrary things, or if they overthrow the whole gospel, but if they evangelize or preach, but a little beside the gospel, which you have received, if they weaken it in any point, let them be accursed." And that he meaneth of the gospel contained in the scriptures, his words declare upon the same sentence repeated. "Christ himself bringeth in Abraham, speaking in the parable, declaring that he will have more credit to be given to the scriptures, than if the dead should revive again. But Paul, when I say Paul, I say Christ himself, for it was he which moved his mind, preferreth the scriptures before angels, descending from heaven, and very rightly. For the angels, be they never so great, are servants and ministers. But all the scriptures came unto us, not from servants, but from the Lord of all. For this cause he

saith, if any shall preach unto you, beside that which we preach unto you," &c. By this you may see how justly and agreeably to the ancient fathers' judgment, we charge the Popish church with addition to the scriptures.

We acknowledge, that as well that which the Apostles preached, as that which they did write, is the gospel. But we affirm, that they preached nothing for the gospel, but that which was written in the scriptures, of the Old Testament, *Rom. 1. 2. Act. 26. 22.* and afterward, was also written in the scriptures of the New Testament. Therefore when we teach neither unctuary, nor besides the word written, we are sure to avoid the Apostle's curse, wherinto all papists incur, teaching both contrary, and besides the scriptures, under colour of unwritten traditions. But we know whatsoever the Apostles taught is contained in the scriptures, "For the gospel which they preached," saith Ireneus, "afterward by the will of God, they delivered in writing, to be the foundation and pillar of our faith," *Lib. 3. cap. 1.* Tertullian, against Hermogenes the heretic, saith, "let him show that his opinion is written, if it be not written let him be afraid of that wo which is appointed for them that add or take away." Athanasius in the beginning of his book against idols, saith: "The holy scriptures inspired of God, are by themselves sufficient to teach the truth." *Cyril, Joan. lib. 11. cap. ultimo.* hath these words: "All things which our Lord did, are not written, but such things as they which did write, thought to be sufficient, as well for manners, as for doctrine, that glistering in right faith, and works, and virtue, we might come to the kingdom of heaven, by our Lord Jesus Christ." Hierom, *Agg. cap. 1.* saith, "Other things, which without the authority and testimony of the scriptures, they invent and feign of their own accord, the sword of God's word doth strike." Therefore, all after preaching and sowing of novelties, besides the holy scriptures, is that which Tertullian, Ireneus, Vincentius, Augustin, and Hierom condemn, which ought to be accused of all Christian catholics.

18. That Paul owed any duty to him as Pope, and his great superior in authority, you are never able to prove. That he came so far of duty, you allege Tertullian, *de prescript.* who saith: "he came up to Jerusalem to know of Peter, office, and duty, and right verity of the same faith and preaching. For both they would not have marvelled that a persecutor he was made a preacher, if he had preached any thing contrary, neither would they have magnified the Lord because Paul his adversary was come to them. Therefore they gave him the right hand, in sign of concord and agreement, and ordained between them, the distribution of the office or duty, not separation of the gospel." Therefore his coming was about his office and authority of preaching, not of duty unto Peter, as his superior in authority, who willingly yielded unto him the greatest and largest charge of preaching among the Gentiles. But he came



to see Peter, as Chrysostom saith: "to behold him, as men behold a thing, or person of name, excellency, or majesty." It is well he came not to kiss his foot, as emperors do to the pope. But Chrysostom's words are these: "he came to see him, as they are wont to speak, which go to see great and noble cities, to know them." Where is the person of excellency and majesty? But what writeth Chrysostom immediately before upon this text? "what can be more modest than this mind? After so great, and so many good acts, when he had no need at all of Peter, neither wanted his voice, but was equal in honour unto him, for I will here say no more, yet he went up unto him, as to his elder. That blessed man went not to learn any thing of him, nor to receive any correction, but only to see him, and honour him with his presence." Hierom maketh a mystery of the number of the days, maketh not Peter Pope: and saith in his commentaries, "that he went not to learn of him, but to give honour to him, which was an Apostle before him, for he had no need of great instruction, and therefore tarried but a short time with him." Ambrose saith: "It was meet that he should desire to see Peter, because he was first among the Apostles, to whom our Saviour committed the charge of the churches not to learn any thing of him, who had already learned of that author by whom Peter himself was instructed, but for affection of Apostleship, that Peter might know that the same license was given to him, that he himself had received. Therefore when he came to him, he was lodged and abode with him fifteen days, as a fellow Apostle of the same mind and agreement." Chrysostom, *John. Hom. 87*, saith that Paul went to see him, "because he was the mouth and chief of the Apostles." And yet as he saith upon this text, "he was equal in honour with Peter." Upon the next chapter he saith: "Paul was equal in dignity with Peter the highest." Maximus doubteth not to call Paul often *summum Apostolum*, the high Apostle. *Oecom. cent. 4. 97. cent. 2. 7.*

#### CHAPTER 2.

2. Paul went not to put his doctrine and calling unto the trial of others, for then he should have done so at the first, for his doctrine and calling was of as high authority as theirs, but he went to declare unto others, upon occasion of slanders, his consent and agreement with the rest of the apostles: "It is one thing to confer," saith Hierom, "another thing to learn. Among them that confer, there is an equality, but of him that teacheth, and him that learneth, he is less that learneth." Therefore Paul went to confer with his equals, not that any trial or approbation of his calling or doctrine were necessary, as if he had been their inferior. But for them which have not the like extraordinary calling and authorizing as Paul had, it is necessary for them, to submit their calling and doctrine, to the ordinary governors of God's church. I say to the lawful governors of God's church, not to Antichrist and the enemies of God's

church, what place soever they usurp. As for going up to any principal place of our religion, we know none, but when a general council is kept, neither is there any means to confer with Peter and the apostles, but by submitting ourselves to their holy writings. As for Luther and Calvin, or they that join in doctrine with them, they never refused to put their doctrine to such conference of lawful council or holy bishops as they ought to do: but have often desired that such a general council, by consent of Christian princes, might be gathered. But your quarrel against them is because they will not put their preaching in judgment of your unlawful chapter of Trent, where the pope, who is accused of heresy, should be the only judge, which particular assembly, for many other prejudices, popish France also hath refused to acknowledge for a lawful council.

2. The approbation of Paul's doctrine by the rest of the apostles was requisite to confute the slander of the false apostles, who reported that he agreed not in doctrine with the other apostles: not "that all other men could not, or would not acknowledge that his doctrine was of the Holy Ghost, till it were allowed by such as were without all exception known to be apostles, or that without conference he knew he should have lost his labour, both for the time past and to come:" for then he should and would have sought approbation at the first, not have preached so many years without conference: "not that Paul feared," saith Hierom upon this text, "lest by the space of 17 years, he had preached a false gospel among the Gentiles, but that he might declare to them that were apostles before him, that he neither did nor had run in vain, as ignorant men thought." If he feared not, &c. he had security of preaching the gospel, before it was confirmed by the sentence of Peter, and the rest of the apostles that were with him. You see therefore, that Hierom upon deliberation in his commentary, writeth contrary to that he did write in heat of contention against Augustin. That he went up by revelation it proveth not, "that having his apostleship and gospel liked and approved by them, he might preach with more fruit:" for he preached before with as great fruit to the conversion of many nations; but that to stop the mouths of the slanderers, and to confirm the weak, it was expedient that he should have the approbation of the rest of the apostles, and their acknowledging of the apostleship of the Gentiles, to be chiefly committed to him. Tertullian writeth against Marcion, which received but one gospel of Luke, showing that Paul, of whom Luke learned his gospel, refused not to have it confirmed by the testimony and authority of the ancient apostles, and so should Marcion receive the gospel of Matthew and John, as well as of Luke. What Heretics those be that will be tried only by the scriptures, and not by men judging according to the scriptures, I know not, but sure I am, those men whom you specially malign are none such. Another

matter you may gather out of this place, that it is no absurdity "to have the scriptures approved by the church's testimony, as the adversaries make it." But we make no such absurdity, but that you should hold, that the authority of the scriptures doth depend upon the church's approbation. For to give testimony unto the truth, and to discern truth from falsehood, is no derogation to the dignity or certainty of truth. But when you affirm, that the church might have refused the gospel of Matthew or John, and taken the gospel of Bartholomew or Nicodemus, this we affirm to be a foul absurdity. And when you say, that "disputation whether the scripture or the church, be of greater authority is superfluous:" you seem to grant equal authority to the church with the scripture, which is to match the authority of men with the authority of God. Therefore let us consider your reasons. First you say, "either giveth testimony to other." This is a fond reason: for the lawyer may give testimony to the written law, and the written law giveth testimony to him if he say true, but yet is of greater authority than the lawyer. for the lawyer must obey the law, and the law written will convince the lawyer of error if he give a wrong testimony. So the church must obey the scripture, which is able to convince her of error if she go astray; the scripture is not subject to the church, therefore of greater authority. Further you say, "they be both assured by the Holy Ghost from all error." Of the scripture it is certain: but that the church is assured from error, it cannot be proved. For the scriptures were needless, if the church without them be assured from error. But the church is no longer assured from error, than she followeth the word of God delivered in the scriptures, which is the rule of truth. But by your collection that followed: "The church yet being before the scriptures, the spouse of Christ, and proper dwelling temple or subject of God and his graces," it seemeth you mean, that the church in this respect should be of greater authority than the scripture: wherein you commit a foul paralogism or sophistication, by the scriptures, meaning the writing of them, and not the matter that is written, which is the word of God. For the word of God which is written in the scriptures, was doubtless before the church was the spouse of Christ. For by the word of God, the church was first gathered to have any being or excellency that it hath. Your other argument is as absurd as this. "The scriptures were for the church, and not the church for the scriptures." Which is as good, as if a man would say, the prince is for the people, and not the people for the prince: therefore the people is of greater authority than the prince. Or thus, the law is made for people, and not people for the law, therefore the law is not above the people, neither are they subject to it. Moreover you say, "in the church there is judicial authority by office and jurisdiction to determine of doubtful questions, touching

the sense of the scriptures, and other controversies of religion, of which judicial power, the scriptures be not capable." I answer, there is no other judicial authority in the church, than in the commonwealth, which is to determine controversies according to the law, and the true meaning thereof; where in question of the sense of the law, the law-maker's mind is to be discussed by his words, and the circumstances and occasions of making the law. So the meaning of the scriptures, is to be taken only out of the scriptures, so saith Clemens: "You ought not to seek a strange and foreign sense without the scriptures, that you may confirm it by any means by the scriptures: but the sense of truth you must take out of the scriptures themselves." *Dist. 37. cap. Relatum.* And that this is not so hard a matter to do, Augustin testifieth, who saith, that "nothing is almost gathered out of any obscure places of scripture, which is not found in other places to be uttered most plainly." Therefore the scripture hath authority to determine all controversies of religion, though not speaking as men upon the bench, for which cause some of you have blasphemed the scriptures to be a dumb judge, yet the scripture speaketh sufficiently, to inform the conscience of every man that is desirous to hear the truth, and feel the resolution thereof out of the scriptures. Wherefore Paul doubteth not to say, when he had cited many testimonies of scripture, "we know that what things the law saith, it speaketh to them that are under the law," *Rom. 3. 19.* The scriptures therefore in their kind, are capable of speech, and so of judgment and judicial power: and the truth and determination thereof, are as evident and particular, as is necessary for any times or persons, so saith the apostle. "The whole scripture inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to exhort, to rebuke, that the man of God may be perfect and prepared to all good works." *2 Tim. 3. 16.* Yet the ministry of man is necessary by God's ordinance, not of authority above the scriptures, but subject unto them. The controversy therefore is not like as you make it, in a case of law, whether the judge or the evidence be of greater authority: but whether the judge or the law be of greater authority. Where every wise man will grant that the law is of greater authority, whereunto the judge is to obey, and according to which to give his sentence, or else by the law his erroneous sentence is to be reversed. With such proud hypocrites have we to do, as will be judges of the scriptures themselves, and not submit their judgment to be tried by the scriptures, whom no wise commonwealth would tolerate, both because they arrogate judgment without commission, and though they give sentence against all justice, yet by no law they will have their judgment to be examined.

6. The gospel and preaching of Paul, was not put to the church's probation, as you surmise, but if it had been, this verse proveth plainly that the church added no authority to

his gospel and preaching. No more doth it to the scriptures, which it receiveth and acknowledgeth to be true. And although the authority of the church do move men which never heard of the scriptures, to give credit unto them: yet are men bound to take them for truth, although the church did not move them, nor testify of the scriptures, that they are the truth. For men are bound to believe the word of God, because it is the word of God, and not because it is approved of men to be the word of God. As Adam, Noah, and Abraham did believe the word of God, and were bound to believe it, when there was no church that could move them to it. The apostles believed the gospel of our Saviour Christ before he wrought any miracle, because it was testified by the scriptures, *John* 1. 45. And Christ himself preached, saying: "Repent and believe the gospel," when there was no church, whose authority could make men to believe: yet were the apostles bound to believe in Christ, and the Jews to believe the gospel, because it was the word of God. The scriptures therefore being the word of God, are of full and sufficient authority of themselves, and the Spirit of God which speaketh in them, is of sufficient authority to procure credit unto them, even without the testimony of men, and doth procure the church itself to acknowledge them to be the true and undoubted word of God. And as the whole church is bound to believe them, for the Spirit of truth that speaketh in them, so is every particular person and people bound to believe them, and take them for the truth, although they never heard that the church doth approve them. Nevertheless the testimony of the church in respect of men's infirmity of judgment, is requisite to induce men to give credit to the scriptures, and is a good confirmation of men's faith, not as the authority of men, but as the authority of God's Spirit in men, consenting unto the truth, and framing the obedience of men unto the truth. Therefore that saying of Augustin maketh nothing against us, nor troubleth us one whit. Augustin speaketh not of himself, at such time as he was a Christian, but putting the case he were an infidel yet to be converted: it is plain both by the words going immediately before, and by the whole discourse. He saith not, unless the authority of the church moved me, as though nothing else should move him, but the church's authority: for his word is not *moveret*, but *commoveret*. But his saying is to this effect: "I for my part would not believe the gospel, unless the authority of the church, with other things did move me, or did also move me." But when the question was between him and the Donatists, where the church was, on his side or on theirs, then he fleeth not to that unlearned petition of principle, which yet is the whole bulwark of Papistry, that the Catholic Church was on his side, but requireth the matter to be discussed, by the authority of the scriptures. "Let us not hear," saith he, "this say I, and this sayest thou, but let us hear. Thus saith the Lord.

There are the books of the Lord, unto whose authority we do both consent, both believe, both serve. There let us seek the church, there let us discuss our cause." *De unitat Eccl. cap. 3*, and in the same chapter, "I will not have the holy church to be demonstrated, or showed forth by human documents, but by divine oracles." Again, "Therefore let us seek her in the holy scriptures."

7. You slander us, as you do commonly, to teach, "that the apostle's charge was so distinct, that none could preach, &c. but in their several places, which by God's appointment or their lot, for more particular regard of peace and order's sake, were limited to every one." For contrariwise we teach, that every one of the apostles had as large and general authority as the other, and that any of the apostles by their commission, might lawfully have preached and exercised his apostleship and jurisdiction at Rome, as well as Peter and Paul. But after this distinction was made by God for causes before mentioned, it was not lawful for the apostles to leave or forsake their special charge, and to intrude themselves one into another's limits, which would have bred the contrary enormities to those causes, for which their charges were distinguished: namely, neglect of some provinces, dissension, and confusion. Therefore it was not lawful for Peter, to whom by God was committed the chief apostleship of the circumcision, to forsake this charge, and to take upon him the chief apostleship of the Gentiles. And certain it is, that Peter did never consent to break that order, which was here taken by him, and the rest of the apostles, and Paul. Therefore though he came to Rome, and preached at Rome, and died at Rome, yet was he the chief Apostle of the circumcision still, and Paul the chief apostle of the uncircumcision or Gentiles. And therefore the pope might more probably have conveyed his title of supremacy from Paul, than from Peter. And although the Papists would now seem craftily to derive his authority from both, yet holding their own principles, that is impossible. For if Peter were not chief apostle of the church of the Gentiles, as the text is plain that he was not; his successor, admitting he had Peter's whole authority, which none that is a wise man will grant, cannot have chief authority over the church of the Gentiles, because Paul was beheaded at Rome. For if there must be but one head, and that was Peter, as the Papists affirm, then can the pope derive none authority from Paul. But let us see how cleanly you can convey the matter. You say, it "is plain by this place, that to Peter and Paul, as to the two chief and most renowned apostles, the church of all nations, that is, of the Jews and Gentiles, was given." I will not stand upon your terms, for in truth the apostles were rather given to the churches, than the churches to them, *Eph.* 4. You speak of them as though they were two great benefices or Bishoprics. But we agree that they were made chief apostles, the one over the Jews, the other over the

Gentiles. You say, the first and principal was Peter's lot. Provided always, that Christ is as properly the light and salvation of the Gentiles, as he is the glory of his people Israel, and that he was the minister of circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises of the fathers, that the Gentiles might glorify God for his, &c. And therefore Paul's lot was no less, but much more glorious than Peter's. But he was not so limited to the Gentiles only, but that he might preach to the Jews also, and so might Peter to the Gentiles, as either did. Whether Paul did write to the Hebrews, divers old doctors doubt: and whether Peter was the first that preached to the Gentiles, I have somewhat said upon, *Acts 15*. Certain it is, that Paul at his first conversion, was sent immediately to the Gentiles, *Acts 26. 17. Gal. 1. 6*. Yet this distinction remaineth firm, Peter was chief of the church of the Jews, and Paul was chief of the church of the Gentiles. And therefore it is no treachery, but a necessary conclusion of Calvin, that Peter could not be chief of the church of the Gentiles, except he went against God's ordinance, and the appointment made between him and Paul. That he might not preach at Rome, nor deal among the Gentiles, Calvin doth not say; but that he might not so deal among the Gentiles, or occupy any such seat at Rome, whereby he should take upon him to be the chief apostle of the Gentiles, which prerogative by God's ordinance, and his own appointment, was decreed unto Paul. You say, "So he might bar John from Ephesus also." I answer, what place soever John had at Ephesus, I will be bold upon the authority of this text to affirm, that he was neither above Peter in Apostleship of the circumcision, nor above Paul in the Apostleship of the Gentiles. But it is perilous sedition in Calvin, to exhort all men to keep fast the aforesaid compact. Why so, I pray you, was it not grounded upon the ordinance of the Holy Ghost? and testified unto us in the scriptures? is it sedition to keep the ordinance of the Holy Ghost? or cannot your popedom stand? unless this compact decreed by the Holy Ghost be broken? no verily, therefore you cry sedition, as Athalia, when she was deposed from her usurped tyranny, cried treason, sedition. But it is belike a worse matter, that Calvin exhorteth all men rather to have respect to "Paul's Apostleship, than to Peter's, as though the preaching, authority, and Apostleship of both were not alike true, and all of one Holy Spirit, whether they preached to Jews or Gentiles." Indeed if Calvin should make a difference of truth or spirit in the Apostles' preaching, and the authority of their doctrine, you might worthily charge him with more than sedition, even with heresy and blasphemy. But these be his words, by which he shall clear himself of all crimes, and make his impudent accusers, if not ashamed, yet worthy to be baffled of all honest minds, that love truth and plain dealings: "I do not greatly regard whether Peter were bishop of Rome, seeing Paul doth testify, that the

Apostleship of Peter doth pertain peculiarly unto the Jews, and that his Apostleship pertaineth to us. Therefore that this society which they between themselves covenanted, may be ratified with us, yea rather that the ordinance of the Holy Ghost may be counted firm with us; it is convenient, that we should have respect to the Apostleship of Paul rather than of Peter; for so the Holy Ghost divided the provinces between them, that he appointed Peter to the Jews, and Paul to us. Now therefore let the papists seek their primacy elsewhere than in the word of God, where it is not found to be grounded." By these words it is manifest, that Calvin maketh no difference between the truth of the Apostles' doctrine, or the authority of the Holy Spirit, by which they preached both to the Jews and Gentiles, but will have us that are Gentiles to keep steadfast the difference of primacy, and distinction of provinces, which the Holy Ghost hath made, and to acknowledge Paul to be the chief Apostle of the Gentiles, and not Peter. Seeing therefore it is certain that Paul was once the chief Apostle of the Gentiles by God's appointment, Peter had not chief authority over all the church by Christ's saying: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, &c. But let us see how you will convey this primacy over the church of the Gentiles from Paul to Peter. You are not able to show, that Paul was by the Holy Ghost deprived of it by whom he was invested in it. You cannot show that he did voluntarily resign it, and yet if you could, his resignation were not yet good in law, except it were approved by Christ, of whom he had his institution in it. Let us see then what poor evidence you have to bring it from Paul to Peter. You say, "partly by the daily decay of the Jewish state, and their incredulity, and partly for that in Christianity the distinction of Jew and Gentile ceased after a season, they went both to the chief city of the Gentiles, and there founded the church common to the Hebrews, and all nations." This decay of the Jewish state, was not so long as Peter and Paul lived together, and specially it was not before Paul came to Rome: for at such time as Paul was apprehended at Jerusalem, whence he was shortly after carried to Rome, the Jewish state was not decayed, as is manifest by the words of James to Paul, *Acts 21, 20*. Thou seest brother, how many ten thousands there are of the Jews that have believed, and are all zealous of the law. This text doth also prove, that the distinction of Jews and Gentiles did not cease at the same time, therefore there is no reason why Peter in that respect, should found a church common to both the churches at Rome. Therefore these causes of Peter's forsaking his charge and Apostleship over the Jews are false and forged, and so much the more apparently, in that you confess, that Peter founded the church at Rome before Paul. And if the stories be true that write of his first coming, and sitting there twenty-five years; he founded the church there before this ordinance and compact was made, therefore upon

no such pretended cause. And yet if all the Jews had been dead, or revolted from the Christian religion it was not lawful for him, being left of the one church, to usurp primacy in the church of the Gentiles, which was committed to another, except you could shew by what new commission he was translated into that primacy, and Paul deprived of it. The church of Rome indeed was happy, if both the Apostles poured out their whole doctrine there and confirmed the same with their blood: so was it happy that John preached there in the days of Domitian, when they both were dead, yet thereby the city of Rome gained not the supreme authority over the church, as the emperor had over the world. And no man that is not mad will grant, that John being at Rome after that Peter was dead, was under the jurisdiction of Linus, Clemens, Cletus, or Anacletus, or whosoever was bishop there in that time, for the stories do not agree: but John continued his Apostleship, and the authority thereof so long as he lived, which was greater than any bishop that succeeded the Apostles, as it is plain by the order of dignity and degrees of the church, set down by the Apostle Paul, *1 Cor. 12. 28.* Whereas by your vain supposition of the pope's supremacy, Clemens, or some other bishop of Rome after Peter was superior unto John. And as that ass, which counterfeited the epistles of Clemens to James the Apostle supposeth, giving him charge also of such weighty matters, namely of shaking the clothes of the Lord's table, out of the holy vestry, and of keeping the sacrament from nice and rottenness, *Epist. 2. ad Jacob.* Every wise man that readeth him, may think the author of the epistle, was more worthy to have his ears nailed to the pillory, than to take upon him to teach one of the three pillars of the church, who had learned of Christ himself, and had so long governed the church of Jerusalem before Clemens was a Christian. Rome was not the chief city of the Christian Gentiles by God's election, as Jerusalem was of the Jews, but by tyranny and unjust oppression of other nations, as Babylon was sometime in the east.

9. All catholic pastors must communicate not only with Peter, but also with every one of the true Apostles of Christ in all necessary points of faith and doctrine, or else they be not shepherds but wolves. They must also communicate with all the lawful successors of the Apostles, as well as with Peter's successors: successors I mean in faith and doctrine, not in place only. And in this union and communion was Paul seventeen years, as Hierom noted, before he came up at this time to Jerusalem, unless you will say he was all that seventeen years no pastor but a wolf. He came not therefore now first to be joined unto them, nor to be tried for his doctrine and calling, but by this brotherly meeting to stop the mouths of slanderers, and to confirm the faith of the weak in his doctrine, that it was agreeable to the doctrine of all the Apostles. That Paul was sent to them, and not they to him, it was both in respect of their seniority, and for

that they were the greater number there remaining at that time in Jerusalem, not that they were his superiors, or better known to the Gentiles to be ordinary Apostles. And the giving of hands of fellowship, was a mutual acceptance of the one and the other, and no sign of superiority in them above Paul. Neither was this the first time that they took him into their fellowship, but long before, namely when he came first to Jerusalem, *Acts 9. 27.* And in the contents of that chapter you confess as much yourselves, which now it seemeth you have forgotten. Hierom's rule is not of every one that sitteth in Peter's chair, which is not a successor of Peter's doctrine. For Hierom would not have gathered with Liberius, whom he confesseth to have subscribed to heresy, nor with Marcellinus sacrificing to idols, nor with Honorius condemned for heresy in the Council of Constantinople the 6th, nor with other heretical bishops of Rome. Neither doth he for that cause call Rome the most sure haven of communion, absolutely, but saith, "that certain priests of Alexandria, and their pope or bishop Athanasius, and one Peter declining the persecution of the Arian heresy, fled to Rome as unto the most sure haven of their communion." Because in no church, with whom they had fellowship, they could be so safe from the persecution of the Arians at that time, as at Rome, while Rome was under Constantine a catholic emperor, and Julius a catholic bishop governed the church there. But soon after when Constantius obtained the empire of the city of Rome, and Liberius by him was first banished and after restored, and Felix banished at that time, as Damasus writeth, "there was exceeding great persecution of the clergy at Rome; so that many priests and clerks were slain within the church; and that for six years while Liberius reigned with the Arians, there could no catholic priest or clerk be suffered to enter either into the church, or into the common baths." If Athanasius at that time had come to Rome, he should not have found so sure a haven there, as he did before. For neither was Rome then of his communion, when the emperor, the bishop, and such as occupied the place of the clergy were Arians, neither was any place of his communion for that season, a more dangerous rock to his safety and the rest that were with him, than Rome. Therefore this saying of Hierom is both falsely and unlearnedly perverted from his true meaning, to set up your idol of Rome. But you note a ridiculous argument of the heretics that would prove Peter to have no pre-eminence above Paul, being his fellow Apostle. You would be glad we had none other arguments: although we do not argue of the fellowship only, which yet argueth an equality in authority, though there were other pre-eminences of Peter and of Paul: yet had Peter no authority over Paul nor Paul over Peter. No nor over Barnabas, for then he would have over-ruled him in the case of their contention that made them to part company, *Acts 15:* and Barnabas would have obeyed. But all primacy and pre-eminence

doth not argue superiority in power and authority. And Chrysostom upon this place saith, "now he hath showed himself equal in honour with the rest, he compareth not himself with the rest, but with the highest, declaring that each of them had obtained equal dignity." Ambrose saith, "he nameth only Peter, and compareth him with himself, because Peter received the primacy to found the church, and he also in equal manner or measure was elected to have the primacy, in founding the churches of the Gentiles, yet so, that Peter might preach to the Gentiles it cause were, and Paul to the Jews. For it is found that each did both, but yet full authority is known to be given to Peter in preaching among the Jews, and the authority of Paul is found perfect in preaching among the Gentiles, whereupon in faith and truth he calleth himself the master of the Gentiles. He saith that the gift which he received of God, to be worthy to have the primacy in preaching to the Gentiles, as Peter had in preaching to the circumcision, was approved even by those Apostles, which were more noble among the rest, whom for their steadfastness he calleth pillars, which were always with our Lord in secret matters, and were worthy to see his glory in the mount. And as he giveth fellows to Peter notable men among the Apostles, so also he adjoineth Barnabas to himself, which by divine judgment was joined to him, yet he challengeth the grace of primacy granted by God to himself alone, like as it was granted to Peter alone among the Apostles, so that the Apostle of the circumcision did give the right hand to the Apostle of the Gentiles, to declare the concord of their society, that either of both knowing that they had obtained the spirit of perfection of the Lord in dispensation of the gospel, might show that in nothing they had need the one of the other." Oecumenius upon this place saith, "consider now how he maketh himself equal to Peter, for this was needful, that he might be thought worthy of credit among the Galatians." Primasius saith in the person of Paul, "I am not inferior to him, for we are both ordained of one into one ministry, that I should preach to the Gentiles, as Peter to the Jews." These ancient Fathers testify for us, of the equality of the two principal Apostles, Peter and Paul.

II. With wicked Porphyry and Faustus the Manichee we have nothing to do, neither do we gladly charge Peter, as you do falsely slander us, any further than the Scripture chargeth him to the glory of God. But to the matter in controversy, you say, we argue against the superiority of Peter, because he was reprehended by Paul, which is false, for upon the only reprehending of him, we do not so argue. But the fathers, you say, make it an example to the superiors, to bear with humility the correction and controlment of their inferiors, *Cyprian, Epist. 71*. Verily the example may extend even to superiors, to bear a just reprehension of their inferiors. But Cyprian doth not so gather, for he saith, "that Peter did not challenge or take upon

him any thing as superior to Paul, which he could not have done, but in time and seniority only, that Peter hereby giveth us a document of concord and patience, that we should not stubbornly love our own things, but such things as are suggested unto us, sometimes by our brethren and companions profitably and wholesomely, if they be true and lawful, we should count them our own." That you translate in Augustin, the inferiors to resist their betters, his words are, *minores majoribus*, the younger to resist the elder, as he saith before, "To be corrected of their juniors, than Paul." So that his words argue no superiority of Peter, but in time and seniority. No more do they in the other place, where Paul is called the latter apostle, that is, junior in time, yet it might be, as he was, equal in authority. Cyprian saith, "All the apostles were with Peter, *de simplicitate Prælatorum*." That superiors may in some sort be reprehended of their inferiors, it is no question. But where you say the pope may be reproved, and ought to take it in good part, as it proceedeth of zeal, and love, and patiently, whencesoever it come; I will set down what is found in your canon law, that men may see how well you agree, and consider whether the pope will be ordered by that, rather than by your sentence, *Part. 1. dist. 4. cap. Si Papa*; thus we read, "if the pope be found negligent of his own and his brethren's salvation, unprofitable and remiss in his works, and also holding his peace of goodness, which doth more hurt him and all men; nevertheless he leadeth with him innumerable people by heaps to the chief slave of hell, with whom he shall be beaten with many stripes for ever. No mortal man doth here presume to reprove his faults, because he himself being to judge all men, is to be judged of no man, except he be found erring from the faith." And in the Extravagant, *de concession. Præbend. Titul. 4. cap. 2. ad Apostolatus*, in the gloss, where is showed, that the pope may do that which to all other is forbidden, it is written, "neither is there any that may be bold to say, my Lord, or sir, why do you so?" And in the margin, "no man may be bold to say to the pope, *Domine, cur ita facis*, sir, why do you so?"

III. Paul testified, it was an error against the truth of the gospel, therefore not in a default in life and conversation only. It was an error of ignorance, not in fact only, for he did not counterfeit for any worldly respect, but because he was truly persuaded that it was not only lawful, but also expedient for him so to do. Whereby Barnabas also was brought to be partaker of their simulation, till they both were corrected and better instructed by Paul. Erasmus in his epistle to the Cardinal of Loraine, set before his translation of Chrysostom upon this epistle, saith, that Augustin chargeth Peter with superstitious simulation, yea with a perverse desire of laying the burden of the Law, upon the shoulders of the Gentiles; and that the articles of your masters, the divines of Paris, do attribute unto Peter error in faith. Therefore

not Protestants only, but Papists also do infer of this place, that Peter erred in faith. It were good for you therefore to decide the question among yourselves, before you take the matter so bodily against us.

11. A vain cavillation: your own vulgar Latin is, *In faciem*, to his face, that is, not behind his back, but in his presence and in presence of others.

16. It is manifest, that justification by faith without the works of the Law, excludeth not only ceremonial works, but all moral, works, from being causes of justification, but not the works of charity from being the effects of justification, and of a justified man.

### CHAPTER 3.

1. If any people or person have been rightly instructed by the Apostles of Christ, it is senseless brutishness to forsake their faith which they first received. But if any people or person have been at the first perverted, rather than converted by false Apostles and heretics unto heresy, as many have been, both people and persons, it is wisdom to forsake their faith, which is either wholly false, or corrupt in any part, and to learn the truth of the Apostles of Christ, as they have set down in their writings. So have England and Germany done.

7. The true justifying faith is the root of all virtues, and they do doubtless follow it, but they go neither before it, nor with it to justification, therefore not to be included in faith, but follow faith.

10. The Apostle knew not your distinction of venial sins, and the text of the law doth utterly overthrow it which is general of all transgressions of the law, great or small. Neither can any be gathered, by the place of Deuteronomy, as you most impudently affirm, having nothing but a bold lie, to oppose against so manifest light of truth. For after Moses hath rehearsed the particular curses, against a great number of heinous crimes, he concludeth with the general curse against all transgressions of the law, whatsoever. And how should the Apostle prove his purpose, that whosoever are of the works of the law, are under the curse, by this text of Deuteronomy, if only such as commit great and heinous crimes, were subject to this curse. For there are many Turks that commit not those heinous crimes, that are expressed in the particular curses. Therefore whosoever keepeth not every iota of the law, is guilty of God's curse, by this sentence. And this is the judgment of all the ancient fathers upon this text.

Chrysostom saith, "That no man is justified by the law, it is clear. For all have sinned, and are subject to the curse:" here is no exception of such as sin venially. Theodoret saith, "The law commandeth that all things be fulfilled which are said in it, and those which by any means transgress, it submitteth unto curses." Ambrose saith, "This is written in Deuteronomy, because if a man

should omit any thing of the law, he should be counted accursed, and the commandments were so great, that it is impossible they should be kept." Hierom saith, "That no man can fulfil the law, and do all things that are commanded, the Apostle testifieth elsewhere: for that which was impossible of the law, in that it was made weak by the flesh, God sending his Son in the similitude of sinful flesh condemned sin of sin, in the flesh, which if it be true, it may be objected unto us: then Moses and Isaias, and the rest of the Prophets, which were under the works of the law, are under the curse, which thing he will not be afraid to confess, which hath read the Apostle, saying, that Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law being made a curse for us, and to answer, that every one of the Saints for his time, was made a curse to the people." Primasius saith, "Because the custom of sinning hath so prevailed, that no man doth keep the law, and therefore not undeservedly are subject to the curse," which afterward he expoundeth that every man doth incur "whosoever shall not keep all the commandments of the law unto the end." Oecumenius saith, "Because no man fulfilleth the law, they are all cursed, as they which have departed from the law, and taken the curse unto themselves." The same in effect hath Theophylact. Of which sayings, you see it is manifestly inferred, as also the plain text, that no man by works is truly just before God, all being guilty of damnation and God's curse, and justified only by Christ through faith.

27. Justification is manifestly ascribed to faith without works, whereby all works are excluded, and not only not mentioned, in the act of justification, yet not excluded from following faith, to declare that we are justified. And in this place the Apostle reasoneth, from the sign to the thing signified, to prove that by faith in Christ, we are the children of God, because baptism representing our putting on of Christ as a garment, to cover our unworthiness, is a seal of justification by faith, to all that are baptized, as circumcision was to all that were circumcised, and namely to Abraham, who was justified before he was circumcised, and that to declare, that circumcision was no cause, but a testimony of his justification. As also Cornelius, and they that were with him, had their hearts purified by faith, and received the Holy Ghost before they were baptized. Whereby God testified, that baptism giveth not grace of the work wrought, but is a seal of grace and justice of faith, and regeneration by God's Spirit. And where you say, that baptism giveth faith to the infant, that had none before, you may as well say, that it giveth faith to many that have none after. But how are you able to prove that baptism giveth faith to an infant? when faith cometh by hearing, *Rom. 10*, which infants cannot do. And if you mean of some other kind of faith than that which cometh by hearing, how say you that baptism giveth faith to the infant that

had none before? when before you baptize him, you examine him whether he believe all the articles of faith, and the infant by his Godfather answers, *Credo*. Contentious arguing against God's church hath made you forgetful of your doctrine and form of ministering the sacrament of baptism.

#### CHAPTER 4.

3. The Papists in like manner, as the heathen and Jews, serve under the elements of the world, and serve those that by nature are no Gods. As the Jews, they not only observe days and times, but also are clogged with an infinite number of ceremonial observations, as of hallowed fire, water, bread, ashes, oil, wax, flowers, branches, garments, clay, spittle, salt, incense, balm, chalices, paxes, pixes, altars, corporals, superaltars, altar cloths, rings, swords, crowns, mitres, bells, churches and church-yards, with many more, under which they are more slavishly, than the Jews under the law, yoked and occupied, with innumerable fleshly, gross and cumbersome offices about them. As the Gentiles, they serve them that by nature are no Gods, not only Angels and Saints, and the counterfeit relics of them, but idols of them. Where you cannot escape by your vain and unlearned distinction of *Latria* and *Dulia*, for the Apostle useth the word "you have served them that are no Gods by nature," showing that all religious service or *Dulia* of such as by nature are no Gods, is heathenish idolatry or service abominable. Therefore the sayings of Augustin pertain nothing unto you. And where you say, for so many sacrifices of the Jews, you have but one, meaning your sacrifice of the mass, to omit that you have no authority of God's word for that one, what count you those oblations of candles, and other things to your images of Christ, and Saints? have you any gross conceit, that they have need or use of such things? or are they sacrifices and oblations, to honour God and the Saints with them, as the heathens used many like? Your Canonists hold, that tithes are still offered to God, as oblations, even as they were in the Jewish law. *Rebuff. de decimis*. Therefore you have more sacrifices than one.

We use no deceit about Augustin's places, but conclude plainly upon his own words, *Ep. 118*, where he saith, that our Lord Jesus "hath joined together the society of the new people, with sacraments, in number the fewest, in observation the easiest, in signification the most excellent, such as is baptism, consecrated in the name of the Trinity, and the communication of his body and blood, and if any other be contained in the canonical scripture." Of these words we gather that Augustin knew but two sacraments of this kind: because he saith they are "fewest in number, for two is the least number:" because he saith, he hath "joined or bound together, the society of the new people, by these," for these are sufficient for that purpose, and necessary for all men that live in years of discretion, to receive if they can. So are not matrimony and ordina-

tion, and therefore not to be numbered with these. Repentance, although it be necessary for all, yet hath it no outward element, which is necessary to make a sacrament. Confirmation with oil hath no testimony in the Scriptures, nor extreme oil to be a perpetual sacrament or seal of spiritual grace, which was used only for bodily healing, *Jam. 5*. Therefore by Augustin's saying, there are but two sacraments, in that sense, that baptism and the Lord's Supper are called sacraments. But you reply, that he insinuateth, that there be other beside these two, of the same sort in the scriptures. I answer, he doth not insinuate any such a thing, but testifieth, that these two only be found in the Scriptures. Yet not willing to strive, if any man can find "any other sacrament in the Scriptures," whereas if he had known five beside these two Sacraments, in such sort as they are, he would have said, and the rest, or the other five, which are contained in the Scriptures, but now he saith, if any one other, not acknowledging himself any other, but if any other may be found in the Scriptures, he thinketh it is not past one. *But contra Pet. lib. 2. c. 104*. "he nameth oil also." I grant, but there he speaketh of the oil and anointing that was used in baptism, which of the donatists was called the *Chrism*, by Augustin "in the kind of visible signs holy as baptism itself:" and not of another sacrament of confirmation, which elsewhere, he affirmeth to be "nothing but prayer with imposition of hands." *De bap. contr. Don. lib. 3. cap. 16. In Psal. 103*, he saith, "The gift of the Sacraments in baptism, in the eucharist, in the rest of the sacraments what is the gift." In which he acknowledgeth more holy sacraments, but not in such sort as baptism and the eucharist are. In the same Psalm, where he saith, "the sacraments are hid from the Pagans," he nameth only the sacrament of baptism and the Sacrament of the eucharist.

Matrimony and ordination were not so hidden from them. Therefore though he name Matrimony, orders, *chrism*, or any other thing sacraments, as he doth many other things beside, it followeth not that they are sacraments, as baptism and the eucharist. But as for penance, he calleth it not a sacrament but only he saith: "The same cause is of reconciliation, which is of baptism, if perhaps danger of ending his life do prevent the penitent. For our mother the church ought not to be willing, that even they should depart out of this life, without the pledge of their peace:" meaning the sacrament of the communion, which is the pledge of their reconciliation. Now where you quote the book *De visitatione infirmorum*, for extreme unction, Erasmus telleth you, "It is the speech of a babler, neither learned nor eloquent, and most impudently intitled to Augustin." Of the same mould, *De Serm. 215. De tempore*, and the treatise *De rectitud. Cath. Convers.* Yet doth not the author call extreme unction a sacrament, but promiseth health of body as well as of soul by it. Prosper speaketh not



of the extreme unction, but alluding to the widow, which gave part of her meal and oil to Elias, saith, "So the soul is satisfied with her Lord departing in body, loving him that chastiseth, keepeth the faith of marriage bed with chaste love, being defended with the sacrament of meal and the unction of oil, surely waiting for the acceptable reign, when her Lord shall say unto her: O good servant," &c. which words if you could have construed aright, I marvel how you should have applied to extreme unction. But belike you would have translated, "the body departing to the Lord," whereas it is manifest to him that observeth the discourse of Prosper, he meaneth to show how the soul is a widow: namely, by the Lord's departure in body, beside, that the Latin tongue will abide no such construction, as you would make, and the rest that followeth, doth not agree to him that is dying and departing out of the world. Therefore either by the mystery of meal, and the unction of oil, he meaneth the spiritual food of the soul, or if he mean by the one, the sacrament of the bread of life, by the other he meaneth the oil used in baptism, yet calleth he it not a sacrament, but distinguisheth it from a sacrament. Innocentius by his answer to the Bishop of Engubium, showeth, that this ceremony of unction in sickness, was not universally received, nor thought necessary, neither was it well known of whom it should be ministered. Therefore Innocentius of that place of James saith, "That it might be understood of the faithful that are sick which may be anointed with the holy oil of chrism, which being once made by the Bishop, it is lawful not only for Priests, but also for all Christians, to use it in anointing, in their or their friends' necessity. But this seemeth to be superfluously added, that you should doubt, that to be lawful to a Bishop, which without doubt is lawful to Priests. For it is therefore said of Priests, because the Bishops being hindered by other business, cannot go to all sick persons. But if the Bishop can, and think it meet to visit any man, he may both bless him, and touch him with chrism without any doubting, seeing it pertaineth to him to make the chrism. But upon penitents it cannot be poured, because it is a kind of sacrament." We see, that by the Bishop of Rome's judgment, not only the Bishop or Priest, but every Christian may minister this ceremony of unction, contrary to your new doctrine, whereby you make it proper only to Priests. He doth not affirm, that it is necessary for all Christians before they die in extremity of sickness, but may be used of the faithful that are sick, though not extremely. for in extremity of sickness, even penitents are admitted to the sacrament of communion. Where he saith, it is a kind of sacrament, he meaneth by sacrament, a holy ceremony of the church, except you will make an eighth sacrament of that heaven which *cap. 5*, he saith, being made by the Bishop, was sent on the Lord's day to the Priests of every church within the city of Rome, which "I think," saith

he, "ought not to be done in the out parishes, because the sacraments are not to be carried far off." You see he calleth a consecrated heaven, which they sent about at that time for a sign of their fellowship, a sacrament. Therefore Innocentius though a bishop of Rome is no patron of your sacrament of extreme unction, as you mean and hold it to be a sacrament. Cyril or Origen speaketh not a word of the sacrament of extreme unction, but saith, "This text of James is fulfilled in the seventh hard and laborious kind of remission of sins by repentance, when the sinner washeth his bed with tears, and tears are made bread unto him, day and night, when he is not ashamed to declare his sin, unto the Lord's Priest, and to seek medicine, according to him that saith, I said I will pronounce against myself mine injustice, and thou hast remitted the impiety of my heart. In whom also that is fulfilled which the Apostle James saith: If any man be sick or weak," &c. You see he meaneth only of prayers made by the Priests, to obtain remission of sins for him that is a public penitent. Chrysostom also gathereth out of it, the Priests' duty to pray for the people, and power to remit sins, but the sacrament of extreme unction, he doth not mention, nor yet the ceremony of anointing with oil. Rabanus Maurus, who lived Anno 855, knew but four: baptism, chrism, the body, and the blood of Christ; which in effect are but three. *De instit. Cler. lib. 1. cap. 31. Isidorus orig. lib. 6. cap. De officiis. Sunt autem sacramenta, Baptisma, et Chrisma, Corpus, et Sanguis Christi. Per Baptis. et chrism. unum sacramentum videtur intelligi: De impost. man. georsim tract. Paschasius de Corpore et Sang. Sunt autem sacramenta Christi in Ecclesia, baptismus et Chrisma. Corpus quoque domini et Sanguis.* The yesterday councils of Florence and Trent came too late to make sacraments fifteen hundred years after Christ. Augustin extendeth the name of sacrament to more than seven, *Matt. 1.*

You say we forge that Augustin should say, that the church and Christians in his days, "were laden with observation of unprofitable ceremonies, that they were in as great servility to such things, as the Jews." Whether we forge this, let his own words testify: "That which is instituted beside custom, that it should be as it were an observation of a sacrament, I can not allow, although I dare not freely disallow many such things, for avoiding offence of certain, either holy or troublesome persons. But this grieveth me very much, many most wholesome precepts that are in the holy scriptures are less regarded, and all things are so full of many presumptions, that he is more grievously reproved which within his octaves hath touched the earth with his bare foot, than he which hath buried his mind in drunkenness. Therefore all such things as are neither contained in the authorities of holy scriptures, nor found to have been decreed in the councils of bishops, nor are confirmed by the custom of the whole church, but are varied innumerable

after the diverse manners of diverse places, so that scarce or never there can be found out the causes which men in the institution of them followed, when they may conveniently, I think without all doubt they are to be cut off. For although neither this can be found, how they be against the faith, yet they oppress with servile burdens the religion itself, which the mercy of God would have to be free in most few and most manifest celebrations of sacraments, so that the condition of the Jews is more tolerable, who although they acknowledged not the time of their liberty, yet they are subject to the burdens of the law, not to the presumptions of men." Doth not Augustin say, as much as you report us to say, and more also? And may we not justly infer that the state of the Papists is much worse now, wherein are infinite vain ceremonies, beside the vile opinion of merit by using such things? But let us see how you would shift off the matter, you say, "He speaketh of some particular presumptions and usage of certain persons;" but he saith, "All things are full of so many presumptions," and that the multitude of them, though they were not directly against the faith, did oppress religion itself with servile burdens; what say you to that? they are contrary to the freedom which the mercy of God hath given to religion. The state of the Jews is more tolerable, being subject to ceremonies of God's institution than of Christians, subject to human presumptions. Some of them were observed as sacraments, which were none: there was more grievous punishment for transgressing man's ordinances, as among Papists for eating flesh on Good Friday, than for swearing or being drunk on the Lord's day, than for the breach of God's commandments. To all these things you say nothing. "But he neither writ nor meant," you say, "of any ceremony either appointed by scripture, council, or customs of the Catholic church." It is true. But are all Popish ceremonies such? if all such were removed according as Augustin judgeth they ought to be, which you observe, neither appointed by the holy scriptures, nor decreed in councils general, for provincial councils never had authority to ordain ceremonies, but for their own provinces, nor are confirmed by the custom of the whole church, I say, if all such Popish ceremonies, were taken away, you should leave a very small number behind. You say, Augustin in other places, "alloweth all the ceremonies done in the ministration of the sacraments, and elsewhere." You must tell us where, and what ceremonies he doth allow, and we shall shape you an answer. In the mean time his judgment uttered in this place, doth condemn the multitude of your Popish rites to be servile burdens, worse than the Jews, and so you serve under the elements of the world, worse than ever the Jews did.

9. You must prove your number of seven sacraments, before you can make so many instruments of grace. Another point is to prove, "That sacraments are vessels of grace," as though the favour of God were

carried in them. Instruments or seals to confirm our faith in the grace of God, we acknowledge them to be. If none but sacraments are exempt from being the weak and beggarly elements of the world, what is all other Popish trash of holy bread, holy water, salt, spittle, fire, wax, boughs, &c.

10. When your observation of days is as full of superstition and idolatry, as those of the Gentiles or Jews, we do not falsely or deceitfully interpret the Apostle's saying, against your Popish observation of holydays, which here also you affirm to be necessary. For that the Lord's day, testified in the Scriptures ought to be kept, and that other days also may be kept by the church's ordinance for the assembly of Christians to the exercise of religion, we acknowledge. But that any are necessary more than be of the Holy Ghost's appointing in the Scriptures, we deny. Augustin, *contra adimant*, speaking of the observation of the Lord's day, Easter, and other Christian festivities of days, saith, "because we understand whereto they appertain, we observe not the times, but those things that are signified by those times. Where is then the holy time of Lent, the good or holy time of this or that feast? Hierom likewise upon this text, defending the Christian solemnities from Judaism, saith, "Lest the unordered and unappointed gathering together of the people should diminish the faith of Christ, for this cause certain days are appointed, that we should all meet together in one place. Not that this day in which we come together is Celebrior, more noble or holy, but that on what day soever we must come together, greater joy might arise by sight one of another." You see Hierom maketh none other end of observing such days than we do, denying the celebrity, much more the sanctification of such days. Touching the antiquity of the feasts of the nativity, Epiphany, and ascension of Christ, there is no credit to be given to that bastard book of Clemens' constitutions, although we acknowledge those festivities have been observed of ancient times, *Matt. 2*, where also the places of Origen, *hom. 3. in divers*, and Augustin, *ep. 23*, are discussed also, *Acts 2*. That any contention should arise, for keeping or not keeping of such feasts, is a fault in our time, but yet such a fault as was very ancient, as appeareth by the contentions of Victor, and the bishops of the East, for the celebration of Easter, and pursued with more bitterness by Victor bishop of Rome, than by any of our time, for he presumed to excommunicate as heretics all such as would not keep Easter after his manner, *Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 25*. We acknowledge it was a very ancient custom of the church, to celebrate the memory of martyrs, as the church of Smyrna doth write in their epistle, *Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 12*. For the remembrance of them that have fought before us, and for the exercise and preparation of them that shall fight hereafter. But your Popish manner of celebration is nothing like, either in the form or the end, for you keep your holy-

days, as the Jews did the feast of the calf; whereof it is written, the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up again to play. In your churches you solemnize them with idolatrous worshipping of the creatures, and their images; out of the churches with banquetting, revelling, and idleness. So that the people by your festivities of Martyrs, are not taught what true martyrdom is, nor prepared to suffer for Christ, but rather to become epicures, whose belly is their God, and who glory in their shame, when they see the solemnities of saints kept with all worldly pomp, and show of pleasant things in the church, and all carnal delights abroad.

Concerning the assumption of the Virgin Mary and her festivities, *Acts 1*. Your urging of a feast of her departure, as a thing necessary, declareth that you do servilely like the Jews, and not freely as Christians observe days and times. You gather of our not observing of her assumption, that either we hate her, or else think her worthy of less remembrance, than any other saint. As though we were bound to show our love toward her, by keeping a festival day, or as though there were none other way to keep the remembrance of her than by holydays. Our Saviour Christ hath taught us to keep the remembrance of Mary Magdalen by preaching the gospel, *Matt. 26. 13*. And we are well assured, that we cannot testify our love unto her better, nor honour her more, than in ascribing all honour of our redemption and salvation, to her Son our Lord Jesus Christ. But it is a weighty argument why we should have one holyday more for her, than we have, because she prophesieth the contrary of all Catholic generations that they should bless her. If there be no way to bless her, or to celebrate her blessedness, but by some new found Ladyday, then her prophecy failed of the effect, for many hundred years after she uttered the same. For she saith, even from this present time henceforward all generations shall call me blessed. At least the feast of her nativity should have been kept holy then presently, and so forth during her life. But Durand testifieth, that this feast of old time was not celebrated, until a certain religious man for many years together, heard the angels on this night, solemnizing it in heaven, to whom when he inquired the cause, it was revealed, that the angels did rejoice, because the blessed virgin was born on that night, which the apostolic pope did approve to be authentical, and commanded the feast to be celebrated, that in solemnizing it, we might be conformable to the court of heaven. Also in the second lesson read in your church in the feast of her nativity, it is said, that after other her more ancient solemnities, the devotion of the faithful was not content till it had added this present solemnity of her nativity. By this text you see, this feast is none of the ancient feasts, and also that the other solemnities of her purification and annunciation are her festivities also. But seeing this feast was but of late institu-

ted, and her assumption was not heard of in the church for many hundred years after her death, all Catholic generations blessed her otherwise, than by keeping these holydays, or else her prophecy could not be true. By Cyprian, *ep. 34*, we learn how the ancient feasts of martyrs were celebrated. We offer sacrifice for them, saith he, always, as you remember, so often as we celebrate the passions and days of the martyrs by yearly commemoration. These sacrifices were praise and thanksgiving to God, the commemoration for example to men.

We learn by many testimonies of the ancient fathers, how Christian solemnities may be kept, that they be not Jewish or heathenish observations, as when they are free from superstition, idolatry, or opinion of holiness in the times, and when they be kept freely as things indifferent, wherein the church may use her liberty, to appoint or abrogate what is best for edification, and not to be servilely bound to keep them of necessity, as you defend that they are. The saying of Augustin, *contra Faust. lib. 20. cap. 21*, if you had set it down at large, and rightly translated it, would not have made so great show for you, as you imagine. The Christian people, saith he, do celebrate together the memories of the martyrs, with religious solemnity, both to stir them up to imitation, and that they may be adjoined to their merits, and helped with their prayers; yet so that we set up altars to none of the martyrs, but to the God of the martyrs himself. For which of the prelates standing in the places of their holy bodies, said at any time, we offer to thee, O Peter, or O Paul, or O Cyprian? but that which is offered, is offered to God which hath crowned the martyrs, at their memories whom he hath crowned; that by admonition of the very places, greater affection may arise, to kindle love both towards them whom we may follow, and him by whose aid we may be able to follow them. Therefore we worship the martyrs with that worship of love and society, wherewith holy men of God are worshipped also in this life, whose heart we perceive to be ready to such suffering, for the truth of the gospel.

Now let all indifferent men judge, whether you worship the saints departed on their festival days, as they did in Augustin's time, whether with the same kind of worship wherewith godly men living may be worshipped, with the only difference of greater devotion, and more securely, because they are past all danger, which also he addeth. That you translate of partaking their merits, Augustin meaneth of being joined to them in worthiness, by imitation of their virtues, not by communication of merits. For the word merit oftentimes he useth for the dignity or worthiness of any person, and he saith not *communicat meritum*, but *consocietur meritum*; which significeth not communication of merits, but association or adjoining, or to be made fellow in merits. Christ doth communicate his merits to us, and we are partakers of his

merits. But he doth not consociate us to his merits, which were to make us fellows in merits with him. That he saith of saints departed praying for us, because we find it not in Scripture, we leave it in doubt. But seeing prayer is a sacrifice due only to God, as the sacrifice of praise, which in the same chapter he confesseth to be a part of the worship due only to God, out of the fiftieth Psalm, we may conclude out of his words, that our prayers are not to be offered to saints, although some seed of that superstition was sowed in his time.

Dividing of the scripture to be read at certain times, is a thing indifferent, and hath been diversely used. And although some have inveighed against such division, yet they meant not thereby to bring in hellish horror, and all disorder. For those churches, which using their liberty, keep no such division of reading, yet have all things done decently, and according to order.

24. We learn that Abraham's house being the church, was a figure or pattern of the church to come, and that all notable mutations therein do prefigure or set forth the like in the whole church that followed. But we do not learn to draw the scriptures from the sense of the words, which you call the literal sense, to any allegorical interpretation, which is feigned and counterfeited in man's brain, and hath no ground of the Spirit of God, whereby Origen fell into heresies, and divers ancient fathers handled not the scriptures according to the sense of the Holy Ghost. But that the Apostle in this place urging the term of allegory, meaneth no such descanting upon the scripture, as you call a deeper and spiritual and more principal meaning, divers of the ancient fathers also do bear witness. Chryso tom upon this place, saith, "A figure he calleth improperly an allegory. But this is the meaning of that he saith. This history declareth not only that which appeareth, but also setteth forth higher matters." Theodoret upon this place saith, "The divine apostle hath said these things are said by allegory, meaning, but they are otherwise understood, for he hath not taken away the story, but teacheth what things are prefigured in the story."

Ambrose saith: "Isaac was born to be a figure of Christ. Therefore he saith these things are said by allegory, because the persons of Ishmael and Isaac by one thing signify another." Photius saith: "They are spoken allegorically, that is, the nativities of these two sons were figures of two testaments." These prefigurations differ much from allegorical interpretation. And if we should admit that the apostle, who was certain of the sense of the Holy Ghost, did make an allegorical interpretation, yet is it not lawful for every man which hath no such assurance to make allegories of the holy scripture, where he hath no ground of the words to yield any such sense. Neither is it sufficient that nothing but truth be gathered out of them, which is elsewhere plainly set forth: for it is not law-

ful to exclude every truth out of any text of scripture, where the Holy Ghost meaneth not to teach any such matter. How vain a thing, therefore those allegories are, the variety of them gathered by divers men out of the same text, doth declare, seeing they have no foundation in the word, but only in the brain of the inventor. And it is as easy a matter to interpret Virgil's *Aeneids*, or Ovid's *Metamorphosis* allegorically as the scriptures, and to apply all things in them to truth and spiritual understanding. Which if it be an abuse of the profane writings of those Poets, to draw their sayings to a far other meaning than ever they had, how much more is it in like manner an abuse of the holy sayings of the prophets, of Christ, and his apostles?

#### CHAPTER 5.

6. In the margin you promise us, that justification by faith only is disproved by conference of scriptures. You say it is a working faith that doth justify, and we never said otherwise. You say the works of circumcision and prepuce, that is of Jews and Gentiles, without faith avail not: we say as much; but yet faith justifieth without the work of Jews or Gentiles, *ergo* only faith does justify. But faith which worketh by charity, not which is idle or dead; "this is," say you, "as who should say, faith and good works, not works without faith." But we answer, whosoever should so say, should say contrary to the Apostle, which saith a man is justified by faith without works, and therefore not by works and faith, but by faith only, without the merit of works. For only faith excludeth nothing but the merit of works. This conference therefore doth nothing derogate from the truth of justification by faith only, for we never meant any other faith but a true, lively, working faith, whereby only a man is justified. Therefore Ambrose saith upon this text, "Neither uncircumcision availeth any thing, nor circumcision, but only faith in love is needful unto justification." Augustin *de fide et operibus* reasoneth manifestly against them that thought to be justified by a dead faith, which is void of good works. For even in the same place he saith of good works, "They follow him that is justified, they go not before him that is to be justified." Whereupon it followeth invincibly, that they be no cause of justification, for the cause goeth before the effect; but they be the effect of justification, which followeth it as the cause. But against this, you say, it is proved by this place, "that faith hath her whole activity and operation toward justice and salvation of charity, and not contrariwise, without which it cannot have any act meritorious, or agreeable to God, for our salvation." For act meritorious it needeth not, seeing we are not justified by the merit of faith, but by the merit of Christ apprehended by faith. And it is most agreeable to God, who justifieth the ungodly freely, and saveth by his grace, to justify us by the only instrument of faith, whereby the whole glory of our salvation is

ascribed to grace, as the Apostle saith, "By grace you are saved, not of works." *I. Jh. 2.* Charity, by which faith worketh therefore, declareth faith to be living and not dead, as the fruit declareth the tree to be living and a good tree, but thereof it followeth not, that faith hath no effect peculiar to her, in which charity doth not concur, though it be not separated from faith. And yourselves acknowledge the first justification, which we acknowledge to be the only justification before God to salvation, to be of mere grace without works, therefore by faith only, where is then the activity of charity whereof you speak? And that which Augustin saith in the place cited, is of bare knowledge, such as is in devils, not of justification. For it followeth immediately, "Faith may be without charity, but it cannot profit." Therefore the Apostle Paul saith, "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth any thing, but faith which worketh by love: so distinguishing it from that faith by which devils do believe and tremble." You see plainly of what faith he speaketh, which is not profitable, being void of charity. And where you fear lest we will make charity the instrument only of faith in well working, and so the inferior cause, we make not charity a dead instrument, but the first effect of faith next our justification, whereof proceedeth all obedience of love to our neighbour. That the Apostle saith charity is the greater, it is in respect of larger continuance, not in respect of justification. That which he saith of all faith without charity, he meaneth of faith by which miracles may be done, not of justifying faith. That charity is the perfection of the law, it is true; but no man hath perfect charity, therefore no man performeth the law. And where you say, faith is not the perfection of the law, Augustin saith, "Faith obtaineth that which the law commandeth," *De natura et gratia, cap. 16.* "Again it might be rightly said, that all the commandments of God pertain to faith only, if not a dead faith be understood, but that living faith which worketh by love," *De fide et operibus, cap. 22.* But faith, you say, worketh by charity, as the body by the soul, the matter by the form. This is an improper working, for the matter is passible, and the form active, the soul rather worketh by the body, than the body by the soul. But that charity is the form or life of faith, you say James doth plainly insinuate, when he maketh faith without charity to be as a dead corpse without life. I answer, James by that example showeth, that a dead and fruitless faith is nothing worth: and that as by actions of life, a body is known to live, so by works, which is an act or effect of faith, faith is known to be living and not dead. But that charity is the form or life of faith, you cannot prove out of his words, or the whole discourse of that chapter.

13. Carnal liberty is doubtless condemned, but Augustin doth not charge them with carnal liberty which refuse to be taught by such

superiors, as will not teach them out of the word of God: for such be self-masters, and no lawful superiors. But while you seem to restrain all men from licentiousness, you would have liberty to teach what you list, and to enforce men to receive it, or else charge them with fleshly and carnal liberty.

17. Even by this saying you may see he denieth the will of man to be free from the thralldom of sin, before it be enlarged by grace: yet it is always free from constraint or compulsion. These men therefore are they that say, when they have committed any heinous crimes, "I am unwilling to do it, I am constrained, I am compelled, I am overcome, I do that I will not, as the Apostle saith," &c. *Iude ex August. ser. De verbu Apostoli* upon this text. "There be men unthankful to grace, which ascribe much to poor and wounded nature. It is true, man when he was created, received great strength of free will, but by sinning he lost it." *De verb. Apost. ser. 2.* Beside this, the text is plain against the freedom of our will captive unto sin.

21. All other sins follow of infidelity, as virtues do of faith. And all sins of their own nature are damnable, even those which are committed by them that have faith: yet if they have true faith, there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ, which walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit, that is, which are they in whom sin doth not reign, not they that are void of sin, as Augustin doth interpret.

#### CHAPTER 6.

6. The form of words which Augustin useth, doth declare, that he taketh not merit in that sense you speak of. "He would not say, they shall give into your bosom, but because they shall merit to receive a heavenly reward, by the merits of them to whom they shall give but a cup of cold water." He saith not, other men shall bestow part of their merits unto them, but they shall merit by other men's merits, that is, God shall reward them by occasion of them, to whom they shall give a cup of cold water. For admit he be a hypocrite, to whom alms is bestowed in the name of a disciple, or a just man, or a prophet, shall not the giver in faith and simplicity, have as great a reward, as if he were a true prophet, just man, or disciple? yes verily. Therefore the reward dependeth not in participation of other men's merits, but only upon God's promise. What Augustin thought of merits, he hath best expressed in those books which he wrote against the Pelagians, where he showeth plentifully, that we are saved by grace without merits: and of the reward of good works, he saith often, that "God crowneth us, because he crowneth in us his gifts, not our merits." *Psal. 69. and Psal. 70. Con. 2.*

9. Faith, by which only we are justified, is the root whereon those seeds do grow, which by God's merciful promise, not by the merit of the works, are made the seed of eternal life.

14. You falsify Augustin. For his word is *in cordibus*, not *in frontibus*, he hath fastened his cross in the hearts of the faithful. For they only can say, God forbid that I should glory but in the cross of Christ, in whose hearts the cross of Christ is fastened by faith, which cannot be fastened on men's foreheads, and many have it signed in their foreheads, that have it not fastened in their hearts by faith.

15. You might as well say, note here, that whatsoever Paul hath written in this whole epistle, of justification by faith, without the works of the law, he overthroweth it all in the end and conclusion. In the fifth chapter, he speaketh of faith, as the cause of our justification, here of works and obedience, the fruits of faith, and end of our justification. For none of your conclusions can be gathered out of the text, in any lawful form of argument. There is indeed in the justified, a new creature of justice inherent, but they are thereby declared just, not made just. But where you deny faith to be the instrumental cause of our justification, you go against the doctrine of your own doctors. For Thomas Aquinas confesseth, that we are

justified by faith instrumentally, or as by an instrumental cause. And what can apprehend or receive the grace and mercy of God, by which we are saved, but faith, the root and beginning of all virtues? To deny faith therefore to be the instrument of our justification, is to deny that we have received the grace of justification. And seeing God justifieth the ungodly man, that believeth in him, *Rom.* 4, 5, no virtue inherent can be of the form or essence of justification. For an ungodly man hath no virtue inherent in him, and good works are not the form, but the end of our justification, *Ephes.* 2, 9, 10. Neither doth faith itself merit justification, but God reputeth faith without merit of works, unto justice, *Rom.* 4. And that faith doth not merit in the cause of justification, Augustin proveth effectually, *Ep.* 106. and *Simp. lib.* 1. *Qu.* 2. The formal cause of our justification therefore, is the promise of the gospel, which is the seed of immortality, *Eph.* 2, 20. *1 Pet.* 1, 23, and the material cause is the justice of Christ, imputed through faith, *2 Cor.* 5, 21. *1 Cor.* 1, 30.

---

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE EPHESIANS.

### CHAPTER I.

4. To be holy and immaculate by imputation of Christ's justice, is to be truly holy and immaculate before God. For otherwise, no man is immaculate in this life, by justice inherent in himself.

13. All the ancient interpreters, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Theodoret, Augustin, *apud Bedam*, Primasius, Hierom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, interpret it of the Holy Ghost, that is, given to every one of the children of God, and not one of them, either of baptism, confirmation, crossing, or chrisming. And it is manifest that the Apostle speaketh of that sealing, which is the undoubted pledge of our salvation, which is no outward sacrament or ceremony, without the inward seal of the Spirit of God. These learned men that you speak of therefore, be your masters of the new learning, for the ancient learning had no such interpretation.

21. Calvin's words are these: "As of the diversity of the names, we gather, that there be divers orders: so to inquire of them over subtly, and to define their number, and to appoint their degrees, is a point not only of foolish curiosity, but also of ungodly and dangerous rashness." Calvin meaneth to inquire, define, or appoint more subtly, than the word of God hath revealed, is both vain curiosity, and impious temerity. What infidelity of blasphemy is contained in this saying! If the diligence of the holy doctors, have concluded anything certainly out of the word of God, Calvin speaketh not one word against them.

Calvin never purposed or endeavoured to bring any article of religion in doubt: but would have all articles of religion grounded upon the word of God, that they might be undoubted.

22. That which is proper to Christ, is not communicable to any creature: to be head of his body, is proper to Christ: therefore it agreeth not to any creature, to be head of Christ's body, which is his church, in that sense that Christ is head thereof. Neither is any man, king, lord, bishop, pastor, pontifex, apostle, pillar, foundation, rock, light, or master of the church, or truth, as Christ is properly all these. For that which is proper to Christ, is not common to any other. Earthly kings, and earthly lords, be so kings and lords, as they be his subjects, and servants, lieutenants, and deputies, so I say of bishops and pastors. The high priest's office he hath himself, without any deputy, and executeth it in his own person, in that he offered himself the only sacrifice of our redemption once for all, and being entered into the holiest place, appeareth in the presence of God for us, to make perpetual intercession for us, *Heb.* 9, 24, &c. As he was immediate Apostle from God his Father, so he hath given and sent Apostles from himself. The Apostles are pillars and foundations, rocks of stones, but yet so, that Christ is the only corner stone, only main foundation, and steadfast rock, that beareth up the whole building. Christ is the only true light which lighteneth every man that cometh into this world: and John Baptist, though a light yet

was not that light, nor any Apostle or other messenger, which is but as a candle, or a star taking his light of the sun. Christ is the only master of the church, and truth, forbidding us to call or acknowledge, any other master or author of truth, though he have many ushers under him, that teach the church in that truth, which they have learned of him. So Christ is the only head of the church, as you confess in such sort, as no earthly man, or mere creature can be. Now it may be doubted, whether you take the pope, to be a mere creature, because some of your canonists have said unto him, "Thou art neither God, nor man, thou art, as it were a neuter between both." As also, some of you have called him *Dominus Deus noster Papa*, our Lord God the Pope. Some have denied that he is a man, as the See of Peter is subject unto him. *Clemens in promio in gloss. Extravag. de verb. signi, Cap. cum inter. in glossa edit. Paris, 1513. Decret. scilicet. de electione. Fundamenta, in gloss.* But to take you at the best, because you say, no pope is so head of the church, as Christ is the head of his mystical body, it remaineth, that if you will have him head any way, you must show by whom he is so constituted, and made head, as Paul saith, that Christ is by God. The pope you say, is ministerial head of the church, and yet you say, the church can be body to none, but unto Christ, whereof it followeth, that none can properly be head of the church but Christ. For every head, is head of some body, and no body but a monster hath two heads. Of the whole church, being one body consisting of all the members, there can be but one head, that is Christ. You answer, he is head, but of that part only, which is on earth. Then is he not head of the Catholic and universal church, by your own confession, neither hath he anything to do in purgatory. But that he is head of the militant church, what proof have you out of the scriptures? You answer, the Apostle said of this ministerial head, the head cannot say to the feet, you are not necessary for me. You durst not for shame note thus much upon that text, lest your very special friends should note your impudence, yea you have noted upon the 15th verse, that Christ is the head of that spiritual body, which is resembled to our natural body. Therefore this is but a voluntary, new and absurd exposition, contrary to the manifest meaning of the Apostle. If you will say, our principal head may justly say, he hath no need of his feet or lowest members, it is utterly false: for as he is head of his mystical body, he cannot spare any one of his lowest members, but every one is required to his perfection and fulness, as you have noted yourself upon this verse. When Scripture faileth, you flee to Hierom's authority, who maketh nothing for you, in calling Damasus highest priest, seeing that he confesseth elsewhere, that the poor bishop of Engubium, is of the same worthiness and priesthood as the great bishop of Rome, and that all bishops are alike the Apostles' successors, *Epi. Evagrius*. Wherefore seeing you conclude, that the church is not called the mystical body of the

pope, it is lawful for us to infer, that the pope is not head of the mystical body of Christ, but only Christ himself.

23. Christ is full and perfect in himself, but as by his gracious dispensation he is the head of his church, he is not full or perfect without his body.

#### CHAPTER 2.

8. This justification of mere grace by faith only, without works, is that, by which we are saved, as the text is plain, and all the ancient fathers consent, for this new device of the first and second justification, was unknown to them. So saith Paul, whom God hath justified, he hath glorified. *Rom. 8. 30.* Theodoret saith, "The grace of God hath vouchsafed us of these good things, we have brought only faith." Again, "We believed not our own accord, but being called, we came to him, and when we were come, he required not purity and innocence of life, but accepting faith only, he forgave us our sins."

9. Augustin meaneth none otherwise, but that good works are necessary, and that faith void of good works doth not suffice, as he showeth also in Psalm 144, upon this text. "What then do we not work well? yea we work, but how? God worketh in us, because by faith we give place in our heart to him, which worketh good in us, and by us: therefore hear whence thou werkest good, for we are his work created," &c. Chrysostom saith, *Ephes. Hom. 4.* "He hath not refused men that have works, but he hath saved them being destitute of works by grace that no man might have whereof to glory. And then lest hearing that it is not of works, but all is prepared and finished by faith, thou shouldst become idle, see what he addeh, for we are his work."

20. Where the Prophets and Apostles are called the foundation, Christ himself hath his proper place to be the corner stone. We deny not, that the church is builded upon Peter, as one of the foundation stones, but that upon Peter only, as the main foundation, which is Christ alone, we deny that the church is builded. *1 Cor. 3. 11.*

#### CHAPTER 3.

17. The text is plain: Christ dwelleth in us by faith, and by faith we are justified, in the merits and justice of Christ only. *2 Cor. 5. 21.*

17. From that faith by which only we are justified by God unto salvation, charity can never be separated.

#### CHAPTER 4.

5. In the former saying of Cyprian, these words, "He that forsaketh Peter's chair, upon which the church was built," are none of Cyprian's words in the ancient books of Cyprian written and printed, but lately foisted in by Pammelius. Likewise in the second testimony, where Cyprian hath *super Petram*, upon the rock, Pammelius hath turned it into

*Petrus*, upon Peter. Such patchery will serve well, to make Ponry seen ancient among the ignorant, but it is gross paltry in the judgment of all that be wise and learned. Therefore your conclusion, that the unity of the church consisteth in fellowship with Peter's chair, is builded upon mere jorgery and foisting. And if those sayings were true, we might as truly say, that the Pope holdeth not Peter's chair, that holdeth not Peter's faith. The saying of Hilary maketh nothing against Calvin, nor them that consent in doctrine with him, which acknowledge but one faith as one God.

9. His descending doth not signify any passing from place to place, but teacheth the greatness of his dispensation, that when he was most high, he abased himself so much, and endured so great abasement." Theodoret upon this text, in this sense he descended to hell.

12. The Apostle nameth all functions necessary for the planting and continuance of doctrine, and the unity of the church in the truth, among which the Pope is none, therefore he hath no function for certainty and unity of truth, as is pretended. The functions pertaining to the external government of the church are not here named, but only such as pertain unto doctrine, where the Apostle should have left out the principal of all, if the Pope's supremacy were so necessary for continuance of unity in truth, as you affirm. The functions of bishops, elders, and deacons, as they respect the external government and policy of the church, are elsewhere named generally and particularly; but in respect of the office of teaching, they are contained under pastors and teachers. But the Pope who is neither sent of Christ, neither teacheth nor feedeth, how should he be an Apostle, pastor, or teacher? But for his feeding and teaching you will not greatly strive: for his Apostleship you can find nothing in the scripture, nor in the ancient fathers for a thousand years after Christ, and therefore it began alike in Bernard's time, who as he being carried away with the error of his age, ascribeth too much to the Bishop of Rome, so he meant not to make him an Apostle, as those that were sent immediately of Christ, and not of men or by men, of whom Paul speaketh in this place, who had also an office distinct from all others. Therefore seeing the Pope hath neither sending from Christ, nor executeth the office of an Apostle, we may say to him, as Tertullian said to Marcion the heretic, "If thou be a Prophet, foreshow sometime. If thou be an Apostle, preach everywhere. If thou be an Apostolic man, agree in doctrine with the Apostles."

13. The church of Christ hath never wanted pastors and teachers, for her continuance in the truth of the doctrine of salvation, nor ever shall want them. Wherefore that church which can prove by the holy scriptures that she holdeth the doctrine of the Gospel contained in the same, need not to be careful to know the names of the persons, and of the places where such pastors and teachers have lived.

But the doctrine proved to be true, doth argue that it had always had such continuance and succession, as God promiseth to true doctrine. Contrariwise, the succession of persons and places, proveth not the continuance of truth. And therefore you make a foolish and unlearned argument, when you say, "The Catholic Church, that is to say, that visible company of Christians which hath ever had, and by good record can prove they ever have had, a continual ordinary succession of bishops, pastors, and doctors, is the only true church." For first, it shall not be granted unto you, that the Catholic Church is always a visible company, as you mean visible, to be always in sight, even of the wicked world. The Popish Church hath no succession from the Apostles, for many hundred years after Christ. For they cannot be said to succeed them, whose doctrine they renounce. That succession which they show, is not of pastors and teachers, but of wolves and other dumb dogs, or teachers of lies and fables. If it were granted that they have succession, which have continuance of the names of Bishops, &c., in such places as the Apostles have taught without consent in doctrine with them; the Greek churches, and other churches of the east, all which they account, and some are indeed heretics, have as ordinary succession, and as good records to show from the Apostles, and even from Peter, as you have of your Popes from Peter. If this succession prove not them to be the true church, no more doth it prove you. If truth of doctrine be necessary to prove a true church, the scriptures are sufficient to prove a true church, with lawful succession also. Where you say, for many ages, we cannot show that we have had any one Bishop, it is false, for all the true Bishops of the Primitive Church for six hundred years and more after Christ, in all necessary points of doctrine agree with us, and therefore were ancestors of our church. In the latter times also, for every age we can name divers pastors and teachers, even in the most dark times, and under the greatest tyranny of Antichrist, by whom the true doctrine and Church of God have been continued, though obscurely as the moon in the wane or eclipse even until our days. In which God having openly revealed the wickedness of Antichrist, the Church of Christ is again restored into the light and sight of the world, and daily prevaileth against the blind brood of Antichrist. The succession of the Bishops of Rome, and other pastors and teachers from the Apostles, was alleged by the ancient fathers against those heretics which taught new doctrine, which neither the Apostles nor their successors heard of in the church, before the several arising of those heretics. But seeing the Papists are never able to prove, that we dissent in doctrine from the word of God, nor from the most ancient fathers of the Primitive Church, as we prove that they do, the argument of succession used by the ancient fathers maketh directly against them,



and nothing against us. One example shall serve instead of many. Gregory, Bishop of Rome testifieth, that none of his predecessors did ever use that profane name of singularity, to be universal Bishop, which yet his successors have usurped; therefore have declared that they were the very Antichrists according to Gregory's prophecy, and authors of a new heresy, never before received in the church for six hundred years after Christ. *Gregory lib. 4. Ep. 32, et 36.*

11. The pastors and teachers do not preserve unity in truth, but by teaching the word of truth which seeing Luther and Calvin in all points necessary to salvation did teach, they are not to be numbered among heretics, but instead of their names, the Papists being placed, will make your note sound and catholic.

23. We believe as the Apostle teacheth, that we must be renewed in the spirit of our mind and put on the new man, &c. But this renovation is only begun in this life, and not perfected until we be made perfectly just, and holy after this life. And therefore the Apostle teacheth us, to apprehend the justice of Christ only, that we may be justified unto salvation in this life. *2 Cor. 5. 21.* Neither doth this place prove that our will doth work with God before God do alter our will, and of unwillingness to holiness and righteousness, by his Spirit maketh us willing, for of ourselves we are not apt to think any thing. *2 Cor. 3. 5.*

#### CHAPTER 5.

23. This note is false and foolish. For even in the first translation that was printed, *Matt. 16.* the marginal note is this; upon this rock, that is, saith Augustin, "upon the confession which thou hast made, acknowledging me to be Christ the Son of the living God, I will build my congregation or church." By which it is manifest, that the translator understood congregation which expresseth the Greek word better than church, to be all one with church. And he rather used the word congregation, than church, to avoid ambiguity, because this word church is commonly taken for the house of the assembly of Christians, and that the people might know that the church is a gathering together of all the members into one body, which in the name of church doth not appear. But after the people were taught to distinguish of the word church, and to understand it for the mystical body of Christ, the later translations used that term: not that the other was any corruption, or the later any correction, but to declare that both is one.

24. A lewd slander! for we never taught, that the Catholic Church can fall from Christ, by error, idolatry, or false worship, although great multitudes, and particular churches, such as the church of Rome is, may fall from him: and the best church may err, yet not so, that she can fall from him. And if it be a note of the true church, as you say, to be always obedient to Christ's words, and commandments; it is certain the church of Rome cannot be the true church of Christ, which so

long hath disobeyed the word and commandment of Christ, in so many things. Namely, in worshipping of images, in maintaining traditions of men contrary to his word, in robbing the people of the one half of the sacrament, in forbidding the people to search the scriptures, in forbidding meats and marriage, in using an unknown tongue in common prayers and ministering sacraments, in usurping a sacrificing priesthood, in perverting the use of his supper unto a sacrifice propitiatory, which is contumelious to his death, and in many other.

29. The manifold dignity of the church, we know and do acknowledge better than you. And how contemptible soever our congregation seem to be in the eyes of the proud whore of Babylon, we know, it is the glorious spouse of Christ, not clothed in gold, purple, pearls, precious stones, as the strumpet of Rome, *Apoc. 17* but with the spiritual light of the sun with a crown of twelve stars, having the moon under her feet, &c. *Apoc. 12.* Neither do we teach, as you impudently slander us, that the church "may err, that is to say, may be divorced from her spouse, for idolatry, superstition, heresy, or other abominations." But that company with is fallen into idolatry, heresy, and gross abominations, as the Romish rabble, is fallen from Christ to Antichrist. But the true heavenly Jerusalem, which is the mother of us all, although while she is a stranger of the earth, she hath her imperfections and spots, that she may ever acknowledge by whose grace she standeth, and therefore in some points may err, and be deceived by infirmity of her members, who are all and every one, subject both to error and sin while they live in this pilgrimage: yet is she and every true member of her body preserved by special grace of Christ her spouse, that she cannot fall clean away from him, into any damnable error, idolatry, or abomination. Whereby neither of both your surmised absurdities doth follow, that either Christ may be without a spouse or church on earth, neither may the Catholic Church have such errors, that remaining his wife, she should be notwithstanding a very whore. The church of Judah in the time of the reign of divers kings, did offer sacrifices in the high places, yet only to the Lord, which was an error; but not so great that it made a divorce of the church from Christ, or that it made the church of Judah a very whore, *2 Reg. 12. et cap. 11. 14. &c.* therefore the Catholic Church always is and hath been, and teacheth all truth necessary to salvation, therefore to honour God truly and sincerely, as touching the substance of God's honour: though in the exterior form and manner thereof, and some other opinions, not being of the necessity of salvation, she may be sometimes deceived. The feast of the Paschal lamb, which was one of the principal sacrifices and sacraments of the church of Israel, pertaining to the worship of God, was not kept so precisely according to the word of God, and the institution thereof, from the days of the judges, in the time of all the best kings as it was in the eighteenth year of the reign

of Josias, 2 Reg. 23. 32. Likewise the feast of tabernacles, had not been so solemnly kept, from the days of Joshua, as it was after the captivity. *Nehem.* 8. 18. By which it is manifest, that the church in the mean time, erred somewhat from the true external form of God's worship, yet not in the substance thereof, and therefore continued still the spouse of Christ, and only true church of God.

32. The apostle saith, the spiritual conjunction of Christ and his church is a great mystery, as Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Hierom, Gaudentius Brixianus, *ep. ad Germinia. Mysterium hoc grande est: Ego autem dico in Christo et Eccl.* Eucherius in *Gen. lib. 7. cap. 22. et lib. 2. cap. 22.* Prosper. *Aquit. de prom. et præd. per cap. 1.* Remigius in *Ps. 15.* Albinus in *Ps. 37.* Cassianus de *incarn. Dom. lib. 5.* Paschasius de *Corpore et Sang. cap. 7.* do understand it: but admit it be so as Augustin and some other of the ancient fathers take it, that matrimony is a great mystery, of the conjunction of Christ and his church, yet it followeth not, that matrimony is a sacrament, as baptism and the Lord's supper be called sacraments, or that it is a sacrament of the New Testament, seeing matrimony was instituted in Paradise, before the fall of man. But where you say, we have none, but a fleshly estimation of marriage, and that we acknowledge no grace, mystery, or sanctification thereby, more than brute beasts, it is a vile and malicious slander. We acknowledge matrimony to be a holy and pure institution of God, honourable in all men, yea even in the ministers of his word and sacraments, according to the express doctrine of the Holy Ghost, and necessary for some men, and that God giveth grace and sanctification thereby, to his faithful, to live in holiness and pureness, from filthy pollution of the flesh. And as for mystery, we acknowledge not one, but many mysteries in matrimony, as Hierom and Nazianzen did acknowledge. Yet seeing the whole dispensation of our salvation, is testified by the sacraments of our regeneration, and of our spiritual nourishment, whereby we are assured, that we are both born of God, and fed by him to be his children forever: we know no more visible signs of those invisible graces, instituted by our Saviour Christ in the New Testament, but baptism and the Lord's Supper. But you that make so great a sacrament of matrimony, what grace, mystery, and sanctification you acknowledge thereby, you declare by your Antichristian prohibiting of so gracious and holy institution, to them to whom the dispensation of the holy word and mysteries of God is committed. Yea even to them, for whom, in respect of their infirmity it is necessary, and that contrary to the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, who alloweth a bishop, priest, and deacon to be the husband of one wife. Notwithstanding, you profess with blasphemous mouths, "that the sacred order of priesthood is profaned," yea you say "profaned and made mere laical, and popular, by marriage." Whereas you complain that Calvin doth false-

ly say, that you gather matrimony to be a sacrament of the Greek or Latin words only, which is mystery or sacrament, which you know, to have of their nature a more general signification; your own arguments do verily his saying: for you can find no more of it, but that it is a holy and great mystery. Yet is not every holy and great mystery a sacrament of the New Testament, as baptism and the eucharist are. The master of the sentences confesseth, that matrimony was instituted before sin, *lib. 5. dist. 26.* therefore it is no sacrament of the New Testament. And what other argument hath Peter Lombard, the master of your divinity, to prove that matrimony is a sacrament, but only the name of *sacramentum*, used in this place? But we must tell you, why we call baptism and the Lord's Supper, which are never so named expressly in the scripture, by the name of mysteries or sacraments. You would have it thought, only upon the popish church's authority. But we have the authority of the word of God, expressly, beside the testimony of the church, calling those holy seals by those names. Paul calleth the ministers of Christ the dispensers of the mysteries of God, *1 Cor. 4. 1.* Therefore these holy seals, being a special charge of their dispensation, are in scripture expressly called mysteries, which is the Greek of sacraments: saving that the word *sacramentum* in Latin hath some other significations, that the Greek word mystery hath not. But why do we not call matrimony by the same name? Verily in Greek or Latin we make no doubt, to call matrimony so. But seeing the English word sacrament by use of English speech, is restrained, and taken only for outward seals of God's grace unto our salvation, we forbear to call matrimony so commonly, although for names and terms, so the simple might keep the difference and distinction of things, we make no great account, to use them or leave them.

#### CHAPTER 6.

14. A man may be clothed with the justice of Christ, which is without him, and be partaker thereof by faith, through the communication of God's Spirit. And the term of clothing doth import a matter without the body rather than within. Yet the Apostle, not so curious in terms, and respecting the works of justice that are outward, speaketh indeed of an inward virtue of justice, which is in the regenerate by God's grace, and whereby they are truly just, but not perfectly, in God's sight, and therefore are not justified thereby, to abide his judgment, but by the only justice of Christ imputed to them by faith, which is most perfect justice, and able to endure the severity of God's judgment.

23. We have noted upon the like texts many times, and now we say that faith void of good works is a dead faith, and an unprofitable faith, a devilish faith, and not available to justification or salvation; yet by a true lively Christian faith only that worketh by love, we are justified unto salvation.

THE ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE EPISTLE OF  
PAUL TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

## CHAPTER 2.

9. Calvin, as zealous for the glory of God, to whom only our salvation is to be ascribed, abhorreth the name of merit in any man toward his own salvation, but not in that respect, but for other good causes denieth, that Christ did merit any thing for himself by his death, but altogether for us. His reasons are these. This opinion, that Christ did merit for himself, obscureth the grace of Christ, while men imagine that he came for any other cause than for our salvation, and that he had greater respect for himself than of us: which is contrary to the whole scope of scripture, which teacheth, that he gave himself for us, not to merit for himself. Of this opinion it followeth, that a man may merit divine honour and the throne of God himself, which is blasphemous, therefore Christ hath this exaltation, as due unto his divine nature, as he saith in his prayer, *Joh. 17. 5.* Glorify me, O Father, with that glory which I had with thee before the world was made, and not merited by his passion. And the exaltation which the Apostle speaketh of in this text, is that which God challengeth as proper to himself. *Isa. 45. 22.* Therefore it is the glory due to our Saviour Christ's divinity, and not merited by his suffering in his humanity. So is this text expounded at large by Gaudentius an ancient bishop of Brixia, who lived in Ambrose's time, *Epist. ad Paulum Diaconum*. But this you say is contrary to all learned men's judgment, and Calvin unlearnedly denieth it. As though only Papists were all learned men, and whatsoever savoureth not of their slavour were unlearnedly spoken. By which the intolerable pride of this Antichristian generation is discovered, that whereas they are for the most part but *Semidocti*, scarce half learned, in comparison of sound learned men indeed, and who so is or ever was the best learned among them, may find many peers among us for learning: yet every babbler amongst them will brag of all learning and all learned men, and all is unlearned, or unlearnedly uttered, that they in their proud and scornful conceits will not allow for learning. And that we may have a taste of their great learning, they allege for proof that Christ did merit, that saying, *Apoc. 5.* The Lamb that was slain is worthy to receive Power and Divinity: so that by Popish learning, and learned conclusion of Papists, it followeth, that the Lamb of God obtained his divinity by merit, and not by nature, which learning were very good for that ancient learned heretic Arius. *Heb. 2.* we read also, that we see Jesus for the passion of death crowned with glory and honour. But the true construction of the text is, we see Jesus, which by the passion of death was made a little less than the Angels, crowned with glory and honour. Therefore he that was in the form of God, and thought it no robbery to be

equal with God, gained no honour and glory in this exaltation, but received that which forever was due to his eternal and divine nature, though he did for a time humble himself in his humanity, and became obedient to the most shameful and cursed death of the cross. Augustin, in the place you quote, saith never a word to prove that Christ merited either his divinity or divine honour by his death, but only reciteth this text, where the conjunction signifieth not a cause, but a consequence, as Calvin both truly and learnedly doth affirm.

10. The bowing of the knee at the sound of the name of Jesus, as it is used in Popery, is not commanded nor prophesied in this place. But it pertaineth to the subjection of all creatures to the judgment of Christ, when not only Turks and Jews, which now yield no honour to Jesus, but even the devils themselves shall be constrained to acknowledge that he is their Judge. The capping or kneeling at the name of Jesus, is of itself an indifferent thing, and therefore may be used superstitiously, as in Popery, where the people stoop at the sound of the name when it is read, not understanding either what it meaneth, or what is read concerning him. Also in sitting and not veiling at the name of Christ, Emanuel, God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and bowing only at the name of Jesus. And due reverence may be yielded to our Saviour, without any such outward ceremony of capping or kneeling. But Popish worshipping of the sacrament as God, of the saints with religious worship, and service of Christ's image and cross, even with Latria, which you call worship due to God: these worshippings, which are merely heathenish and idolatrous, are unfitly compared with bowing at the name of Jesus. And yet you complain, that to remove such impiety is to abolish all true religion out of the world, and to make men plain atheists. The same was the complaint of the Pagans against the Christians. But to worship God only, according to the prescript of his holy word is true religion, and to teach men to worship contrary thereunto, maketh men either idolaters, or altogether atheists. And where you say the popish church doth not honour these things, nor count them holy, for their matter, colour, sound, &c. but for respect, and relation they have to our Saviour, &c. it is too short a cloak to cover your idolatry. For the same was the persuasion of the Israelites in their golden calf, which they did not honour for the matter, colour, fashion, but for the relation it had to God that brought them out of the land of Egypt, *Exod. 32. 4. 5.* The like had the Israelites of Jeroboam's Calves, *1 Reg. 12. 20.* Augustin telleth, that the Gentiles in his time had the like excuse for their idolatry. "I worship not that stone or that image that is without sense, for your prophet could not know that it hath eyes

and seeth not, and I be ignorant that this image hath no soul, nor seeth with his eyes, nor heareth with his ears. Therefore I do not worship that: but I adore that I see, and serve him whom I see not, who is that? the invisible divine power, which is president of that image. After this manner, while they give a reason of their images, they seem eloquent to themselves, because they worship not idols, and worship devils. They answer, we worship not evil spirits, but the angels, as you call them, do we worship, even the powers or virtues of the great God. As ministers of the great God I would you would worship them, you should easily learn of them not to worship them." *Psal.* 96. Therefore it is not sufficient to say, such things bring us to the remembrance and apprehension of Christ, by sight, hearing, and use of the same signs. For we must do in religion and God's service, not that seemeth good to us, but that only which he commandeth, *Deut.* 4. 2. c. 12. 32. For otherwise, by such respects and relations, remembrances and apprehensions, all idolatry and false worshipping may be defended.

12. We teach no vain presumption, to make men secure of their predestination and salvation, but we protest that the elect are predestinate unto good works which if they do not bring forth after they be called, they cannot be saved, neither are they predestinated to life eternal. And yet we teach men to believe assuredly that God will perform his promise made unto all that truly believe in him, that they shall be saved. And this confidence doth well agree with the fear of God, and indeed, can be in none but in them that fear and love God.

13. Augustin teacheth plentifully, that man's free will is servile, captive, lost, until by grace it begin to be enlarged and restored: yet is man's will free from constraint, and so meaneth Augustin, whensoever he acknowledgeth man to have free-will. And in this place very plainly he showeth, that men have no power of will to work well by their will, but only of God, who worketh in them.

### CHAPTER 3.

9. You misreport Augustin: for although he say the justice of God is so called, not whereby he is just, but wherewith he maketh us just, or which is of God, he saith not that this justice wherewith we are justified by faith, is in man: but contrariwise, he saith expressly, "it is the justice of God, not our justice; in him, not in us, *De verbis Apostoli, ser.* 6." Christ was made sin that we might be made justice, not our justice but God's justice, neither in us but in him, as he declared sin not to be his but ours, not placed in him but in us, by the similitude of sinful flesh, in which he was crucified. *Enchir.* c. 41. 2 *Cor.* 5.

11. Paul was sure to come to the mark, yet doth he not cease to labour, neither do we promise any other security of salvation by only faith, but unto those that labour in their calling, and be fruitful of good works.

12. That perfection which the Apostle as-

cribeth to himself and others in this life, is of knowledge, not of justice. For although all knowledge that men can attain unto in this life, is imperfect in respect of the knowledge we shall have after this life, yet it may well be called perfect, when it is of all that God hath revealed in his word. So it cannot be said of that justice which is in us, in any respect. For although Sodom was called just in respect of Jerusalem, yet no man can say that Sodom was perfect in justice, because Jerusalem was more unjust.

15. We defend not our dissensions, but confess that it is altogether a fault, that there is any dissension among us: yet we truly say, that notwithstanding our dissensions, we agree in the principal articles of faith necessary to salvation, as the Church in the Apostles' time, and other Catholic Fathers did, notwithstanding their dissension: and as you say, the Papists do, notwithstanding the dissensions, between your Dominicans and Franciscans, Thomists and Scotists, Canonists and Divines. You acknowledge therefore, that there may be dissensions, but with a double proviso. First, that the controversies be such, and in such things, as be not against the set known rule of faith: such is the difference between Luther and Zuinglius, Westphalus and Calvin. They both acknowledge the eating of Christ's flesh to be necessary, but after what manner it is present to be eaten in the sacrament by faith, they differ. They that contend about ceremonies and external form of government in the church, do fully agree in all points of the doctrine of faith necessary to salvation. These contentions therefore for these matters are not unlike, the one of them to the dissension between Cyprian and Cornelius, the Bishops of Africa and of the East taking part with Cyprian, and other of the West with Cornelius, which was about the rebaptizing of them that had been baptized by Heretics. The other to the contention of Victor Bishop of Rome against the bishops of the East, about the celebration of Easter, or of Epiphanius and Chrysostom about the government and discipline of the church. Your second proviso is, that the controversy be such as break not the mutual society, fellowship, and communion in prayer, service, sacraments, and other offices of life and religion. So you say, it is not in our controversies, for one chargeth another with heresy, idolatry, &c. and also condemneth others' ceremonies, manner of administration, till it come to excommunication and banishment: sometimes burning one of another. Indeed such moderation as you speak of, ought to be kept in all such differences: but it hath not always been so among them that were true Catholics, neither among Papists themselves. And although the contentions among us have been more bitterly pursued than was meet, yet those with whom we agree, have kept, and always do, for the most part, keep that moderation and Christian love, which ought to be observed in such cases, according to the Apostle's rule in this text. And that any have proceeded to burning

one of another for these differences, you are not able to prove by one example. For there hath none been burned, but for such heresies, as you yourselves confess to be worthy of death. But that this moderation hath not been kept between the ancient Fathers in their controversies, is manifest by the example of Victor, who did excommunicate all the Bishops of the East, which were not of his opinion. And they, more moderate than he, commanded him to be quiet and keep peace, *Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 25.* Stephen also, Bishop of Rome, excommunicated Cyprian and the Bishops of Africa, yea Cyprian, though he were more charitable than Stephen, spared not angrily to inveigh against Stephen. *August. cont. Donat. lib. 5. cap. 23. and 25.*

It is reported, that Epiphanius and Chrysostom were so bitter in their contention, that the one did ban the other, *Hist. Tripart. lib. 10. cap. 12.* But all these were but sport and play, in comparison of the cruel hatred between the Guelphs and the Gibelins, between the Popes and Popes themselves, when they were two or three at once. What excommunications, condemnations of heresy, idolatry, atheism, what cruel murdering, by burning, drowning, sacking, mangling one of the other's bodies when they came within their claws, not sparing their dead carcasses, for rancour and hatred against their persons: your own stories are full of the examples, passing all that is read of the barbarous Scythians, or other heathenish nations. What burned the Dominic Friars of Berne, but hatred of the Franciscans; for counterfeiting of visions, and miracles was not so dainty a matter among Friars in that time, but that as Tully writeth of the Romish Soothsayers, a man might have marvelled, if so often as they met, they laughed not one upon another, to remember how with their feigned monsters

they mocked the world. Your contentions therefore have been greater than ours, of greater matters, as of the head of your church, which you say is necessary for the preservation of the whole body, and more cruelly pursued than ever any hath been among us.

17. It is a great derogation to Christ, when people follow the religion of Augustin, the religion of Benedict, the religion of Dominic, the religion of Francis, and one shall say, that I am of Augustin, I of Dominic, I of Francis, and I of Jesus. *1 Cor. 1.*

#### CHAPTER 4.

3. Hierom contessteth, that some of the Latins say he was next to Peter, whereby Linus and Anacletus are excluded. Damasus maketh Clemens the next successor of Peter. Linus and Cletus but Peter's suffragans while he lived himself, and placeth Anacletus after Clemens, whom Hierom placeth before. Ireneus placeth next to Peter, Linus, Anacletes, Clemens, and next to Clemens, Euaristus. Tertullian, saith, Clemens was next after Peter, and ordained by him. Optatus and Augustin say, Linus succeeded to Peter, Clemens to Linus, Anacletus to Clemens, and to Anacletus Euaristus. Epiphanius maketh Peter and Paul both bishops of Rome, then Linus, Cletus, Clemens, Euaristus. By this diversity you see, what certainty there is of the succession from Peter, whereof the Papists make such brags.

3. The word yokel-fellow is as precisely agreeable to the Greek as can be. And Clemens Alexandrinus hereof gathereth, that Paul had a wife, which he left by her consent, at Philippi. Yet we acknowledge it cannot be proved by this text. Why then should our translation be suspicious, when it is consonant to the original, as is possible.

### ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT OF THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS.

Seeing Paul passed twice through Phrygia, where this city of the Colossians stood, *Act. 16. 6. and 18. 23.* it is not unlike, that he planted the Church there. And that he had been there it seemeth by his Epistle to Philemon, i scribed also to Archippus the Minister of the church of Colosse, as is manifest in the last chapter of this Epistle. Neither is Epaphras any where in the Scripture called an Apostle, although it is not unlike he was an Evangelist, and of some is thought to be the same that is called also Epaphroditus. The false Apostles called the intercession of

Angels humility, as you do in effect, when you say, that men must not presume to come to God or Christ, but as they come to an earthly Prince by mediators or intercessors. Neither doth Paul teach them that it is lawful to desire any other in heaven to pray for them, with *per Christum Dominum nostrum* in the end, as you use in the Popish Church, but contrariwise he teacheth that there is no mediator of intercession in heaven, but only Christ. But how well you observe your conclusion, *per Christum Dominum nostrum, I have declared, John. 16.*

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS.

## CHAPTER I.

6. We hold no opinion that the church ever did, or shall ever decay, though many have fallen from it, and the meetings of the Christians were as obscure in times of persecution before Constantine, as they have been since the tyranny of Antichrist usurped the temple of God. Neither saith Augustin any thing to the contrary, *Epist.* 80. But *Ps.* 10, he saith expressly, that the church is oftentimes obscure as the moon in the wane or eclipse.

12. How can you conclude out of the text, that we are made worthy otherwise than by acceptance and imputation of Christ's justice? Yea what can be more contrary to the text, than that you say, we deserve our salvation condignly, when he saith expressly we have it through redemption of Christ and remission of our sins by him, who hath reconciled all things to him, by the blood of his Cross. Chrysostom upon this text saith, *Hom.* 2. in *epist. ad Col.* "Such are those things that are given, that he hath not only given them, but also hath made us able to take them. No man showeth such a conversation of life, that he may be worthy of the kingdom: but this gift is altogether of God. Therefore he saith, when we have done all things, say we are unprofitable servants." Theodoret saith, "We praise the merciful God who, whereas we were unworthy, hath made us partakers of the light of the Saints."

24. Christ suffereth in his members, by which suffering they are made conformable unto Christ their head, through their patience, and help to confirm the faith one of another. So the apostles' suffering was for the glory of God, and the confirmation of the church in the faith of the gospel which he had taught. But that the sufferings of any man are meritorious or satisfactory, either for himself or others, it is horrible blasphemy against the merit and satisfaction of Christ's death, which wanteth nothing in himself to merit and satisfy for all his members. Paul, *Rom.* 8. 17, whom you quote, speaketh of conformity unto Christ by sufferings, not of merit or satisfaction. Nor yet Leo, *Serm.* 19. *De Passione.* Wherefore this blasphemy of merits and satisfaction by suffering, standeth upon your own credit, without any testimony of scriptures and doctors. The sacraments are appointed by Christ, to confirm our faith in the merits of Christ, not to apply the merits of Christ by them unto us, as by the work wrought. Which opinion also is injurious to the passion of Christ: and therefore you shall never stop our clamours against it, and against the merit and satisfaction of men's sufferings, except you can do it by the word of God. And whereas you say, that under pretence of Christ's passion, we take away the value of all good works, it is false, for we acknowledge that, by the merit of his passion, our works are accepted and rewarded, though

we join them not in value with the works of Christ, to merit or satisfy for sin. Therefore, having brought no manner of proof before, but your bare word, you make an impudent conclusion thereof, that it is plain, that the sufferings of Christ's members are satisfactory, both for the sufferers, and for others. Let us hear then how you answer the objections that are brought against your blasphemous beggarly principle. For you say, "Though one member cannot merit for another properly, yet one may bear the burden, and discharge the debt of another." To take your grant, if one by his suffering cannot merit for another, then one's suffering is not meritorious for another indeed, neither properly or improperly, though you seem to conclude a sophistical distinction in that word properly. But how improperly may he merit by bearing another's burden? For who will grant, that one can bear the burden, or pay the debt of another man's sins? seeing the scripture saith, the soul that sinneth, even that shall die, *Ezek.* 18. 20. And every one shall bear his own burden, *Gal.* 6. 5. No man can redeem his brother, or give a price to God for him, *Ps.* 49. 8. You see therefore how agreeable it is to the law of God and nature, that one man should bear another's burden, and satisfy to God for his sins: though one of charity may bear another's burden, and help him in his life: and how ridiculous Wicliff was to deny the same: but the old proverb is found true, a fool laugheth, when there is nothing to be laughed at. But you rise upon us lustily, and say, "We see here, that passions of the saints are always suffered for the common good of the whole body." What then? "Ergo," they be meritorious and satisfactory for the whole church. This conclusion is not more worthy of laughing, than hissing. "And sometimes by the special intention of the sufferer, they are applicable to special persons, one or many." What then? "Ergo," they be meritorious and satisfactory: what ass ever brayed such conclusions? Paul "wisheth to be Anathema for the Jews, that is, a sacrifice, according to Origen, and he speaketh of his death, as of a libation, host, or offering, so do the fathers of the passions of Martyrs." What of this? "Ergo," Paul's death might have been a sacrifice propitiatory for the Jews, and so it was, at least for others meritorious, and satisfactory for their sins! "Yet being dedicated and sanctified in Christ's blood, they have a forcible cry, intercession, and satisfaction for the church, and the particular necessity of the same." Verily you must make new logic, and create new reason, before these conclusions can follow of your antecedent or premises. Yet you go forward with them, and say, "that some do abound in such satisfaction, to the help of them that lack them." Paul reckoneth up his afflictions, and glorieth in them.

2 Cor. 11. Indeed he saith, he will glory in his infirmities, in which the grace of God worketh most effectually: but of merit and satisfaction, not a word, nor a syllable. The example of Job, "who avoucheth," as you say, "that his penalty far exceeded his sins." But that is false: for although he uttered sometimes words of impatience, yet in that sixth chapter he hath no such saying: but according to your corrupt translation. Whereas the truth is, he complaineth that his sorrows were greater than he could express, not greater than his sins had deserved. For although he might justly defend his innocency against his friends, which charged him with hypocrisy, yet when he cometh into the presence of God, he layeth his hand on his mouth and will not excuse himself: yea he confesseth, that he is not able to answer to one of a thousand, that God might lay to his charge, *Job* 9. 2. 3. 39, 37. Your example, "our lady which never sinned yet suffered so great dolour:" while you pretend to honour her, you do most horrible injury, both to Christ and her. For if she never sinned, how can the scripture be true. All have sinned, and are destitute of the glory of God, *Rom.* 3. 23. And if she never sinned, how can she rejoice in God her Saviour? How can she be one of Christ's people, who was called Jesus, because he should save his people from their sins, *Matt.* 1. This therefore being the ground of your indulgences, is most miserable and blasphemous beggary, *2 Cor.* 2. Now that we have seen, you have nothing out of the ancient fathers for you: let us see what there is in them against you. Chrysostom upon this text, *Hom.* 4, saith, "You are not reconciled to God by us, but by Christ, although we do these things." Ambrose saith, "He confesseth that he rejoiceth in tribulations which he suffered, because he seeth their profit in the faith of the believers. He declared in the beginning, how great and how infinite the omnipotency of Christ is, that he might teach that their hope is to be reposed only in him." Theodoret saith, "He knew that life was procured by his suffering: for he said, he fulfilled those afflictions of Christ, which are wanting, as he which fulfilled that which was remaining, and sustained afflictions for them. And this was that which remained, that he might preach to the Gentiles, and show the liberal procurer of health unto them." There is not one of the ancient fathers that gathereth any merit or satisfaction of men's sufferings out of this text.

## CHAPTER 2.

8. Where you say, we have none other arguments against the carnal presence of Christ in the sacrament, it is false. For we have many arguments both out of the scriptures, and also out of the ancient fathers. Neither have we any arguments out of philosophy, but such as are grounded upon the holy scriptures, which teach the perfect humanity of Christ, and all the essential properties of a true and natural body.

34

16. When popish choice of meats and days is more superstitious and burdalous than the Judaical difference of meats and days, we do rightly apply this and such like places against them. Not against Christian fasts or feasts, such as yours are not: for your abstinence from flesh is no fast, but a superstitious change of meats according to the tradition of men, upon a vain pretence that flesh was cursed of God, and not fish, as Durand confesseth, *lib.* 6. *cap. de jejuniis*. The Apostle's doctrine therefore being general, is not only against the Jews, but against any superstition that is like unto theirs. Of your feasts Judaically and servilely observed, *Gal.* 4.

18. You take great pains to little purpose: for what religion of Angels soever it be, such as the heathen used, such as Simon Magus invented, such as some Jews observed, or such as you Papists use, all religion of Angels is forbidden: yea all superstition or will-worship, which is not after the precept of God's word. We do not therefore abuse this place against your superstitious honouring and invocating of Angels. Augustin saith, "If you would rightly worship the Angels, you should learn of them not to worship them." *Ps.* 69. The same father among heresies, reciteth a sect called Angelici, which were inclined to the worship of Angels, *ad Quod. vult Deum. Her.* 39. Epiphanius among other wicked opinions and doings, noteth the Cainans for invocation of Angels. *Her.* 38. Of building temples in honour of Angels, Augustin saith, "If we should make a temple of timber and stone, to any holy and most excellent Angel, should we not be accursed from the truth of Christ, and from the church of God, because we should give that service to a creature which is due only to God?" *Contra Maximin. lib.* 1. *Tit.* 11. What is it then for Papists to build and hallow churches unto the honour of Michael and Gabriel? "But the scriptures," you say, "record so often that the Angels do offer our prayers up to God, and to have been lawfully revered of the patriarchs as God's ministers." The proof of this is contained in four quotations. The first, *Joshua* 5. 14, where Joshua falleth down and worshippeth no Angel, but the Lord God himself, our Saviour Christ, the Prince of our Lord's army, that is of all Angels, appearing to him in the shape of a man, as it is plain in the text. The next is *Tob.* 12. 12, which is not canonical scripture, nor agreeable unto it, for the scripture always maketh Christ our only Mediator, by whom our prayers and all other spiritual sacrifices are offered to God. *1 Pet.* 2. 5. *Heb.* 13. 15. The third text, *Gen.* 48. 16, "The Angel which delivered me," &c. By whom Jacob meaneth the Angel of the Covenant, which is Christ, and no creature. *Mal.* 3. 1. For no creature but Christ himself delivered him from all evil. And Paul calleth the Angel which led the people of Israel, Christ, *1 Cor.* 10. 9. And although he should mean the ministry of an Angel, yet his prayer was to God, and not to the Angel, that he would pro-

tect those children by his Angel as he had done Jacob himself. The last, 1 *Tim.* 5. 21, where the Apostle doth charge Timothy in the presence of God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect Angels to observe these things. Out of which words I cannot imagine how you would gather your conclusion, that Saints do offer our prayers, and have been revered of the patriarchs. Paul calleth God, and our Saviour Christ, and his holy Angels to be witnesses of this his weighty charge. And Moses calleth heaven and earth to witness that he hath set before them life and death. *Deut.* 30. 19. May we hereof conclude, that heaven and earth did offer his prayers, or that he did yield any religious worship to heaven and earth? As for due reverence which is of love, not of service, there is no doubt but all the Saints of God do yield unto them. And so doth Augustin of the Angels, "We honour them with charity, not with service. Neither do we build temples unto them, for they will not be so honoured of us, because they know that we, when we are good, are the temples of the highest God. Therefore it is rightly written, that a man was forbidden by an Angel to worship him, and bidden to worship God only, under whom he also was a fellow servant with him." *De vera relig.* cap. 55. The texts are evident. *Apoc.* cap. 19. 10. and 22. 8. Where the Angel denieth to be worshipped by John, who was not so ignorant to worship him as God, but thought some religious worship was due to him, as to a messenger of God. But that Angels may be prayed unto, and can help and hear us, you send us first to Hierom, in cap. 10. *Daniel*, where is never a word to prove that Angels may be prayed unto. Only Hierom, beside the text and beside the truth, saith in the person of the Angel, that he did offer Daniel's prayers: but that he was to be prayed unto there is no word. That the Angels may know our prayers when it pleaseth God, and be ministers of his help unto us, it is no question. We acknowledge they are appointed for our guard and defence, according to God's pleasure. The Angel in that chapter of Daniel, was ready at the first prayers of Daniel, but the Prince of Persia withstood him twenty-one days. Whereby he declareth, that his message was delayed for that time, and for what benefit of the church. Where lest you should build too much upon Hierom's authority, for offering our prayers by the Angel, he understandeth the Prince of Persia to be an Angel, and so maketh a resistance of one Angel against another, which is a gross absurdity. Your next proof is out of Ambrose. *Ps.* 118. ser. 1. Where there is no word to prove, that Angels may be prayed unto. Only he showeth that Angels are present in all places to be witnesses of our actions, and to protect and defend God's children as it pleaseth him to send them. The third is Augustin, *De civit.* lib. 10. cap. 12, where he saith, "That God doth none otherwise hear them that call upon him, than he seeth, that they will call upon

him: for even when his Angels do hear, he heareth them, as in a true temple not made with hands." His meaning is, that God hath no need of the ministry of Angels, to have our prayers presented to him by them: but when they do hear our prayers made to him, he in the Angels themselves heareth them. Wherefore here is nothing to prove, that we may pray to Angels, because the Angels sometimes hear us pray to God. The last is *Bede*, *Cant. lib.* 4. cap. 24. Where there is no word of praying to Angels, nor of any reverence given to them. Only he saith out of Appollonius, that "the ministries of Angels do never decline from their power and office, but always remain as high as palm trees." And out of Julianus he saith, "The companies of his Saints both of men and of Angels do serve his Godhead, and do celebrate the honour of the King with continual praise." I conclude therefore with Augustin's exhortation, agreeable to this text, "Let religion therefore bind us to one Almighty God, because between our mind, whereby we understand him to be our father and the truth, that is that inward light by which we understand him, there is no creature set between." *De vera Relig.* cap. 55. Theodoret, upon this text, saith that it was decreed in the Council of Laodicea, that men should not pray unto the Angels: and that unto his time they had in divers places of Phrygia, as a remnant of his ancient superstition, churches or oratories of Michael.

20. A marvellous matter to make such an outcry of our translation, which is agreeable to the sense of the Apostle though we cannot express it in one word. But we do it, say you, to make the name of tradition odious. And be not the traditions and decrees of men odious? which the Apostle, *verse* 22, calleth the precepts and doctrines of men, as Christ doth the traditions of the Jews. *Matt.* 15. But where traditions are commended, you say, the word which flatly signifieth traditions, we translate instructions, ordinances. I answer, the Greek word will bear our translation, and we do avoid the term of traditions, to distinguish the ordinances and doctrine delivered by the Apostles, from the traditions of men which our Saviour Christ condemneth. *Matt.* 15.

21. This maketh not against your prohibitions of touching of meats and handling of chalices and such like. Why so? Because you be no heretics. Nay, but because you have such precepts and doctrines of men, contrary to the scriptures, you declare yourselves to be as great heretics as these men, against whom the Apostle speaketh, and to hold either the same or the like heresies. You say, "Superstition or voluntary worship is that which is invented by heretics of their own head, without the warrant of Christ in the scriptures." Herein we agree with you, and such is all Popish superstition. But you come in with an or, that "it hath the warrant" of the Holy Ghost in the church: verily, the church hath no authority of the Holy



Ghost, to decree contrary to the scriptures, to make religion in touching and tasting, which the scripture saith to be free. Neither are we commanded to obey any man, but so far forth as his doctrine and decrees are warrantable by the holy scriptures. For neither the church, nor any person therein, hath power to command or forbid the use of any creature for religion's sake. But if any company of men do take upon them to set up a new religion or worship, in whole or in part, which hath not the warrant of Christ in the scriptures, we see by this place it is also contrary to the scriptures, therefore that company show themselves not to be of the Church of Christ, but of Antichrist, and he that commandeth the contrary to this text, usurpeth God's authority as Antichrist, having no commission from God, or our Saviour Christ.

23. Your abstinence from flesh, and eating of fish, with drinking of wine, and eating of all manner of fruits and spices, is no Christian fast; but a hypocritical counterfeiting. Your abstinence from flesh, and allowing fish, for more holiness, because the waters were not cursed, when all flesh was cursed, is the very doctrine of devils. Your very fasting and punishing of your carcasses, not for chastisement, to bring them in subjection to the spirit, but by your arrogant opinion of merit, to prefer such bodily exercises even before faith of the heart, and true contrition of the soul, and other fruits of God's Spirit, is as vile hypocrisy and heresy as ever was in the ancient heretics. And therefore you can never shift yourselves from the condemnation of this text, except you leave your wicked heresies.

CHAPTER 3.

5. A marvellous impudent and foolish corruption, to make image and idol all one. A great corruption I promise you to express a Greek word, by a Latin or English word. For that εἰδωλον signifieth an image, not only all the new dictionaries do testify, but also the ancient Greek lexicons of Hesychius and Phavorinus, and so is the word used by Plato, Homer, and all other ancient writers. But if there be so great difference between idols and images, why do you translate out of your Latin, which is *servitus simulachrorum*, the service of images, contrary to your Latin, calling the service of idols? if you will stand in argument with us, that *simulachrum* signifieth the same that εἰδωλον doth in Greek, and not that εἰκων, the use of all the learned authors in the Latin tongue, is against you, and Tully, the father of Latin eloquence, which oftentimes useth the word *simulachrum* for the same that is otherwise called *imago* or *effigies*. One or two examples, I will bring for many, *pro Archia,*

he saith, standing images, and other images are not similitudes or images of the minds but of the bodies. Against Verres, he nameth the shape and image of Mithridates. Lactantius, an eloquent Christian, calleth men, the living images of God, where you must translate the living idols of God, it is this your translation be true. Peronius a popish Friar in *Dionysius, de celest. Hierarch. lib. 1. c. 1.* for the Greek word εἰκων translateth *simulachra*, which if you should understand for an idol, would make a mad meaning of Dionysius. Why spiritual idolatry, may not be called spiritual worshipping of images, I greatly marvel, though it seem to you never so ridiculous. For there is spiritual worship as well as bodily, and spiritual images as well as bodily images, though you laugh till your spleen ache. But yours is the blind heresy, which worshippeth them that have eyes and see not, and by the judgment of God and the prophet's execration, are become like unto those whom you worship, that is having eyes and see not, for who is so blind as he that will not see?

10. We know there is in the regenerate a quality inherent of justice, inchoated and imperfect, by which we are not justified before God, but only by the justice of Christ imputed to us through faith: whereby our sins are hid and covered from the sight of God's justice. Yet so that they are forgiven and removed from us, as far as the east is from the west: and not remain still in us, as you falsely say we affirm, after baptism, although corruption of our nature which is of original sin doth remain in us during our natural life. And our renovation is begun in regeneration, not perfected until after this life. And that doth Augustin expressly affirm, in the first place, whither you send us. "For not from that hour in which every man was baptized, all his old infirmity is consumed, but renovation beginneth of the remission of all sins." And the same argument he holdeth, against Julianus the Pelagian as appeareth by these words. "Although in baptism be performed full remission of sins, yet there hath remained wherein we might profit to a better wrestling to be watchfully and continually exercised, against the troops of evil desires, rebelling within us, for which it is said, even to them that are baptized, mortify your members which are upon the earth." &c.

21. Retribution of the heavenly inheritance is not the wages merited by good and faithful service done to men, as unto God, but it is the reward promised and freely given to God's children, of his mere grace and mercy, by which they are made his children, and so have interest unto his inheritance: and yet it is truly and duly rendered, because it is promised.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE THESSALONIANS.

### CHAPTER 1.

6. Paul requireth, that men be no otherwise followers of him, than he is of Christ, 1 *Cor.* 11. 1, but by following him learn to follow Christ. Neither doth he set up for this purpose a new order, rule, or religion of Paulians, as you do of Franciscans, Dominicans, &c., but exhorteth all Christians together, to this kind of imitations, whereas your sects and new religions, do make divisions among Christians. How can such diversity of sects among you bring men to the imitation of Christ, which was but one? wherefore your Popish religions have a vain pretence to follow Christ by following a man's rule, when they leave the rule of Christ, which is expressed in his holy word, and is common to all Christians.

9. Our translation is according to the true signification of the word, and this text maketh as much against Papists, as other idolaters; when they are turned from serving the living and true God, to worship dead idols of Christ and his saints.

### CHAPTER 2.

12. Since God caused the scripture first to be written, there is no doctrine to be counted the word of God, but that which is contained in the scripture. So were all the preachings of Paul contained in the scriptures of the Law and the prophets, before he did put any word of them in writing, as he testifieth, *Acts* 25. 22. And whatsoever the lawful apostles, pastors, and priests of God do preach in the unity of the church, is no otherwise to be taken for God's own word, but as it is consonant and agreeable unto the holy scriptures, and for the substance of doctrine contained in them. Else are they no better than the doctrines and traditions of men.

16. A poor shift of descent, to excuse your blasphemous confidence in the merit of creatures. Paul calleth the Thessalonians his hope, joy, and crown, &c., because he hopeth to have joy and reward for his labour, bestowed in their conversion, according to the promise of God. Show the like promises if you can, for salvation to be obtained by the merits of saints' prayers, or else you cannot without

blasphemy, in any sense, call creatures your hope, and much less have special confidence in their prayers. The apostle speaketh this, in respect of his love toward them, therefore Theodoret saith, "Because he likened himself to a mother which cherisheth her children, he also imitateth the words of mothers, which are wont to call their young children their hope, their joy, and such like. Chrysostom saith, "Do you not acknowledge these words to be the words of women, which being inflamed with love, speak after this manner to their young children?" Ambrose saith, "The perfection of the scholars, is the joy and crown of the master."

### CHAPTER 4.

10. In that justification wherein they are declared to be just which is by good works, they ought to proceed and increase: but in justification by faith they cannot proceed, because they are perfectly just by the righteousness of Christ. "For he which hath believed, is as just as he that hath fulfilled the whole law. He that believeth in Christ hath the perfection of the law." *Amb. in 10. ad Rom.*

10. The commandments of God uttered by man are to be received not as the commandments of man but of God. Paul speaketh of the express commandments of God. All other precepts of the church, or our pastors, are to be received, if they be agreeable to the word of God, and not otherwise. For otherwise they be not of the Holy Ghost, but of men only.

### CHAPTER 5.

21. The spirit of the true Catholic Church, is the spirit whereby the scriptures were inspired. Therefore by the scriptures we shall try whether they boast truly of the spirit. For all Heretics challenge the Catholic Church as well as the spirit, but by the scriptures they are confounded. Therefore Ambrose saith upon this text: "What things soever do agree to the sayings of the apostles, and of our Lord himself, those things are to be accounted well said, or blessed, and to be retained; but from those things which are seen to be contrary to faith we must abstain."

## ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE THESSALONIANS.

Paul speaketh of no unwritten traditions. For these that he speaketh of, though they were not written in his Epistles to the Thessalonians, yet they were written in other Epistles, or in the gospels, or at least in the law and the prophets. As that commandment

of tradition which he mentioned, *cap* 3, that the poor ought to labour for their living, if they be able to work, is the commandment of God, Thou shalt not steal: for they that eat not their own bread, do steal their living.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE THESSALONIANS.

## CHAPTER I.

3. The apostle doth never assure men to merit the kingdom of God by constancy in persecution, but only to look for it assuredly upon the certainty of God's promises, which are grounded upon his grace and mercy in Christ not upon our merit.

5. The Greek word signifieth to be counted worthy, which is of God's free acceptance by grace, and not of the merit of our constancy. And whereas you say, we have so translated it ourselves, I confess it is an imperfection in our translations, for it should be, that our God would vouchsafe you, or count you worthy, as in this place. But because the making worthy is referred to God, our translators were not so careful of the term, seeing it might be understood, that God by his grace maketh us worthy in his account. Nevertheless, howsoever our translators have gone awry in that verse 11, you have falsely translated your own Latin text, which is *dignetur*, that our God would vouchsafe or accept as worthy. For you are never able to prove that *dignari* signifieth to make worthy, as you have wilfully corrupted the text, to make it serve your heresy. And whereas the apostle saith further, it is God's justice to repay glory to the afflicted, it is not for the merits of the affliction, but for the performance of his promise.

10. A wise comparison, to show that Christ is glorified, where he is despoiled of the glory of his office of Mediator and Advocate, which by you is communicated to Saints. And when his Saints are worshipped like idols with superstition after your own invention, and not according to the holy scriptures.

## CHAPTER 2.

3. Augustin did read *refuga*, which signifieth a revolter, which error of his translation caused him to think the defection and the revelation of Antichrist to be all one, although the defection pertain to the revelation of Antichrist, as you say rightly. But this apostacy, say you, by the judgment in a manner of all ancient writers, is the general forsaking and fall of the Roman empire. Indeed most of the ancient fathers did judge, that the Roman empire should first be decayed, before Antichrist were revealed, and that agreeth most aptly to the revelation of the Pope to be Antichrist, who was not revealed before the See of the empire was removed from the city of Rome, whereby it ceased to be the empire of Rome, and also was decayed and divided into many parts, as Tertullian saith, "Who shall be taken away but the Roman state? whose departing being dispersed into ten Kings, shall bring in Antichrist." By ten, according to the custom of the scripture, are meant many. And so was there many kingdoms made of the Roman empire, before the pope openly usurped Antichristian tyranny. Yet not all the ancient

fathers, nor all whom you cite, do so understand this revolt. Chrysostom upon this text, *Hom. 3*, saith, "what is that he calleth here defection? He calleth Antichrist himself the defection, as he which should destroy and carry away very many. Inasmuch, saith he, that if it were possible, even the elect should be offended." You see Chrysostom calleth Antichrist the defection, in respect of the great multitude that he shall carry away from Christ. That you quote, *Hom. 4*, is upon another text, of him that shall be taken away, namely, the Roman empire, agreeing with that which Tertullian said. Hierom indeed saith, the defection to be from the Roman empire, and so doth Ambrose. But Augustin, as I said before, reading instead of apostacy or defection, *refuga*, which is an apostate or revolter, doth expound it of Antichrist himself, saying, "He calleth him a revolter, namely, from the Lord God; which if it may be rightly said of all the ungodly, how much more of him?" That which he saith after, of taking away the Roman empire, pertaineth to the 7th verse. Theodoret also upon this place, saith, "The defection he calleth Antichrist himself, giving him a name of the thing itself. For his endeavour is to bring from the truth, and to cause men to revolt. Primasius hath divers interpretations; the first is, that departing, saith he, is a forsaking of the truth. Oecumenius saith, "He calleth the defection Antichrist himself, because he shall separate many from Christ, or else he saith, the apostacy or defection is a separation from God." The same in effect hath Theophylact, *9. Basil, ep. 60*, who judgeth that the heresy of the Arians was the beginning of this apostacy. Therefore you see divers of the ancient fathers understand this revolt to be from Christ, from God, from the truth. Then was it no such presumption in Calvin to refuse the one sort, whom without contempt he calleth learned and witty, and to receive the other, whom he judged to interpret more agreeable to the truth. For whereas you say, he refuseth the other, because their exposition agreeth not with his blasphemous fiction, that the pope should be Antichrist. Indeed, his opinion is blasphemous against your Lord God the pope, but against the God of Heaven, and his Son Jesus Christ it is not, nor any fiction, but a true interpretation. And although the word apostacy do rather signify a defection from Christ, than from the Roman empire, yet even that defection from the Roman empire agreeth as fitly as is possible, with this exposition, that the pope is Antichrist. For the pope was not openly revealed to be Antichrist, before the Roman empire was forsaken, and divided into many kingdoms, all subject to the pope. This apostacy therefore is rightly interpreted to be a wicked revolting from God, of the greatest multitude of men, and is called of

Calvin, a certain general defection of the visible church, which being hardly builded, was by the tyranny and subtlety of Antichrist overthrown, as a house with a sudden tempest, and lay long in the ruins. Yet the spiritual house of Christ, the church of his elect, even among those ruins, was marvelously preserved by his grace, and never perished out of the world. Which, as Calvin doth oftentimes affirm, so is it not contrary to the general apostacy or defection here spoken of. For this revolt is but of hypocrites, which falsely professed the truth, and in their life and doctrine denied the power thereof, who seem to be the church and are not. Neither doth Calvin, Wickliff, or Luther, &c., use any collusion of words, to hide the matter, but plainly speak, that you may understand them if you list, when they say, the true church of Christ is perpetual, and yet there was a certain general apostacy of the visible church, that is, of the greatest multitude of men which seemed to be the church by outward profession, but wanting faith, was not the true church of Christ, and therefore being seduced with error, revolted unto Antichrist. That you speak of their variety and contrariety in this matter, is but a fit of your ordinary railing without reason or argument to prove your saying.

We hold no defection or revolt of the true church, but of that which seemed to be the church and was not, while it had nothing of Christianity, but an outward profession in name and ceremonies. For we acknowledge that the true church, though obscure, and as it were driven into the wilderness by the tyranny of Antichrist, yet still continued dispersed over the world, to be the glorious spouse of Christ, no less in his account when it was persecuted, than when it enjoyed peace and tranquillity. Neither doth Augustin refute this opinion, but the heresy of the Donatists, which said that the church was perished out of all the world, except only from Africa where they were. Which opinion of theirs, your Popish heresy resembleth, affirming that the church is perished out of all the world, except where your pope doth sit and bear rule. Contrariwise, we hold with Augustin, that God hath the Church of his elect in all parts of the world, wheresoever the substance of Christian faith unto salvation is truly taught, though it be not free from all spot of errors, or wheresoever there are but two or three gathered together in Christ's name, though it be in Rome, under the most cruel persecution of Antichrist. We acknowledge with Augustin, that the true church shall not fail to the world's end; that it did not fail in the time of Antichrist, nor was driven into any corner of the world; but was, is, and shall be always dispersed in many nations. Yea this apostacy of many which seemed to be members of the church, is acknowledged by Augustin himself, and many other ancient fathers. And even in these places that you quote, *De unitate Ecclesie*, where he confuteth the Donatists, that said,

the church was perished out of all the world, and remained only in Africa, he acknowledgeth the paucity of the godly, in respect of the wicked, *cap. 12*, saying, "We do not so say, that the church is spread over the whole world, that only good men are in the sacraments of the church, and not also evil men, and those also many more, that in comparison of them, the good are but few, whereas by themselves they make a great number: and *cap. 13*, the saying of Christ, shall the Son of Man find faith? which the Donatists wrested to prove the apostacy of the whole world, he confesseth to be meant of the great abundance of the wicked, and fewness of the good, because iniquity shall abound, and charity shall wax cold. Likewise *De civitate lib. 20. cap. 8*, where he saith, "that the church which is predestinated and elected before the constitution of the world shall not be seduced when the devil is loosed. In which time of Antichrist, it is to be believed, that there shall not want at that time, either they which may fall from the church, or which may come to the church. As first the church was multiplied of all nations, according to the prophecies, so it is to be confessed, that the charity of many doth wax cold, when iniquity aboundeth, also that many shall give place to the universal and greatest persecutions, and subtleties of the devil, when he shall be loosed." In the rest of the places quoted, there is nothing else, but that the church hath not perished out of all the world, and remained in Africa alone, that Christians shall continue to the end of the world, that the church of Christ which is Christ's inheritance, shall never have an end. All which may well stand with the apostacy or general defection of the visible church, or that which seemed to be the church, here prophesied from the faith of Christ. Hierom against the Luciferians, saith, "That Christ should be too poor, if either he had no church, or if he had his church only in Sardinia. If Satan possess Britain, France, the East, the people of India, the barbarous nations, and the whole world at once, how are the trophies of the cross brought to a corner of all the earth! Forsooth the mighty adversary hath granted to Christ, Spain and the Celtiberians, which are pale coloured men, and disdained to possess the province of the Ethiopians." This he said against those heretics, which said, all the world was the devil's, and of the church was made a stew. This maketh nothing against us, which certainly believe the Catholic church, though we see it not with our bodily eyes, nor limit it to any one place, or any few places. But that the church should never be hidden, nor the true members driven into corners, to avoid the persecution of Antichrist: nor that there should be no revolt of the visible church, from the faith of Christ to the fables of Antichrist, you can never prove out of this saying.

So great is your desire to charge us with this apostacy, that you overthrow all that you said before, denying the revolt of the visible

church. For so you may be counted the true church, and we the Heretics and Antichrists, you are content to grant, that the greater revolt of kingdoms, people, and provinces from the church shall be fully achieved by Antichrist, which is that general defection and ruin of the visible church, which we speak of, notwithstanding that true Christians, when public intercourse of the faithful with the church shall cease, shall yet continue in obedience of the church. So that for the point of apostacy or defection, we are agreed. Let us see then whether this apostacy may so agree to you, as it cannot be applied to us. Which if it may be, then out of doubt you are the church of Antichrist, and not we.

To decide this controversy, who is better than Paul, who here prophesieth of the apostacy? The same apostle, *1 Tim.* 4, giveth such evident notes of this apostacy, as agree properly unto you, but not in anywise come near unto us. For after he had set forth that great mystery of religion or piety, consisting in the doctrine of Christ, which is God showed in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of the angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed in the world, and taken up in glory, which should always remain in the true church, which is the pillar and ground of truth: he addeth, that the Spirit speaketh not obscurely, but evidently and plainly, that in the latter time, some shall revolt from the faith, placing the chief religion and piety in abstinence from marriage and meats, and therefore forbidding both, speaking lies in hypocrisy, but attending to spirits of error and doctrine of devils. By which place, being an evident revelation of God's Spirit, it is manifest that this revolt from true religion is discerned by hypocritical abstinence and forbidding of marriage and meats, which you cannot deny to be done of you, to some men at all times, and to all men at some times, as you will have the times and persons to be counted more holy and religious, that observe your prohibitions. These therefore being given as evident notes, to know who they be that revolt from the faith, from the church, and from Christ, being found in you, do argue invincibly, that you are the defection, you are the apostacy, you are the revolvers, and not we, in whom no such thing can be proved. But by the way, you would bring us into great envy, for calling Peter's chair, the chair of pestilence, as the Donatists did. It is shame to lie upon the Devil, for the Donatists did not so call Peter's chair only, but all the apostolic chairs in the world. And therefore Augustin answereth: "If all men throughout the world, were such as thou dost most falsely charge them, what hath the chair of the church of Rome done unto thee, in which Peter sat, and in which at this day Anastasius doth sit? or of the chair of Jerusalem in which James sat, and in which John now sitteth, with whom we are knit in the Catholic unity, and from whom you have with wicked rage, separated yourselves? Why dost thou call the apostolic chair the chair of

pestilence? If for the men, whom thou thinkest to speak the law, and not to do it, did our Lord Jesus Christ for the Pharisees of whom he said, they say and do not, any injury to the chair in which they sat?" By this place it appeareth, that the Donatists bare not malice only against the chair of Peter, but against all other apostolic chairs, when they could not deny but that they which sat in them taught the doctrine of the apostles. By which it appeareth also, who sit in the apostolic chairs, namely, they that teach the doctrine of the apostles, as the Pharisees sitting in the chair of Moses. Not they that sleep where the apostles sometime taught, and much less they that teach things contrary to the doctrine of the apostles.

You affirm falsely, that Peter's See standeth still at Rome, when all other Apostolic Sees be gone. What should I speak of the churches of India, and Ethiopia, planted by the apostles, and continued even until this day? That the first bishops of Rome were true successors of the apostle, in teaching the substance of Christian faith truly, and suffering martyrdom for the same, it is no commendation of them which succeeded in place after, being in life and doctrine contrary unto the same. Where you say, the Heathen emperors were as afraid of them as if they had been competitors of the empire, it is false, neither doth Cyprian so say. But that the tyrant did more patiently hear of a competitor of the empire, to be set up against him, than of a priest of God to be appointed, after he had slain his predecessor: his malice therefore was greater, though his fear were none at all. Or as Pammelius doth read and understand it: Cornelius did more patiently tolerate the prince that was then his enemy, than Novatianus the priest that was his enemy or competitor. That the emperors did yield up the city of Rome to the pope, it cannot be proved by any lawful records, but that the pope usurped dominion of the city, after the emperors had lost the possession of Italy, the stories do testify. And albeit, the emperors, as well of Greece, as of Germany, retained the name and title of the emperors of Rome, yet were they not indeed emperors of Rome, when they possessed not the city of Rome, and therefore were more truly called the emperors of Constantinople, the emperors of Almain, than of Rome where neither of them both had dominion or obedience. So the tyranny of the pope came in place of the Roman empire. That the Christians honoured the memories of the apostles, whom the Heathen tyrants had slain, it pertaineth nothing to the dignity of the pope, that holdeth not the apostles' doctrine and humility: but that the later kings and emperors, which were become the horns of the beast, submitted their crowns and sceptres not only to such idols as the pope made of martyrs, but also to the very seat of that sinful man, it declareth him plainly to be the successor, neither of Christ, nor of Peter, nor of the holy martyrs the bishops of Rome, but to be the king of pride, that ex-

alteth himself above all princes that are set up by God's ordinance, and so above God himself. That the popedom hath continued eight or nine hundred years in worldly pomp and dignity, it agreeth also with the prophecies of the tyranny of Antichrist, whereas the church of Christ doth more flourish in spiritual glory, though it be in adversity, than in prosperity and worldly dignity. Whereas you challenge 1600 years of continuance, you must strike off almost 700 years of that account. For Gregory that more than 600 years after Christ, propheted constantly of the revelation of Antichrist to be at hand, testifieth, that "none of his predecessors usurped that profane, proud, sacrilegious, and Antichristian name of universal bishop," whereby Antichrist began openly to be revealed, *lib. 4. Epist. 30, and 38 &c.* And it was more than 300 years after that the efficacy of error did thoroughly prevail to the advancement of Antichrist in his highest pride and wickedness, when Sylvester the Second, by the devil himself, was set up in the seat of Antichrist, *Anno Christi 1000*, as is testified by stories even of Papists themselves, Benno Cardinalis, Petrus Præmonstr. Platina, Hermanus Shedel, &c. That which Augustin saith of standing sure, notwithstanding the barking of Heretics about it, is the Catholic Church, and not the See of Rome: and yet all former heresies have made a way for the kingdom of Antichrist. The first Heathen emperors could not prevail again against the church of Christ, and therefore the church of Rome continued in their greatest persecutions: but the Goths, Vandals, Alaricens, Gensericus, Attila, and others that wasted the Roman empire, prepared an entrance to the revelation of Antichrist, who, as Chrysostom and other ancient writers say, invaded the Roman empire, after it was overthrown and laid waste by these barbarous enemies. As for other kings and princes, that lived since the manifestation of Antichrist, they have served as vassals to maintain his usurped tyranny, howsoever they had emulation amongst themselves: yea their mutual wars and divisions have greatly augmented his tyrannical dominion. And although the pride, cruelty, filthiness, and all other vices of the popes have been greater and more notorious than of any Heathen tyrants: yet their tyranny by the just judgment of God, for the punishment of the contemners of his gospel, hath continued to this day. And to put you in more comfort, Antichrist shall in some sort continue, even until the coming of our Saviour Christ to judgment. And hereof it is, that some of you have been bold to affirm, that although the See of Rome should be utterly overthrown, as you have just cause to fear the accomplishment of the prophecies of the utter destruction of the whore of Babylon, yet the pope shall be bishop of Rome, and Peter's successor, though he remove his seat to Calcutta. Where, if he forget to bring his triple crown with him, he may borrow that which the idol of the devil there worshipped doth wear, not much differing in fashion from his.

3. The scripture calleth not foreign persecutors Antichrists, though they be enemies of Christ, but such as went out from us, being none of us, 1 *John 2. 19.* as all heretics and false teachers: yet not every heretic is that great Antichrist, but he which above all other doth most impugn Christ, and prevail most to the seducing of the wicked unto their destruction. And this great Antichrist, to discharge the pope of being the same, you affirm to be one special and singular man, and not one state, kingdom, and succession of men therein, as the papacy is, whereby the tyranny of Antichrist is upholden and continued, even until the coming of Christ. Let us see then upon what ground this your affirmation standeth, which being overthrown, we shall plainly prove out of the scriptures, that the great Antichrist is not one singular man, but a whole state or kingdom of men, continuing under one head by succession, whereunto also we will join the testimony of the most ancient and best approved writers of the primitive church. You say, the Heathen Emperors, Turks, and Heretics were many, therefore they could not be this one great Antichrist. Although for Heathens and Turks, your conclusion is true, yet it followeth not of your argument, which taketh that for proof which is the whole matter in question. The Heathen persecutors and Turks, are altogether without the church: Antichrist must sit in the visible church of God. Other heretics as you confess, are but limbs and members of that body of impiety, whereof the great Antichrist is the head or chief. But it is a main reason, that "by the article always added in Greek, is signified one special and singular man." But this is so false, that children which have scarce tasted of the Greek tongue, are able to disprove it by infinite examples, *Lukr 4. 4. ο ανθρωπος*, man shall not live by bread only, *Mark 2. 27.* The Sabbath was made *δια του ανθρωπου, και ο ανθρωπος* for man, and not man for the Sabbath, *2 Tim. 3. 17.* That the man of God *ο του θεου ανθρωπος* may be perfect, *Mat. 12. 35. ο αγαθος ανθρωπος, ο πονηρος ανθρωπος* a good man, an evil man, *1 John 2. 18.* in one verse *ο αντιχριστος* and *αντιχριστοι πολλοι*, Antichrist, and many Antichrists, *Mat. 5. 25. ο αντιδικος* the adversary, *John 10. 10. ο κλεπτης*, the chief, verse 12. *ο μισθωτος*, the hireling. Your next reason is, "the direct and peculiar opposition of Antichrist unto Christ's person, *John 5. 43.* and that he shall be received of the Jews as their Messias:" but no such thing can be proved out of that text. The tribe of Dan, from whence he shall be born, *Genesis 49. 17.* but that is a weak conjecture, and cannot be proved out of the text. For help therefore you alledge the testimony of the fathers. Irenæus, *lib. 5.* who conjectureth out of Hierom, 8. 16. that Antichrist should come from the tribe of Dan, where the prophet speaketh of the coming of Nebuchadnezzar, by the city called Dan as even Hierom doth expound the place. Another conjecture is, that the tribe of Dan is not numbered in the Apocalypse, with them that are saved, *Apocalypse 7.* The cause is mani-

fest, for that the tribe of Levi, supplieth the twelfth place, which in the account of the church was not to be omitted. But hereof we may not infer, that none of the tribe of Dan were saved, and much less, that Antichrist should be born of this tribe. Ireneus therefore doth not ground upon this conjecture, but showeth immediately, how we are to judge both of his, and other ancient fathers' conjectures, concerning Antichrist, namely, as the event shall approve them. "Therefore," saith he, "it is more certain, and without danger, to tarry until the fulfilling of the prophecy, than to suspect and guess of any names." Next to Ireneus you place Hierom, in *Dan. 11*, who saith not that Antichrist should be of the tribe of Dan, but that Christian interpreters did expound that place of Daniel of Antichrist, "which to arise of a small nation, that is, by the people of the Jews, and shall be so base and contemptible, that princely honour shall not be given unto him, but by craft and subtlety, he shall obtain principality, so that the arms of the warlike people of Rome shall be overcome and broken by him. And this he shall do, because he shall counterfeit, that he is the captain or chief of the covenant, that is, of the law and testament of God." There is nothing in this saying, which may not be applied to the pope, who, as all that profess Christianity, proceeded first from the Jews, after by craft and hypocrisy, subverted the Roman empire, and invaded the tyranny. Hierom saith not, that Antichrist shall be born of the tribe of Dan or be a Jew by nation, but that he is to arise of the contemptible nation of the Jews. Augustin saith no more, but that it was thought, Antichrist should arise of the tribe of Dan. Therefore this surmise hath no ground in the Scriptures, and but a faint conjecture of the ancient fathers. The note of Antichrist's name, *Apocalypse* 13. 18, being the number of the beast, doth plainly prove, that Antichrist is no singular man: for the beast signifieth by all interpreters, in a manner, the Roman empire, in which Antichrist succeedeth the heathen and heretical persecutors. And the number of his name is contained in *λατεινος*. The Latin man, not only because he sitteth at Rome, the chief city of the Latin empire, but because his tyranny is chief in the Latin church, and enforceeth the public exercise of religion to be in Latin: yea generally he hath brought all civil contracts of buying and selling in the Latin tongue. And this was thought very like to be the name of Antichrist by Ireneus, almost 1400 years ago: for among o her names that he mentioned, he saith, *Sed et Lateinos, &c.* "But even the name *Lateinos* hath the number of 666. And it is very like to be the true name: for that which is most truly a kingdom, hath that name, for they are Latins which now reign." You see plainly by the judgment of Ireneus, that it is not necessary to understand this text, or any in the scripture so, that Antichrist must be one singular man, but rather one kingdom, of which every king or chief ruler is Antichrist.

The time of his revelation is not appointed so near the world's end, but the time of his destruction by the coming of Christ: his reign is not called short, but in comparison of the large and eternal reign of Christ: as the time of the coming of Christ to judgment is accounted short in God's judgment, to whom a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years. By his feigned miracles, or any figure of him in the scripture, it cannot be proved that he is a singular man. Now therefore, let us see out of the scriptures, how it can be proved, that Antichrist is not one singular person. Most evident out of this text, where it is said, that the man of sin shall be revealed, whereby it may be rightly gathered, as John also plainly saith, that Antichrist was even then, but he was not revealed, or openly showed, but closely carried about in many of his members. Paul saith, verse 7th. The mystery of iniquity doth even now work, and shall not be utterly destroyed, before the second coming of Christ. Seeing therefore, it is impossible that one man could have continuance from the Apostles' time to the day of judgment, it is manifest that Antichrist is no one singular man, but a continual succession of heretics, first secretly, and after openly, advancing themselves against Christ, and God his Father. Hereto agree the most clear testimonies of John, *1 John* 2. 22. "Who is a liar, but he who denieth that Jesus is Christ, the same is Antichrist, which denieth the Father and the Son. Every one that denieth the Son, hath not the Father." This note, as it doth agree to all heretics, so principally to the pope, who denieth the offices of Christ, as other heretics had denied his person. *1 John* 4. 3. "Every spirit which confesseth not Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God, and the same is the spirit of Antichrist, which you have heard that he cometh, and now he is in the world." *2 John* verse 7th. "There are many deceivers entered into the world, which confess not Jesus Christ, that he is come in the flesh, the same is ο πλεως και ο αιτυχιωτος, the deceiver, and the Antichrist." Mark that many deceivers, are the deceiver, and the Antichrist with the Greek article. *1 John* 2. 18. "Little children this is the last time, and as you have heard that ο αιτυχιωτος, the Antichrist cometh, even now there are many Antichrists." Therefore Antichrist is no one, but many, and his coming not deferred until within the three years and a half of the end of the world, as the Papists by gross understanding of the mystical time, described in the *Apocalypse*, would have it: but he was come in mystery, and secretly, even in the Apostles' time, and that mystery, by the malice and subtlety of Satan, which is the spirit of Antichrist, ceased not to work, until the open and plain revelation of his pride was publicly professed in the Papacy. Now for the opinion of the ancient fathers, you heard before, that Ireneus thought it very likely to be true of a whole kingdom of Latins: and therefore it was not proper to one singular man. Hierom, in the place by you quoted,

acknowledging that all that were not of the communion of Damasus, which professed the divinity of Christ, belonged to Antichrist, doth plainly avouch, that Antichrist was in his time no singular man, but the body of all heretics, the enemies of Christ, whose head was not yet revealed. So in the other place, they that have new names, after any man in the author of their doctrine, as Arians, Donatists, Papists, be Antichrist. Calvinists, Zuinglians, &c. be but names of reproach, invented as the like were by your predecessors, the old Heretics, Athanasians, Alexandrians, Joanites, &c.

That it is not the sentence of Irenæus and Hierom I have showed plainly out of their own words; now it remaineth, that we inquire what other ancient fathers thought upon the matter. Augustin testifieth, that according to the judgment of some fathers before him, the mystery of iniquity is understood of evil men and hypocrites, which are in the church, until they come to so great a number, as may make a great people for Antichrist, &c. according to the testimony of 1 *John* 2. whereby Antichrist by their judgment can be no singular man. Yea some understood, as he saith, not only the prince himself, but his whole body, that is the multitude of men pertaining to him, together with their prince to be Antichrist. *De civit. cap.* 19. Chrysostom upon this place, *Hom.* 3, applying the text of *Matt.* 21. 21. of many false Christs and false prophets, able to deceive the elect, if it were possible, to Antichrist, signifieth that it is not necessary to take Antichrist for one singular man. Also, *Homil.* 4, where he showeth that Antichrist shall come in place of the Roman Empire, as the Roman Empire came in place of the Macedonian, the Macedonian of the Persian, the Persian of the Median, the Median of the Babylonian, he likewise signifieth, that Antichrist is a kingdom continued by succession, as all the rest were whom he nameth. Primasius interpreting this text, by *Matthew* 24. 24, declareth, that he thought Antichrist to be no one singular person. Tertullian against Marcion, *lib.* 5. saith, "who is that man of sin, son of perdition? &c. After our opinion, Antichrist; as the old and new prophecies do teach, as John the evangelist saith, that Antichrists are already gone forth into the world, spirits, forerunners of Antichrist." Cyprian, *de Epist.* 76, saith, "that all the Lord's adversaries are Antichrists." Rufinus, *exposit. symboli* applying also that text, *Matt.* 24. 24, to the coming of Antichrist declareth, that he thought not Antichrist to be one singular man. Therefore it is not the common sentence of all the ancient Fathers, that Antichrist should be one singular person. Seeing therefore it is manifest by the scripture, that Antichrist is the whole body of Christ's enemies, unto the end of the world, wherein there is yet a principal head to be openly revealed, why should it be counted a foolish paradox, that the pope is Antichrist? You say, because he is Christ's chief minister. A sound argument, if it were not all that is in controversy. But Beza you say, "pricketh so high, that he maketh this

great Antichrist to have been in Paul's days, though he was not open to the world." Verily Beza saith none otherwise than Paul himself, and John say. But who should that be, you say, God knoweth, except he mean Peter, because he was the first of the order of popes. But Beza expresseth his meaning plainly, when he saith, "heretics and false Apostles that craftily and closely went about to make a defection from Christ," and therefore as it is malicious, so a most foolish and senseless surmise, that he should mean of Peter, who was none of the order of these popes, which are now Antichrists. But you are "sure that except Peter were Antichrist, neither the whole order, nor any of the order can be Antichrist." You can never prove, that Peter was of that order of Popes, that now are Antichrists: you say they are Peter's lawful successors in dignity, and in the truth of Christ's religion. This indeed you say but when shall it be proved; that Peter ever took upon him to dispense against the Law of God, to usurp authority above earthly princes, to make articles of faith, &c. a hundred like matters that the pope doth and hath done? whereof all the papists, the limbs of Antichrist alive and dead, neither could or can ever prove, that the Apostle Peter did, or taught any thing like. Where Beza saith, that divers of the ancient Catholic fathers unawares served towards the setting up of the great Antichrist, it cannot be denied, when they yielded too much to the usurped claim of the bishops of Rome, who long before the revelation of Antichrist, the mystery of iniquity working greatly in that see, exalted themselves, as Socrates testifieth, "beyond the limits of priesthood, into foreign dominions," and yet challenged a great deal more than they could obtain of the ancient Catholic fathers: and for all that by many degrees less than the popes, when they openly showed themselves to be Antichrists, did openly take upon them. But there is, belike, a great contradiction between that which I wrote against Sanders Rock, of Gregory and Leo, and that which was uttered by the bishop of Sarum at Paul's cross. whereas, if any reasonable man will compare both our sayings, he shall find no repugnance at all in them. The bishop spake of those points, wherein Leo and Gregory, which also he declared in that sermon, taught contrary to the papists, my writing was of their error concerning Peter's greater dignity, than the holy scriptures doth allow him. Which error had taken root by long continuance of time, because the mystery of iniquity had wrought in the see of Rome five hundred years before the time of Leo and Gregory. This is counted a malapert and impudent part, to place the see of Antichrist, working in the see of Rome, even in Peter's time, and to make these two holy fathers great workers and furtherers of the same. Indeed furtherers I make them, as Beza doth many others, yet unawares, while they saw not whereunto the mystery tended, especially the elder. As for the other, when he foresaw the revelation of Antichrist, he hindered it to his



power: but I make them not willing and witting workers and furtherers of the mystery of iniquity. The chief matter is, whether the mystery of iniquity did work in the see of Rome in Peter's time. That it did work in Peter's time, the text of Paul is plain. That it did work at Rome, where Antichrist should be openly showed, John is plain in the Revelation, 17. 9, 18. The ancient fathers, Tertullian, Hierom, Augustin, &c. testify that Rome is Babylon, the See of Antichrist. And many of the old Fathers suspected that Nero was Antichrist, who was emperor of Rome in Peter's time. Yea the papists themselves confessing that Peter in his epistle, called Rome Babylon, must needs grant, that Rome is the See of Antichrist and that the mystery of Antichrist did work there, even in Peter's time or else why should he call it Babylon? Now that this mystery did work in the Church of Rome, where Antichrist was to be openly showed, how can it be denied? seeing it did work in other churches. If Simon Magus, the father of heretics, as papists confess, first broached his heresy at Rome, and there contended with Peter, as it were for the chief place of the church, did not the mystery of Antichrist begin in the See of Rome, even in Peter's time? Again, when there were schisms at Corinth, one saying I am of Cephas, I am of Paul, &c. might not the like be at Rome? but all this while, you will say, Peter's chair was free from these mysteries of iniquity. I do willingly confess, that Peter himself, and many godly bishops were utter enemies to Antichristian pride; and therefore I do not place the mystery of iniquity in the See of Rome precisely in Peter's time, but near the same, which in process of time, began by little and little to show itself. As when Anicetus contended with Polycarp about the celebration of Easter, yet with more modesty than Victor, who excommunicated the bishops of Asia, because they would not consent with him in the same ceremony. Cornelius and Stephen were good men, and martyrs: yet by Cyprian, Firmilian, and many others, they were thought to take too much upon them, in the question of rebaptism, although their cause was better. Also in admitting the complaints of fugitive heretics that were judged and excommunicated in Africa. Much more the ambitious titles challenged by the See of Rome, were disliked and condemned in the Council of Carthage, 3. c. 26. "that the bishop of the first See, be not called prince of priests, or highest priest, or any such thing, but only bishop of the first See." Whereunto Gratian, 1. *Distinct.* 99, addeth, "as for universal, let not the bishop of Rome himself be called." After this, appeals were forbidden unto the See of Rome, under pain of excommunication, *cont. Milvianum cap. 22. et conc. Afric. cap. 92.* To heal which wound the bishops of Rome, Zosimus and Celestinus, obtruded to the bishops of Africa, a forged canon of the Council of Nice, which by true copies of the Nicene Council, sent from Cyril of Alexandria, and Atticus of Constantinople,

was discovered, *Ep. conc. Afric. ad Celestinum.* After this, Leo by his legates, and his epistles to Martinian and Fulcheria, *Ep. 54.* and 55, laboured to hinder the decree of the general Council of Chalcedon, whereby the bishop of Constantinople was made equal with the bishop of Rome, under pretence of defending the privileges granted to the See of Alexandria, and of Antioch, by the Council of Nice. But notwithstanding all his practice and endeavour, the General Council of Chalcedon concluded against him, that the bishop of Constantinople should be his equal in all things. Whereupon John bishop of Constantinople being lifted up in pride, was not content to be fellow with the bishop of Rome, but would be his superior: yea would translate the authority of all bishops unto his own See and person, by taking upon him the title of universal bishop. Which when Gregory bishop of Rome perceived, after he could not prevail with him by admonition, he declared him openly to be the forerunner of the great Antichrist: for thus he writeth. "But in this his pride, what other thing is signified, but that the times of Antichrist are even now at hand? because he imitateth him which despising the legions of angels in equal joy, assayed to break out in the top of singularity, saying, I will exalt my throne above the stars of heaven, &c., *lib. 4. ep. 34.* "All things are done which were foreshowed. The king of pride is at hand, and that which is a vile thing to be spoken, an army of priests is prepared for him, because they that were appointed to be chief in humility, do serve as soldiers under pride and arrogance," *lib. 4. epist. 38.* Thus have we proved by the holy scriptures, and the testimonies of many ancient fathers, that Antichrist is no one singular man; that Rome is the place appointed for his sovereign seat: that the time of his revelation was at hand nine hundred years ago; that he exercised his Antichristian pride, especially by the clergy, which are his guard or army: that the universal authority which he usurpeth by the name of universal bishop, is the pride of Lucifer, whereof Antichrist is king. These three last points no Papist can deny, except he will affirm, that the bishop of Rome erred in so great matters of faith, as are the revelation of Antichrist, the description of his qualities and instruments, and the authority of the See of Rome.

4. As a hypocrite he prayeth to Christ and saints, yet in his blasphemous doctrine and decrees he exalteth himself above all that is called God, or worshipped. Even so he calleth himself servant of servants, yet maketh slaves of all kings that will submit themselves under his tyranny, making them to kiss his feet, and to hold his stirrup, and when he rideth in Pontificalibus, to wait upon him as his vassals, treading upon the Emperor's neck, deposing of emperors and kings at his pleasure.

4. There is nothing in this chapter to prove that Antichrist shall not permit any God to be worshipped but only himself. The apos-

tle saith no more, but that he shall exalt himself above all that is called God, or worshipped, which he shall do under colour and pretence of the service of God and Christ, else could he never prevail to deceive any Christians. Neither is there any thing to prove, that he shall deceive the incredulous Jews only or principally, but rather those that profess the Christian religion in word, which they do not believe in heart. Neither is it said, or can it be proved, that Christ shall come immediately after the revelation of Antichrist; but contrariwise it is said, that Christ shall consume him with the Spirit of his mouth, which is his holy word, and utterly abolish him with his glorious presence. He biddeth them not stick to any traditions of doctrine not written in the scripture, but to such as he had delivered both by preaching and writing, who preached no doctrine but that which is, and then was, contained in the holy scriptures.

4. That the great Antichrist came nine hundred years ago, you have heard by the testimony of Gregory. As for your other surmise, that he shall abolish the public exercise of all other religions true and false, saying that which must be done to himself, it hath no colour of reason out of the scripture, although it be true that Antichrist maketh account of no religion, yet under the colour of religion and God's service, he usurpeth all honour due to God. So saith Hieron, that Antichrist shall obtain his Antichristian exaltation, by counterfeiting that he is the captain or chief of the covenant, that is, of the law and testament of God, *Dan. cap. 11.* He shall not therefore abolish all religion true or false, or suffer none to be worshipped but himself, but by feigning that he is the chief of religion, and captain of God's covenant as the pope doth. He should by Hieron's judgment advance himself above all religion. And therefore although we be not bound to seek a figure of Antichrist in the blasphemous decree of Darius, yet the pope, not for a time, but perpetually decreeth, that none other in effect be acknowledged for God, but himself. Seeing he alone taketh upon him to dispense against the Law of God, which argueth that he arrogateth to himself authority above God the Lawmaker. For no Law can be dispensed withal, but either by the same authority by which it was made, or by a greater. Above Christ he exalteth himself, and his propheticall, kingly, and priestly office, not only in abrogating his institution of the supper of both kinds, and many other notorious matters, but also in granting full pardon of all sins, and absolving men both from the pain and the fault, which he denieth to have been done by Christ in the sacrifice of his death and passion. Yea, he deposeth Christ out of his eternal priesthood, by setting up another sacrifice and priesthood after the order of Melchisedec, whereby he protesteth against the sufficiency of the sacrifice and priesthood of Christ, and also maketh every one of his vile creatures, the mass priests,

superior to Christ, God and Man, whom they take upon them to offer to God his Father. Whereas Christ himself could not have offered that most acceptable sacrifice of himself, unless by his divine and eternal Spirit, he had been in some respect better than himself. Against the Holy Ghost he exalteth himself, blaspheming the scriptures inspired by him, to be imperfect and insufficient for the instruction of the Church, without his traditions and decrees, by pronouncing that to be profane, and forbidding as unholy, that which he hath sanctified, as marriage and meats, and giving special holiness to such creatures as he listeth. By usurping the office of the Holy Spirit, in applying the merits of Christ, and the effect of his passion, according to his pleasure, by his indulgences and pardons, and by sacraments and ceremonies of his own invention. Arrogating in all things the spirit of truth, that he cannot err, exempting himself from all mortal judgments, though he carry infinite thousands with him to hell! beside innumerable other blasphemings of proud speeches, doctrines and decrees, whereof his laws and religion are full. And therefore, although to blind the eyes of the simple, he hath some hypocritical title of humility to make some show of adoring God, in external and ceremonial manner, yet cannot he so dissemble his pride and contempt of God, but many times it breaketh forth into open blasphemy, as hath been noted in divers of them, but that which is notorious in all, and maintained by all, cannot be hidden. How in his greatest pomp the sacrament which he pretendeth to honour as God, is carried before him on his hackney, when he himself is carried on men's shoulders. How his throne is set above the altar. How the cross which must be carried on the right hand of Kings, swords or sceptres, because divine honour is due to it, as they say, is notwithstanding laid under his feet; how in the Jubilee he beateth open the gates of Paradise with a golden hammer, with a hundred more notes of Antichristian pride, expressed in the Pontificals, and practised in their solemnities.

4. Though some of the ancient fathers supposed that Antichrist should sit in the Temple at Jerusalem, yet they had no reason out of the word of God so to think. For the Temple of Solomon being utterly destroyed, though another like it should be builded according to this surmise, yet could it not be called the Temple of God. But the church of Christ is by the Apostle called the Temple of God. *1 Cor. 3. 16. 17. 2 Cor. 6. Apoc. 3. 12.* Wherefore the Apostle meaneth, that Antichrist shall sit in the visible Church of God, or that which is so called and commonly reputed, and there usurp divine authority. That "the abomination of desolation consisteth chiefly in abolishing the popish Mass," is a vain presumption without authority of the Scriptures, or testimony of the ancient fathers. For rather the Mass is an abomination that bringeth desolation, because it over-

throweth the virtue of the sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ, in which is the only comfort of all Christian men's consciences.

Now you confess, that by the judgment of Augustin and Hierom, Antichrist should sit in the church of Christ, rather than the Temple of Solomon. By Augustin, he should not only sit in the church of God, but take upon him with his retinue to be the only church of God. For thus he writeth, reporting the opinion of other men whereunto he giveth his assent. "Some will have not only the Prince or chief himself, but his whole body, that is, the multitude of men pertaining to him, to be understood in this place, together with their Prince, to be Antichrist. And think that it should be said more rightly in Latin, as it is in the Greek, that he should sit, not in the Temple of God, but as the Temple of God, as though he himself were the Temple of God, which is the church." There could nothing be said more properly of the Pope, who boasteth himself to be head and foundation of the church, and that there is none other church of God, but he and his body. Hierom saith: "He shall sit in the Temple of Jerusalem, as some think, or in the church, as we more truly judge." Neither are these fathers alone, but others of good credit joining with them. Chrysostom upon this text saith: "That Antichrist shall command himself to be worshipped instead of God, and to be placed in the Temple of God, not only at Jerusalem, but also in the churches. Theodoret saith: "He calleth the Temple of God, the church in which Antichrist shall arrogate unto himself the chief state, endeavouring to show himself as God." Primasius saith: "That which is called God, is the church, that which is worshipped, is the highest God. So that he shall sit in the Temple of God, boasting himself that he is God. That is, that he himself is the church: which is as if he should say, he sitteth as the Temple of God, boasting that he himself is the Temple of God, or he sitteth as God, boasting that he is God." This is out of the rules of Ticonius, out of which it is like that Augustin also took his judgment aforesaid. Severianus, *apud Oecumenium*, saith upon this text, "He speaketh not of the Temple of Jerusalem, but of the churches of God." So saith Theophylact, "Not in the Temple which is at Jerusalem, specially, but simply in the churches and in every Temple of God." Thus you see by the most and best approved authors' judgment, Antichrist should sit in the church of God, "But not as though he should be a chief member of the church of Christ, or a special part of his body mystical;" say you. Indeed Antichrist is no member or part of the church, or mystical body of Christ, yet he sitteth in the visible church, boasting himself to be the chief head thereof, yea as though he and his body were the church itself, as Augustin and Primasius testify: he taketh upon him the chief seat in the church, as Theodoret saith. Therefore all things agree so aptly to the Pope, as the great Antichrist can be no where

else found, but in his person and place. We do not therefore make the Pope a member of the church of Christ, but an enemy thereof, usurping tyranny above the church, and thereby declaring that he is Antichrist. Whereas John saith, that Antichrist and his precursors should go out of the church, it is true, and so is the Pope gone from the doctrine of the Apostles, and out of the church of Christ, whereof the bishops of Rome, his predecessors, were sometimes true members and servants of the church. But yet those heretics continued in the outward face of the church, and profession of Christianity, though they were never true members of the church and mystical body of Christ. Example of one of these Antichrists we may see in the proud prelate *Diotrephes*, that would not receive John himself, and usurped tyranny in the church, *3 John, verse 9*. The like is to be said of *Cerinthus*, and other heretics, that boasted of the church of Christ and Christianity, as the Pope doth, yet were enemies of the church, and no true members thereof. And even that which you affirm of Antichrist, is true of the Pope. For he is revolted from the Catholic church of Christ, and boasteth that he only and his are the church, and usurpeth upon the church by tyranny, and by challenging worship, religion, and government thereof. He is adored by the Popish churches, where his sacrilegious decrees are obeyed, above and against the laws of God, and so he sitteth in the Temple, and against the Temple of God, therefore by your own description, we may call him Antichrist.

Both these causes agree most aptly to the Pope: "For he impugneth Christ's kingdom in earth, that is his spiritual regimen, which he constituted and appointed in his church, and the form of government ordained therein, applying them to himself by singular tyranny and usurpation." All this and much more Gregory saith of him that usurpeth but the title of Universal Bishop. How much more doth it agree to the Pope, who doth not only make himself Prince of Bishops, and Preident of Ecclesiastical judgments, but taketh away all authority of bishops, and usurpeth all unto himself. "Far from all Christian men's hearts," saith he, "be this name of blasphemy, in which the honour of all Priests is taken away, while it is proudly challenged of one man to himself. *Lib. 4. Epist. 32. 34. 36. 38*. But that which is more properly the spiritual kingdom of Christ, than the external form of government in the church, the Pope impugneth. The other cause, for impugning Christ's Priesthood, doth most properly agree to the Pope, and specially for setting up and maintaining that horrible blasphemy of the sacrifice of the Mass, and communicating the Priesthood after the order of Melchisedec to all his shavelings, which is the special and singular dignity of Christ alone, *Ps. 1. 10. Heb. 7*. And lest we should seek further for the blasphemous exaltation of Antichrist, behold you are not afraid to say; "That the sovereignty of Christ in earth, consisteth only

in the two, the Pope's primacy, and the sacrifice of the Mass. Whereby you exclude all sovereignty of Christ governing his church on earth and every one of his elect by his Holy Spirit; ruling the same by his heavenly word, and subduing his enemies by his mighty power and providence, working effectually in the preaching of the gospel, and administration of his sacraments. You acknowledge the sovereignty of Christ to consist in nothing but in those two, wherein his sovereignty is most oppugned and blasphemed. What blasphemy is it to say, that the Priesthood of Christ is exercised only or most properly in earth, by the sacrifice of the Mass? As though Christ being ascended into heaven, after he hath by one sacrifice of himself once offered, made perfect forever all those that are sanctified, doth not only and most properly exercise his priesthood in his own person, which none else can exercise, because none else but he alone is able to save forever, those that by him come unto God, always living that he may make intercession for us, *Heb. 7. 24, 25.*

6. Augustin which saw not the fulfilling of this Prophecy, professeth his ignorance, as Ireneus doth in part: yet most of the ancient writers understand this "let," to be the Roman Empire, which so long as it stood, Antichrist could not possess the city of Rome, which was appointed for the seat of his tyranny, nor usurp such dominion as after that was taken away, he challenged. That we feign nothing upon this text is manifest, because we affirm nothing but that which the ancient fathers have said before us. Although because we see all these things openly revealed, which were to them more obscure, because they were not performed, we note the person more boldly, and clearly we pronounce of the fulfilling of this prophecy. That the mystery of iniquity is the covert working of heretics towards the manifestation of Antichrist himself, we agree with you. Whereas Antichrist the Pope openly blasphemeth the scriptures as insufficient, and notwithstanding the institution of Christ, depriveth the people of the Lord's blood: though he by his wicked life lead infinite thousands of souls to hell with him, most impudently boasteth that he is not to be reproved or judged of any man; braggeth that he cannot err; that he hath all laws in the closet of his breast; that he is above all laws; that his will is instead of reason, and such like matters which you cannot deny.

The other words the ancient fathers, for the most part, do expound of the Roman Empire, which was utterly subverted before Antichrist was in his highest exaltation, and now is nothing but a name and shadow of an Empire, and long since when it was of some power, ceased to be the Empire of Rome; when Antichrist had set up his kingdom there, and the Emperor had nothing but a bare name of the Empire of Rome. Yet Theodoret thinketh as Calvin doth, that this "let" should be the preaching of the Gospel

over all the world, which because it was promised by our Saviour Christ, must have been fulfilled before Antichrist, or the end of the world to come. Where you conclude, that all men perceive our doctrine and doings tend to plain Atheism and Antichristianism, it is nothing but impudent railing without any reason.

9. Beside the strange and wondrous works of Antichrist in removing the monarchy from Greece to France, and then to Germany, to the utter overthrow of it in both places, with divers other translations of kingdoms, deposing of emperors and princes, and setting up his vassals in many dominions, &c., there was never any state of religion of the heathen so full of miracles, lying signs, and wonders, as the religion of Antichrist: the most of them being monstrous fables, some magical illusions, and craty conveyances of legerdemain. Of which reports the legends, portuses, festivals, promptuaries, sermons, and other books are stuffed so full, that nothing almost is thought to be sufficiently proved, that is not confirmed by a number of false and frivolous miracles: yea they cease not at this day to continue some of these monstrous fictions, as of their miraculous hosts at Mechlin, and of the miraculous blood of Christ, at Paris, as good as the blood of Hailes, which was a collection of honey and saffron renewed as often as it pleased them, of the Virgin Mary's milk, with ten thousand false tales of relics, that are in every corner of the Pope's dominion. Besides new cures also of the restoring of Margaret Jesop to her limbs at the sacrament of miracles, whom the beadies of bridewell, if they had had in cure for her whoredom, would have healed also of her lameness. With the vision of the black dog, and other fables reported by Bristow. As for our doctrine, it having manifest testimony of the holy scriptures, needeth no confirmation of miracles. Although God himself, for the preservation of his church worketh great things, which being done by him, ought to be wonderful in our eyes. Among which the marvellous preservation of our sovereign, against so many conspiracies, treasons, rebellions, murderings, poisonings, conjurings, invasions, and other devilish practices, devised by Antichrist and his limbs, against her person, her realm, and kingdom, now these thirty years continuing, is as glorious a work of his merciful protection, as ever was seen in any age, or is recorded in any story, holy or profane.

15. Our translations are true and according to the true sense of the word, and of the text. And seeing traditions are sometimes taken in evil part, as you confess, we do rightly avoid the ambiguity, when, as the signification of the word doth bear, we translate instructions, constitutions, ordinances. And it is as much advantage as you can justly require, to have instructions, constitutions, ordinances of the Apostles, unwritten, but that under the voice, sound, and colour of the word, traditions, you would have all your fables and inventions of false doctrine, received without any exami-

nation or trial, whether they came from the Apostles or no.

But now let us see whether this text doth allow any traditions, instructions, or ordinances of the Apostles, that are no where expressed and contained in the scriptures. Paul willeth them to hold the traditions which they had learned, whether it were by word or by his epistle: *ergo*, say you, "not only the things written and set down in the holy scriptures, but all other points of truth and points of religion uttered by word of mouth, and delivered by the Apostles to their scholars by tradition, be here approved. Indeed as well that which the Apostles did preach, as that which they did write, is here approved. But how doth it follow out of this text, that the Apostle did preach or deliver any thing by word of mouth, which is not written and set down in the holy scriptures? Unless this be your argument, all was not written in the epistle to the Thessalonians, *ergo*, it is no where written or set down in the holy scriptures. Therefore this text proveth not that the Apostles left traditions, necessary to be observed unto salvation, which are not contained in the scriptures: or that the scriptures do not contain all things necessary to be known, believed, and practised unto salvation. Having therefore no warrant in the scriptures for such traditions as are no where written, you bring a whole troop of ancient fathers, who if they had been always attentive in this point, should not in some things have been so carried away as they were. Yet if their sayings be well marked according to their meanings, they speak nothing for the credit of Popish traditions, that is articles of doctrine necessary to salvation, not written or set down in the scriptures. For some time they call the scriptures itself by the name of tradition, or else they speak of doctrine contained in the scriptures, and able to be proved by them, though not expressed in the same terms: as Omousion, the Trinity, the three persons, the baptism of infants, and such like. Or else of ceremonies and rites, which are not necessary to be at all times, and in all places the same. For many of those external observations and rites, which they ascribe to tradition of the Apostles, have been long since abolished and grown out of use, and are not observed even in the Popish Church, whereas they have a greater number which be of later invention, which yet they would fater upon the Apostles. Last of all, those few errors which, the mystery of iniquity prevailing, were received in their time, divers of the ancient fathers ascribe to tradition, because they had no ground in the scriptures. Now therefore let us consider your testimonies for tradition unwritten, in order. You note in the margin *Dionys. eccl. Hier. cap. 1.* Who speaketh of the sacraments and ceremonies of the church used in his time, referreth them partly to the scripture, partly to the tradition of bishops. Meaning the sacraments to have their institution set down in the scriptures, other ceremonies to have

been ordained by the governors of the church, and by them delivered unto him. But of doctrine delivered by the Apostles, that is no where written in the scriptures, and yet it is necessary to salvation, he speaketh not one word.

Chrysostom's words be these, "Hereof it is manifest, that they delivered not all by epistle, but many things without letters, and the one is of as great credit as the other. Therefore we think the tradition of the church also to be worthy of credit. It is a tradition, inquire no more." It is certain that Chrysostom speaketh of such traditions as are not expressed in so many words in the scriptures, yet are they contained indeed in them, or else of those last words it is a tradition, &c. it should follow, that we should never search the scriptures for any thing, but depend wholly upon tradition. But that the scripture is not only necessary, but also containeth doctrine sufficient for our salvation, he declareth plentifully, in other places. One example shall suffice. *2 Tim. Hom. 9.* "If we have need to learn any thing, or not to know any thing, there, in the scriptures, we shall learn it. If it be needful to reprove falsehood from thence we shall draw it. If any thing be lacking unto us, that we must obtain, to be corrected or chastised unto exhortation or comfort, out of the same also we do learn it." Theodoret's words are these, "You have a rule of doctrine, the words which we deliver unto you, which both being present, we have preached unto you, and being absent, we have written unto you." This Greek father as you see, so understandeth this place, that the Apostle hath written the same things that he preached. Therefore delivered nothing unwritten. Hentenius a Papist, translating Oecumenius into Latin, even in this text, for the Greek word *καταβολα*, rendereth institutions, as some of our translations have. The comment is the very words of Chrysostom in effect, and have the same meaning. "The Apostle delivereth some things both by writing and without writing, and both are worthy to be observed. Therefore the tradition of the church without writing also is to be observed." He meaneth as Chrysostom, that the doctrine of the church, taken out of the holy scriptures, is to be observed, though it be not expressed in them, in such form of words, as it is delivered by the church. So the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles was nothing but the doctrine of the holy scriptures of the Old Testament, yet uttered not always in the same forms of speech, although the argument and matter were manifestly contained in them.

Basil speaketh partly of such doctrine as is contained in the scriptures, though not in the same form of words, as the glorifying of the Holy Ghost, with the Father and the Son, which is the matter he defendeth by tradition: partly of ceremonies and rites, which are not necessary to salvation. Among which ceremonies, he rehearseth, as an Apostolic tradition, a custom that the Christians had of

old time, between Easter and Whitsuntide, to pray standing, which long since is grown out of use, and not observed by the Papists themselves, no more than that form of glorifying the Trinity, which he so earnestly defendeth. Therefore these traditions are not necessary. Of the elevation of the Eucharist, he speaketh not, but of showing of the bread of thanksgiving, and the cup of blessing. Neither speaketh he of divers ceremonies used before and after consecration, but of other words or forms of prayer not expressed in the Gospel, used before and after the ministration of the sacrament, yet doubtless contained in the scriptures, and agreeable to them for the matter. Hallowing the font, he nameth not, but blessing of the water of baptism. Of exorcisms, he speaketh nothing. But that he acknowledgeth the scripture to contain all doctrine necessary to salvation, he expresseth his mind sufficiently in other places. "It is a most certain argument of infidelity, and a most certain sign of pride, if any man will reject any of those things that are written, or being in any thing that is not written, when our Lord saith. My sheep hear my voice, and a stranger's they will not hear." *Tract. de fide*. "Of such things as are in use with us, some are under the commandment of God prescribed in the scripture, some things are omitted; concerning those things that are written no liberty is given us at all, either to do any thing that is forbidden, or to omit any thing that is commanded; seeing the Lord hath only charged us and said, thou shalt keep the word which I commanded thee this day, thou shalt not add to it, nor take away from it, &c., but of all those things that are omitted, the Apostle Paul hath set forth a rule for us. All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient." This is Basil's answer to this question, "Whether it be lawful or expedient that a man permit unto himself to do or say any things which he thinketh to be good, without the testimony of the holy scriptures?" *Reg. brev. inter.* I. Basil therefore, being rightly understood, maketh nothing for Popish traditions that are urged without scripture, as necessary to salvation.

Hierom you say, reckoneth up divers like traditions, that are necessary, as you said the other were, which Basil mentioneth. In the former place his words be these, in the person of the Luciferian heretic. "Knowest thou not, that this is the custom of the church, that hands are laid afterwards upon them that are baptized, and so the Holy Ghost is called upon? Thou demandest where it is written? In the Acts of the Apostles. But if the authority of the scripture did not warrant it, the consent of the whole world in this part would obtain the force of a precept. For many other things which are observed in the churches by tradition, have obtained the authority of a written law, as in baptism, to dip the head thrice. Afterward, that they which are come forth from baptism would taste a temper of milk and honey, to signify their

infancy. On the Lord's day, and throughout every Pentecost, neither to pray on the knees, nor to fast, and many other things are not written, which reasonable observation hath challenged."

Of all these ceremonies you observe only one. Therefore every child may see, that these ceremonies, with others, were either untruly ascribed to the apostles, or if they came from the apostles, they are not necessary for us. If you say, the church hath authority to abrogate or admit traditions of the apostles at her pleasure, you may say as much of the holy scriptures. For we heard before, that traditions unwritten were as worthy of credit as those that are written. But the truth is, these ceremonies came not from the apostles, but that men might more esteem them, were attributed to the apostles' tradition, as Hierom declareth, *Ep. ad Licin.*

"That you demand of the Sabbath or Saturday, whether it is to be fasted, and of the Eucharist, whether it is to be received every day, which thing the church of Rome and Spain are said to observe, the most eloquent man Hippolytus hath written of them, and divers writers gathering here and there, out of sundry authors have set forth their opinions. But I think good to admonish you briefly of this thing: that ecclesiastical traditions especially such as do not hinder the faith, are so to be observed as they have been delivered of our elders. And that the custom of some men, is not overthrown with the contrary usage of other men. And I would we could fast, at all times, which we read in the Acts of the Apostles, that Paul and the believers with him did in the days of Pentecost, and on the Lord's day. And yet they are not to be accused of Manichees' heresy, seeing carnal meat ought not to have been preferred before spiritual meat. Also I would we might always receive the Eucharist, without condemnation of ourselves, and a pricking conscience, and hear the Psalmist's saying: 'Taste and see how sweet the Lord is, and to sing with him: my heart hath uttered a good saying. I say not this because I think the Lord's days are to be fasted, and that I would do away the solemnity which is continued for sixty days together: but let every province abound in her own sense, and esteem the precepts of their elders, to be Apostolic laws.'" You see by his judgment, that many ceremonies were accounted Apostolic traditions, which were contrary to the very practice of the Apostles, and that the custom of every country, was esteemed as an apostolic law. This maketh altogether, against your position of apostolic traditions beside the scripture, and the same to be necessary for Christian men in all places and times to observe. But that Hierom would have no doctrine obtruded as necessary to salvation which is not contained in the holy scriptures, he showeth in divers places, *Matt. 23*. "That which hath no authority of the holy scriptures, is as easily condemned, as it is allowed:" and in *Aug. cap. 1*. "Such things as

men find out and feign of themselves as it were of apostolic tradition without the authority and testimonies of the scriptures, the sword of God's word doth strike down." Next to Hierom, you place Augustin, who you say doth not only refer many ceremonies to the apostolic tradition, "but also he writeth that many articles of our religion and points of highest importance, are not so much to be proved by scriptures, as by tradition." That some articles are proved both by scriptures, and also by tradition, it is no hurt, for that only is a true tradition, that hath the testimony of the scripture to warrant it. Nay, say you; he avoucheth that in no wise we could believe that children in their infancy should be baptized. Verily if he did so avouch, he was in a great error. For we have as good arguments out of the scriptures, that infants are to be baptized as old folks. But you do impudently belie him, for he hath no such words or meaning. For he saith, "The custom of the church, in baptizing of the infants, is not to be despised, nor by any means to be accounted superfluous, neither to be credited at all, if it were not an apostolic tradition. For even that age hath a great weight or testimony, which first merited to shed blood for Christ."

How prove you, that by apostolic tradition or delivery, he meaneth here an unwritten tradition? He is so far from denying, that this custom hath testimony in the scripture, that he presently allegeth an argument out of the scripture to confirm it. They that may shed their blood for Christ, may be baptized, infants, as the scripture testifieth, did shed their blood for Christ, therefore they may be baptized. *De baptismo contra Donat. lib. 4. cap. 24.* He proveth the baptism of infants, not only by the custom of the church observed ever since the apostles, but also by the institution of circumcision out of the scriptures. So likewise, that such as were baptized by heretics, were not to be rebaptized, he proveth by the saying of *John 13.* He that is once washed, needeth no more to be washed. *De baptismo lib. 2. cap. 14.* And by example of them that were circumcised in the ten tribes, where Jeroboam's calves were worshipped.

That evil men have baptism and do give and receive baptism, though they be not changed into better men, we have proved as I think sufficiently both out of the canonical scriptures, and out of Cyprian's own writings. *De hap. lib. 6. cap. 3.* Of which it followeth manifestly, that such as are baptized by heretics, are not to be baptized again. Therefore this point of religion hath sufficient warrant out of the scriptures. Helvidius was not condemned by tradition only, but because he affirmed a new doctrine, without the testimony of the scriptures, as Hierom saith. "As we deny not those things which are not written, so we reject those things which are not written. That God was born of a virgin we believe, because we read it, that Mary had matrimonial company with her husband after her childbirth we believe it not, because we

do not read it." *Cont. Helv.* Neither doth Augustin speak any thing of this condemnation by tradition only. "But," you say, "without tradition no heretic will yield, be the scriptures never so plain." And what heretic was ever so gentle, to yield to tradition, that would not yield to the scriptures? but whether heretics yield or no, they may always be confuted by the holy scriptures, and so have all heretics been always beaten down, though Satan which inspired them with arrogance and error, will not suffer them to yield. As for Zuinglius whom you name among heretics, he would always yield to the scriptures. Epiphanius in the first place, *Hæres. 63.* speaketh of the commonly received doctrine of the church, whereunto our interpretations of the scriptures ought to be agreeable, and not following allegories, or other strange senses. Whereby he declareth that the traditions of which he speaketh, are the sense of the scriptures, though they be not the very words, as that which he saith, to be the apostle's tradition: that it is a sin to marry after virginity decreed, according to this tradition, he saith, that text, *1 Cor. 7.* is to be interpreted, "if a virgin marry she sinneth not," and therefore to be spoken of such virgins as had not decreed or vowed virginity. And the tradition he proveth immediately out of the scripture. *1 Tim. 5. 22.* of widows that break their first faith. In the latter place, *Hæres. 55.* he joineth tradition unto the scriptures, both which together, are a good confirmation of truth, that no man be deceived with new fables. But that tradition, or continuance of doctrine, which hath no foundation in the scriptures is sufficient to build upon, he saith not.

Ireneus, doth first confute the heretics out of the holy scriptures, saying, "The apostles first preach the gospel and afterward by the will of God delivered it in writing, to be the foundation and pillar of our faith." *lib. 3. cap. 1.* which doctrine the church from the apostles had preserved unto this time. "But when the heretics," saith he, "are reproved out of the scriptures, they fall to accusing the scriptures themselves, as though all is not well in them, and that they be not of sufficient authority, and that the truth cannot be found out of them, by them that know not the tradition. For that was not delivered by writing, but by word of mouth, for which cause Paul said we speak wisdom among them that are perfect," &c. *lib. 3. cap. 2.* Against these heretics therefore, that alleged tradition of the apostles beside the scriptures, to confirm their blasphemous heresies, as the Papists do, Ireneus showeth, that we cannot learn the apostolic tradition, any where but in the apostolic churches, in the church of Rome, as the most notable, by reason of that dominion of the city, where the doctrine of the apostles, had been continued by succession of bishops, unto this time. All which apostolic churches did teach no tradition of the apostles, but that which was contained in the holy scriptures. And it is most clear, in that he saith, of Polycarp, "This man taught always, those things

which he had learned of the apostles, and which he delivered to the church, and which are only true." If these traditions were only true, then they were contained in the scriptures, which no true Christian will deny to be true. That he saith of barbarous people, which learned the truth only by tradition, without the scripture, he meaneth of such as learned of their pastors, as many unlearned men do at this time, who learned of the scriptures, not that there was any such since Christ's time, which never had the scriptures, either of the Old or New Testament, and so long continued.

Tertullian indeed reckoneth up a number of customs grounded upon tradition out of the scriptures: but they were rites and ceremonies, whereof many are not observed by the Papists themselves. As the temper of milk and honey, given to them that were newly baptized: to abstain from washing a whole week after. Oblations for the birth day yearly, not to fast, nor kneel in prayer, or worshipping of God on the Lord's day: nor between Easter and Whitsuntide with a great deal more crossing the forehead than the Papists themselves use, at every going out, at every step, at every coming in, at putting on of apparel, at putting on of shoes, at washing, at tables, at lights, at beds, at seats, &c. If all these were traditions of the apostles, yet are they not necessary: if these be not apostolic traditions, what warrant have we for the other?

But concerning matters necessary to be believed and observed, Tertullian elsewhere doth testify, that the scripture containeth all such matters. "Take away from heretics," saith he, "those things which they hold with Ethnic, that they may stay their questions upon the scriptures only, and they are not able to stand." *De resurrect. carn.* "We need no curiosity after Christ Jesus nor inquisition after the gospel, when we believe it, we desire to believe nothing else. For this is the first thing that we believe, that there is nothing more that we ought to believe." The things whereof Origen speaketh are also rites and ceremonies, and yet for the chief substance of them contained in the scriptures, or else have their reason out of them. As for example, the bowing the knees in prayer hath many testimonies in the scripture, *Luke 22. 41. Acts 9. 40. and 21. 15. Eph. 3. 14.*

The reason of praying toward the East, was that Paradise was planted in the East, so praying toward the East signifieth, that we have respect to return to our old country, *Disp. 8. cap. 27.* The interrogations and answers used in baptism are grounded upon the doctrine of baptism, which is plentifully set forth in the scriptures. Wherefore the saying of Origen, maketh nothing for your unwritten traditions, which have no ground in the scriptures, many of them being clean contrary to the scriptures. But now at length, you are come to an error received of ancient time, whereby many good men while they perceived not the mystery of iniquity secretly working, were deceived, the error I mean of pray-

ing for the dead, which being first began of the Montanists, for any thing that we can learn in antiquity, and having a fair show of charity, was after admitted into open practice of the church: and then because it could not be justified by the scripture, was defended by tradition. The Montanists were first authors of it, because Tertullian who was a Montanist, is the first of all ancient and authentic writers, that make mention of it, and that only in such books, as he did write after he fell into that heresy. Oblations for the dead made yearly on the day of men's death were but thanksgiving, as those which were for the days of men's birth.

Dionyse, which was not the Areopagite, but of latter time, by likelihood the bishop of Alexandria, which succeeded Origen, this father you say, "referreth prayer and oblation for the dead in the liturgy or Mass, to an apostolic tradition," in *fine Eccles. Hierarch. cap. 7. part 3.* But that is false, for he speaketh not of any prayer or oblation for the dead in the liturgy, neither doth he refer that prayer, for oblation he hath none, whereof he speaketh, to apostolic tradition. But because prayer for the dead was not long before brought in, neither was it received of all men, he saith: "It is necessary for us to declare, that tradition which we have received of our divine masters, concerning that prayer which the bishop maketh for him that is dead." The sum of that prayer he expressed before. "He prayeth to God, that he will remit unto him that is departed all things which by human frailty and weakness he hath transgressed, and to place him in light, in the region of the living, in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in that place which is far from sorrow, pain, and mourning." Afterward he expoundeth this prayer, not to be a petition of any thing which is not already granted, but an interpretation and declaration of that which God hath already performed, unto the person that is to be buried. For this prayer was not said at the liturgy or celebration of the Lord's Supper, but at the burial of the dead. Wherein also they used another ceremony, which was, that the bishop and all that were present, did salute him that was dead, which you may likewise refer to apostolic tradition, as divers other ceremonies, which he reporteth to have been used, and yet perhaps were never used in the church of Rome; certain it is, that of long time they have been out of use. Of Tertullian's oblations, I have spoken before: they were kept yearly, they were kept also for the birth of men, but that they were prayers, or used at the liturgy, he speaketh no word. Yet elsewhere he speaketh of prayer for the dead, which I take to have proceeded from the spirit of Montanus, until an ancient head can be brought forth to avouch it. Augustin, *de cur. cap. 1.* saith: "We read in the book of Maccabees, that sacrifice was offered for the dead, but although it were no where read in the old scriptures; yet the authority of the whole church is not small, which in this part is notable, wherein the



prayers of the priest, which are offered unto the Lord God at his altar, the commendation of the dead hath his place." Chrysostom, *in 3. ph.* more expressly saith, "It was not in vain decreed by the apostles, that in the celebration of the reverend mysteries, a memory should be made of them that are departed," &c. Damascen of much later time followeth the same error. But seeing we prove out of the scriptures themselves, and even by testimony of the same ancient fathers, that the scriptures do teach all things necessary to be believed and practised, we are not to admit any testimonies of men, contrary to the scriptures, and contrary to that they themselves in other places have affirmed, agreeably to the scriptures. But further for the credit of tradition, you say, you might add "that the scriptures themselves, be given us by tradition, else we should not, nor could not take them for the infallible word of God, no more than the works of Ignatius, Clement," &c. Hereto I answer, the books are given us by tradition, but the matter written in these books, doth justify the tradition to be true, and the Spirit also of God, which is in the elect. Therefore they take not their credit and authority of tradition only. And we ought to take them as the infallible word of God, though no tradition did commend them. Yea many thousands that never examined by what tradition the books were preserved unto this time, have received them for the infallible word of God, being taught by the word contained in them, and the Spirit of God, bearing witness to the same. Moreover you say the "true sense of the scriptures, which the Catholics have, and Heretics have not, remaineth in the church by tradition." I answer, if that sense of the scripture be not proved out of the scriptures themselves, which in places ensy, do expound whatsoever is necessary to be known as uttered in hard places, it is not the sense of the scriptures, neither ought the Catholic Church, upon any tradition, to receive such a sense, as cannot be proved out of the scripture. *Aug. de Doctrin. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 6. Clemens dist. 37. cap. Re'atum.*

You say the creed is an apostolic tradition because the doctrine thereof is grounded upon the holy scriptures. Then you demand, "what scripture we have to prove that we must accept nothing not expressly written in scriptures." Here is foolish sophistry in this word expressly. For we do not hold that we must accept nothing, but that which is expressed in such form of words in the scriptures, but whatsoever is neither expressed in plain terms, neither can be necessarily concluded out the scriptures, we ought not to accept it. And this we prove by many plain testimonies of scripture, and arguments concluding necessarily upon them. A few shall serve for example, seeing we do not handle common places, but answer to vain cavillations. *Deut. 4. 2. Deut. 12. 32. Deut. 28. 53. Isa. 8. 20. John 20. 31. 2 Tim. 3. 15, 16, 17.* And where you say you have to the contrary plain scriptures, it is false, for you have none out

of which you can in any lawful form of argument, conclude your assertion. What your brag is of all the fathers, I have showed before, as also of your evident reason, that we must believe tradition or nothing at all. For our controversy is not, whether we must believe any tradition, but whether we must believe any tradition that is not contained in the scripture, and by the scripture proved to be true. But yet we must be asked further: "If we were assured that such and such things, which be not expressed in scriptures, were taught and delivered by word of mouth from the apostles, whether we would believe them or no?" I answer, if the things you speak of be counted as necessary to salvation, you might as well ask us if the sky shall fall, whether we shall have great store of larks or no. For when we are assured that the apostles have taught all things necessary to salvation in the scriptures, how shall we be assured that they have omitted any thing which they have taught only by word of mouth? But if we might be assured that they have taught contrary by word of mouth, to that they have left in writing, namely, of the sufficiency of the scripture, to make us wise unto salvation, without impiety, we are already taught in the scripture, not only not to believe such preaching, but also to hold them and that their doctrine accursed. But that they have taught such things you say, we may be assured: "by such as lived in the apostles' days." For my part, I would believe none that lived in their days, contrary to their own writings: "the testimony of so many fathers near their days." If the first be not sufficient, much less they that succeeded. "The whole church's practice and asseveration descending down from man to man to our time, and this for a matter of fact in all reasonable men's judgment, you think to be a sufficient proof." But it is no reason to believe any man, or all men, against the apostles, who have testified the contrary in their writings, seeing their writings are the word of God. Notwithstanding, if we should believe other men against them, in a matter of fact, whereby they should be convinced to have taught by word of mouth, contrary to anything, which they have taught in their writing, yet they themselves have taught us in the writing to reject whatsoever they or an angel of heaven might bring to the contrary. But now all your three allegations are false, for neither do you bring any man's testimony that lived in the apostle's days, nor of them that lived near their time, avouching any tradition necessary to salvation, omitted by them, neither the whole practice of the church from their time unto us. But you say, it is known that Ignatius, the apostles' equal in time, wrote a book of the apostles' traditions, as Eusebius witnesseth, *lib. 3. Eccl. hist. cap. 20.* If it be so well known as you say, that Ignatius wrote such a book of apostolic traditions, how prove you that he wrote of such apostolic traditions as were uttered by word of mouth and not contained in the scriptures? And if that were proved, where is the book

that we might see what they were? But in truth Ignatius did write no such book, but contrariwise did testify that the tradition or doctrine of the apostles was expressed in writing. And that it is which Eusebius saith: He exhorted the church to hold fast the tradition of the apostles, "which he testifying, that for certainty it was already contained in writing, thought necessary to be established or diligently observed."

Tertullian's book of prescription proveth that all heresies are later than the truth, and that no heresy can deduce their errors from the apostles, by continual succession as the church could do. Of apostolic tradition not taught in the scriptures, he speaketh not, but of the doctrine of the apostles first by them delivered, and so preserved in the church. And as he requireth Heretics to show their offspring from the apostles, you are never able to prove any point of popery. Contrariwise, whatsoever we teach, seeing we prove it out of the scriptures, there is no question to be made, but that it was the tradition of the apostles.

11. God's action in such things, is not only a permission, but a just judgment and execution of the same against the reprobate, which deserve it. So be Augustin's words: "The Apostle doubted not to add, and say, therefore God shall send unto them the efficacy of error, that they may believe a lie. For God shall send, because he shall by his just judgment permit the devil to do those things, although he do them of an unjust and malignant purpose. That all may be judged, saith he, which have not believed the truth, but have consented to iniquity. Therefore being first judged, they shall be seduced, and being seduced, they shall be judged, but being judged, they shall be seduced by those judgments of God, which are secretly just, and justly secret, by which we never ceased to judge, since the beginning of sin of the reasonable creature. But being seduced, they shall be judged in the last and manifest judgment by Jesus Christ, which shall judge the just most justly, who himself was judged most unjustly." By this it appeareth, how honestly you deal with the doctors, to conclude your pleasure out of their words, contrary to their meaning.

### CHAPTER 3.

6. Here also, we translate according to the true sense of the word, and of the Apostle, avoiding the word of tradition, not for any evil signification, for it is no more than delivery, but because it is taken of you for an unwritten tradition, when the Apostle speaketh expressly of a doctrine delivered in writing, and therefore your collection is vain and childish. Your own vulgar Latin interpreter, 1 Cor. 11. 2, translateth the same word *precepta*, precepts or instructions, or commandments, or ordinances, whom our translations follow in this place.

10. It is a general precept, that no man should live idly, though all men cannot or

need not work with their hands. The clergy ought not also to deserve their living by their painful labour, though it is not necessary nor expedient that they should always work with their hands. Neither doth Calvin excuse any such thing of them that labour in study and teaching. But against the Popish idle monks, friars, and the rest of that rabble, as also against idle priests, this text is strong, that if they will not labour, they should not be maintained by the sweat of other men's brows. Neither is this a natural admonition only, but a divine precept, that every man should eat his own bread, for otherwise he is a thief that devoureth other men's bread. You say that some of the clergy did ever voluntarily occupy themselves in teaching, writing, graving, painting, planting, sowing, embroidering, or such like seemly and innocent labours; and for this you quote *Hierom praefat. in Job*, and *in vita Hilarion*. In the former place there is no word of any such matter. But Hierom defending his diligence in correcting the old translations of the scripture against the envious, saith, "They that will, let them have the old books written either in purple parchments, with gold and silver burdens, rather than in books drawn out in letters of an inch long, as they say, so they will suffer me and mine, to have our poor papers and books not so beautiful as well corrected." In the other place he saith, that Hilarion "dugged the ground with a mattock, that the labour of his work might double the labour of his fasting, and also weaving baskets of bull-rushes, he followed the discipline of the monks of Egypt, and the sentence of the apostle; he that doth not work, let him not eat." So that of such exercises as you speak of, here is no word. Which I say not as though I thought any of them unlawful for a minister of the church to exercise, either for his recreation, or when he hath leisure from the necessary affairs of his calling. But because you would under colour of these idle occupations and some of them perniciously abused, as engraving, painting, embroidering of things to serve idolatry, excuse the idleness of many of your clergy, who when they do nothing that pertaineth to the office of ministers, practise such matters to drive away the time only, as others do waste their time in tables, cards, bowls, or such like pastimes. But let us see how you excuse the idleness of your monks. The monks of the primitive church you say which laboured, were few priests. And as few of yours do exercise the office of true ministers of the true church, but are idle priests, to say mass and sing service, and fill their paunches. The old monks you say, were taken from servile works and handicrafts, and oftentimes professed of bondmen. Admit some were so, your votaries for the most part are such, as being apt for no good service in the church or commonwealth, are thrust in by their friends, or else driven for poverty, to seek an idle and wealthy life in those dens which you call cloisters. Those old monks you say did

work, as some of your nuns do, certain hours. And what letteth your monks to work, except perhaps their full bellies? Augustin indeed opposed himself against the mystery of iniquity, working in the idle monks of his days, and did write sharply against them; even such as carried about with them counterfeit relics of martyrs, to keep themselves from labour, *De oper. Monach. cap. 28.* But you have found a high point in Augustin, that the religious were shaven in his time, because those disorderly monks were called *Crimati*, as shaven monks are called shavelings. But Crinitus doth not signify him that hath hair on his head, but him that hath long hair, as you might have learned out of Virgil calling the harper, *Crimitus Joppas.* And Augustin hath never a word of shaving, but of polling or clipping the hair short, which he urgeth not as proper to monks, but as common to all Christians, and required by the apostle, *1 Cor. 11*, which those monks to elude, did say ridiculously, that they which had gelded themselves for the kingdom of heaven, were no men, *cap. 32.* and that there was no necessity or religion in polling the hair very short. Hierom testifieth of Hilariion, he polled his head once a year on Easter day. Yea it is to be proved, that shaving of heads was avoided as heathenish superstition, as Hierom saith in *Ezek. lib. 13. cap. 44.* who out of that saying of Ezekiel concerning the priests, "they shall neither shave their heads, nor suffer their hair to grow long, but shall poll their heads," saith, "it is clearly showed, that we ought not to have shaven heads as the priests and worshippers of Isis and Serapis, nor suffer our hair to grow long down, which is the property of riotous persons," &c.

You see then how well you defend your shavelings by the ancient fathers against the new Protestants. As for nuns cutting their hair, Hierom speaketh only of the virgins and widows in the monastries of Egypt and Syria, who used so to do for any religion, but because they neither entered into any baths, nor used any oil on their heads, he saith they did it, "To avoid little beasts, which breed between the skin and the hair, and other filthiness." They were neither so superstitious, nor yet so nice and delicate, as Popish nuns. But that all monks are not bound to work and labour, you prove by Augustin, that such as preach or minister the sacraments, or serve the altar, may challenge their living of them whom they serve; and all religious men commonly do so now, you say. What say you, be all your religious

men preachers? no, but they serve the altar, you will say, because they say mass. A sore labour, for which they should be spared; but Augustin meaneth of them that laboured in the ministry of the gospel, either preaching or ministering the sacraments, or else studying to make themselves fit for such service, and such indeed are not bound to labour with their hands, if they may be otherwise maintained, without injury and oppression of the poor. But as for them that can do none other but idol service in saying mass, it was never in his meaning to privilege them from labour, for all had their hours of prayer and singing of Psalms appointed. As for gentlemen that have given lands and goods, there are not many in your cloisters, to enjoy that privilege. And yet even such ought to exercise themselves in study or some other profitable exercise, that their bodies are able to endure, for idleness is not allowed in any man. Therefore in vain you go about to excuse the idleness of your Popish monks and clergy, of whom many neither study, nor are apt for study, neither preach nor are able to preach, neither serve the altar in painful and profitable labour, but in idle and idolitrous exercises.

14. Our obedience to our pastors is such as ought not to hinder our duty to civil magistrates, nor our obedience to civil magistrates, our duty toward our spiritual pastors; and each office hath their proper kind of lawful correction or punishment.

15. This proveth not that all Popish censures be grounded in the scriptures and examples of the apostles, but only such as the apostle speaketh of, and the scriptures elsewhere alloweth. But that a priest under colour of ecclesiastical censure should deprive a prince of his kingdom, and absolve his subjects from the oath of obedience given unto him; it hath no warrant in the word of God, but is a plain note of Antichristian tyranny. Where you have the cases prescribed, and appointed by your canon law, wherein men may partake with them that are excommunicated, other than cases of mere necessity and several duty, you play fast and loose at your pleasure. As also pope Gregory in his last bull of dispensation, for Papists to counterfeit obedience to the Queen, until he could find some means to despatch her of the possession of her kingdom, declareth plainly that no conscience of ecclesiastical censure, but respect of worldly advantage, carrieth him hither and thither, as occasion moveth him.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL TO TIMOTHY.

### CHAPTER I.

3. The proper mark of heretics, is to teach otherwise than the truth, or contrary to it. But if the teacher find men entangled with pernicious errors, though they be in never so

great peace and agreement among themselves, they be not in the unity of the Catholic church. He teacheth otherwise, that teacheth otherwise than he learneth out of the scripture, and not he that teacheth other-

wise than men be falsely persuaded. Therefore, seeing Luther taught not otherwise than the prophets and apostles, his doctrine was not odd, singular, and new, but Catholic, ancient, and true. Therefore finding many nations seduced by the errors of Antichrist, he called them back to the true faith, taught by the apostles, from which the Popish church had made a manifest revolt and apostacy. Yet were there before him the persecuted churches of God in divers nations that held the same true faith and religion that he preached to the Papists, as well in England, as in France, Italy, Germany, Bohemia, Moravia, &c., who with all the churches of the parts of the world, not agreeing with the Romish church, by this wise note, must hear nothing taught otherwise than they are persuaded they have received from the apostles. But so you may have any vain show of reason to retain your favourites in popery, you care not what become of the truth, and of the Catholic Church of Christ.

4. All Popish fables, no less than Jewish fables, being contrary to the laws of God, are after doctrines, and human constitutions, contained in the Popish Cabala, that is, tradition, and in the Popish Talmud, that is, the canon law or school divinity, but not in the holy scripture. But the doctrine of them which is grounded upon the holy scriptures, which are the word of truth, cannot be condemned of fables. Contrariwise, Popery that is builded upon such fables, as never more fond were invented to maintain heathenish superstition, above all other heresies may be entitled heretical fables. For the fables of the Valentians and Manichees, though they were monstrous lies, yet they are exceeded by the Popish fables of relics, of Saints' lives, of purgatory, and of feigned miracles. Neither any heretics or schismatics of our time, for fabulous inventions may be compared unto them.

4. Not all questions, but such as pertain not to the edifying of God, which is by faith, are to be avoided. Those contentions and questions which have been necessarily moved to build up the ruins of the Church in faith, which Antichrist had made in heresy and infidelity, have brought forth great increase of good life and true devotion in them that have embraced the faith. The wickedness that aboundeth is rather discovered by the light in most, than increased in any by the coming of the light. But this is condemnation, saith our Saviour Christ, that men love darkness rather than light, because their works are evil, *John 3*.

5. That he hath charity, he hath it of faith. It may be rightly said, saith Augustin, that all the commendments of God pertain to faith only, if not a dead faith, but that living faith which worketh by love be understood. *De fide et oper cap. 22*.

5. We give to charity her due commendation, and yet in justification we must prefer faith before charity, because we are justified by faith without the works of charity, which are

the works of the law. And whereas it is said, charity is the end and perfection of the law, we do acknowledge it to be so, but this charity is in no man before faith, by which God justifieth the ungodly man, neither in any justified man is it so perfect, that he may be justified thereby through the covenant of the law; therefore the only hope of all godly men, saith Augustin, groaning under this burden of corruptible flesh, and in this infirmity of our life, is that we have a mediator Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins. *Ad Bonifac. lib. 3. cap. 5*. What obstinate blindness then is in the proud hypocritical Papists, to seek their justification in their works? But charity, you say, is justice itself, and the formal cause of our justification. It you meant that justification, by which we are not made just in the sight of God, but declared to be just before men, whereof James speaketh, we would not greatly contend with you. But when you make charity the formal cause of our justification before God, which the scripture saith to be of the ungodly man, whose sins are forgiven, and therefore without works, what obstinate blindness possesseth your proud and stubborn hearts, that you will not yield to so great and clear light of truth? As Augustin saith, "perfect charity is perfect justice," so he saith in the same place, "that no man hath perfect charity in this life." Whereof it followeth, that no man is justified before God by that charity which he hath in this life, for by imperfect justice we cannot be perfectly justified, but by faith we are perfectly justified by the justice of Christ, which of God's mere grace is given unto us. Therefore charity or the works proceeding thereof, are no cause of our justification before God through Jesus Christ. For since that time, saith Augustin, good works begin since the time we are justified, we are not justified because they went before, *Ep. 120. Honorato*.

7. Heretics are oftentimes learned, but never rightly learned in the truth. But boasters of learning were never any heretics, more than the Papists, which neither in the scriptures, nor in any other good learning, for the most part, are half so well learned as they would be accounted. Whose ignorance may sometime move admiration, not only to the learned, but even to them that have mean understanding; but their impudency in lying, slandering, forging, falsifying, wresting, and vain collecting, and false concluding, passeth all admiration in them that with any indifferent ears and eyes read their books or hear them preach.

The apostles had extraordinary power to afflict the bodies of men that obstinately opposed themselves against the truth: but it was not ordinary in all them that had power of excommunication in the primitive church. But notwithstanding, just excommunication by them that have lawful authority is greatly to be feared. But when Antichrist sendeth out his thunderbolts against the professors of God's truth, it is not to be regarded; and ex-

perience of these thirty years in England hath showed that God blesseth where the pope curseth. That which Hieron speaketh of making Christ's body with their holy mouth, is of making the sacrament of Christ's body wherewith we are spiritually nourished, as also he saith, that by them we are made Christians, speaking of the administration of the sacrament of baptism which we receive by them, but are made Christians properly by the working of God's Spirit.

19. They that have not a good conscience with faith, may fall from faith, and make shipwreck of it, but it is not a lively faith, where y a man is justified, but a dead faith, consisting only in knowledge of the principles of religion. But they that are justified by a lively faith can never finally fall from it, because, whom God justifieth he also glorifieth. *Rom. 8.*

#### CHAPTER 2.

1. Augustin professing how hard a matter it is to distinguish between these words, which the Apostle useth, endeavoureth to show this distinction in that which all, or almost all the church doth frequent, meaning the form of the celebration of the Lord's Supper. For of the popish mass he speaketh no word. And if the apostle had purposed in these words to describe the mass, he hath omitted the chief and almost only essential part thereof, which is the sacrifice of the natural body and blood of Christ. Therefore doubtless the apostle speaketh not of the celebration of the mass. And that you may know, Augustin speaketh of the communion, and not of the mass, his words are plain, which you mangle because they have no show for your mass. "We may take *precationes*, which we make in the celebration of the sacraments before that which is on the Lord's table beginneth to be blessed, *Orationes*, prayers, when that is blessed and sanctified, and broken to be distributed, all which petition the whole church in a manner concludeth with the Lord's prayer." Then discoursing a little upon the Greek word *προσευχη*, he addeth: "If more usually in the scriptures, a vow is called *ευχη*, except the general name of prayer, that prayer is properly to be understood, which we make according to a vow. And all those things are vowed which are offered to God, especially the oblation of the holy altar, in which sacrament that our greatest vow is set forth, wherein we vow that we will abide in Christ, and in the fellowship of the body of Christ, of which thing it is a sacrament, that we being many, are one bread and one body. Therefore in the sanctification and preparation of the distribution thereof, I think the apostle commanded properly, that prayers should be made, which some unskillfully interpreted adoration, for that is according to a vow, which in the scriptures is most commonly called *ευχη*. But *interpellationes* are made when the people is blessed. For when the prelates as advocates do offer unto the most merciful power those whom they have

by imposition of hands undertaken, which being ended, and so worthy a sacrament received, thanksgiving concludeth all things." This is the very order of our communion, which was the order of the celebration of the communion in Augustin's time, where no sacrifice is offered, but of thanksgiving for the death of Christ, and of ourselves to continue always in the unity of Christ's body. *1. 1. ad. Tim.* Hieron hath not respect to the celebration of the Lord's Supper, in that he saith, but by that form of prayer which Christ taught his apostles, as by other scriptures he confuteth the Pelagians. His words are these: "So he taught his apostles, that believing the sacrifice of his body, they should be bold daily to speak, Our Father," &c. But according to your fancy and false interpretation, the Lord's prayer should never be said but at mass, which Christ taught his apostles, not upon presumption of their own merits, but trusting in the sacrifice of his death, to utter daily.

Epiphanius speaketh of public prayers used in the liturgy, but without any respect to this text, for any thing that can be gathered of his words.

Chrysostom showeth expressly, that he meaneth not of the liturgy, but of morning and evening prayers. "The faithful," saith he, "do know it, how every day in the morning, and in the evening, prayers are poured forth to the Lord, how observations are made by the church, for all the world, for kings, and all that are in authority."

Ambrose also speaketh generally of the public prayers of the church, not referring them to the liturgy or celebration of the Lord's Supper.

Prosper saith, that this law of prayer is kept not only of the priests, but of all the faithful throughout the world, without any relation unto the liturgy. And so we understand the text, principally of public prayers, and according to them, of all Christian men's private prayers. What cause you had therefore to challenge such profound sense of the scriptures unto the popish church, and to charge us with profane, popular, and light skimming them over, let all indifferent men judge, by those your quotations of the holy fathers. That I speak nothing of your doggish eloquence, where you ascribe unto the holy scripture, a certain profane, popular, and light skim, which is gathered of us, how religiously, learnedly, and gravely, let wise men judge, and God himself revenge.

2. While you would most absurdly ground your popish sacrifice of the mass upon the public prayers, here prescribed by the apostle, you shall fall into the same peck of troubles, that Augustin in the place by you quoted, placeth the Pelagian. "That for infants which are not baptized, would have daily oblations, and the sacrifices of the holy priests continually offered for them." So you, finding in this text, that heathen kings must be commended in these prayers, and minding in any case to gain oblation and sacrifice, whereof the apostle speaketh not, with these prayers, are driven

to say, that the priests more properly and particularly offer the holy sacrifice for Christians, than for heathen princes, as though it were offered also for them that are not the members of Christ, though not so properly, nor particularly. Augustin saith: "Behold another gulf, from whence he should never come forth, except he repent that he hath said. For who would offer the body of Christ, except it be for them that are members of Christ?" Wherefore you must either repent that you say, of the oblation or holy sacrifice offered for them in any sort, or else you must take part with the Pelagian against Augustin, which you are ready enough to do.

4. God will have men of all sorts to be saved, as well as kings, as subjects, but not every particular man, according to his secret counsel: for then all should be saved, and none damned. The judgments of God, concerning the damnation and reprobation of the wicked, are often secret, but always just. Your distinction of God's conditional will, doth not satisfy the question, nor avoid the difficulty which you would escape, that the damnation of men is not to be imputed to God. For no man hath will to accept the general medicine that God hath prepared, but those whom God vouchsafeth by his grace to make willing to accept it. This is the resolution of Augustin, in all those places which you quote, after much debating of the question. That the right sense is, that God will have some of all sorts saved, not all of every sort, and specially *Ench. c. 103.* "He will have all men to be saved, not that there is not any man whom he will not have to be saved, which would not work miracles among them, whom he saith that they would have repented, if he had done them: but that we understand by all men, all kinds of men, by what difference soever they are distributed, kings, private men, noble, ignoble, high, low, learned, unlearned."

5. Here we are noted of too much peevishness and spitefulness, because we say, as the Apostle saith, that we have one only Mediator Jesus Christ. And with many words we are taught, as if we were young children, what a Mediator is, and how Christ is our only Mediator, when as indeed there is nothing brought but the common blind distinction, that Christ is our only Mediator of redemption, but not of intercession. But the Apostle speaketh so plainly of prayer and intercession, as that distinction cannot serve, therefore retaining it indeed, but being ashamed plainly to use it, in circumstance of words you bring in nothing else but it. And first you tell us that we understand not what it is to be a Mediator. In that sense Paul doth attribute it only to Christ. Yes, God be thanked, we need not learn of you. *Theophylact, Alex. M. Ep. pasch. 1.* But let us hear what you take upon you to teach us. "To be thus a Mediator, is to be God and man, to be that one eternal Priest and Redeemer, which by his death has reconciled us to God, and paid his blood as a full and sufficient ransom for all our sins." Praise be to God, we never thought otherwise of our

Saviour Christ, and would God you would always abide by this doctrine. For then you would give over your blasphemous priesthood and sacrifice, your purgatory, and merits of works, and trust only in Jesus Christ our full and perfect Redeemer. "That he is the singular advocate and patron of mankind, that by himself alone, and by his own merits, procureth all grace and mercy to mankind in the sight of his Father, none making any intercession for him, nor giving any grace or force to his prayers," &c. If you would abide by this confession, or did believe as you say, you would not make so many advocates and patrons of mankind, as you do; you would not defend this prayer of your Popish Church: *Tu per Thomæ sanguinem, &c.* "By the blood of Thomas, which for thee he did spend, make us, Christ, to climb whither Thomas did ascend." Nor a thousand other, in which you pray by the merits, by the intercession, by the help of this Saint, or that Saint to be heard, to be helped, to be saved, &c. As in the mass of one Apostle. *Exaudi Domine, &c.* "Lord hear thy people, praying with thee patronage of thy holy Apostle N. that being always defended by thy aid, they may serve thee with secure devotion. &c. Lord we rehearsing the solemnities of thy blessed Apostle N. beseech thee, that by his aid, we may receive thy benefits, for whom we offer to thee the sacrifices of praise." In the birth of one martyr: "Lord be present at our supplications, and by the intercession of thy blessed martyr N. bestow upon us graciously thy perpetual mercy." In the mass of any confessor: "Lord receive the sacrifice of the reconciliation and praise, which by thy blessed confessor N. coming between, may bring us to pardon, and may appoint this action into perpetual grace." In the mass of Rock, the Post communion: "Lord we have received thy holy things, remembering the merits of Rock, perform we beseech thee, that we may both be defended by his faithful aid, and also profit by his noble example." Of Adelm: "O God, which this day hast lifted up Adelm to eternal joys, we beseech thee let thy mercy bring us thither by his merits." The conclusion of all these collects, as of many other such, is that whereof you brag so often, *per Christum Dominum, &c.* "By Christ our Lord." So that Christ is your mediator, advocate, and patron, with the patronage, and by the aid of an apostle, by the intercession of a martyr, by the intervention of a confessor, by the remembrance of the merits, and by the faithful aid of Rock, by the merits of Adelm, and such like. Where you say, "That none of you asketh either grace in this life, or glory in the next, but by him," the public prayers of your Antichristian Church prove your falsehood; for you ask of Christ himself eternal life, by the blood of Thomas, besides many other requests that you make unto Saints, without any mediation of Christ, as that horrible blasphemy of yours declareth to the Virgin Mary: "Entreat the

Father, command thy Son," or that which Bonaventura, a Saint of yours, uttereth in these words, "By the right of a mother, command thy Son, compel God to be merciful to sinners." With infinite like blasphemies, perverting the whole Psalter of David, all to the honour, or rather to the dishonour of the blessed Virgin. "But the adversaries," you say, "do think too basely of Christ's mediation, if they imagine this to be his only prerogative, to pray for us." Surely we do not imagine, but being taught by the scripture, both here and elsewhere, we know most certainly, that the office of intercession pertaineth unto Christ, as part of his mediation. For Paul, speaking here of intercession, saith, he is our only Mediator, to make our prayers acceptable and effectual. Likewise the Apostle to the Hebrews, saith, he liveth always to make intercession for us. *Heb. 7, 25.* But why should you imagine that we think so basely of Christ's mediation, when we do at all times, and in all places acknowledge him to be our only Mediator of redemption, salvation, intercession; and strive for nothing more, than that the whole glory of our salvation, from the beginning to the end, should be ascribed to him, as to our only and most sufficient Mediator? Another argument of like force it is, "that we think so basely of Christ's mediation, if we imagine that you make the Saints your mediators, in that sort as Christ is, when you desire them to pray for you." Although we were deceived in our imagination, of your making of Saints mediators, yet it followeth not, that we therefore think too basely of the mediation of Christ. But that we be not deceived, nor do falsely charge you, you said before, that you do "acknowledge Christ in such sort to be our singular advocate and patron, but by himself alone, and by his own merits, procureth all grace and mercy," &c. And yet your usual prayers, taken out of your Portuis, do cry out against you, whereunto I will add some out of your English primers, printed in Queen Mary's time, of like or worse blasphemy. "Holy Mary mother, most pure of virgins all, mother and daughter of the king celestial. So comfort us in our desolation, that by thy prayer and special mediation, we may enjoy the reward of the heavenly reign. Holy mother of God, make thy petition, that we may deserve Christ and his promission. We beseech thee of thy pity, to have us in remembrance, and make means for us unto Christ, that we being supported through thy help, may deserve to attain to the kingdom of heaven. Grant that through the intercession of the virgin thy mother, we may be delivered from this present heaviness, and have the fruition of eternal gladness. The dolorous compassion of God's sweet mother, bring us to the bliss of Almighty God the Father. But no Catholic," you say, "can or dare think or speak so basely unto Christ, to desire him to pray for us, but you say, Lord have mercy upon us, Christ have mercy upon us, and not Christ pray for us, as you say to our lady

and the rest." Indeed our Saviour Christ saith, after he hath by his mediation and intercession brought us unto the favour of God. In that day you shall ask in my name, and I say not to you, that I will pray to the Father for you, for the Father himself loveth you. *John 16, 26.* If then the prayer of Christ to God his Father be needless for us, what use is there of the prayers of other creatures? But you would have men think, you give a singular prerogative to Christ, when you desire him to have mercy upon you, as though you did not likewise desire other creatures to have mercy upon you. In the primer aforesaid, you pray thus; "O thou meek mother, have mercy therefore on wretches, for whom thou hadst these pains all, seeing thy Son that vine cluster pressed sore, and from the pestilence of death eternal, keep us, by avoiding the fiend infernal, and join us with them which rewarded be with eternal life, seeing the Deity." And in your Latin Portuis, "O Mary, pure, chaste, godly, have mercy on us wretches. Virgin mother, make thy Son reconciled unto us. Let the wisdom of the Father save us, by the prayers of the mother. O virgin worthy of God, be favourable to us that pray. She that hath brought forth the flower, let her give us the savour of the flower. O Virgin Mary, preserve thy servants. Let the merits of Mary bring us to the kingdom of heaven." By these, and many other, it is manifest, that howsoever you would hide your blasphemous intercession of Saints, the Popish Church doth invoke Saints in such sort, as Christ only, by your own confession, is to be invocated. And if you did but only desire the prayers of Saints departed, as some of the ancient fathers, about four or five hundred years after Christ, being deceived by the mystery of iniquity, preparing a way to Antichrist, began to invoke them, as we desire the prayers of the Saints yet living, the error were much less: but yet, seeing we have no warrant so to do out of the holy scriptures, and even that kind of invocation by consequence, implieth great absurdities, you were not to be excused. To pray one for another in this life, is a duty of charity, commended in the scripture, which we are bound to yield, and require one for another, and is nothing injurious to the mediation of Christ. For we do not so desire the godly living to pray for us, as that by their worthiness we are brought into the favour of God, but as the members of the same body of Christ, we join in mutual prayers, they for us, and we for them, as we have warrant in the holy scripture. But to pray to Saints departed, we have no warrant, commandments, promise, or approved example. Wherefore such invocation is at the least superstitious, and will-worship. Beside that, it is injurious to the mediation of Christ, and the mercy of God, who without any suffrage of others, heareth us himself, and hath promised to grant all our requests, made in the name of Jesus Christ his Son. *John. 16, 23.*

1 John 5. 14. Whereupon Ambrose saith, "Therefore we are brought into the presence of kings by tribunes and countries, because the king is a man, and knoweth not to whom he ought to commit the commonwealth: but to obtain the favour of God, from whom nothing is hidden, for he knoweth the worthiness of all men, there is no need of any to entreat for us, but a devout mind. For whosoever such a one speaketh unto God, he will answer him. *In ep. ad Rom. cap. 1.*

So saith Chrysostom, "There is no need of any porter, there is no need of any mediator, there is no need of any minister, but say thou thyself, Lord have mercy upon me, and God will be present, while thou art yet speaking, he will say, I am come." *Ex variis in Matt. locis, Hom. 17.* You see therefore, that suffrages of Saints departed are needless, and yet you are not content with suffrages or prayers; but you ascribe unto them all that is proper to Christ, even reconciliation unto God, as in that blasphemous prayer in the English primer is manifest. "Hail Queen, mother of mercy, our life, our sweetness, our hope, unto thee we do cry and sigh, weeping and wailing. Come off therefore our patroness, cast upon us thy pitiful eyes, and after this our banishment, show to us the blessed fruit of thy womb. O gate of glory, be for us a reconciliation unto the Father, and the Son: from the wretched their faults expel, wipe the spots of sins unclean," &c.

Touching the word mediator, so Christ may have that which is proper unto him, as very God and man, we contend not for the sound of words and syllables. Cyril saith, that many of the Saints used the ministry of mediation, as Paul himself, Moses, Jeremy, &c., in this life: but in Heaven only Christ is our mediator and advocate with the Father, and our only Saviour, although men in this life be called saviours and redeemers, which be ministers and instruments of God's salvation and redemption. Which offices and ministries, except you can prove by the scriptures to be appointed to the Saints departed, you strive in vain for the terms. You have indeed distributed the several offices and charges unto Saints, and appointed us several patrons for all purposes: as nations; France to Denis, England to George, Scotland to Andrew. And diseases; tooth-ache to Apollonia, the pestilence to Rock, the ague to Petronilla. Beasts; as hogs to Anthony, horses to Loye, &c. Degrees of men and occupations; scholars to Gregory, soldiers to Morris, physicians to Cosmus and Damianus, painters to Luke, shoemakers to Crispin and Crispianus, for fire Agatha, for the sea Nicholas, for corn Iodocus, for wine, Urban, &c. But by what warrant from God, you are not able to show out of his word. But because you are not ashamed to say that Cyril doth plainly confute all our cavillations against the mediation of Saints, I will set down his own words. In the same epistle he saith, "There is one God, and one Mediator of God and man, even Jesus Christ,

which hath given himself to be a redemption for all. Jesus Christ is the Mediator of God and men, not only because he hath reconciled men to God, but also because naturally and substantially, he is God and man in one person. For by this means God reconciled our nature to himself: for else how should Paul have called Christ our one Mediator? For many of the Saints have used the ministry of mediation: and Paul himself crieth out, we desire you for Christ, be ye reconciled to God. Moses also was a mediator, for he ministered unto the children of Israel the law given by God. Also blessed Jeremy was a mediator, especially when he cried unto God. Remember me standing before thee, to speak good things for them, what need many words? Every one of the Prophets were mediators, and every one of the Apostles: how then is Christ the only mediator of God and men? But that his mediation is new and unheard of in any other: but it is not impertinent also, briefly to express the manner how he is a mediator. That which joineth together to things, as a mean or midst, is of necessity touched of both, and after this manner, divers things are joined together by the midst. And Christ is mediator of God and man, because in him being one, God and man, are joined together."

Are not these words very pregnant for you, to make so great a vaunt of them? He proveth that only Christ is a mediator properly, whereas all the Prophets and Apostles, while they lived, were ministers of his mediation, and therefore might improperly be called mediators. But "if the name of saviour and redeemer, be in the scriptures given to men without derogation unto Christ, you ask what we can say, why there may not be many mediators in an inferior degree, to the only and singular mediator." First, we say, there is great difference between temporal deliverance and redemption, in respect whereof men are called saviours and redeemers in the scripture, and the spiritual and eternal salvation and redemption, which only Christ has purchased unto us: and therefore you might as well say, seeing the name of God and Christ in the scriptures is given to men, as unto princes and prophets, why may you not say, that there may be many Gods and Christs in an inferior degree to him, which is only God and Christ and in the office of the eternal salvation and redemption? Secondly we say, that these which in the scriptures are called saviours and redeemers, are by God appointed for such temporal deliverance and redemption: show the like appointment in the scriptures of Saints departed, to be mediators of eternal salvation and redemption, in an inferior degree to Christ, our only mediator and advocate, and we will shake hands with you. But this if you cannot do, think not, but we have enough to say, why Christ should be our only mediator and advocate in Heaven with God his Father, so that he shall have have no



inferior mediators and advocates under him.

To Bernard's authority, who was more than a thousand years after Christ, I oppose Ambrose, which was seven hundred years elder than he, who saith in the place before rehearsed: "We have no need of any suffragator," much less of a mediator, "unto God." The place of Basil is forged and counterfeit, as many other are, in that idolatrous Council, to maintain idolatry, and this most manifestly, because Julian the Apostate being utterly revolted from the faith, was not to be prayed for: but public prayers were made in the church against him, and not for him. Theodoret, *Hist. lib. 3. cap. 9. and 17.*

I conclude with the words of Augustin, *contr. Parm. lib. 2. cap. 8.* "If the Apostle had said so: These things have I written unto you, that you should not sin: but if any man sin, you have me a mediator with the Father, and I do by my prayer obtain pardon for your sins, as Parmenianus in a certain place, placed the bishop a mediator between the people and God, what good and faithful Christian could abide him? who would behold him as an Apostle of Christ, and not as Antichrist?" God give us grace therefore still to detest your Antichristian doctrine, and practice of many mediators, and with the Apostle Paul in this place, to acknowledge our Saviour Christ to be our only mediator with God, both of intercession and redemption.

12. Although women are forbidden to teach publicly, yet they ought according to their knowledge to instruct their family privately: and God hath sometimes extraordinarily used the ministry of women to the converting of great nations. Neither doth Paul reprove women for talking of the scripture, which, so it be with modesty seemly for the sex, is greatly commended by Hierom in many virtuous women. Yea he exhorteth Læta, a godly matron, to season the tender tongue of her young daughter with sweet Psalms. "Let them seek her," saith he, "in the journey of this world, among the multitude and frequency of her kinstolks, but let them find her no where else, but in the closet of the scriptures, inquiring of the Prophets and Apostles, of her spiritual marriage." And as evil women have been sometimes promoters of heresy, so have good women been promoters of true religion, and have given their life for the testimony of the truth, as constantly and readily as men. Wherefore that which is a reproach only of wicked persons, ought not to be abused unto the untimely of the whole sex.

### CHAPTER 3.

2. These qualities ought to be common to all the ministers of the word of God and sacraments, as well to the inferior Priests, as to the highest Bishops: although as every man is called to higher honour, he ought to endeavour more to excel in virtue.

2. The text is plain, that a Bishop, a Priest, or a Deacon, must be the husband of one

wife: and therefore, if all the men that ever were or shall be, should say the contrary, marriage is both lawful and convenient for a Bishop, Elder, or Deacon, by the judgment of the Holy Ghost. And it was nothing else but the mystery of iniquity, working closely by the subtlety of Satan, that deceived Hierom, and many other ancient godly Fathers, in causing them to think and write, not so honourably of marriage in the clergy, as the holy institution thereof, and the allowance of God unto all degrees of men doth require. We know nothing by Vigilantius, but that as he was ancient, so he was as good a Catholic as Hierom, and in some points defended the truth, against superstition more sincerely than Hierom. For that he did write so bitterly against him, it was but his private affection, who write also as bitterly against Rufinus, and as tauntingly against Augustin, both which were as good Catholics as he himself. The church in his time did not condemn Vigilantius, either of heresy or error, but in some things confirmed his judgment. For vigils, or watches, against the abuse of which he did write, were soon after abolished, and are not retained by the Papists themselves. But Hierom being in a chase, because the Bishop of Barcelona suffered Vigilantius to teach in his church uncontrolled, falleth out also with other godly Bishops that took his part, and upon hearsay chargeth them, how truly God knoweth, that they ordained no Deacons, except they first married wives, with further surmise of their suspicion against all unmarried men. Whereas it is more like that understanding this text rightly, they judged married men to be as fit as unmarried men for the holy ministry, though it be not necessary that all should be married, or all unmarried. And the Greek church hath of long time observed this custom, to ordain none before they be married. But the Protestants, you say, though they command not every Priest to be married, yet they mislike them that will not marry. This is a lewd slander: for without respect of being married or unmarried, so they live honestly, and teach sincerely, they are liked and allowed of us. You say, "they suspect ill of every single person in the church." Verily the single life of Popish Priests was so far from chastity, that there are few Parishes in England, that cannot bring manifest proof of the incontinency of one Popish Priest or other: but that we do therefore suspect ill of every single person in the church, you are able to bring no proof. For we verily persuade ourselves, that there be many, both in the ministry, and among the people, that leading a single life without vow, keep their bodies in chastity and continence, a hundred times better than many Popish votaries. That the gift of continence is rare, the incontinence of so many as vowed chastity among you, and so little performed it, may give us just occasion to think so. But we are bold to say always, that the Bishop or Priest, having not the gift of continence, may do his duty and charge

better married than unmarried, which is not any whit against the Apostle, but expressly with him, who affirmeth that it is better for such to marry than to burn. Otherwise the single hath less cause to be distracted and entangled with the world in some respect, than the married man: and yet a prudent and faithful wife, may be occasion that her husband should be less entangled with worldly matters, than if he were unmarried.

This text of the apostle is plain, that although he commanded not all to be married, yet he alloweth any that is married, so he have but one wife, with the other qualities here required to be ordained bishop, elder, or deacon. Neither speaketh he only of them that have been married, and their wives perhaps dead, but of them that are presently married: for the verb is of the present tense. A bishop must be the husband of one wife, and, 1. *Tit. 6*, if any is or be the husband of one wife, therefore not such an one, as hath been married, but such an one as is married, may be a bishop or priest. The apostle therefore, verse 11 of this chapter, giveth order what manner of women their wives should be, which your vulgar Latin hath corruptly translated "Mulieres," and you for a poor advantage of your heresy, the women, contrary to the manifest circumstance of the text, and the method of the apostle, who would not so abruptly when he had spoken of bishops and deacons, which he will have to be the husbands of one wife, speak generally of women which pertain nothing to bishops and deacons, and then return again to deacons. More probably doth Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others, understand women that were deaconesses, for the help of the poor. But where you say, it is no more but an inhibition, that none having been twice married, or being "Bigamus," should be admitted, it is false: for he is the husband of one wife, which hath but one wife at one time, though he hath been married more than once or twice, and although his wife were a widow before he married her. But this your "exposition only is," as you say, "agreeable to the practice of the whole church, the definition of ancient councils, and the doctrine of all the fathers, without exception." If this proud brag were true, as it is false, yet the authority of the Holy Ghost is to be preferred before all that you name, whose words cannot without manifest violence be restrained to such an exposition.

Therefore Chrysostom expoundeth this text against Polygamy, which is the having of many wives at once, saying: "He saith not this as making a law, that none without a wife may be made a bishop, but appointing a measure of that matter: for it was lawful for the Jews to be joined in the second marriage, and to have two wives at once." But in his exposition upon Titus, you would have us believe, that he forgot what he said here, or in so short time changed his exposition, and agreeth wholly with you, whereas in truth, if you understood him right, he confirmeth that

which he saith upon this text. For he speaketh against such lascivious persons as after their wife was departed from them, not lawfully divorced, married another. For such were not the husbands of one wife: seeing she that departed, or was unjustly put away, remained still a lawful wife. His words are these: For what cause doth he bring forth even such kind of men? He purposeth utterly to stop the mouths of heretics, which condemn marriage: showing that marriage is without fault, and is so precious, that with it any man may be preferred, even to the holy seat of a bishopric. Also with this saying he chastiseth unchaste persons, while he suffereth them not after their second marriage, to be taken to the government of the church, and the dignity of a pastor: for he which is found not to have kept his benevolence toward his wife, which is gone from him, how should he be a very good teacher to the church? nay rather, to what crimes shall he not daily be subject: For ye all know, that although by the laws such second marriages are permitted, yet that thing is open to many accusations: therefore he will have the bishop to give no occasion to them that are under him. Therefore before all things he setteth down: if any be without crime, that is, if all his life be void of reproof, if no man can reprove his manners. Finally hear what our Lord saith: if the light which is in thee be darkness, how great shall the darkness be?

Here it is plain, that he speaketh of second marriage in them, whose first wife was not dead, but gone away. For he that marrieth after his wife is dead, is not to be charged with lasciviousness, nor to be accounted unchaste, and much less he that in his first marriage taketh a widow, nor daily subject to many crimes, or to any crime in respect of his marriage, neither is his life and manners to be reprov'd, that liveth chastely with his second wife, neither is to be accounted darkness, who after his wife is dead, marrieth in the Lord.

Therefore Chrysostom speaketh of such second marriages, as were permitted by the civil laws, after unlawful divorcements, or departures of wives from their husbands, and not against the marriage of them, that after their wife is departed out of this life, do marry another in the fear of God, as it is free by God's ordinance, and willed by Paul to the younger sort of widows, 2 *Tim. 5*. For such marriage is not open to any just accusation.

Therefore Chrysostom in both places, is directly contrary to your false and enforced exposition. So is Theodoret upon this text: "The husband of one wife, the preaching then began. And neither the Gentiles did exercise virginity, nor the Jews did admit it: for they esteemed the procreation of children to be a blessing. Therefore for as much as at that time, they were not easily to be found which exercised continency, he commandeth of such as had married wives, to ordain them which had honoured temperancy. And concerning that saying, the husband of one wife,

I think certain men have said well. For of old time both Greeks and Jews were wont to be married with two, three, or more wives at once. But even now also when the Imperial laws forbid men to marry two wives at once, they have to do with concubines and harlots. They have said therefore, that the holy apostle saith, That he which dwelleth honestly with one wife, is worthy to be ordained a bishop. For, say they, he doth not reject the second marriage, which hath often commanded that it should be used. For a woman, saith he, is bound by the same law so long as her husband liveth, but if her husband be dead, she is free, that she may marry to whom she will, only in the Lord. Again, I say to the unmarried and to the widows, and joining both the states together he maketh one law for them. Indeed if the vow of continency have been made, the second marriage is not in the power of their will. For if he have thrust away the first wife, and be joined to another, he is worthy to be reprehended, and is justly subject to accusation. But if force of death hath disjoined his first wife, and nature urging, hath compelled him to be joined to a second wife, his second marriage is proceeded not of his will but of casualty. These things considered, I admit their interpretation which have so understood the place." Hierom also, no great favourer of marriage, and inclined to that opinion, that he which hath been twice lawfully married, should not be ordained, yet in his commentary upon the epistle to Titus, agreeth not with your exposition, and declareth that there were many which did interpret these words as we do. His words are these: "As touching that he saith, the husband of one wife, we ought to understand it so, that we think not that every one that hath been but once married, is better than he that hath been twice married, but that he may exhort unto one only marriage and continency, which can bring forth his own example in teaching. For put the case, there is one which lost his wife when he was a very young man, and being overcome with the necessity of his flesh, hath taken the second wife, which within short time after he hath lost also: and after that hath lived continently, and that there is another man which hath had the use of matrimony, and his wife even until old age, as many think it a felicity never to have ceased from the work of the flesh, which of these two seemeth to be the better, the more chaste, the more continent? Verily he which in his second marriage was unhappy, and afterward lived chastely and holily, and not he which by old age was separated from embracing his wife. Therefore let him not please himself which having been but once married, is chosen: that he is better than every one which hath been twice married. Seeing in him his happiness was chosen rather than his will. Some interpreters of this place do give this sense: It was of the Jewish custom, say they, that men had two wives or more at once, as we read in the old law of Abraham and Jacob: and this they will have to be the Apostle's

commandment in this place, that he which is to be chosen a bishop have not two wives together at one time. Many more superstitiously than truly, do think that such are not to be chosen in the priesthood, which when they were Gentiles had one wife, and after they had lost her, since they were baptized in Christ, have married another wife, whereas if this were to be observed, they should rather be kept from the bishop's office, which following before wandering lust by harlots, have taken one wife since they were regenerated; and it is much more detestable to have committed fornications with many, than to have been twice married: for in the one is felicity of matrimony, in the other lasciviousness prone to sin." Theophylact saith upon this text: "let him be the husband of one wife. He spake this because of the Jews, for to them was permitted polygamy, that is to join marriage with many together."

By these testimonies you may see how brazen faced these Rhemists are, which are not ashamed to say, that this "their exposition only is the doctrine of all the fathers without exception." Whereas it is evident, that Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact, and by the testimony of Theodoret and Hierom, many other ancient fathers before them interpreted this text only against polygamy, or many wives at once. And there is no doubt, but according to their doctrine that so understood the Scripture, the church practised in ordaining them that had been married more than once, and in allowing them that were ordained to live chastely with one wife. But Ambrose, you say, affirmeth that none may be taken into the Clergy that have been twice married. What then? Other doctors were of another judgment, as we heard before: and Hierom condemneth his opinion plainly of superstition. *Ep. 82.* Where he thinketh, that such as had been often married before baptism, were excluded. But he affirmeth that the holy council of Nice have taken this order. Yet no such thing appeareth in the acts of that council, and therefore it is like he was deceived by some false copy. For it is not unlike that the council of Nice was falsified as well in this point, as in the point of the Bishop of Rome's usurped authority, which was openly discovered in the council of Africa. Ambrose alloweth him that hath a wife to be ordained Bishop or Priest, as his words are plain, "He commandeth that a Bishop be the husband of one wife, not that he exclude him that is unmarried, for this is above the law of the precept, but that with matrimonial chastity, he keep the grace of his washing or baptism. Neither is he again invited to get children by the Apostle's authority, for he said, having children, or begetting children." By these words it appeareth, that Ambrose thought it lawful, though not necessary, for a Bishop to be married and also to beget children: and of the same judgment he is upon this text: so doth Hierom, although he say the clergy is made of them that have been but once married, and

allegeth that the text may be expounded only against Polygamy, as in his Commentary upon the Epistle to Titus, against them that refuse him that was married before baptism and after. *Oceano cont. Jov. lib. 1.* He confesseth that such manner of men were chosen to be Priests, because there were not so many Virgins, as it was necessary to have Priests. And as concerning that opinion, that he which had one wife before he was baptized, and another after, cannot be ordained; he calleth it the heresy of Cain, and disputeth earnestly against it, in that Epistle to Oceanus, neither doth Augustin simply allow it: but saith, "They did understand the Apostle more sharply, which thought he was not to be ordained which had another wife, being a learner of a Pagan. As for Innocentius, Leo, and Gregory, Bishops of Rome, in which See the mystery of iniquity wrought more strongly than in other places, and specially toward the revelation of Antichrist, it is less marvel, if they thought any thing more hardly of marriage. And yet *Leo, Epist. 87,* toucheth not the case, nor yet *Gregory, lib. 2. Ep. 25.* But that such as had been twice married, or had married a widow, should not be admitted, they both affirm. As for the book *De Ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*, falsely bearing the name of Augustin, it deserveth none answer: and yet the author excludeth them that have had wives before baptism, or one concubine, which if it were true, Augustin could never have been made Bishop, for he confesseth that he had two concubines. *Conf. lib. 6. cap. 15.* The reason that Leo allegeth out of the law, to prove that he is Bigamus that hath married a widow, because the high priest was forbidden to marry a widow, is insufficient, for that prohibition extended only to the high priest, which was a figure of Christ, and pertaineth no more unto the ministers of the church in the New Testament, than any other parts of his office, that were peculiar to that state and calling. But that the godly ancient fathers accounted bigamy to be in them that had two wives at once, and not in them that had been twice married, Justin martyr is a good witness: who, *Apol. 2,* expounding that saying of our Saviour Christ, "He that marrieth her that is forsaken committeth adultery," concludeth, that they which according to man's law, "do marry two wives, by our master's judgment, are sinners." The ancient Councils also of Neocesarea and Laodicea, putting them to open penance, that were Digami, seem to mean of such as were married contrary to God's law to the second wife, before the first was dead, or else it was a gross error to punish that which was no sin, with a whole year's, or two years' open penance.

We depart neither from the Apostle's doctrine, nor from the judgment of all the ancient fathers, as the places of Chrysostom, Theodoret and Hierom do declare, in understanding this text, of him that is the husband of one wife at one time, though he have been married more than once. And seeing the Holy Ghost

doth not restrain marriage from them that are ordained being single, it were Antichristian presumption and the doctrine of devils to forbid that which God hath left to be free. That you say it was never lawful in God's church to marry after holy orders, and that there is not one authentical example thereof in the world, it is a lewd and impudent lie. For to omit so many of your popish church, which by the Pope's dispensation have married after holy orders, the Council of Ancyra, *Can. 9. or 10,* alloweth them, that when they are ordained deacons, do profess that they must have wives to marry after orders taken, and to continue in the ministry, *Matt. 8;* where also is handled the judgment of the Nicene Council, according to the sentence of Paphnutius, and the saying of Epiphanius. Saving that you say, Epiphanius never heard that any bishop did beget children, as he did of other inferior degrees. Where I might answer you that under the name of priests, bishops are also contained, as you confess sometimes. And Athanasius, *ad Drecontium,* affirmeth, "that he knew many bishops not married, and contrariwise monks made fathers of children, as on the other side you may see," saith he "bishops fathers of children, and monks that have not sought liberty of generation, and that clerks have drunk wine, and monks have fasted. For so it is lawful, and after this manner it shall not be prohibited, but let every man strive in what he will," &c.

Where you say, Eusebius saith that such as be consecrated to the holy ministry should abstain wholly from their wives which they had before, it is false. His words are these; "according to the laws of the New Testament, begetting of children is not altogether forbidden, although that which is not unlike to the ancient godly men, is appointed. For the word saith, that a bishop must be the husband of one wife, but also it is meet that even they which are consecrated and exercised about the ministry of God do abstain from thenceforth, from matrimonial company." He speaketh therefore of that which he judged convenient, but not necessary. Hierom was too much addicted to extol continency and virginity, and therefore, otherwise than the truth requireth, he pronounceth of the Apostles: yet can he not deny, but many bishops and priests in his time were married, and did also use the act of marriage, although they abstained at sometimes, as appeareth by the former place in his apology. For in the other place he saith, bishops, priests, and deacons are chosen, either virgins or widows, *vel certe post sacerdotium in aeternum pudici,* "or at least after priesthood for ever chaste," we may well understand him, of them that live chastely in marriage. For else it would follow, that married men were *impudici*, unchaste and filthy, which crime of reproach of marriage, Hierom in that apology laboureth to wipe away from himself. But Socrates, *lib. 5. cap. 22,* saith that in his time "many bishops even in the time that they were bishops begat children of their lawful wives." Au-

gustin, *de adulterinis conjugis*, saith, that some which were constrained to be of the clergy did continue continent by God's help to the end: he saith, that they were bound unto it by the law of God. For of Peter, the author of those questions under his name saith, "it is known that he had a wife, and the begetting of children did not hinder him to take the primacy among the Apostles." *Question. cit. utro mixt. q. 102.*

The rest that you say, of our complaining of these necessities, &c. and thinking there is no life without women, is vain and slanderous. We know God's gifts are diverse, and that to some he giveth the gift of continency, but not to all. And therefore to whom God giveth not the gift, we say it is impossible for him to have it. But it is a matter so easy, and the gift in every man's power that will seek it, as you defend, the more inexcusable it is in the popish clergy, if they keep not continency, which also they have vowed or professed, as it is well known how ill they kept it in times past, and it is to be doubted they would do little better hereafter, if they were settled in such ease and wealth as they have been.

But to prove that it was generally the church's order from the Apostles' time, that the clergy should abstain from marriage, you will us to see Tertullian, in his first book to his wife, where no such matter is; although as he had at that time embraced the heresy of Montanus, he saith, that second marriages were against the discipline of the church and the prescript of the Apostle, which suffereth not them that have been twice married to be bishops. But the Catholic Church in his time allowed them to be bishops that were twice married, and that doth Tertullian object unto the catholics as a crime, in his book *De Monogamia*. Whereby we may see, from how good a spring<sup>e</sup> that interpretation of this text proceeded, that a bishop might not be one that had been twice married, even from the filthy sink of Montanus the heretic. And yet it is not like that Tertullian abstained from his wife, because he useth not that for a reason to persuade her from second marriage, that he had experience by long abstinence in marriage, that she had strength to refrain her from second marriage, if she would use it. The book *De Singularitate clericorum*, though it be none of Cyprian's works, yet doth it not show, that it was the general order of the church from the Apostles, that the ministers of the church should be unmarried, or abstain from their wives, but that such as had promised openly to abstain from lawful marriage, should not secretly keep company with strange women. Therefore he saith, *Num. 4.* "why hath he taken a woman to him, which hath despised to marry a wife. He hath given to me a suspected plea, which hath refused a lawful wife and taken an unlawful woman." The third canon of the Council of Nice likewise forbiddeth all strange women to dwell with the ministers of the church, but not their own wives. The Council of Neocæsarea, *cap. 1.* deposeth him that marrieth after he is a priest from

his dignity, but if he commit fornication or adultery, casteth him out of the church and putteth him to open penance among laymen. This provincial constitution, though not grounded upon the word of God, yet declareth that they counted it a breach of man's law, for a priest to marry, and therefore deposed him from his order, but no sin against God, therefore they never divorced him, nor put him to penance, as they did them that committed fornication or adultery. But that a married man might be ordained and retain his wife, it appeareth in the same council, *can. 8.* The Council of An-cyra, *Can. 10.* decreed in these words, "the deacons, whosoever, at the time of their ordination, protested saying, they would have wives, and that they could not contain, if afterwards they come to be married, let them remain in the ministry, because the bishop hath given them license. But so many as held their peace, and received imposition of hands professing continency, if after they come to be married, ought to cease from the ministry." This canon doth show most manifestly, that abstinence from marriage was not exacted of any, but such as would willingly profess it, and that it was lawful to marry even after holy orders taken, contrary to your stout assertion. Therefore whatsoever was decreed in the latter councils, can be no prejudice to the ancient truth, and practice of the church. And seeing the Council of Nice the first allowed the clergy to continue with their wives, you are not able to show a contrary decree more ancient, than that ungodly and unlearned epistle of Siricius, bishop of Rome, to the bishops of Africa, in which he would prove, that the Apostle, although he said a bishop must be the husband of one wife, yet would have him to abstain from his wife, because he saith elsewhere, "they that are in the flesh cannot please God." According to which decretal epistle, that Council of Carthage 2. was held, it all be not counterfeit, the epistle, Rescript, council and all, as there is good cause to suspect. The councils of Toletane 2. and Orleans 3. being of much later time, and nearer to the open revelation of Antichrist, it is less marvel if they drew nearer to the prohibition of marriage, and the canon 3. of Toledo, which you quote, forbiddeth the cohabitation only of strange women: and in the first canon, these Spanish bishops allow married men to be taken into the ministry, so they promise to renounce the works of the flesh. The Council of Orleans deposeth them that abstain not from their own wives, yet leaveth them in the communion of laymen. And howsoever the mystery of iniquity wrought sometimes more closely, sometimes more openly, yet Gregory the Seventh, otherwise called Hildebrand, placed by the devil, whom as a necromancer he served, in the Antichristian See of Rome about five hundred years ago, was the first that by cruel decrees of excommunication, deprived the ministers of the church of their lawful wives, and compelled the clergy to the vow of continency. For until his time, and in his time, many

of the priests were married, though by hypocrisy of other popes and prelates, they were sometimes molested, yet never utterly prohibited or divorced from them. But whosoever was author of the clergy's single life by prohibition of marriage, it is certain he learned it of the devil, as the Apostle testifieth in the beginning of the next chapter.

4. Peter and Philip begat sons, and Philip gave his daughters in marriage. *Clemens. Strom. lib. 3.*

6. There was never heresy that hath admitted more unworthy persons into their clergy than the heresy of Papistry hath, not only into inferior places, but even into their bishop's See, and unto the See of Rome itself, as their own histories do testify of many.

8. Paul knew no subdeacons, and therefore you cannot comprehend them under his rule of deacons. Bishops and elders differ not in order, but only in office of government. Pope Urban in the decrees confesseth that the Primitive Church had only these two orders of deacons and priests. *Dist. 60. cap. Nullus in Episcopatum*, whereupon it may appear how true he said, that told your five orders to have been ever since Christ's time in the church, and that it might be proved by all antiquity. In the ancient times there is mention of under deacons which were assigned to some inferior service in that ministry, for an orderly and quiet distribution of those duties, and so might be comprehended under the names of deacons. But your subdeacons are a distinct degree and order from deacons, nothing intermeddling with the duty and office of deacons, therefore nothing like the ancient under deacons, but in name only. As for these other offices which you name *acoluthi*; they were young men appointed to attend upon the bishop, for their learning to be instructed by his doctrine and example, that afterward they might be meet to be called unto the same office. The Exorcists were such as had the gift to cast out devils in them that were possessed, and were called *Energumeni*. The readers were such as were appointed to read the text of the scriptures openly in the church. The door-keepers were assigned to keep the entry of the church, that no Heathen person or excommunicated should enter, but such only as were admitted either to the hearing of the Word, or to the prayers, or to the sacraments. They had also singers, labourers, confessors, diggers, sextons and catechists, as appeareth by Ignatius, *ad Antioch. Canon. Apost. 43. Hierom de septem ordinibus. Cyprian Epist. 24. Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 3.* So that if you will have all offices that were in the Primitive Church, to be several orders of the ministry, you must have at the least ten or eleven orders. That continence was required by ancient canons of subdeacons also, you ground much upon Epiphanius, who confesseth that it was not generally observed in his time. It sufficeth us to have only those orders and degrees as necessary, which the holy scripture hath commended. Other variable offices, as every church shall think ex-

pedient for their government and discipline, they may institute or retain. As for the ridiculous offices that are appointed to these popish orders, to carry tapers, cruets, fly flaps, and to drive dogs out of the church, it is superfluous to write, the ancient Primitive Church knew no such vanities. And whereas you send the learned to the council of Carthage 4, where you say Augustin was present, the learned may justly suspect the credit of that council, which is wholly patched out of the pope's decrees. Where Gratian saith, that Pope Zosimus was present by his deputies, *Dist. 93. cap. Diaconi ita*, &c. by the date that is given to it, Zosimus was not yet pope, but either Syricius or Anastasius.

Many ancient copies of these decrees have no title of the council of Carthage, but of ancient statutes of the church. And therefore those decrees seem to be of a later making than Augustin's time. And yet in those decrees, the priest receiveth no power to consecrate, nor to offer for the quick and the dead; and the deacon is ordained to minister. The subdeacon hath a platter and a cup, a cruse of water and a towel delivered unto him, to signify that he is appointed to serve the tables, as *Acts 6*. Not a popish patten, chalice, cruet, and other toys for the mass. The acoluth hath a candlestick and wax candle delivered, that he may know he is bound to light the candles of the church, which came together in time of persecution in the night season. In remembrance whereof, even in time of peace, they kept the vigils and night watches, when they lighted wax candles, as Hierom saith, to drive away the darkness of the night, and not in the day time, as Vigilantius objected, except, perhaps superstitious women, which had more zeal than knowledge, as Hierom said, lighted them in the day time also. The acoluth also had a litle cruse delivered unto him, to serve wine for the communion. But admit they were then decreed, the popish church hath not for many years had any use of these inferior orders: for a poor sexton, or a boy doth, most commonly execute all those offices, which in those degrees are appointed to acolites, ostiaries, readers: yea most commonly, they supply the office of deacons and subdeacons also, when mass is said. Neither do they ordain acolites to do their office, nor any of the rest, but as preparatories to priesthood. These offices therefore in the church are needless.

15. Ambrose saith not, that Damasus was the ruler of the whole church, or governor of the universal church, but a ruler and governor of the church of God, as every other Catholic bishop was, and is by Paul's words, *Acts 20. 28*. If you ask why then doth he name Damasus alone, rather than any other bishop? I answer, because the Arians had greatly overrun, not only the east churches, but also the west churches, and the city of Rome itself in the time of Liberius and Felix, that were his predecessors, and the Catholics began to recover their strength again under Damasus. To distinguish the Catholic church

from the Arian's Heretical companions, whereof there were great troops still remaining, he nameth Damasus Bishop of Rome, a governor of the church of God, being the chief bishop of Italy, with whom he did communicate. As also Hierom against the Arians, professeth that he would join with Damasus, because he maintaineth the truth of Christ's Divinity against those Heretics in the east. Wherefore the saying of Ambrose doth no more allow Gregory the Thirteenth to be a Catholic bishop, than Liberius, Honorius, Vigilus, or any other that were found to be Heretics, much less make him the governor of the universal church of Christ.

15. As this place pincheth all Heretics generally, so the Papists most specially. For seeing the church of God is the pillar and stay of truth, and the Romish church is not the pillar and stay of truth, but an enemy thereof, and a bolster out of lies, fables, heresies, and the doctrine of devils, it followeth inevitably, that the Romish church is not the church of God. The minor hath been often proved, both by preaching, disputing, and writing, and is sufficiently declared in this answer. But how, I pray you, doth it pinch us, as you imagine? You say "we oppose ourselves directly against the very letter and confessed sense of the same." How prove you that? you answer, some say "the church is lost or hidden." Who saith the church is lost? none of us ever said so, some perhaps have said, that the true church hath been hidden from the eyes of the world, and of Antichrist, that hath persecuted her. But hereof, I trow, it followeth not, except it be in Rhemish logic, that therefore the church is not the pillar of truth. You add, that "some say the church is fallen away from Christ these many ages, and that it become a stew, and the seat of Antichrist." We say so indeed of the Romish church, yet Christ hath, and had his church and chaste spouse all this while, which is the pillar of truth. Yet again, you say, "that some of us say, it is driven to a corner only of the world." But you say untruly, for we believe that it is, and always was dispersed in many nations, although in respect of the persecution, it is said to be driven into the wilderness. *Apoc.* 12. And you acknowledge, when Antichrist cometh, it shall be driven into corners, and great straits, yet for all that, it was always, and ever shall be, the pillar and stay of the truth.

You charge "the Protestants to say, that it may and doth err, and hath shamefully erred for many hundred years together." We say not that the Catholic Church of Christ, but that the church of Rome hath shamefully and damnablely erred these many hundred years. We say also, that the true church of Christ, may err and have spots in doctrine, as well as in conversation, yet not in any point necessary unto salvation; and for all that be the pillar and stay of truth, for it is no otherwise called the stay and pillar of truth, than it is called the chaste virgin without spot or wrinkle, *Eph.* 5. 27. Having neither perfection of

truth nor of holiness in her members in this world, but so far forth as she is directed by the word of God and his Holy Spirit, which ministereth always sufficient truth to conduct them to the state of perfection after this life. The church therefore is the pillar and stay of truth, because all truth necessary to salvation, is to be found no where in the world, but in the church of God, and this truth is always to be found in every church of God, though it be not always pure from all contagion of errors. For Paul instructeth Timothy how to behave himself in the church of Ephesus, or any other part of the Catholic Church of Christ, that it may continue the house or church of God, whose office is to be a pillar and stay of truth that is learned out of God's word. He doth not send Timothy to learn of the church, whereof he was appointed a teacher, but he willeth Timothy to teach the Church out of the word of God, that it might still continue the pillar and stay of truth. For if any particular church, as the church of Rome, contain the word of God and presume to decree both without it and against it, even in articles of faith necessary to salvation, it ceaseth to be the church of God, and the pillar and stay of truth, which is to become a harlot, a maintainer of heresy and false doctrine. But let us hear what main reason you have to prove that the church cannot err in any thing.

I deny that the popish church is that, whereof Peter was a governor in his time, and Damasus in the time of Ambrose. That principle you must prove.

You say, that the church is the pillar of truth, ergo it cannot err. I deny your argument, for Peter was a pillar of truth, yet he erred, and was reproved by Paul. *Gal.* 2. 11. I have showed how it cannot err, and how it may err, being the pillar and stay of the truth builded upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the corner stone. *Ephes.* 2. 20, &c.

You say, it hath the Spirit of God to lead it into all truth, to the end of the world: *Ergo*, it cannot err. I deny this argument. Every one of God's elect, after they be called, have the spirit of truth by Christ's prayer, *John* 17, unto their life's end, yet they may err, though not finally to their damnation.

Although the gates of hell shall not prevail against the church of Christ, to overthrow it, it followeth not, that it cannot err, for every true Christian is builded upon the same rock, which is Christ, and the gates of hell shall not prevail, to condemn any true Christian.

He hath placed apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and doctors, to the full consummation and perfection of the whole body, and every member, that we be not carried about, &c. *Ergo*, the church cannot err. You may as well conclude, that no true member of the church can err. And certain it is, that the doctrine of the apostles, prophets, and evangelists, if it be continually taught, by the pastors and teachers, is sufficient to preserve the church, and every true member from all

error in doctrine. But if they decline from the rule of the apostles, prophets, and evangelists, they err themselves, and deceive as many as follow them. Paul therefore declareth, what an excellent benefit Christ hath bestowed on his church and every true member thereof; he doth not assure either the whole church, or every member thereof, of truth always, if they neglect the benefit; although he otherwise assure his whole body and every part thereof, never to be deceived finally unto destruction. But seeing there be some pastors and teachers, builders of the church, that build wood, hay, and stubble upon the foundation Christ, which shall be saved, although they lose their combustible work, the church by such builders may be brought into error, but holding still the foundation, can never be deprived of salvation. 1 Cor. 3.

He hath prayed for the church, that it be sanctified in the verity: *Ergo*, it cannot err. The conclusion followeth not, for the church is sanctified in the truth, and yet may err, as it doth sin in every member thereof. And the same prayer pertaineth to every one of God's elect which may err, and yet be sanctified in the truth, not to err unto damnation. *John* 17. 20.

He hath prayed that the faith of the chief governor thereof fail not. *Ergo*, it cannot err. This is the worst of all the arguments, that went before, for there is no part of it true. Christ prayed not for Peter, as chief governor of the church, but as one of the true members thereof, that his faith should not fail, which prayer he made generally for every member of the church which may yet err, and so did Peter, *Gal.* 2. That special prayer for Peter was, that his faith should not fail in that grievous temptation, when he was sifted by Satan: and cannot be applied to every one that is bishop, where Peter taught; except you will say, that every one of them must deny Christ, as Peter did.

The church "is Christ's house, his spouse, his body, his lot, kingdom, and inheritance:" this is confessed, but hereof it followeth no more that it is free from all error, than that it is free from all spot of sin while it is a stranger on the earth.

He loveth it as his own flesh, and it cannot be divorced or separated from him: *Ergo*, it cannot err. We may as well conclude, that seeing he loveth every one of his members, as his own flesh, for we are every one members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones, which cannot be separated from him. *Ephes.* 5. 30. Therefore none of his members can err, or sin. And yet it is certain that none of his members can err or sin unto eternal damnation, though every error and sin deserve damnation.

The new testament, scriptures, sacraments and sacrifice cannot be changed, being the everlasting dowry of the church, continued and never rightly occupied in any other church, but in your popish church, which you falsely call the catholic church: *Ergo*, the

church, and that the popish church cannot err. As great learning as you would be thought to have, you show it little, in setting the worst argument in the last place. For beside the inconsequence of the argument, common with all the rest of his brethren that went before, it containeth three most impudent and beggarly petitions of the whole matter in controversy.

That the New Testament, the scriptures, sacraments, and sacrifice of Christ have been ever continued in the right use of them in the popish church.

That no other church hath rightly occupied them. And that the popish church is the Catholic Church of Christ: but if all these three principles were admitted as true, which while heaven and earth standeth shall never be granted of us, nor proved by you, yet the conclusion is false. For that the true Catholic Church though she have the right use of the New Testament, scriptures, sacraments, and sacrifice of Christ to the salvation of all her members, yet she hath not always such perfection of knowledge but that she may be deceived in some things.

Your general conclusion is yet more impudent, that all those points of doctrine, faith, and worship, that any man thinketh to be errors, in the Popish Church, be no errors, although they be never so contrary to the New Testament, which is God's covenant of remission of sins freely and justification by grace, and faith only, as your doctrines of merits, and satisfaction, though they be never so contrary to the scriptures, as the communion under one kind, worshipping of images and other creatures, prohibition of marriage and meats, &c., and though they overthrow the only sacrifice of Christ's death, and sufficiency thereof, by the daily sacrifice of the mass, and the pope's pardons, *a pana et culpa*, &c. But the faithful know that church to be the pillar and stay of truth, which is builded upon the foundation of the apostles, Jesus Christ being the head corner stone; therefore they seek the church in the holy scriptures, which are the monuments of the prophets and apostles, and a perfect testimony of Christ, and so lean to the church, as the church leameth to the scripture, and to Christ the only foundation thereof. For none other thing did the apostles, and the Nicene Council mean, when they taught us to believe and confess the catholic and apostolic church of Christ. For neither the apostles, nor the Nicene Council, had authority to make any articles of faith, but to teach and declare, those points of doctrine that the Spirit of Truth hath revealed to be necessary articles of faith unto salvation. But it sufficeth not you, that we confess that there is a Catholic Church, whereof every Christian man must be a child and member, that he may be saved. But further you require, that we acknowledge, "that that which is called the Catholic Church, and known so to be, and communicateth with the See Apostolic, is the church." Here is as great uncertainty as before: for all heretics call them-



selves the Catholic Church. But how shall they be known to be the Catholic Church, and to communicate with the See Apostolic, but by their consent in doctrine with the holy scriptures, and writings of the apostles? The churches of the east, call and count themselves the Catholic Church, as much as the papists, and communicate with the Apostolic Sees of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, Ephesus, where the apostles Peter, Andrew, James, and John, and Mark the evangelist have sitten, and their doctrine in many points is more agreeable to the writings of the apostles, and evangelists, than the papists; yet the papists will not acknowledge them to be the Catholic Church, therefore this rule is no part of our creed, at leastwise, it cannot sufficiently direct us to the Catholic Church, which is the article of our faith. Your second rule: "that we must hear, believe and obey the same, as the touchstone, pillar, and firmament of truth," so it be rightly understood, we do yield unto; but this church is that, which is builded upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles whose doctrine is comprehended in the holy scriptures, and is therefore called the pillar and stay of truth, because it teacheth this true doctrine. Therefore what church is the pillar of truth, which we must hear, believe, and obey: we must know only out of the scriptures, and so far acknowledge it to be the pillar of truth, as it teacheth nothing, but that which is contained in the word of truth, declared in the scriptures. And thus the ancient fathers have taught us to know the church. *Chrysostom, opere imperfect, in Mat. Hom. 24. Augustin, de unitate Ecclesie, cap. 3. and 16.* Neither did the Nicene Creed say, I believe in the Catholic Church, otherwise than we say in the apostles' creed, I believe the Catholic church, *Rom. 10.*

We seek not to fly from the known visible church to the hid congregation of the predestinate. For that which is known to be the visible church is a part of the Catholic church, which we believe to be the congregation of all the true members of Christ; although in the external society of the visible church, there be many, that be not of the church, as John saith, they went from us, but they were none of us, *John 2. 19.*

Where you deny the congregation of the predestinate to be the Catholic church of Christ, you flatly deny an article of our faith. Augustin expounding the articles of the creed saith, "That the church is here to be taken for the whole, and not for that part only, which is a stranger upon earth," *Eucher, ad Laurent, cap. 56.* And oftentimes in his writings affirmeth, the Catholic church to consist of all the predestinate, which are the members of Christ's mystical body, and that no wicked men pertain unto it, but only the good, holy, and just. *De baptism. lib. 6. cap. 3. De civitat. Dei, lib. 21 cap. 25. In Joan. Tr. 45.* Whereby you may see this is not a new and false apprehension of Wickliff, but an old and true judgment of the Catholic Church. But let us

hear what arguments you have against this apprehension. You say, "the company of the predestinate maketh not any one society among them-selves, many of them being yet unborn, and many yet infidels and heretics, and therefore be not of the one house of God, which is here called the pillar of truth." If you had said, many are not yet in the visible church, which be unborn or uncalled, we would have agreed with you, but yet all the elect be of the Catholic Church, which in the time appointed, shall be born and called. For is not that the Catholic church for which Christ died, that he might sanctify it and cleanse it by the laver of water in his word, *Eph. 5. 25, 26.* Or did he deliver himself, for that society of men which then were born and called? was it not the spouse of Christ, for which he delivered himself, and which not many lines before, you affirmed to be the pillar of truth, which could not err? certain it is, Christ died for the company of the predestinate, therefore the company of the predestinate are the church and spouse of Christ, therefore the house of God and the pillar of truth, yet most properly called the pillar of truth in respect of that part, which is a stranger here upon the earth.

"But those of the predestinate," you say, "that be already of the church, make no several company from the known Catholic church. Therefore he speaketh of the visible church." I answer, that those of the predestinate, that be already not only of the church, but also in the visible church, are the same with the church militant which is a part of the Catholic Church, and even that is the pillar of truth in this world. I understand visible, that which may be seen of men, not that which is always in the sight of the wicked, nor ever in the sight of every godly man. You say further, "Paul instructeth not Timothy, how to teach, preach, correct, and converse, in the invisible society of the predestinate, but in the visible house of God." I say, he instructed him how to behave himself in both, not as in two churches, but in one, seeing that the latter, is but a part of the former. For else the predestinate, that are yet unborn and uncalled, should not pertain to his charge. In truth, he teacheth him how to behave himself in the church of Ephesus, or any other particular congregation, whereof he should have charge, and not in the Catholic Church, as it is dispersed in the whole world. For every particular church is even as the whole, the pillar and stay of truth, so long as it continueth the true church of Christ. Yet this difference observed, that any visible particular church, may cease to be in this or that place, but the Catholic church shall never be removed out of the world, before the end of the world.

The presence of Christ by his spirit, according to his promise and prayers, as I have showed before, pertaineth to every true member of Christ's body, as much as to the whole. Yet every member may err of infirmity though not finally unto damnation. Augustin

in that place quoted, saith nothing to prove that the church cannot err, but that the word of truth, which he calleth confession of Christ shall never fail from the whole church, though many members deny Christ for a time, as Peter did, and afterward repent. "Not altogether out of the mouth of Peter," saith he, "in whom was a figure of the church, the word of truth was taken away, who although for an hour he had denied Christ, being troubled through fear, yet by weeping he was restored, and by confession was crowned."

But these words of Lactantius, are very notable, and yet they note nothing for your purpose, that the church cannot err in any thing, but in matters necessary to eternal life and salvation, which we grant. "Notwithstanding inasmuch as all singular companies of heretics," as he saith, "think themselves chiefly to be Christians, and the Catholic church. We must beware that we take not a church falsely called Catholic instead of the true church."

The note to discern the true church which Lactantius giveth is obscure, but if it be compared with that which he writeth in the former part of the chapter, that Christ and his ambassadors have given precepts that are certain, which we ought always to keep, which are their heavenly writings from which all heresies have swarmed, it may be better understood. "We must know," saith he, "that to be the true Catholic church, in which is the confession and repentance, which wholesomely cure the sins and wounds whereunto the frailty of the flesh is subject." His meaning is, that the true Catholic Church teacheth the way of salvation by true faith, and remission of sins, according to the Scriptures. *De vera sapientia, lib. 4. cap. 30.* Cyprian saith, "That they which departed from Christ do perish through their own fault, but the church which believeth in Christ, and which holdeth that which she hath once known, doth never depart from him altogether, and that they are the church which continue in the house of God." Whereby the reader may see, how without shame you falsify Cyprian to make a colour for your assertion, which Cyprian doth nothing favour.

Irenus speaketh of the true doctrine of salvation, which the church in his time did embrace, having testimony, as he saith, of the prophets and apostles, *lib. 3. cap. 40*, which we confess to be true of the Catholic church in all ages, yet may the church err in matters of less moment, as in his time in the contention about the celebration of Easter: in Augustin's times, in giving the communion to infants, &c. Neither is there any of the ancient fathers that holdeth it a pernicious absurdity, to affirm that the church of Christ can err in any point of religion, keeping still the foundation. Augustin saith expressly, "the determination of the former general councils, which represent the whole church, may oftentimes be reformed by the latter, when by any experiments of things

that is opened, which before was shut, and known which before was unknown." *De bapt. cont. Don. lib. 2. cap. 2.* Therefore in some things even the whole church visible of earth may err. Neither is there any of the ancient fathers that expound this text, that gather thereof that the church cannot err.

Chrysostom saith, "The church is not as the temple of the Jews, for this containeth faith and preaching, for truth is the pillar and stay of the church." By which words you see, in what sense the church is the pillar of truth, namely, because the truth is preached in it, which is the pillar and stay of the church itself. For truth maketh the church, the church maketh not truth. Theodoret saith, "He calleth the house of God and the church of those that have believed. And those he called the pillar and stay of truth. For being founded on the rock, they remain steadfast and immovable, and in the things themselves do preach the truth of doctrine. The world, saith Ambrose, is in prevarication, troubled with divers errors. Therefore it is necessary that it be said, that there is the house of God, and the truth where he is feared according to his own will, while his servants profess that of him, which he hath vouchsafed to teach, &c. The church is therefore the pillar and stay of truth, because it is her duty to possess the truth as Christ hath taught it, which assisted by his grace, she doth sufficiently to the salvation of all her children, though not so perfectly always but that in some point she may be deceived

#### CHAPTER 4.

3. Seeing the Spirit speaketh so evidently of this matter, you labour in vain to post over the crime to the old heretics, who as in their prohibition of marriage, they were forerunners of Antichrist, so there was none of them, to whom his clear prophecy may so properly be applied, as unto Antichrist himself, and his nearer members. For those old heretics that ascribed the institution of matrimony to Satan, and the creation and procreation of mankind unto the devil, spake not falsehood in hypocrisy, but in open blasphemy, and therefore might easily be discerned and avoided. But you that under pretence of holiness, religion, chastity, purity, fasting, prayer, by laws and decrees forbid marriage and meats to some men at all times, and to all men at some times, are they of whom the Spirit speaketh evidently, that they utter their false doctrine in hypocrisy, and therefore had need to be described by your special notes, and the church to be forewarned of you by this prophecy. For after the Apostle hath declared wherein the great mystery of true religion consisteth that is taught and believed in the Church of Christ: he doth immediately give evident notes of the mystery of iniquity maintained in the false church of Antichrist, who placeth the highest points of religion, in the prohibition of marriage and meats. In so much as they are specially, and in a manner only, called and computed of you religious,

that obey this prohibition of marriage and meats, though they live no more continently, than the old heretics, called *Origenianus carpes*, filthy Origenists, who as Epiphanius testifieth of them, "Rejected marriage, and yet lust ceased not among them, and defiled their body and mind with wantonness. For some of them are in the habit of monks that live solitarily, and some of the women are in the habit of women that live solitarily, but they are corrupt, performing their lust in their bodies. They study not for chastity, but for feigned chastity, and that which hath the name only of chastity. They desire to be in honour, for the exercise of chastity supposed to be in them." *Epiph. hares.* 64. Such were your monks, friars, and nuns for the most part in England, as was found manifestly in the visitation of their houses before their suppression. And even the Manichees permitted marriage to their laymen, which they call their hearers, but in no wise to their clergy, which they call their elects or chosen men. *Aug. de her. ad Quod vult Deum her.* 46. Again, such as had made the vow of chastity and were not able to perform it, the heretics called Apostolici, would not permit to marry, which was contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, which as Epiphanius doth testify, judged that it was better for such to marry openly, than to burn privily. *Heres.* 61. Therefore there is no way for you to escape the judgment of the Holy Ghost, by turning the matter over to the old heretics, who with as good reason might post it off from one to another, the Manichees to the Tacianists, and the Tacianists to the Manichees, as you do to them. But the marks are so evident, as no heretic that forbiddeth marriage or meats, can escape clear, and you that forbid them with colour of more perfection and holiness in hypocrisy, and all other heretics are most properly described by them.

Not only the Manichees, Encratites, Arians and such like old heretics, as condemned the eating of flesh, as unclean and abominable, but even the Papists also command to abstain from meats for piety and religion's sake, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving. Counting such holiness in eating of fish, they that are the most holy among you that eat no flesh, as the Charterhouse monks, counting generally the eating of fish or fruits and spices, to be a holy fast at such times as the tasting of flesh or white meats is thought a heinous sin, and for this cause, as Durand testifieth, because all flesh was accused, not fish in the days of Noah. *Lib. 6. cap. De aliis jejuniis.* So that fasting is but pretended in hypocrisy, for a colour that the liberty of Christians might be brought into bondage of Antichrist's law. Wherein how like the Popish fasts are unto the fasts of the Manichees, Augustin showeth, *De moribus Manichæorum, lib. 2. cap. 13,* who counted it a wonderful praise to them, and a holy fast, that they did not eat flesh nor drink wine, as they said, to chastise them-

selves and bridle lust, but of mere hypocrisy, as he saith: "for I demand of you," saith he, "if there be a man which may well be so sparing and thrifty that moderating the appetite of his belly and throat, he eateth not twice in one day, and when he suppeth, he hath set before him a few herbs sodden, and seasoned with a little bacon, so much as is sufficient to stay his hunger. Likewise he quenbeth his thirst, having respect unto his health, with two or three draughts of wine mingled with water, and this is his daily fare. There is another on the other side which tasteth no flesh nor wine, but at the ninth hour he taketh gladly exquisite and strange fruits, varied in many several dishes, sprinkled with plenty of pepper, and suppeth in the beginning of the night with like fare, drinketh the sweet liquor of figs or other fruits, as delicate as wine and excellent wine in sweetness, and drinketh not so much as he thirsteth, but as much as he listeth, and provideth his fare daily, and enjoyeth such a delicate diet of no necessity, but with great pleasure: which of these concerning meat and drink, do you judge to lead his life in greater abstinence? I suppose that you are not so blind, that you will prefer him that liveth with a little bacon and wine before this gourmand. So truth constraineth, but your error singeth otherwise: for if one of you elect, saith he, should but once sup with the former man of sparing diet, and should but anoint his lips with rusty bacon, or but take the savour of it, as a breaker of his fast or abstinence, he shall be condemned to hell fire." What difference there is then between the fast of the Manichees, and the fast of the Papists, saving that the Papists, more gross in hypocrisy, allowed fish commonly, and wine with all delicate confections at all times, even on their Good Friday fasts: when to eat one piece of rusty bacon hath been counted a more heinous sin than to kill a man.

Is it not intolerable impudency in the Papists, that being convicted by so evident a prophecy of the spirit, they are not ashamed to say it is but a similitude of words? Is fasting, an abstinence from flesh? May not a priest live chastely in marriage? to whom the Holy Ghost alloweth one wife, or may they not live chastely out of marriage without prohibition to any, of that which God hath made free for all? But "by appointing days of abstinence from certain meats," you say, "your church doth not condemn these meats," which is nothing else but falsehood in hypocrisy, for you forbid them for holiness, for religion's sake, and therefore condemn them as unclean and unholy, though not by God's creation, yet by your Antichristian prohibition. As for the voluntary abstinence of the Rechabites and Nazarites, it was no prohibition of God's creatures, nor other abstinence than God allowed. The fast of the Ninevites, Moses, Elias, Anna, John Baptist, and Christ, was nothing in the world like your Popish prohibition. For your abstinence by prohibition from

flesh, and filling the belly with fish or other delicacies by your permission, is no fast nor abstinence for any lawful cause of chastisement of the body, but a mere note of Antichristian hypocrisy. Which yet showeth itself more evidently, when you make it as lawful for Antichrist to prohibit the use of God's creatures for religion, as it was for God himself in Paradise, for obedience, or in the law for signification, to forbid the use of his own creatures. Wherein Antichrist is exalted above God, to forbid that which God hath appointed to be free. But there are for all this, say you, divers good causes of abstinence. I grant it, but no cause of prohibition for causes of religion. For albeit God for obedience in Paradise, or for signification in the old law, commanded abstinence from certain meats, yet when he hath made all meats free in the New Testament, none but Antichrist either for obedience or signification will prohibit that which God hath permitted. In the time of Rabanus Maurus, anno 855, there was no general prohibition of flesh to all men, but only to monks, and to them of four-footed beasts only, the flesh of birds being permitted, because they were created of the same element that fishes were. As he writeth *De inst. Cler. lib. 2. cap. 26 and 27*, wine was also prohibited. And afterward in the time of Ludovicus Pius because they devoured so many birds, they were prohibited also, yet blood was allowed to them in all their broths, *ibid.* And yet the Pope's law hath presumed not only to prohibit some kind of creatures under a false pretence of fasting, but also such as were prohibited to the Jews in the old law, as unclean, as appeareth by *Jov. part 15. cap. 97, and 100. 118*, where penance is appointed for eating unclean beasts, or such as died alone, or were torn with beasts, or strangled, or touched by unclean beasts, or for eating or drinking that wherein a dog or a cat hath lapped, or wherein a mouse or a weasel hath been drowned, and such like.

Boniface also forbade all the servants of God, from all hunting and hawking with dogs or hawks. *Jov. part 13. cap. 29*. Gratian, *Dist. 86*, in divers chapters, maketh it a great sin to hunt, and the art of hunting is counted a vice, *cap. Qui venatoribus*. In the gloss it is declared to be unlawful for all men in Lent, &c. Hunting is also condemned because it cannot be without crying, and no Hunter can be a holy man so long as he continueth a huntsman, *cap. Isa. and in gloss*. The abstinence from meat offered to idols is either for offence, or for participation with idolatry, not for conscience of the eater, if the other causes do ease. For chastising of the body, it is unlawful to abstain, but that is in respect of the quantity or quality of the meat, which more provoketh carnal lusts, not in prohibition of any kind, as you do in your fasts of all flesh, yea of that which hath but touched flesh, though it be never so gross, as Augustin putteth the example of rusty bacon, and in never so small a quantity. When you per-

mit all delicate fishes, fruits, wines, spices, confections, even to the filling of the stomach: and that which filleth up the measure of this Antichristian note, you do not only thus abstain, but you prohibit under pain of damnation, the eating of such meats, in any quantity, or of any quality. As for abstinence for health, or for any civil respect, that is nothing to the matter now in hand, when the apostle giveth it as a note of Antichristian apostacy, to forbid meat or marriage for religion's sake.

God the author of matrimony hath appointed what degrees of consanguinity or affinity are to be avoided in contracting the same. But wherfore may Antichrist forbid the ministers of the church to marry according to God's ordinance, which he hath left free for them? Our Saviour Christ forbiddeth not any to marry, but him that is married already, and not lawfully divorced. And albeit he had done so, because he was the author of marriage, as God, yet it is not lawful for Antichrist to prohibit whatsoever it was lawful for Christ to forbid.

The apostle forbiddeth no widows that serve the church to marry, but such as for their years had no need to marry, and willingly abstained from marriage that they might serve the church. For which service a married woman is unfit, because she is bound to serve her husband. As for her which had twice or oftener lawfully married, he refuseth not, but only such a one as had been unlawfully coupled to more husbands than one at once, as departing or being unlawfully separated from one, and then taking another. But you by law prohibit married men to serve in the church, and the ministers of the church to marry, whom God alloweth to have one wife, and enforce them to take the vow of continency, though they be not able to perform it, and though they be not able to keep it, yet you condemn their marriage with the Heretics that called themselves apostolics. And it is a mere mockery, that you honour matrimony more than Protestants, accounting it a holy sacrament, when you account the holy calling of priesthood to be profaned by matrimony, which is nothing else but to speak a lie in hypocrisy.

This old deceitful practice you forget not to use against us. But we do justly charge you with old heresies, which you do hold indeed, not as the Heretics did falsely accuse the Catholics. You cannot deny, impudent as you are, but that you do forbid meats and marriage, which the church did not in Augustin's and Hieron's days. There were that abstained from marriage, and there were that fasted, but there was no law to compel any to the one or to the other. Theodoret upon this text, saith: "He doth not dispraise the single life and continence, but he accuseth them which compel men by making a law to follow it." Therefore these ancient fathers answer not our objections, nor yet you by saying, "you think not that meats are unclean, or of an ill creation, but you abstain for pun-

ishment of your bodies, and taming your concupiscences."

So said the Manichees, as Augustin testifieth: but he proved that they lied, and so do you. "If you abstain," saith he, "of frugality, and to tame lust, with which by such meats and drinks we are delighted and taken, I bear it, and I allow it: but it is not so, for I demand of you, &c. as before." *De moribus Man. lib. 2. cap. 13.* As for marriage, you do not only prefer virginity and continency, as a state more agreeable to God in itself, and more meet for the clergy, which yet the Holy Ghost hath not taught you, but you enforce it by law as necessary for the clergy, and condemn matrimony, as "profaning the sacred order of priesthood," I use your blasphemous and devilish words. You condemn the state of marriage, as carnal, wherein no man can please God, approving that vile decretal under the name of Sirinus, *ep. 4. cap. 9*, where he saith, that the ministers of the church must abstain from matrimony, "because they that be in the flesh cannot please God." All this and much more we continually tell the Papists, and they cannot but see it, yet their cauterized consciences feeling nothing, they continue in their audacity and impudency to bear it out still.

4. The creatures in their lawful use to the Christian receiver, are sanctified by the word of God, and by prayer. By whom the prayer be pronounced it is not greatly material, seeing every one ought to join in consent with him that uttereth the prayer. Although for order or comeliness sake it is most convenient, that the good man of the house, or any by his appointment, or a minister if he be present, or the best man in the company do pronounce the prayer in the name of the rest. But that the meat should be sanctified, or is sufficiently blessed with the sign of the cross, it is altogether beside the book. For the gifts of God are to be sanctified by the word of God, and by prayer, not by the sign of the cross, which is neither the word of God nor prayer. As for blessing of the person, whereof the prerogative is to the greater, it is not here spoken of, but only of the sanctification of meats to the lawful use of Christians.

4. We see the creatures of God to be good both by their first creation, and also after their corruption through sin, by sanctification, which is by the word of God which hath given the use of them unto us, and by prayer by which the use of them is consecrated unto us. Therefore not only such abstinence is detested, as condemneth the creatures to be naught by nature or creation, but that also which forbiddeth them to be received upon any hypocritical surmise of unholiness, when they be given to be received with thanksgiving, being sanctified by the word of God, and by prayer.

5. All the creatures of God, not only by creation, but also by sanctification, by the word of God and prayer, are alike holy in the necessary and lawful use of them to true Chris-

tians, which be clean and holy. Yet are there some things specially applied to the service of God, which in that respect, in another kind are more specially called holy, as the Sabbath day, the temple, the ark, the altar, &c. But that such things gave holiness to things that touched them, otherwise than according to God's word they were dedicated to God's service, it is false. For even the sacrifices of the ungodly, which not only touched the altar, but also lay upon it and were offered in it, because they were not offered with such faith as they should be offered by the word of God, were abominable unto the Lord, as he testifieth often by the prophets. Therefore that our Saviour Christ saith of the temple and the altar, sanctifying the gold and the gift, his meaning is plain, that the temple when it is holy, is the principal, and the gold that is offered in it is the necessary, so of the altar and the gift. Not that the temple or altar had power to give holiness to every thing that touched it. Neither are all creatures to be severed from the common use, and consecrated to the service of God, but only such as he hath prescribed and appointed by his holy word, without which, all other sanctifying or consecrating of creatures to the use of religion, is superstitious and idolatrous. The places and times of God's apparition, or working some special wonders, were holy for that time only of God's presence, and not for ever after. For Bethel was not counted holy forever of the faithful, but of the superstitious and the idolatrous Israelites, who by the wickedness of Jeroboam were brought to esteem it more holy than Jerusalem, the place which God had chosen. But by the prophets, Bethel that by Jacob was called the house of God, was termed Bethaven, the house of wickedness or vanity. *Hosea 4. 15.* So the hill on which Christ was transfigured, is called holy in respect of the time in which the transfiguration was, not that the holiness of the place doth always continue, or that there was any pilgrimage of the faithful unto it.

Such memories or monuments of holy things have no holiness in them, but may stir up men's minds to the remembrance of holy things. But seeing to the unclean all things are unclean, not by creation, but by pollution of sin, and the abuse of Satan: the apostle showeth how all creatures in their lawful use, are sanctified unto the clean, namely, by the word of God, who hath generally permitted unto the faithful the free use of them, and by prayer, by which they are specially sanctified to the private use of every one of the faithful. The sign of the cross is superstitiously added by Chrysostom, which is omitted by the apostle. And where you are not content with this vulgar and common benediction of our meats and drinks, whereof the apostle speaketh, but will extend the same to a more exact sanctification, and higher applying of some creatures, &c. beside the word of God: you declare that you prefer your own inventions and superstitions before

the prescript commandments and rules of the word of God. For sanctifying of meats and drinks, according to the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, was never greatly regarded in popery, nor is yet much practiced among your recusant Papists in England. But other toys which you call sanctified creatures by the pope's holiness, and not by the holiness of God's word are highly esteemed. But the Greek word, you say, doth import such a matter: you would make the ignorant believe so. But they that know the Greek tongue as well as you, are bold to tell you there is no such matter imported by it. And the text is plain, that no such thing can be allowed by it. Not only because the apostle speaketh only of the common or ordinary use of God's creatures, but also because he appointeth two means, both necessary to sanctification, the word of God and prayer. For if men will presume of prayer, without the word of God, their prayer is not of faith, and so it is sin. As also if men will presume of sanctification by God's word, and contemn prayer, it cannot but be grievous presumption and sin in them. Therefore seeing you cannot bring the word of God to approve that your "more exact sanctifying, and higher applying of creatures," &c. under colour whereof you bring in all your execrable holy things, it is at the least superstition, and vain worshipping of God, if it be not blasphemous usurping of the honour and office of the Holy Ghost, to whom it pertaineth to sanctify, and whatsoever is sanctified indeed, is rightly and truly, being dedicated by the ministry of man, sanctified and hallowed by him.

Having nothing out of the word of God, you think to carry the matter by the words and practice of men. But of what weight that is in matters of religion, even those men, unto whose authority you would lean, may sufficiently instruct you. And yet the matter is far from that you would bear the ignorant in hand. Augustin's words of that pretended holy bread, are against the Pelagians, which contended, that baptism was not necessary for the infants of the faithful, because they are holy. "Sanctification is not after one sort. For I think that the Cathumens, after a certain manner of theirs, are sanctified by the sign of the cross and prayer of imposition of hands, and that which they receive, although it be not the body of Christ, yet it is holy, and more holy than those meats with which we are nourished, because it is a sacrament. And even those meats wherewith we are nourished to the necessary maintenance of this life, the same apostle said to be sanctified by the word of God and prayer, which we make when we are to refresh our bodies," &c. Here Augustin speaketh of a supposed sanctification and of a superstitious kind of bread, which without any word of God, he calleth a sacrament, by which you may see how largely he useth that term. But what holiness was in it, or how it could be holy without the word of God, how can we be assured? And yet what kind of holiness it was, he after de-

clareth, namely, such as could not make the receivers holy if they were not baptized. As for Popish holy bread, it was not, for that is not given to them that are not baptized, neither is it a sacrament, therefore it was one of those burdensome ceremonies and human presumptions of which he complaineth, and wisheth that they might be taken away, *Ephe.* 118. The loaves that were sent by the ancient fathers from one to another, were but tokens of friendship and communication, and no such hallowed bread as you fantasy; for they desired one another to make them blessings, by their thankful acceptance of them, *Ep.* 34, 35. And they called them blessings, not for any consecration, but according to the phrase of the scripture, *1 Sam.* 25, 27, where Abigail desired David to take a blessing of her hand, that is, a gift or present. So *2 Reg.* 5, 15, Naaman desired Elisha to take a blessing of him, that is a gift and no hallowed matter. But there was great concourse, as Hierom testifieth, of all sorts unto Hilarion, that they might receive of him bread or oil that he had blessed. This was for the great holiness that was supposed to be of that person, not an ordinary ceremony of holy bread, or holy oil. But was he as ready to give it, as they to desire it? No, verily. Hierom saith, he hath no mind but of the wilderness. Whereby it appeareth it was rather a superstition in them to require it, than any usurpation in him to grant any such thing.

Therefore Hierom admireth his humility, that despised such honour as was offered unto him. That in the primitive church, the people commonly brought bread to the priests to be hallowed, is not proved by the place you quote, for there the author doth not speak of any such use, but sheweth by a similitude, how in the Lord's prayer, we call that our bread which we pray to God to give us, "that is," saith he, "give us that bread which we have prepared, that while it is given of thee, it may be sanctified." As for example, if a layman should offer bread to a priest, that the Priest should take it, and sanctify it, and so give it to him. In that it is bread, it is his that offereth it, but that it is sanctified, it is the benefit of the priest." Is not a common custom here strongly proved, or rather disproved? For if there had been any such common custom as you speak of, he would not have said, "As for example, if a layman, but as when a layman offereth bread to a priest," &c.

The mention made in the council of Carthage, and the canons of the apostles is a condemnation of such superstition, and a commandment that nothing be offered but bread and wine for the sacrament, which is of grapes and corn. Wherefore you have small support even of man's authority, as you have none of God's word for hallowing of wax, fire, palms, ashes, &c., when you cannot bring so much as a shadow of antiquity for your holy bread. The sanctifying of the water in baptism, and the bread and wine in the Lord's supper, hath the word of

God manifestly to warrant it, as none of your Popish trumpety, which you call hallowed or blessed creatures, hath. That which Augustin saith of the sign of the cross, importeth not any necessity thereof unto sanctification, but sheweth that it was a ceremony so usual, that without it nothing was done *rite*, that is, according to the rite and ceremony, if that sign were lacking.

Verily, but that we know the impudence of the whore of Babylon, we would marvel how the Romish church without the warrant of God's words, which the apostle maketh necessary unto sanctification, durst attempt such blessings and conjurings of creatures as she doth. Yea to ascribe such power unto the devil, over them after they be sanctified by the word of God, that they need any such exorcisms or blessings to drive him away, which is in other terms, and by another fetch to renew the old blasphemy of the Manichees, from which in the beginning you would seem to purge yourselves. But Christ, you say, hath given authority over all devils, *Luke 9*. To whom I pray you? To his apostles, when he sent them to preach, not to all priests, more than the power of working other miracles, which he then gave to his apostles. And giving them authority over all devils, did he bid them conjure the devil out of water, salt, bread, or such like? or rather to cast out devils mightily from them that were possessed with them, not that all creatures were possessed by them. Neither doth the apostle speak here of prayer to expel the devil out of God's creatures, but to make the use of God's creatures sanctified in themselves by God's word, holy and sanctified unto us. How you begin your conjuration of holy water and such like, it skilleth not, seeing you have no word of God to attempt any such matters. Certain it is, that your exorcisms are no prayers, but mere conjurations, for those words, our help is in the name of the Lord, are no words of prayer, and your prayers follow the conjurations being as good as they. For you pray that your conjured salt and water may be salvation of body and soul to all that receive them. You conjure not the devil out of the creatures, but the creatures themselves. "I conjure or command thee, thou creature of salt or water, &c., not that the devil should depart from thee, but that thou be made conjured salt to the salvation of the believers, and that thou be health of soul and body to all that receive thee; and that from the place where thou art sprinkled, all fantasies and wickedness of devilish fraud, and every unclean spirit being conjured, may fly away and depart." So likewise you conjure and charge the water in the name of God, "that thou be made conjured water, to drive away all power of the enemy, and that thou mayst be able to root out, and to pull out the enemy itself, with all his revolted angels," &c. Who gave you such authority, to lay such a charge, or to bestow such a power upon the creatures of God? Wilt not thou, O God, be revenged of this Antichristian blasphemy? But the

practice and tradition of the first fathers hath so expounded Paul's words, as you say.

You do well to say the practice and unwritten tradition, for none of the fathers that interpret this text, in their writings do mention any such exposition. For practice therefore, you send us first to Augustin for exorcisms, and namely of children, who saith indeed, that in baptism the power of the devil is exorcised in children, meaning that they are delivered from the tyranny of the devil, whom they do renounce by the hearts and mouths of them that bear them, which is nothing to your magical exorcisms of children. The book *De dogmatibus*, is none of Augustin's, yet he speaketh not only of exorcisms, but also of exultations, which you use not, to call the unclean spirit from them that are to be baptized. Although there is great difference between the casting out of the devil from children, which in some sense is truly performed according to the scripture, *Luke 11*, and the conjuring and hallowing of creatures, which hath no colour in the scripture. For holy water to be 1400 years old, you send us to that counterfeit epistle of Alexander, which you know to be an impudent forgery, and all the world may know by the date, if there were nothing else, which was when Trajanus and Helianus were consuls, the ninth of the calends of August, which might as well be *Ad Calendas Græcas*, or at the latter Lammas, for there was never any Helianus consul with Trajanus. The famous story that you send us to see in Theodoret, is a miracle wrought by Marcellus bishop of Apamea, in setting the temple of Jupiter a fire, with sprinkling of water after he had signed it with the cross, and prayed, when it would not burn with fire. Which pertaineth nothing to your ordinary ceremony of holy water, which is conjured after another sort, and to another purpose. The other story in Epiphanius, is also of a miracle, in curing a madman, by casting water upon him, in the name of Christ, but no holy water, except you will allow him that is neither priest, nor clerk, nor Christian man, to make holy water. For that miracle was done by a Jew to try a dream that he had, before he was baptized.

But when you come to Gregory, for hallowing of churches with holy water, you come nearer to your time, and the revelation of Antichrist, but then you must strike off 500 years of your 1400 for the age of holy water.

Gregory indeed willetth holy water to be made, and to be sprinkled in the idol's temples, altars to be builded, and relics to be laid up, but where is the ashes strewed in the church? where be the candles? where is the sexton counterfeiting the devil, and answering in a base voice within the church, when the bishop conjureth him without? where are a great many more ceremonies prescribed in your pontifical, to be used in hallowing of churches? I forbear you, if you cannot tell, for Antichrist lacked as yet some years of his open manifestation, and therefore

this ceremonial consecration, prescribed by Gregory, lacked many things that were afterward revealed by the spirit of Antichrist. But among other things we must remember, that Elisha applied salt to the heating and purifying of waters, while you forget that you have not the spirit of Elisha, to work miracles. For your water conjured with salt, cannot heal nor purify any unwholesome waters. How the angel used the fish's liver to drive away the devil, we leave it to you to do the like, if you can. We must have the word of God, and no apocryphal stories to build our faith upon, David's harp did nothing, but it was made to sound by David, whose godly music procured some rest to Saul for the time. Augustin saith not, that a piece of the holy earth saved such a man's chamber from infestation of devils, but that the same ceased at the prayers of a priest, that ordered the sacrifice of the body of Christ there, and prayed earnestly that the said vexation might cease. Therefore you make your marks amiss for the holy earth. But what madness is this? of miracles wrought by God, with external signs of his creatures, to establish an ordinary doctrine and ceremony of hallowing what creatures you will, and to what purpose you are disposed? But Christ occupied divers sanctified elements, some for the health of the body, some for grace and remission of sins, and some to work miracles. And why might not he occupy his own creatures, to such purpose as it pleased him? But shall Antichrist therefore imitate our Saviour Christ, like an ape, to occupy the Lord's creatures, and to sanctify them without his word, to make his false sacraments of them, and to work his lying miracles by them? If God showed miracles by the relics of saints, is it lawful for you to make holy relics what you list? In the story of Julianus, the devil that was conjured fled, when one by chance and custom, made the sign of the cross, *Ergo* the devil is perilously afraid of the cross. No, no, the devil is too crafty and strong, to yield to so weak a weapon, but when he is disposed to play with men, that they may be the more easily seduced by him. In the Acts of the Apostles, we read that the devil would not give place to the name either of Paul, or of Jesus, pronounced by conjurers, but played the devil with them. But you forget yourselves, or else you allege the scripture most impudently. For there you note that the devil contemned the exorcists. Here you say, "the name of Jesus, yea and of Paul, putteth them to flight."

If you furnish yourselves with such stuff as here is brought out of the practice of the ancient church for holy water, wax, palms, ashes, grains, and such like holy bangles: you may easily contemn, but you shall never avoid the force of such arguments, as we bring against your Antichristian blasphemies. But you will further assure your besotted disciples, "that they shall find these actions and creatures, not only by increase of faith, fervour, and devotion, to purge the impurities of their souls,

and procure remission of their daily infirmities, but also that the popes and prelates may join unto the same their blessing and remission of venial sins and spiritual debts." I pass over the absurdity of this saying, where after so great matters without the pope's blessing so small a thing as is remission of venial sins which are washed away with a *Pater-noster*, is promised with the Pope's blessing added to those creatures. But where learn you that faith, fervour, and devotion are increased by these means? The word of God acknowledgeth no such means, but the diligent hearing of the word, and the use of sacraments, with hearty prayers. And where is any such sovereign authority granted to the chief ministers of the church, to join their blessing with remission of sins, to such actions and creatures? But you may feign what you list, to uphold your Antichristian kingdom, which yet shall fall and be consumed daily by the word of the Lord, do what you can. But you have an argument out of James, that remission of sins was annexed to the unction of holy oil, where no such thing is said, although health of body is promised by the gift of miracles, to him that was anointed with oil; and remission of sins, at the prayer of the elders of the church, not only of those that you call venial, but of all his sins, not by any virtue annexed to the oil, but by promise of God, that our prayers are heard, not only for ourselves, but also for our brethren. For the many ways, whereby venial sins are remitted; and the only way whereby mortal sins are forgiven, it is your own stuff, and therefore you may dispose of it as you list. We know that all sins that are forgiven to men of years, are forgiven through faith in the mercy of God reconciled to us by Christ, which faith is confirmed by the seals of his holy sacraments. But where you say, that mortal sins are ordinarily remitted only by the sacraments, either you forget the pope's pardons of all sins, *a pena et culpa*, or else you count the Pope's pardon an extraordinary way of remission.

Gregory indeed did send many superstitious tokens, if the postscript of that epistle be not counterfeit; but yet not with such gross terms of his blessing, and remission of sins, as you speak of. In the former place, among other things he sendeth a little key from the body of Peter for his blessing, "in which is enclosed," saith he, "the iron of his chains, that that which had bound his neck to martyrdom, may loose your neck from all sins." Here you must understand a prayer or a wish of Gregory, or else you must acknowledge that he sent remission of all his sins, as well mortal as venial by this relic, and so mortal sins may be remitted without a sacrament.

In the second place he hath no such matter, but only saith to Athelbert king of Kent: "I have sent you small tokens, which shall not be small unto you, when they be received of you, with the blessing of Peter the Apostle." By the blessing of Peter, he meaneth commendations and prayers from the bishop of Rome, as he himself received presents, with the



blessing of Mark, when he received commendations from the bishop of Alexandria. How his successors that were Antichrists openly revealed did behave themselves in such matters, it is not to be marvelled.

Those your exorcisms be not like conjurations, but very conjurings indeed, and the difference that you make between them and other conjurations, is false. For in those other conjurations the devils be commanded by the names of God, and word of Christ, and by many prayers. Yet are they devilish and abominable abusings of the holy names and words of God, and so are yours, seeing you have no more warrant out of the holy scriptures to conjure than they have.

8. "He saith that bodily exercise," saith Ambrose, "is profitable to little. For to fast and to abstain from meats, the authority of the Creator remaining, profiteth not much, except piety be added." Therfore fasting of itself is not a spiritual exercise, except it be to the end of piety, and so saith Chrysostom. Augustin also in the places quoted, speaking of the fasting and abstinence of godly men in his time, that was without superstition, or any prejudice to Christian liberty, saith, "They exercise piety diligently, as for bodily exercise as the apostle saith, they know to pertain but a short time. They placed not religion in abstinence from marriage and meats, as Popish votaries do.

11. Paul speaketh of an extraordinary grace, which Timothy received by imposition of hands, as many others did, which took not holy orders.

11. When you cite Augustin at large, you deserve small credit. The gifts of the Holy Ghost were given to them that received not holy orders. And it is certain, that Timothy was fit for his calling, either by this extraordinary gift, or by his ordinary study in the scriptures, before he was ordained, or else Paul's rule has been broken, which he giveth, 1 Tim. 3. 2. But that any such grace is given by your sacrament of orders, we cannot see by experience. For he that was an unlearned ass, before he was made priest, is made no better than John Lacklatin by his order of priesthood. Where you note that grace is given, not only in or with the sacrament, but by the sacrament, it is vain, for this grace was commonly given without any sacrament. Seeing all took not orders, that received the gifts of the Holy Ghost by imposition of hands, as it is manifest in the acts of the Apostles.

11. Ambrose saith: "Imposition of hands are the mystical words, by which he that is elected, is confirmed unto the work, receiving authority, his conscience bearing witness that he may be bold instead of our Lord, to offer sacrifice to God." But whereas you gather that he doth allude to the words, spoken in the ordering of your priests, it is a frivolous and fond collection, for he showeth before that this sacrifice is by preaching and teaching, to offer the people to God. And your sacrifice he cannot mean, who take upon you not to offer up Christ himself to his Father,

not to offer in the stead of Christ, as the ministers of the gospel, instead of Christ, exhort men to be reconciled to God. 2 Cor. 20.

11. By any thing that you allege, we see not how it doth give any grace, and much less that it is a sacrament. For the grace whereof Paul speaketh, was an extraordinary gift and followeth not always imposition of hands in the ordering of ministers. And if it did, yet followeth it not, that imposition of hands is a sacrament. For it must be an element, and not an external action only, that maketh a sacrament in that sense. We say baptism and the Lord's Supper are sacraments. Your reason to prove, that Augustin calleth holy orders a sacrament, as precisely and properly, as he doth baptism is sufficient, because he joinech it in name with baptism, for so he doth the catechumen's bread, mentioned *sect. 12*, with the Lord's Supper, yet it followeth not, that he calleth it a sacrament in the same nature, that the Lord's supper is a sacrament. That Christ and his Apostles, by the Spirit of Christ, used the ceremony of imposition of hands, according to the law, it is no warrant for the popish church to borrow the Jewish rites, ceremonies, and sacramental actions, but it argueth an Antichristian spirit in her, which presumeth, that she may do all things that Christ and his Apostles by his commandment did in the law, abrogated by Christ. But the true church of Christ submitte herself to the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles in all things, and is content with those ceremonies which Christ and his Apostles by his commandment, have left unto her.

16. When you can prove any such office to be appointed by Christ, unto the blessed Virgin Mary, and the saints in heaven, to procure salvation unto us as is by Christ committed to the ministers of the gospel, we will not spare to say, that the Virgin Mary, and the saints do save us, that is, are instruments or means of our salvation, as the Apostle saith here to Timothy. But if you are not able to prove such office or charge committed to them, we may say, we have to do not only with blasphemous hypocrites, but also with unlearned heretics, that gather so absurdly out of this text, that the glory of our salvation may be ascribed to creatures, who have not so much as any ministry therein, by God's appointment.

#### CHAPTER 5.

3. Theodoret saith, he speaketh of the church widows from the beginning and so forth. "They must have oil of the church," saith he, "which have none other help or comfort." Ambrose saith nothing to the contrary. But that second marriages were not blessed in his church, it was a smack of Montanism, wherein lay hid the mystery of iniquity: for the second marriage is no less blessed of God, if it be in the Lord, than the first. And yet the state of widowhood, that liveth contently in prayer and fasting, is honourable, and more free to serve God in some respects than the state of wedlock.

5. All Christian men and women are com-

manded to pray continually, *Luke*. 18. 1, of which many are married, therefore continual prayer may stand with marriage. Paul, *1 Cor.* 7. 5, speaketh of some special times, in which more fervent prayer with fasting is requisite.

3. That Deaconesses were appointed to some necessary service about women that were to be professed, or baptized for their instruction, and addressing to that and other sacraments you say, but without sufficient proof: for that which Epiphanius speaketh, is not necessarily to be understood of baptism, or any other sacrament.

If not only the circumstance of the text, but also the judgment of ancient fathers interpreting the same, doth warrant our handling of this place, what mean these hideous outcries of these Popish hypocrites? Paul, you say, prescribeth such only to be chosen as have been but once married. We deny that: for he requireth such as have been of honest conversation, and therefore have not had two husbands alive at once: therefore your Popish conclusions be such as they are accustomed to be, that is, vain and inconsequent. But let us examine them in order. "The like phrase used before of bishops and deacons, that they shall be the husbands of one wife, must needs signify that they cannot be twice married," &c. To this I answer, the phrases are not like, for in them he saith, him that is the husband of one wife: Here he saith, her that hath been the wife of one husband. As he that hath been twice married, is husband of one wife as well in his second marriage, as in his first: so she that hath never had but one husband at one time, is said to have been the wife of one husband.

You say, "that the state of widowhood is more worthy, honourable, decent, and pure, in respect of the service of the church, &c. than of married folks:" but no such thing followeth of the text, but you reply, "that else such as were widows with intention to marry, might have been admitted, as well as those that were never to marry." This is no good consequent, for those that might have sufficient relief by their marriage, were not to be relieved of the public alms of the church, neither were meet for the service of the church, which they must leave when they are married, and attend upon their husbands. Whereas priests and deacons married, or to be married, are not in subjection to their wives, as women are to their husbands, therefore may serve the church, which the other could not.

You say, "that second marriage is disagreeable, and a sign of incontinency, and more lust and fleshliness, than is agreeable or comely for any person belonging to the church." But if the second marriage is not refused in widows, you prove nothing. For although the natural infirmity of incontinency, is declared by often repeating of marriage, yet seeing marriage is a holy medicine for that disease, it hindereth no more once used than often. Hierom also sheweth, that there may

be greater continency showed in some that have been twice married, than in some other, that have been but once married, in *Tit.* 1. Therefore the Apostle in the third chapter, refused not them that had been twice married, but them that had more wives at once than one, as I have proved in that place sufficiently. Neither doth it follow, that as none were to be admitted widows, that intended to marry, so none ought to be admitted to minister the sacraments, that intended to marry. For though it be a greater thing to minister the sacrament, than to serve in the place of widows, yet the reason of marriage is far different. The widow's office could not be executed of them that were under their husband's authority, the sacraments may be ministered by married men. The widows were not to be chosen under threescore years of age, when the disease of incontinency is healed by nature. The ministers of the sacraments cannot be chosen all of such age, as that infirmity may be like to have left them: therefore they are not to be restrained from that remedy, which God hath provided for them. If receiving of the body of Christ, should hinder the liberty of marriage, as you gather out of Hierom, then in those churches, where they received the body of Christ every day, there ought to have been no married folks: and that such there were, it is manifest by Augustin, *Ep.* 117, yea the church of Rome had that custom in his time, and most churches of the West.

You say, "that it is not unlawful to annex by precept, or the party's promise single life to a whole state or order of the faithful, because the apostle," &c. I answer, the apostle requireth not abstinence from marriage, but of such persons as had no need to marry, neither doth he prohibit marriage in any order of the faithful, but requireth that such be received to this service of the church, as neither had any necessity to marry, nor by marrying, should forsake their charge once taken in hand. Therefore it followeth not hereof that the Pope, or any others which are far inferior to the apostle, hath authority to forbid marriage in any order of the faithful, which is expressly contrary to the Apostle's doctrine, *1 Tim.* 4.

You say, "that to refuse the twice married or such as will not live single, is not to condemn second marriages." In this argument you take that which is in controversy, that the apostle refused the twice married: which if he had done, it had been some mislike of second marriages, but that he doth not. He refuseth them that will not live single, because that service of women required them that were not under subjection of their husbands. And this he doth without any reproach unto marriage, for he willeth the younger widows to marry. But if after marriage repeated holily, and by the apostle's counsel, they should be deprived forever, of the relief of the church, and the honour of widowhood: he should both injuriously will them to marry, and signify some mislike or reproach of se-

cond marriage, by which they should be made unworthy of that office in the church. Therefore it is certain that the apostle meaneth, of them that had lived honestly in marriage, whether they were once or twice married, and have not had more husbands than one, at one time. Therefore your conference, and your construction show yourselves not only to be great clerks, but also wonderful wise men, to make such brags of it, and such outcries against us.

How true our exposition of the husband of one wife is, I have showed by sufficient reasons, and as good authority of ancient fathers as Hierom is. But here you say, it is most intolerable impudency, "and a construction that never came to any wise man's cogitation before, to say, that here is an exception only against such widows as have had two husbands together." Why so? because it was a thing never lawful nor heard of. Indeed I confess it was never lawful: but it hath been often heard of, that one woman hath been married to a second husband, when her first husband was alive, and you may hear of some such in Rheims. Such women, though afterward they repented, and became honest women, were unmeet to be admitted to any office in the church. Of polygamy and bigamy, I have spoken upon the third chapter, and who of ancient time was called *δευγαρος*, and what is *δευγατα*. But where you say, "we give example of such widows, in women divorced justly from their husbands in the old law;" you slander us, for we give example of such as were divorced unjustly, either among the Jews or among the Gentiles, and not them only, but such as had forsaken their first husband, and were unlawfully coupled with another. For many such wicked women, as well as wicked men, were converted to the faith, and became good Christians: yet for their former infamous life, were not meet for the service of the church. When we say, it were unreasonable and injurious to second marriages, if the apostle should refuse widows that have lived chastely in marriage, though they had been twice married: we speak no blasphemy against the text, but by those arguments prove, that the text is not against such widows. Neither is there any indecency, or intemperance in the second marriage, more than in the first, when the second as well as the first, is approved by God, to be an honourable and unpolluted remedy, of the natural infirmity of incontinency. But because you say, we are thus "bold with the apostle and all antiquity," beside that you called our exposition a most intolerable "impudency, and a construction that never came to any wise man's cogitation;" you shall hear what one of good antiquity, sober, and wise as any in Rheims, writeth of this matter.

Theodoret, upon these very words of the text: "Hereof also it is manifest, that he rejecteth not second marriages, but decreeth, that they live chastely in matrimony: for he which before hath established the second marriage by law, hath not here forbidden her

which hath been twice married, to obtain bodily relief." Theophylact, saith upon this text, "He requireth of her monogamy, that is, that she hath been coupled to one husband, at once, as a sign of honesty, chastity, and good manners:" for it is no sign of dishonesty, unchasteness, or ill manners to have had two husbands, lawfully. The other place, Chapter 3, he expoundeth plainly to be meant only against Polygamy, or many wives at once. Ambrose expounding this text in his book *de viduis* saith: "Neither truly if any woman have fallen into the second marriage which the Apostolic precepts do not condemn, if she be again loosed from her husband, is kept off from the effect of widowhood, as though she had lost the fruit of shame-fastness: for even she shall have the reward of her lateward chastity, but she shall be more approved which hath not tried the second marriage."

Tertullian in his book *de velandis virginibus*, interpreteth widows, "wives of one husband," that is, such as have been married in times past, by which exposition such as have been twice married, may be understood: and yet when he was a Montanist, he was an enemy to second marriages. By these you see, that our exposition is neither intolerable, nor unworthy of the cogitation of wise men, though the Rheims doctors fret never so much against it.

11. If widows waxing warm, idle, and well fed, did lust after husbands, what do Popish votaries, prelates, and priests, more warm, more idle, and better fed than those poor widows were, lust after? nothing but chastity? Verily, when they were warm, idle, and well fed in England, it is well known, they lusted not for wives, but to quench the fire of their concupiscence with all filthiness and uncleanness, as their manifold acts bear witness. The apostle saith, the younger sort of widows, if they wax wanton against Christ, will cast off the bond or promise of continency, as you expound it. And what think you, will the younger nuns, monks, and priests do? will they keep the promise of continency? No, verily, as the effects have showed. But so they do not marry, what filthiness soever they commit, the bond or promise of continency with you is well enough kept, being made belike with that condition; if not chaste-ly, yet warily. yea many have not kept it so warily, but that they have been openly convicted of incontinency.

11. They that have a will to marry, and therefore do not marry, because they cannot without punishment, which should do better to be married, than to burn, that is, to be wasted with secret flame of lust in lust itself, whom it repenteth of their profession, and they are weary of it, except they reform their heart, and by the fear of God again overcome lust, are to be counted dead women." Augustin of professed virgins. *De sancta virgine*, cap. 34.

12. Epiphanius distinguisheth judgement, which is the Apostle's word, from condemna-

tion, speaking of them that had married after the vow of continency, and saith, "Better is judgment than condemnation, for they which, lest they should be made ashamed before men, do commit fornication privily, and fulfil their lust under the show of single life and continency, have not shame before men but before God, which knoweth their secrets, and at his coming shall convince all flesh, as every one hath sinned."

"Therefore it is better to have one sin, and not many, it is better for him that hath fallen from his course, openly to take a wife to him, according to the law, and to repent a long time from his iniquity, and so again to be restored unto the church, as one that hath done evil, as one that is fallen and broken, and hath need of binding up, and not to be daily wounded of the secret darts of that wickedness, which is put into him by the devil." Cyprian saith of vowed virgins that they were taken a bed with men, and yet said they were chaste: "If they cannot or will not continue, it is better that they marry, than that they fall into the fire with their pleasures, at least let them give no offence to the brethren and sisters." *Ep. 62.* The same judgment hath Hierom, *ad Demetriadem*, "The name of some that behave not themselves well, both defame the purpose of virgins, to whom it must be said openly, that either they should marry, if they cannot live continently, or else they should live continently, if they will not marry." By this it appeareth, that the ancient fathers, although they prefer virginity or continency in them that had vowed the same, yet they allowed marriage in them that could not perform their vow.

12. Although most of the ancient fathers expound this first faith of the vow or promise of continency, yet no such thing can be proved of that text. For the Apostle speaketh not of widows already chosen, but of widows to be chosen, willing young widows not to be chosen, because there was danger in such of lasciviousness against Christ, to marry even to infidels, and to renounce their Christian faith; whereof he giveth example of some that had forsaken Christ and followed Satan, who were not Deaconesses, but rather wanton widows. For this cause Tertullian wrote his second book to his wife, charging her, that if she should marry after his death, not to marry unto an infidel, as divers had done.

The first faith is improperly called the vow of continency, but the faith of Christianity is rightly called the first faith: against which exposition you ask, if the faith of baptism be broken by marriage against Christ; by so marrying, as they renounce Christianity and follow Satan; for these things the Apostle promiseth, and not marriage only, or intention to marry. It is but a forced interpretation of the first faith made to Christ, to be in respect of the second faith given to their husbands: for the Apostle speaketh not of any faith of continency made to Christ; therefore you prove that to be the first faith by that

which is in controversy, and so you do nothing but beg the principle.

But admit that the first faith, according to the interpretation of the ancient fathers, signifies the promise of continency made to God or the church, yet by the authority of the same fathers, such as have made a rash vow, which they are not able to perform, may marry lawfully, rather than burn and live single incontinently. Therefore which way soever you take it, marriage of votaries which cannot contain is not prohibited.

14. He neither commandeth nor counselleth all widows to marry; but the young widows that have not the gift of continency, he willett and commandeth to marry. "Paul saith, I will; Novatus saith, I will not;" saith Theodoros, in like manner as we may say, Paul saith, I will that the younger widows marry; the Pope saith, I will that the younger widows marry not, but let them take the mantle and ring, whether they be assured of the gift of continency or not. The Apostle indeed speaketh not of such as were professed, but he forbiddeth expressly any to be professed, if he speak at all of profession, before 60 years of age when the heat of lust is past. Therefore when he counselleth widows and virgins to continue, he meaneth they should continue so freely without vow, as long as God will give them grace. But if they had made a vow already, say you, neither could they marry without damnation, nor he command or counsel them without sin. "Thus bold are you with the Apostle; as though it were sin to break an unlawful vow, when it is sin to make such a vow. But to vow that which is not in our power to perform is to make an unlawful vow; and such is the vow of continency by them who have not the gift of it. Therefore the Apostle doth not only prefer second marriage before fornication, but also expressly commandeth that none be chosen to that office which required an unmarried woman, but such a one as was at least 60 years old. Therefore the Pope and his Clergy, admitting widows and virgins to profess or vow continency before that age, do sin against the express commandment of the Holy Ghost. But this prohibition you are not ashamed to deny to be perpetual, affirming that it was only meet for that time and the beginning of Christianity. But the incontinency of such young persons in all times proveth that it is necessary forever which was necessary in his time to avoid incontinency. Therefore your reason of the want of Monasteries, and Monkish or Nunnish rules and orders, which you confess not to have been in the Apostles' time, cannot restrain his precept to that time only. For the incontinency of Monks and Nuns in cloisters, and under all your rules and orders, hath and doth daily sufficiently prove, that lust cannot be kept out by the walls of your monasteries, nor by the rules and prescripts of your orders. Therefore, as the experience of some younger widows who had followed after Satan was a sufficient reason to cause the Apostle to re-

fuse all young widows to the office of Deaconesses, so the experience of so many *milch Nuns*, and filthy Monks and Friars teaches us that no young persons should be admitted to any vow or profession of perpetual continency. For your other reason is vain, respecting virgins, who have not had experience of carnal concupiscence as widows have had; and is confuted by infinite examples of unchaste Nuns. Beside they often more burn, that have not had that experience, as good writers testify of gelded men, than they who have quenched that lust in lawful matrimony; and those nuns who have not the gift of continency are not void of experience, although they have it not in lawful matrimony. Yea the devil himself helpeth them in their abominable lusts, as Wierus testifieth of open experience in divers nunneries in Germany, and especially one in the borders of the province of Cologne; where the devil, that is, *the Romish priests*, in the likeness of a dog, was seen to fall upon them, *the nuns*, in the day-time, and in most beastly manner, about the year 1558. Also in the Nunnery of Nazareth at Cologne, the nuns in most filthy manner suffered the same collusion often in the presence and sight of many, in the year 1564. *De prestig. Demon. lib. 3. cap. 3, and 11.* If therefore the example of some that were turned after Satan, was thought a sufficient reason to the apostle to refuse young widows; what doth so many examples of nuns, not only spiritually turned after Satan, as the apostle means, but even in their bodies made the slaves of Satan, but cry out against the wickedness of Antichrist, that so contumeliously rejecteth the apostle's precept, and professeth nuns and widows, be they never so young, against their own consent, being extorted rather than persuaded thereto? Therefore as the pure chastity of virgins and widows is worthily praised of the ancient fathers, so it ought to be free, that it may be of greater commendation, and a more noble victory, and not bound with vows; neither ought any young person, who is not assured of the gift of perpetual continency, to be admitted to make any solemn vow or open profession thereof, by the apostle's doctrine.

15. The apostle speaketh not of any widows chosen to the ministry of the church, but of wanton young widows who had forsaken Christ. For such young widows were never eligible to that office. Paul doth not make a new law upon occasion of them that were fallen, but by example of them, showeth a reason of the law of the church, which refused widows younger than sixty years old. Therefore he saith not, for votaries to marry is to turn after Satan. "For," saith Primasius, "they are turned after Satan, either denying the faith of God, on committing fornication." Augustin saith, "by these words we may understand, that those whom he would have to marry, might better contain than marry, but that it is better for them to marry than to go after Satan, that is, from that excellent purpose of virginity or widowhood, by looking back to fall and perish." And that for

such to marry is not to go after Satan; he showeth that the marriage of such is not to be condemned, but the breach of their purpose, for he saith, "which that the apostle might briefly insinuate, he would not say, that they have damnation, who marry after the purpose of greater holiness, not because they are not condemned, but lest the marriage itself in them might be thought to be condemned." *De bono viduit. cap. 8 and 9.* Therefore for them that are professed to be married, is not to be turned after Satan. But if they have been rashly professed, and are not able to perform that vow of continency, it is better to marry than to burn, by the judgment of Cyprian, Epiphanius, Hierom, and Augustin, *Notes on verses 11 and 12.* Neither doth the scripture provide any other remedy against fornication or burning, in them who have not the gift of continency, but marriage. And Augustin doth rightly acknowledge, that continency is not in a man's own power or liberty, but only the gift of God. But that God will give that gift to every one, when our Saviour Christ and the apostle saith it is not granted to every one, you do not well gather it out of his words. For although when the heat of his youth was passed over incontinently, as he, *Augustin*, confesseth, he obtained by prayer the gift for the rest of his time, it followeth not that every one in the heat of their youth, may have the gift, if they will pray for it. Neither are men any where exhorted to pray for it, with certain promise that they shall obtain it. Therefore your conclusions do not follow, "that continency may be lawfully vowed," which is not in our power to perform. "That it is not impossible to be fulfilled of all men by prayer, fasting, and chastisement," when there is no promise that all men may obtain it by prayer, fasting, &c. The reason that you allege for your third conclusion, is that which is in controversy, and is denied of us. Yet we deny not, but the condition of the continent in some respects is better than of the married. For your fourth conclusion, we persuade none to marry that can live chastely out of marriage, but if they cannot, we persuade them with the Apostle and the ancient fathers, that it is better for them to marry than to burn, if they be not able to keep their rash and unlawful vow. You slander Augustin to say, he avoucheth that the marriage of vowed persons is worse than adultery: for in neither of both places that you quote, he saith so. But *cap. 1.* he saith, that by chaste widowhood, not only evils were avoided, which are adultery and fornication, but also marriage which is good, is extolled. In the *cap. 11.* after he hath by many reasons proved the marriage of such as be good, in whom the breach of vow is evil, he concludeth in these words: "Wherefore I cannot say, that if women that are fallen from a better purpose do marry, it is no marriage, but adultery, but I would not doubt to say plainly, that the falling and ruin from more holy chastity, is worse than adultery." He saith not therefore, that the marriage of

such is worse than adultery, but the breach of vows, and fall from their purpose. For he proveth at large, *cap. 9, 10, 11*, that the marriage is good, and not to be broken, therefore he saith immediately before: "By this inconsiderate opinion, whereby they think that the marriages of those women that are fallen from their holy purpose, are no marriage, no small evil cometh, that wives are separated from their husbands, as though they were adulteresses, and not wives, and when by separating of them, they will restore them to continency, they make their husbands adulterers, when their own wives being alive, they marry other women. As for Jovinian's heresy, we have nothing to do with it, more than Cyprian, Epiphanius, Hierom, Augustin, whose sentences are before rehearsed, willing vowed persons to marry rather than to burn, yet preferring pure continency, before matrimonial chastity, as far as the Apostle doth. Therefore what would those holy doctors have said if they had lived in these times, and seen the filthy life of the popish clergy? which yet they defend as pure chastity, and when the earth stinketh of their abominations, yet they are not ashamed to prefer their foul and unchaste single life, before holy and chaste matrimony.

17. We see double honour, but double livelihood we see not in the text. Forget not your own preferment, and worldly advancement, howsoever you do.

17. To defend your unlearned and unpreaching popes, cardinals, bishops, and priests, say you, there be many good and worthy bishops and priests, that have not the gift of preaching and teaching, but no such thing can be gathered out of the text: for the apostle hath expressly required, and it is the most proper quality, that he expresseth in a bishop or a priest: that he be apt to teach, *1 Tim. 3. 2. Tit. 1. 9*. For all the rest of the virtues are to be required in every true Christian man. Therefore he meaneth, that as every one of them laboureth more in preaching and teaching, he is so much the more to be honoured, or else he meaneth of those elders that Ambrose speaketh of upon the first verse of this chapter, that were appointed only for government, and not for teaching, such as are in some churches at this time. But it was never allowed that any should be such a bishop or priest as you mean, ordained to teach, which is not able, or hath not the gift to teach. Therefore the law being against you, you fly to examples of Alypius and Valerius that were good bishops, and yet had not the gift to teach. For which you quote *Possid. in vit. August. cap. 5*, where no such thing is to be found: for of Alypius there is no mention. Of Valerius it is said, that because he was a Greek, and had not so good utterance in the Latin tongue, he was less profitable to edify by preaching and teaching, and therefore procured Augustin to supply that his want in his life time, but that he had no gift of teaching at all, it is utterly false. But of Alypius, Augustin himself testifieth, that he was worthy

to be a bishop before he was ordained, *Epist. 8*, which he would not have said, if he had not had the gift of teaching at all. But this you note to cover the shame of your popish prelacy, among whom it is a rare thing to have a bishop apt to teach: as Erasmus said, that only England in his time had learned bishops.

23. No man doubteth, but it is lawful, without superstition for chastising of a man's body, to abstain from wine, flesh, fish, fruits, spices, or other creatures, but to forbid the use of them, as though in the very abstinence there were religion, it is the doctrine of devils, *1 Tim. 4*. Therefore we use no calumnious or stale cavillation: but you to hide your blasphemous doctrine, make an impudent and unlearned alteration of the question in controversy between us.

#### CHAPTER 6

20. Timothy had nothing committed to him by unwritten tradition, but the doctrine contained in the holy scriptures, and the government of the church according to the same. Wherefore you do but mock the unlearned readers with a Latin word, which the Apostle used not, nor any of the ancient fathers did include any such matter, as you pretend, therein. Ambrose useth the word *commendatum*, that which is committed, and saith, "he admonisheth, that those things be kept, which were said before," therefore he speaketh of no unwritten tradition. Theodoret saith, "I think he calleth the grace of the spirit, which he receiveth by ordination, the thing that was committed to him." But that was not unwritten traditions, delivered by hands of men. The rest understand it of the Apostolic doctrine, committed to him by Paul, who preached nothing but the Gospel, contained in the holy scriptures. Neither doth Vincentius allow any tradition, but that which is contained in the scriptures, and inveigheth against all new opinions, which have no ground in the holy scriptures, though the authors of them do abuse the scriptures, to make a show for their errors. Ireneus also doth sufficiently declare, that the holy scriptures are the chief treasure of the church, when he saith the Apostles did deliver the Gospel which they preached in writing, to be the foundation and pillar of our faith, *lib. 3. cap. 1*. Neither was it the word *Depositum*, that caused heretics in the days of Clemens, to reject this epistle, but the word knowledge falsely so called, which the Gnostics that bragged of knowledge could not abide. Of the sufficiency of the scriptures he saith, "They that are sealed with the holy scriptures, as I said, ought to esteem them as the best storehouses from whence wisdom is sent out, to what part of life soever they be turned, and to think that this wisdom is the haven of health, which is troubled with no waves." Therefore so long as it is the old truth which we teach, and no new doctrine of falsehood, it skilleth not though we fetched it three or four thousand years hence, over all men's heads, out of Moses and the Prophets. And yet we show

the continuance of this truth also, for the principal points of doctrine, in the ancient fathers, for many hundred years from Christ, and in all ages even in the depth of Antichrist's darkness, until our time. Where as for Popery, first you are driven to disclaim of the authority of the scriptures, for many things, and to fly to unwritten tradition: secondly, you are never able to prove your traditions from hand to hand, from age to age, from Bishop to Bishop, whereof you falsely boast. But in the Primitive Church, always as you ascend higher and higher, you will be forsaken of all men, except perhaps of heretics, long before you come at the Apostles.

20. That only is true and ancient, which is first, and that is false which is later, though it be ancient, as Tertullian proveth at large in his book of prescriptions against heretics, and so meth. Vincentius, and not otherwise. There be heresies 1,500 years old and more, but age cannot make falsehood to be true. As for profane novelties of words, about which you make many words to no purpose, they are such as are not new, only in sound of words, but in sense also. And those words, the sense and true meaning whereof are contained in the scriptures, may be new words, but not profane novelties of words, as those terms, Catholic, Trinity, person, sacrament, incarnation, &c., the meaning of which is found in the scriptures. But the words, mass, transubstantiation, our lady, pope, cardinals, and a hundred such like, whereof neither the word nor the meaning are in the holy scriptures, are profane novelties of words which the Apostle willeth to be avoided. And for those terms which you charge us to use, as we use them they are in the scripture either in word or sense, as will, captive or thrall to sin. *Rom. 7. 15.* Sole faith we defend not to justify, but faith without works which is faith only, and that we have in the scriptures. *Rom. 3. 28.* Fiducia or trust. *Heb. 3. 6 and 4. 16.* Apprehension of the justice of Christ by faith. *Rom. 9. 30.* Imputation of justice. *Rom. 4.* The terrors and anguish of Christ feeling the pains of hell. *Mark 14. 33, 34. Mat. 26. 37. 28. 45. Luke 22. 45. Heb. 5. 7.*

By marks and badges sacramental I know not what you mean, but we find in the scriptures, that the sacraments be signs and seals of the righteousness of faith. *Gen. 17. Rom. 4. 11.* As for the companation, impanation, circumpanation, we renounce them as well as transubstantiation. The presence of Christ in spirit, to faith, by sign, figure, pledge, or effect, we prove by many testimonies of scripture, which teach that Christ was present to the fathers in the Old Testament, in the sacrament of Manna, in the Rock, and other sacraments which could not be in body, before he was incarnate. *1 Cor. 10. 6.* therefore in spirit, to faith, by sign, figure, pledge, effect of grace, &c., which terms, beside that the sense of them is contained in the scrip-

tures, you know we have received also of the ancient fathers, and even in the same meaning that we use them.

Where you say, the Catholics in Augustin's time, did abhor the phrase *Laus Deo*, because the Circumcellions used it, it is false, and you show your great reading in Augustin that understand him no better. The Donatists indeed, of a vain curiosity, changed the usual term, *Deo gratias*, which was honest and godly, and said instead of it, *Deo Laudes*, in which word there was no hurt, nor any cause why the Catholic should abhor the word, that giveth praise to God, because the heretics abused it. But this was the matter that they abhorred. The Circumcellions were furious runagates, of the sect of the Donatists, that spared not to beat, hurt, and wound, yea sometimes to kill the Catholics, when they met them, where they could master them, therefore when they were known by their terms, *Deo Laudes*, the Catholics had good cause to be afraid of them. Therefore saith Augustin, "I would they were the soldiers of Christ and not the soldiers of the devil, by whom *Deo Laudes* being uttered, is more feared than the roaring of a lion. You laugh at our *Deo Gratias*, but men weep at your *Deo Laudes*," meaning those whom they had beaten and hurt. But as for those, that be your proper term, I would you had them wholly to yourselves. For such words as we use in religion, we are ready to give account before God and his church, that they have the true sense and meaning of the holy scriptures, and therefore cannot be called profane or vain novelties of words, which are to be avoided by the Apostle's precepts.

20. Such Heretics were the Valentinians and Gnostics, which not content with the simple knowledge that was contained in the holy scriptures, did arrogate unto themselves, a far higher understanding, which none could attain unto but they that understood the unwritten tradition. "When they are convicted," saith Ireneus, "out of the scriptures, they fall to accusing the scriptures themselves, as though they were not perfect, as though they were not of authority sufficient, because they were diversely uttered, and that the truth out of them cannot be found out of them which know not the tradition, for that was not delivered by writing, but by word of mouth." Join this saying therefore to the other two, out of Ireneus and Vincentius, and you shall make a perfect description of Papists: which boast of the truth of the church, of tradition by word of mouth more certain than the scriptures, all which is nothing else but falsely called knowledge, being indeed, deep blindness and ignorance of the truth, a false brag of the Catholic Church, and a counterfeit boasting of apostolic tradition, where they have nothing but new vanities and profane novelties, not of words only but of matters inspired by the devil, maintained by Antichrist, and upholden by tyranny or sophistry, without authority of the holy scriptures.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL TO TIMOTHY.

### CHAPTER I.

5. If the faith of our progenitors were true, it is sin to forsake it: but to build upon our fathers' faith, when it was false, or none, is to build upon a weak foundation. Therefore the popish people's speeches of their fathers' faith to be the only ground of their religion, against which they will hear nothing, is vain, ridiculous, and damnable. Wherefore whensoever the scripture or the ancient fathers speak in commendation of their fathers' faith, they speak of the true faith. For against their fathers' faith which was none, or false, the scriptures do often cry out. *Ecc.* 20. 18. *Zac.* 1. and *1 Pet.* 1. 18. &c. And Heretics may easily brag of their fathers' faith, as Nestorius and others did, as impudently as the Papists, but they can never prove their faith by the holy scriptures.

6. Here is no such matter to be gathered, for he speaketh of the same extraordinary grace of prophecy that was given by imposition of hands, whereof he spake, *1 Tim.* 4. 14. Neither doth the apostle, or Luke, any where say, that the orders give grace to the ordered, nor that to take orders, is to be delivered to the grace of God. In the place, *Acts* 14, it is said, that Paul and Barnabas sailed to Antioch, from whence they were delivered to the grace of God, and to the work which they fulfilled, meaning that from Antioch they were sent to preach and by prayer commended to the grace of God. For to use your term, the apostles took no orders at Antioch. Paul was an apostle immediately from Christ, and not by men, *Galat.* 1. They both preached before they were sent from Antioch, not without sufficient authority. *Acts* 11. 26. The text is, whence they were delivered to the grace of God, not where they were delivered to the grace of God. Therefore if your gloss were true, the sense should not be they sailed to Antioch, where they took orders, but whence they took orders, which is an unusual kind of speech, and far from the meaning of the Evangelist.

12. Although it be true that all good works and sufferings for his truth be laid up with God to be rewarded, yet the apostle speaketh not of his good deeds, but of himself and his salvation, which by faith he hath committed to God, that will surely preserve him unto the perfect reward of justification in the day of judgment. "What doth he commit to God but his salvation?" saith Ambrose. Theodoret saith, "The grace of God's Spirit." Primasius, "Faith." Chrysostom, "His faith and preaching:" all which come to one end. The sufferings of the Papists in England, are not for Christ and the faith of his church, but for Antichrist and their horrible treasons and murders conspired against their government and their native country.

13. For substance of doctrine, the apostles

taught nothing by word of mouth, but that which is contained in their writings. "The apostles," saith Ireneus, "preached the gospel, and after by the will of God delivered it to us in writing, to be the foundation and pillar of our faith," *lib.* 3. *cap.* 4. Therefore the truth of all those terms which the church useth to express the mysteries of our religion or to meet with the fraud of Heretics, is manifestly contained in the scriptures, though the terms themselves be not expressed. But transubstantiation and mass, be not only not found in the scriptures, but are manifestly contrary to the truth of the scriptures.

16. It is a happy thing to minister to the afflicted for true religion, but not meritorious. The apostle prayeth, that Onesiphorus may be rewarded of God's mercy, and not of the merit of his work.

18. The faithful have their only hope at the day of their death, and at the general resurrection in the mercy of God through Christ. Augustin, "my whole hope is in nothing but thy exceeding great mercy," *Cons. lib.* 10. *cap.* 29. Without which faith, if Moses, Samuel, Noah, Job, Daniel, Jeremiah, or any of the prophets prayed for us, it will not avail us. *Ezek.* 14. 14. 1 *Sam.* 16 *Hier.* 15. 1. *cap.* 7. 16. Therefore, miserable is the condition of papists, which can have no greater hope than that which is given by the prayer of a priest or other papist by them relieved, and therefore must bestow all their lands, honours, and riches, to purchase such a prayer. For with popish priests it hath always been a true proverb, "no penny, no pater-noster." And it is good to mark, what a large net is here spread to bring all the lands, honours, and riches of the world, into the popish priests' hands, when their prayer giveth "the greatest hope that can be to them, that bestow any thing upon them, is worth all that they can give for it."

### CHAPTER 2.

4. The Apostle, *1 Cor.* 7, maketh marriage no more impediment of bishops and priests to employ themselves wholly to God's service, than of all other men and women; and also showeth, that it is necessary for all persons, that have not the gift of continency. For covetousness or immoderate vain delight, it is forbidden to practise physick, &c. but not for necessity of honest recreation. If base offices about princes' service be unfit, what is it to be a steward in a nobleman's or gentleman's house, as it was usual among popish priests? To hear princes' confessions, if they have good cause to make them, is not unmeet for their chaplains. But to bind princes to make their confessions to their priests, is a baser and more servile thing, than is required of any common subject. To be occupied in making of peace, either private or public with such conditions as you add, no reasonable man can



mislike, but to make bloody wars upon Christian princes, as the pope and popish prelates used to do, is contrary to the spiritual soldier's office, whereof the Apostle speaketh.

13. The papists so challenge the scriptures, as they count them insufficient to determine all their controversies: being in that respect inferior to many heretics. And their handling is like to heretics, which learn not their errors out of the scriptures, but study to draw the scriptures to their heresies, where catholics learn their faith out of the plain and evident scriptures, and by the same confirm all true articles thereof.

17. Heretical books with the confutations of them, may be read of them that desire to see the victory of truth against falsehood, as the books of Augustin, Ambrose, Cyril, confuting pagans or heretics.

21. Man hath no free will to make himself a vessel of salvation, but only and altogether of the grace of God, to whose mercy salvation is to be attributed only, and not to man's will, which is ever free from constraint, but never from captivity of sin, until by grace it begin to be enlarged. Therefore saith Augustin, "O evil free will without God," *De verb. Apost. ser.* 11. "Free will made captive, availeth to nothing but to sin." *August. ad Bonif. lib.* 3. *cap.* 8. Where you say the mercy of God worketh all such effects in us, as not only to his providence, but also to our deserts, are agreeable, you join flatly with Pelagius, which said that the grace or mercy of God was bestowed according to men's deserts. Against which was holden the Councils of Milevite and Africane, and it is most directly contrary to the scriptures, *John* 1. 16. *Rom.* 11. 6, &c.

25. Man's will is always free from coercion, but never from thralldom to sin, until it begin to be set at liberty by the grace of God: "why do men presume so much of the possibility of nature? It is wounded, it is maimed, it is vexed, it is lost? It hath need of a true confession, not of false defence. Therefore let the grace of God be sought, not wherewith it may be instructed, but wherewith it may be restored." *Aug. de nat. et grat. cap.* 53.

### CHAPTER 3.

8. The names of those magicians were not necessary to salvation, therefore not expressed in the Old Testament. Albeit the apostle had them of tradition, yet hath not the popish church the like certainty of tradition in such names as you speak of. For neither the number, nor the names of the wise men that came to Christ, were known to the ancient church, as I have showed, *Matt.* 2. verse 4. The penitent thief's name, Dismas, beside that it hath no testimony of antiquity, doth rhyme with the other thief's name, Gismas, as in so casual a matter it is very unlike to be but feigned: the names themselves being such as were neither usual among the Jews, nor among the Gentiles. The story of the soldier that pierced Christ's side, is a very fable, as his name is a childish fiction. For John

would not have concealed the miracle of his sight restored. And he hath his name feigned of his office, because he was a spearman. Which is his name, as truly as that he had two bodies, whereof one lieth at Mantua, the other at Lyons, and both places are sure of it by tradition.

14. So we be sure that we were first instructed in the true faith, we must not give over our old faith for any new fantasy. But if we were first deceived with error, we must not refuse the truth whensoever it is revealed.

16. The apostle said before, that the scriptures are able to make a man wise unto salvation, therefore they contain all doctrine, not only profitable, but also necessary and sufficient to salvation. And this commendation pertaineth even to the scriptures of the Old Testament, but not to every book of them, more than to every line, word, syllable, or letter: but to the whole scripture that God delivered for a sufficient instruction to his church. Which was first the five books of Moses, and afterward the prophets, for a more full and plain declaration of the doctrine contained in those first books, and last of all, the books of the New Testament, for a most plain and full explication of the law and the prophets, and a testimony of the fulfilling of all things that were foreshowed in the law and the prophets. Where you say, there is not any one of those books, nor any part of them, but it is profitable to the end that the apostle speaketh, it is false, for the man of God cannot be made perfect by every part of scripture, but by the whole. But of this commendation of holy scriptures, you say, the heretics, for so you call true catholics, pretend that therefore nothing is necessary to justice and salvation, but the scriptures, wherein not more foolishly than maliciously, you falsify the question, because against the true state of the controversy you are able to say nothing: except you will deny the scriptures itself. Whoever heard or read that we pretend that nothing is necessary to justice and salvation but the scriptures? By which saying we should exclude Christ himself, as unnecessary to justice and salvation, therefore we pretend no such thing. But this is the true state of the controversy. Whether the whole scriptures do contain all doctrine necessary to be learned unto salvation? And we affirm they do, because the scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation, to make the man of God perfect, instructed to all good works. Against this if you could say any thing, you would not so impudently feign a new question, which we do not hold. "But every thing that is profitable or necessary to any effect, excludeth not all other helps, nor is sufficient to attain the same." As though our argument were only of the profit and necessity of the scripture, and not of the perfection. The apostle saith, it is able to make wise to salvation, *ergo*, it is perfect and sufficient for doctrine, it is profitable to every part of the man of God's office, even that he may be perfect, and thoroughly furnished unto every good work. Therefore it is perfect and suf-

ficient, containing all doctrine that is necessary for this end. But you object, "that a man by this reason, might as well prove that the Old Testament were enough, and so exclude the New." We confess that the Old Testament for the time before Christ was enough, but that doth not exclude the New. For all that is more than enough, is not superfluous. God will have his church in the New Testament, to be not only sufficiently as in the Old Testament but most richly and abundantly furnished with all clearness and evidence of knowledge, by the scriptures of the apostles and evangelists. But you cannot by any reason prove, that one piece of the Old Testament is or ever was enough: for any one piece of the Old Testament cannot make Timothy wise to salvation, but the whole may. One piece cannot make the man of God perfect, but the whole can. Therefore he affirmeth not every piece of scripture to have these utilities, but the whole. "But we might see," say you, "in the very next line before, that he requireth his perseverance in the doctrine, which he had taught him, over and above that he had learned out of the scriptures of the Old Testament, which he had read from his infancy, but could not thereby learn all the mysteries of the Christian religion therein." We see indeed that the apostle had taught him to understand the scriptures, but that he taught any thing over and above the scriptures of the Old Testament or that Timothy could not learn all doctrine of all the mysteries of Christian religion in them, we see not, but the contrary. For the apostle saith, these scriptures were able to make him wise unto salvation, which no man can be which is ignorant of the mysteries of Christian religion. Therefore the scriptures of the Old Testament were able to teach him the doctrine of the mysteries of Christian religion. Neither do we gather that Timothy had his knowledge by reading only, without help of masters and teachers, as you falsely slander us. For we acknowledge pastors and teachers to be necessary in the church, yet by reading only, diligent study, and prayer, many have attained without other teachers, to sufficient knowledge. But because you say we make a foolish argument out of this text, to prove that the scriptures contain sufficient doctrine to salvation, let us see whether any of the ancient fathers were as foolish as we, to gather the same conclusion. Chrysostom saith upon this text, *Hom. 9*. "If any thing be needful for us to learn, or to be ignorant of, there," meaning in the scriptures, "shall we learn it, if to reprove falsehood, from thence shall we draw it, if any thing lack to be corrected or rebuked, which must be had unto exhortation, unto comfort, there also do we learn it." *Hom. 8*. "The scriptures do teach both what things are to be done, and what things are not to be done." Theodoret saith: "The scripture is inspired of God, therefore he teacheth the kinds of utility, it is profitable to teach. For whatsoever we know not we learn out of it. To reprove, it reproveth our wicked life. To correct, for it exhorteth that

they which have gone astray, return into the right way. To instruct in righteousness, for it teacheth us the kinds of virtue. That the man of God may be perfect, furnished to all good works. All those things do attribute and ascribe perfection to the God of all." This father by the perfection of the scripture proveth the Holy Ghost to be perfect God.

Primasius saith: "Out of the scripture, he that is ignorant is taught, he that is insolent is reprov'd, he that erreth is corrected, he that can keep no measure is instructed to justice, to every good work not unto one." Oecumenius saith, after he hath rehearsed the particular utilities to teach all true opinions and good works, to reprove errors and vice, he concludeth that the man of God may be not only partaker after a vulgar manner of every good work, but perfect and complete by the doctrine of the scriptures. Not to some kind of good work and to some not, but to all and every good work, saith Theophylact.

#### CHAPTER 4.

3. They that hear us preach mortification according to the scriptures, can testify that we preach not things pleasant to the flesh or carnal man. But your religion is the religion of pleasure, serving all the senses almost in your church service, and bringing men into security through your doctrine of pardons, masses, and merits, to be available not only in this life, but after men be dead.

6. The faithful receive confirmation by the constancy of the martyrs, suffering for the truth. But there is no participation of merits, where the martyr himself doth not merit, but is crowned of God's mercy.

8. This place proveth not, that any works done after the first justification, are meritorious. For this crown of justice is given to the justice of faith, freely given by the grace of God. For whereto should that justification serve, if the reward of justice were not due unto it? Therefore the apostle saith, whom God hath justified, he hath also glorified, *Rom. 8. 30*. And he rendereth heaven as a just judge, not to the merit or worthiness of our works, but to the merit and worthiness of Christ, and as due to us by his promise freely made in Christ. The crown therefore is not only of mercy and of favour in respect of us, but of justice in respect of Christ, who hath purchased it for us by his merits and worthiness. Therefore saith Augustin, "He crowneth his gifts, not our merits, when he crowneth us." In *Ps. 101*, and even in the place quoted by you, he addeth immediately, "And how should this be a crown of justice, if grace had not gone before, which justifieth the ungodly man." You see it is a crown of justice, in respect of our free justification by grace. Neither doth the scripture any where ascribe merit to our works, or worthiness of heaven to works proceeding of grace, but saith, "We are saved by grace, and not of works," *Eph. 2*; which saying could not be true, if we were saved by both, or by works coming of grace. Wherefore if

you had any text of scripture to prove the merit of Christian men's works, you would not fly to an insinuation, *Ibb* 6, where indeed the apostle doth insinuate no such matter; but assurcth the Hebrews, that God will be just of his promise, and not forget to reward their labour and dutiful service, yet this reward is of mercy, not of the merit of the work. The parable of the man sent into the vineyard, is mighty for grace against merits. For although God enter into covenant and promise of a reward, or a wages, yet he showeth in the end that this wages is of his mercy, and not of the merit or worthiness of the work or labour. For if it were of the merit of the work and labour, then by justice, they that wrought but one hour should not have as much as they that wrought all day, or if one hour's labour deserved one penny, twelve hours' labour deserved twelve pence. Therefore the reward is only of God's mercy, in respect of us, not of the merit of our works. I confess it is due by promise and covenant, and so a right debt. But the covenant and promise is established altogether in mercy and grace toward us, through Jesus Christ, in whom is all our merit and worthiness, not in ourselves or our own works, though done by his grace. The Pharisee that trusted in himself, that he was just by works proceeding of God's grace, and therefore gave God thanks for all his virtues, went home without justification, *Luke* 18. 9, 11. Neither saith Augustin anything against this, or if he spake against Christ, he were not to be heard. He often useth the name of merits for good works, but he doth always deny the worthiness of the work, to attain to the reward, ascribing all to the grace and mercy of God. Concerning the place that you cite out of his exposition of *Ps*. 100, he telleth you plainly, how God cometh to be a debtor, "By forgiving sins he hath made himself a debtor of the crown." Therefore he is not a debtor to the merit of our works, but to the mean of his mercy Jesus Christ, whereby our sins are pardoned, to whose justice the crown

of justice is due. *Ps*. 83, he saith, "The Lord hath made himself a debtor, not by receiving any thing, but by promising. It is not said to him, pay that thou hast received, but pay that thou hast promised. He that hath given the death of his Son to a sinner, what doth he keep to him that is saved by the death of his Son? Be out of fear. Hold him as a debtor, because thou hast believed in him, as a promiser." You see, therefore, that the debt groweth not of the worthiness or merit of our works, but by the promise of God, in the worthiness and merit of Christ's death, *Hom*. 14. *de* 50, he saith by an apostrophe to Paul, "When God crowneth thy merits or good works, he crowneth nothing but his own gifts." So he saith in the person of Paul, "I obtained mercy, debts were not paid unto me, for if debts should be paid, punishment should be paid." Here nothing is given as due to the merit of our works, but of the mercy of God, which hath promised reward, and giveth all power to work. Cyprian, in the book named, exhorteth earnestly to the work of alms and piety, assuring men of the reward, that God hath promised to our merit, for so he calleth good works, as before the Pelagian heresy, the fathers used that word more freely, but this question, whether the reward be due to our works of the merit or worthiness of them, he teacheth not. But *ad Quirinum* cap. 4, he saith, "We are to glory of nothing, seeing nothing is our own. That faith only profiteth, and that we may be able to so much as we believe." And *De duplici martyrio*, "He trusteth not in God, that doth not repose the confidence of all his felicity in him alone." By which saying it followeth, that we are not to trust in the merit of good works, but in the mercy of God through Jesus Christ, which is our righteousness.

21. The ancient fathers are not agreed who was next successor to Peter, and who third and fourth, therefore the story of Peter's being at Rome and of his succession in the apostolic chair, is not so certain a matter as the Papists make it. *Phil*. 4.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO TITUS.

### CHAPTER I.

5. Mere popular elections were forbidden by the Council of Laodicea. Yet long after that Council, the people had their elections, moderated by the wisdom and gravity of the clergy, among whom, for order and seemly government, there was always one principal to whom by long use of the church, the name of bishop or superintendent hath been applied; which room Titus exercised in Creta. Timothy in Ephesus, and others in other places. Therefore although in the scripture, a bishop and an elder is of one order and authority in preaching the word, and admini-

stration of the sacraments, as Hierom doth often confess, by ancient use of speech, he is only called a bishop, which is in the scripture called *πολιταρχος, ποιςτας, ηγουμενος*, *Rom*. 12. 8. *1 Tim*. 5. 17. *Ileb*. 13. 17, that is chief in government, to whom the ordination or consecration by imposition of hands, was principally committed. Not that imposition of hands belongeth only to him, for the rest of the elders that were present at ordination, did lay on their hands, or else the Bishop did lay on his hands in the name of the rest. Where you say, Hierom doth attribute to the bishop only, confirming the baptized by giv-

ing them the Holy Ghost, through imposition of hands, and holy Chrism. Hierom's words are these: "I do not deny that this is the custom of the churches, that to them which are baptized far off in little cities by the priests and deacons, the bishop goeth abroad to lay on his hand at the invocation of the Holy Ghost." Here you see there is neither giving of the Holy Ghost, nor holy Chrism, therefore no Popish confirmation. And further, he showeth, that this was a custom, and not a matter of necessity. "But if you ask," saith he, "why he that is baptized in the church, doth not receive the Holy Ghost, but by the hands of the bishop, whom we affirm to be given in true baptism: learn that this observation proceeded of that authority, because after the ascension of our Lord, the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles. And we find that the same hath been done in many places, rather for the honour of priesthood, than for the necessity of a law. Or else, if only at the prayer of a bishop, the Holy Ghost descendeth, they are to be lamented which, in little towns and villages, or places far off, are baptized by the priests and deacons, and die before they be visited of the bishop." You see therefore, that the ceremony of confirmation of the baptized by imposition of hands which calling upon the Holy Ghost, is not necessary to salvation, and therefore no sacrament, as it is holden of you.

Our translation is according to the truth of the word, which we translate. And as the word, elders, in our tongue signifieth age, and not office properly, so doth the Greek word signify age, and not office properly. Yea it is easy to gather by the circumstance of the text, that here it signifieth an office, which hath his name of age, because the elder sort, for wisdom, gravity, and experience, are most meet to govern. And that although young men be called to that office, yet in knowledge, gravity, government of affections, they must be ancient. Your own vulgar Latin doth translate the word when it signifieth office, sometimes *Seniores*, sometimes *Majores natu*. *Acts 15. cap. 16. 20*, which can signify nothing else but elders, seniors, or as you had rather call them by a French English term, ancients.

6. The testimony of a man cannot control the authority of the Holy Ghost, and yet the same man confesseth, that in some places in his time, the ministers of the church were married, and did beget children, and that it was necessary for the multitude that it was required to the ministry, when other were not found, to take such. *Iar. 59*. Before Montanus and other heretics came with his hypocritical fasting, and condemning of second marriages, there was no question, but he that had been twice married, might be a bishop, as they were in Tertullian's time, who objecteth it to the Catholics as a crime, "that Digami, twice married men, were bishops and priests among them." *De Monogam*. But after that time, the mystery of in-

iquity wrought so much, even in godly fathers, that though they do not simply deny second marriages, yet by denying the blessing unto them, by calling them honest fornication, and comely adultery, and otherwise derogating from the holiness of them, they brought them in discredit, that it was thought first unmeet, and then unlawful for one that had been twice married to be received into the ministry. *Athenagoras Apol. Orig. in Luc. hom. 9. Greg. Naz. Or. 32. Hierom. ad Geron-tiam, &c.* And thus came second marriages to be condemned in the ministry. And whatsoever is alleged by Epiphanius, Ambrose, Hierom, or any other, for the continence of the clergy, can argue no necessity thereof, seeing the Holy Ghost so expressly allowed the husband of one wife to be a bishop, priest, or deacon.

Where you say, that all notable bishops were either single, or contained from their wives, it is false. For Ambrose testifieth, that all the Apostles, except John and Paul, had wives. *Com. in 2 Cor. 11*. Clemens Alexandrinus affirmeth, that Peter and Paul begat children. *Strom. 3*. Chæremion Bishop of Nilus fled with his wife in persecution. *Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 42*. Demetrian Bishop of Antioch, had a son called Domnus, that was made bishop instead of Paul Samosatensis, the heretic. *Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 30*. Spiridion was a famous bishop in the Council of Nice that was married, and had a daughter called Irene. *Ruffin. lib. 1. cap. 5*. Gregory Nazianzen was a notable bishop, and father of the other Gregory that succeeded him, as appeareth by the oration that he made in praise of his father. Gregory of Nyssa was a notable bishop, married. *Niceph. lib. 11. cap. 19*. Synesius of Ptolemais was married, and begat children, while he was bishop, as appeareth in divers of his epistles. *Ep. 70, and Ep. 126*. Hilary of Poitiers was married, and had a young daughter, as appeareth by his epistle to her, if it be not counterfeited, and by other records. Germanus was a notable bishop in Africa, and was married, having a daughter called Leontia that was afterward martyred by the Arians. *Victor Uicens. Hist. lib. 3*. Sulpicius Severus Archbishop of Burges in France, writeth to Basula his wife's mother. *Ep. 3, and Paulinus ep. 1, Paulinus Epis*. Nolanus had a wife called Thorosia. *Amb. Ep. 37, ad Sabinum. Aug. Ep. 32 and 34*. Paulinus himself, *Ep. 2 and 3*. Fabianus and Hornisda, Bishops of Rome were married, and many other Bishops of Rome were priest's sons, as Pope Damasus in his Pontifical doth testify. And although many holy men were married, yet it is false, that you say, no holy men ever used their wives after they were in holy orders. For Socrates testifieth of many godly bishops of the east church in his time, that begat lawful children of their lawful wives, since they were bishops. *Lib. 5. cap. 22*. That many also were married after they were in holy orders, I have proved before upon *1 Tim. 3*. That scarce one amongst us

hath the gift of continency, is a new slander: for beside a great number of inferior ministers, both living and departed this life in England, divers godly bishops have lived unmarried, without any note of incontinency. These may serve for example that are departed, Latimer, Ridley, Jewel, Grindal, to convince your impudency.

15. The Popish church's forbidding of meats is Antichristian, and the doctrine of devils, not a voluntary abstaining for chastisement of the body, among whom all kinds of meats and drinks are permitted that provoke lust most of all, only flesh excepted. Therefore they make the creatures of God by their prohibition, unclean, not in respect of their creation, but in respect of their Antichristian prohibition. As the Jewish abstinence was not for any uncleanness in the creatures by God's creation, but only by the prohibition of the law. Therefore, as the apostle meaneth the Jewish superstition, who ceased not to put difference of clean and unclean, according to their old law, so also he comprehendeth much more the Popish superstition, who boasting that they are the disciples of Christ which hath made all things clean to the clean, yet cease not to put difference of meats, clean and unclean, holy and unholy, not according to God's law, as the Jews did, but according to the law of the Pope, which is God's enemy. Augustin in the place quoted, hath never a word sounding to the defence of the Pope's prohibition of meats. 1 Tim. 4.

#### CHAPTER 3.

5. Here is no word to prove, that baptism giveth grace of the work wrought: but the Apostle saith, that God hath saved us by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which is testified by the sacrament of baptism, which is sacramentally the laver of regeneration, not by the work wrought, but by the grace of God's Spirit, by which we are justified. Peter explicated himself, *Pet.* . 21. "Baptism saveth us, not the washing of the filth of the body, but the interrogation of a good conscience," &c.

10. A man may be convicted to be a heretic without a general council, if he do obstinately defend any grievous error, against the manifest authority of the holy scriptures. So were many heretics and heresies condemned, against which there were no councils gathered. Many godly men and the truth itself by councils have been condemned for heretics and heresies: as Athanasius was condemned in the Councils of Tyre and Antioch. Chrysostom in a council holden at Chalcedon. The Councils of Ariminum and Nicomedia decreed against the divinity of Christ for the Arians. The Council of Ephesus the second for Eutyches and Dioscorus, against the truth of Christ's humanity. Therefore your descriptions and marks to know heretics, are not sufficient: for no opinion is to be taken for heresy, which is agreeable to the holy scriptures, though it be condemned by all men in the world. Cy-

prian also had his error confirmed by a Council of Carthage, and did defend it against the bishop of Rome's sentence: yet was he no heretic, but his opinion was erroneous, because it was contrary to the truth of the scripture. Neither was it only the See Apostolic that condemned Pelagius for a heretic, but the councils of Africa. And if the See Apostolic had not condemned him, yet had he been a heretic, and his opinion heresy, because it was contrary to the doctrine of the holy scriptures. Sergius of Constantinople was a heretic, and his opinion, that there was but one will in Christ, was heresy, although the See Apostolic of Rome, did not only not condemn him, but also by Honorius the bishop thereof confirmed his heresy, as is testified, *Council. Const. 6. Act. 13.* in these words. "Besides these also we have foreseen, that Honorius sometime bishop of old Rome, is cast out of the Holy Catholic Church of God and accursed: because we have found by certain writings of his made unto Sergius, that in all things he followed his mind, and confirmed his ungodly opinion." Neither was Arianism made catholic religion, when pope Liberius confirmed it by his subscription, and condemned the catholics by a council holden at Rome, as pope Damasus testified, *in lib. Hierom. in catalog. Athanasius ad solut.* Therefore in the description of a heretic given by Augustin, those are meant to be false and new opinions, which are contrary to the true and ancient doctrine contained in the holy scriptures. Seeing therefore we hold no new or false opinion contrary to the word of God, the marks of heretics and heresies shall never be found in us. We are not condemned of the church of Christ, nor by any general council: for the Romish church is the church of Antichrist, and the chapter of Trent consisting of forty popish bishops, is unworthy the name of a council, much less of a general council, which is not received of the papists themselves. For the papists of France protested against it, as no lawful council in the time of Francis the First. Therefore so long as you have nothing but this most impudent petition of principle, that you are the church, which hath condemned the protestants for heretics, no reasonable man will think us sufficiently confuted or condemned. Specially seeing the question is, whether you or we are the church, as it was between the Donatists and Catholics in Augustin's time: and to be determined only by the scriptures as he saith. "Between us and the Donatists the question is, where the church is? Therefore what shall we do? shall we seek her in our own words, or in the words of her head, our Lord Jesus Christ? I suppose that we ought rather to seek her in his words, which is the truth, and best knoweth his own body?" *De unitat. Eccles. cap. 2.* "I will not have the holy church to be described by human documents, but by divine oracles. Therefore let us seek her in the holy canonical scriptures," *cap. 3 cap. 16.* "Whether they hold the church, let them show none otherwise, but by the canonical

books of the holy scriptures. For we do not say, that therefore men must believe us, because we are in the church, and because Optatus bishop of Milevet, or Ambrose bishop of Milan, or innumerable other bishops, of our communion, have commended that church which we hold, or because it hath been set

forth by the councils of our fellow bishops," &c. Therefore let the papists by the scriptures only prove that they are the church, and that all their doctrine is true, or else they have no authority to condemn other men of heresy, being the greatest heretics themselves.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO PHILEMON.

5. Charity followeth faith by which we are justified, but goeth not before, nor concurrerth with faith unto justification. Yet is charity necessary for a Christian man that looketh to be saved.

5. The apostle naming charity and faith together, doth assign to either of them their proper subject, namely faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and charity toward all the Saints. For he commendeth no faith or trust in men, but in God only, and charity toward all holy men. So doth Theodoret expound the words, "I know," saith he, "how great faith thou

hast reposed in our Lord, which hath saved us, and how great charity thou hast, and how much thou hast helped them that esteem godliness." Ambrose writeth, "He saith he rejoiceth and giveth thanks in his prayers, because he was steadfast in faith, and continued in good works: for he that loveth Christ ought to prove it in his servants," &c. The Apostle speaketh of the Saints living, and not departed, therefore this place cannot serve to colour your Popish faith and belief in Saints that are departed out of this life.

## ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT OF THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE HEBREWS.

Christ never made Peter his vicar general, nor his successor in the headship, but holdeth it himself, and executeth it by his holy spirit. But Peter's apostleship principally over the circumcision, we find in the scripture, and Paul's over the Gentiles, and the composition between Peter, Paul, and the rest of the Apostles, touching that apostleship. *Gal. 2.* But that Peter was nevertheless head of the Gentiles, the holy scriptures never teacheth.

Let the Christian reader note the malice of our adversaries, which charge us with corruption of the scripture without any ground. Because the titles and subscrip'ts of the epistles, be no part of the apostles writings, but added by such as copied out of the same. Therefore if we did leave out the title of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, or the Corinthians, or any other, which is most certain were written by the Apostle Paul, yet were it no corruption of the scripture. But this title some of our translations have left out, because it is not agreed among ancient writers who was the writer of this epistle, Paul, or Barnabas, or Luke, or Clemens. Because divers reasons are brought by some, to prove that it was not written by Paul. And because some ancient Greek copies have not Paul's name in their title, but only "The Epistle to the Hebrews." And so doth Oecumenius entitle it, and Hentenius a Papist translate it. Where you say it was no less doubted, whether it were canonical scrip-

ture than who should be the writer of it, it is false. For many were uncertain of the writer, that doubted not of the authority. For they that ascribe it to Barnabas or Luke, the one an apostle, the other an Evangelist, do not doubt whether it be to be admitted for holy scripture. There were they indeed in the Latin church, that doubted of it. Because the Novatians and Montanists, abused a place or two in it, as Tertullian doth in his book *de pudicitia*, yet nothing doubting, but that it was written by Barnabas, as the title then gave it, and that it was of sufficient authority. Where you say, that by the church only, we know the true scriptures from other writings, it is false. For by the spirit of God, which is the author of them, we know them more certainly, than by the authority of the church.

Seeing therefore the doctrine of the epistle is consonant to the doctrine of the other canonical scriptures, there ought to have been no doubt of it. Of like truth it is that you say, we would have refused it, as well as we do the author. For none of us doth refuse Paul, though some judge that he was not writer of this epistle. Neither are you able to bring any reason, why it is like we would refuse the epistle, which not only maketh manifestly against the sacrifice of the mass, but also against many other points of your heresy, and had not so much as any show against any thing that we teach.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE HEBREWS.

## CHAPTER I.

3. The sacrament is not so the character of Christ's substance, as Christ is of his Father's substance. Beside this, the distinction of the persons of the Father and the Son is invincibly proved by the opposition that is in these relatives, the character and the substance of the Father. For this argument followeth most certainly, the Son is the character of his Father's substance, *ergo*, the Son is not the Father, though of the same substance, nor the Father is the Son: so must the opposition of necessity hold. The sacrament is the figure, sign, and representation of the body of Christ, *ergo*, it is not the body of Christ, but sacramentally, significantly, or representatively. *Paschasius de corpore et sanguine, cap. 4.* Wherefore this is such impudent sophistry to delude the ignorant, that every young sophister in the universities, which knoweth the opposition of relatives, is able to discover it, as a very vain and unlearned shift, to make the sign and the thing signified, to be the same in the very respect and point wherein they are opposite, which is impossible. The word, visible, which you insist in, to make an appearance of opposition, will not serve your turn. For the sacrament is not a figure or sign of the visibleness of Christ's body, but of his body indeed, which is always of his own nature visible though it be not always seen.

6. We deny the body of Christ to be present in the sacrament as you affirm it, that is, really, corporally, substantially, &c. If it were so present with the substance of the elements, or under the accidents of elements: yet, because Christ is not joined either to the elements, or to the accidents of them in unity of person, so that the elements and Christ, of the accidents and Christ, do not make one person, as the Godhead and manhood are one person, which is Christ: we ought not to adore Christ in any such visible form. No more than we may adore God the Father, in the sun, the moon, or any other creature, in which he is verily present, as he is present in all places. Or the Holy Ghost in every true Christian in whom he is present, not only by substance, as God is every where, but also by special grace. Because God the Father, and God the Holy Ghost, is not united to any creature in unity of person, as God the Son is to the humanity: and therefore is to be adored as God manifested in the flesh. Where you say, Christ was not incarnate purposely to be adored, it is false, for he was incarnate to be seen and adored of the angels, and of all the world in the flesh, *1 Tim. 3. 16.* Though not only for that purpose. And if you make so little account of this argument, of the institution or end of the sacrament, why do you not adore likewise every man that hath received it, for so long time as you determine that

Christ is present within him? Or why do you not fall down before every such person, as you do before the Pix, when it is carried about with the sacrament in it, for the same reason that you adore or fall down before the Pix: seeing in respect of Christ's presence, as you suppose it to be, there is as great duty in the one as in the other.

## CHAPTER 2.

9. If it were granted that Christ merited his suffering, it would help you nothing for your meritorious works. And yet we would not for all the world, deny all meritorious works, for we acknowledge the sacrifice of Christ to have merited and deserved for us remission of our sins, and eternal life. But all the glory that Christ hath, was from everlasting due to his person, because he is the eternal Son of God. And it is not long since, you confessed that "straight upon his descending from heaven, it was the duty both of angels and all other creatures to adore him," therefore he merited not his glorification by his death which was due to him so soon as he was incarnate by the right of his godhead. Neither doth this text prove any thing to the contrary, it is but rightly translated. For the apostle saith, that Christ was made less than the angels, in respect of the passion of his death, as Paul saith, he "made himself of no reputation," &c. *Phil. 2. 7.* not that that he was crowned with glory for the merit of his death. And therefore we translate not this sentence heretically, but according to the sense of the apostle, and the judgment of the Catholic fathers. Athanasius distinguished as we do. *De incarnatione, verbi Dei.*

Chrysostom, *Homil. 4.* "If he which should have all subject unto him, died and suffered innumerable things: Why art thou sad, when thou sufferest? For we see Jesus, even him that was made a little less than the angels, for the passion of death. And then again he added, good and prosperous things, crowned with glory." Ambrose saith, "He showeth that the cross of Christ is glory and honour, for which cross he was made less than the angels." Theodoret saith, "He was not less than the angels by nature of his divinity, but by suffering of his humanity." Augustin upon this text, *Cont. Maxim. lib. 3. cap. 18.* saith, "That which is written in the Epistle to the Hebrews. But now we do not yet see all things subject unto him: but we see Jesus, even him that was made a little less than the angels for the passion of death, ought to teach us how we should understand that which is written to the Corinthians, When all things shall be subdued unto him, that it is said according to his humanity, not according to his deity. So therefore appearing in man in whom the passion of death, he was made a little less than the angels, he shall judge the

quick and the dead," *Cap. 25*, "The scripture hath opened why it is said, Thou hast made him a little less than the angels, where it is read: we see Jesus, even him which is made a little less than the angels for the suffering of death. Therefore not for the nature of man, but for the suffering of death." *Primasius* saith, "He was made less than the angels by dying for us." *Fulgent. ad Trasmundum, lib. 3. cap. 20. Eusebius Emisenus Dom. Ad Homil. 3. Cerealis, cont. Maximin. cap. 8. Faustinus contr. Arr. cap. 4. Gregor. Boticus idem.* Seeing our translation therefore is according to the interpretation and distinction of these Catholic fathers, you see either what learning, or what honesty is in these men, to charge us with heretical translation, and transposing of the words. And although we should otherwise distinguish, that Christ by the passion of death was crowned with glory, yet Christ's meriting his glory, were not proved thereby. For all the members of Christ by death attained to the crown of glory, yet not by the merit of their death.

#### CHAPTER 4.

4. Before this epistle was written, the prophet *Isaiah* delivered the same doctrine of the Sabbath that the apostle doth, *Isa. 58. 13, &c. and cap. 66. 23.* The like application, in any ancient writer, to the like end we do not reprehend, when it hath the same warrant of the scripture. But seeing the ancient holy fathers, had neither the same privilege of the Spirit, that they should never err in their applications, nor always the holy scripture to direct them unto such ends, we may justly reprehend them by authority of the holy scriptures, when their applications are not agreeable unto them.

16. Christ is a most merciful mediator, to whom we ought to come with confidence, and by him to God. Therefore we have no need of the mediation of saints departed. This argument, you say, is insufficient. "Whereby we may as well take away the helps and prayers of the living, one for another." I answer, the prayers of the saints living, have both commandment and promise in the scriptures, so hath not invocation of saints departed this life, and therefore they are not of this kind. We have no need of the prayer of saints living, for the merit or worthiness of their persons, but because this mutual duty of praying one for another is by God required, and is acceptable to him, when it is done in faith and obedience unto him, and of love and charity one towards another. The like cause is not of praying to saints in heaven, because there is neither commandment to be obeyed, nor promise to be believed, nor any use of our prayer for them. You say, "you require not the prayers of saints in Heaven, or of your brethren on earth, for any mistrust of God's mercy, but for your own unworthiness." And we go with confidence to the throne of grace, not trusting in our worthiness, or in the worthiness of any other creature, but only in the worthiness of Christ, in whom we are assur-

ed to be heard, according to his promise, whether we be few or many. But you are assured that the prayer of a just man availeth more with him, than of a grievous sinner. And we are assured, that no man's prayer availeth with him any thing at all, in respect of the merit of any just man, but only in the merit and mediation of Christ. Yet we know the prayer of a just man availeth much by God's merciful promise, but not by the worthiness of his prayer; so we say of the intercession of many together, and otherwise the scripture teacheth not. Therefore, seeing we have no promise of help, by invocation of saints, we can have no confidence or hope in such invocation. You say, "You come not less to God, or with less confidence, but with much more affiance in his grace, when ye are accompanied with the prayers of angels and saints," &c. It is manifest that you come less to God, when you go so much to saints, than you should do if you went only to God. The affiance that you have, is not in the mere grace, mercy, and merits of Christ, so great as if you came to Christ only, trusting in his grace, merits and mercy, and not a whit in the merits or worthiness of angels and saints, or any other creature, living or dead. Whether the angels and saints do pray for you or no, you know not by the word of God. But that neither the one nor the other, can know your hearts, or your petitions offered to them in so many places at once, you might learn by the scriptures, and even by natural reason, seeing it is proper to the Divinity only, to know the heart of man, and all things or many things at one instant, *1 Reg. 8. 39.*

#### CHAPTER 5.

1. You do blasphemously confound the office of a priest and a high priest, to establish your Popish sacrificing priesthood. For it is not all one matter to compare Christ with every inferior priest of the law, and with the high priest, who was never but one at once, to signify the singular priesthood of our Saviour Christ.

Where you say, there can no person, people, or commonwealth, appertain to God without the sovereign duties of priesthood, it is true; but for that purpose we have no need of your Popish sacrificing priesthood. For our high priest hath perfectly accomplished whatsoever sacrifice was necessary for our sins, and continueth to make intercession for us forever. Having no office of an external sacrificing priesthood under him, but a ministry of preaching of his word, and administration of his holy sacraments here on earth.

Where you say that in all matters pertaining to God, the priest hath only charge and authority, it is false. For although in preaching and administration of the sacraments, &c., the chosen minister hath only charge and authority to execute them, yet the prince hath charge and authority to command them to be executed according to the word of God. Wherein as he is to be taught by the minis-



ter, so he is bound not to be ignorant thereof, though the minister neglect his duty in teaching of him. For which, and for not executing his office according to the word of God, the prince hath also charge and authority to punish the minister of the church.

Every true Christian is a sacrificing priest, to offer up spiritual sacrifice acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. *1 Peter* 2. 5. But none is our high priest to offer up sacrifice propitiatory for our sins, or to make intercession with God for us, as our mediator and advocate, but only Jesus Christ, although there be priests, elders and ministers chosen and appointed for ministration of the word and sacraments. For although it be the duty of the minister, to conceive or pronounce public prayers in the name of the church, yet he is not as a priest or advocate to present them before God, to be acceptable by the worthiness of his person or office, as the high priest of the law was, as a figure of Christ. Augustin, "If the Apostle had said so, these things have I written unto you, that you should not sin, but if any man sin you have me for a mediator, and I by my prayer obtain pardon for your sins, as in a certain place Parmenian placed the bishop to be a mediator between the people and God, what good or faithful Christian could abide him? who would behold him as an apostle of Christ, and not as an Antichrist." *Contra Parmen. lib. 2. cap. 8.* You see this father counteth it intolerable, and very Antichristianism to place the bishop or any other minister of the church, as mediator between God and the people, to deal in their suits and causes with God as you mean, namely, as sacrificing priests, to obtain pardon for the worthiness of their office. Yet you are bold to say, "That we show ourselves not only ignorant of the scriptures, and of the state of the New Testament, but also to induce a plain atheism into the world, by denying such a priesthood." But where be these scriptures, that we might learn them of you? you are as mute as a stone for any scripture you bring. Well, for lack of scriptures, let us see what reason you have. You say for reason, "That as long as men have to do with God, there must needs be some deputed to deal according to this declaration of the apostle, in things pertaining to God, and those must be priests." I answer, the apostle speaketh only of the high priest's office, which is consummated and perfected in Christ, in whose person is accomplished, whatsoever was figured by the high priest's office of the law, but of inferior priests he speaketh not. You ask them what we do with our own ministers? I answer, we make them not mediators and sacrificing priests, as Parmenian the heretic, and you do, but we have them for such purposes as Christ hath commanded, to minister the word, sacraments, public prayers, discipline, &c., which is no part of the office of Christ's eternal high priesthood, or chief sacrificer's dignity. You ask further, "What we do with sacra-

ments, seeing Christ's death is as well sufficient without them as without sacrifice?" Verily, we use them as seals appointed of God, for confirmation of our faith in Christ's death. But sacrifice, we have none appointed of God, "But the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which be the only sacrifices," saith Justin, "that Christians have received to offer." *Dialog. cum Tryphon.*

You ask, "Why his death standeth not as well with sacrifices, as with sacraments, and with priesthood, as with other ecclesiastical function?" Because Christ's sacrifice cannot be the only propitiatory sacrifice, if there be any other beside it. Sacraments, as seals and memorials to certify us of the effect of his death, may well stand with his sacrifice, as other functions that derogate nothing from his priestly dignity. But the Popish sacrificing priesthood, cannot stand with the death of Christ, because it usurpeth the sacrificing priesthood of Christ, in offering his body, which none could do but he himself, and therefore he is a high priest forever, and hath no successors in that office. "But sacrifice propitiatory," you say, "is the most principal act of religion that man oweth to God, and therefore must be daily offered." We answer, Christ hath most perfectly accomplished that sacrifice himself, by his oblation of himself once for all, as the apostle doth often affirm in plain terms, therefore that sacrifice propitiatory, neither needeth, neither can be offered daily, or any more be repeated, the fruit whereof is eternal. And therefore the devil by setting up a new priesthood and sacrifice, seeketh nothing else, but to deprive men of the fruit and benefit of the singular sacrifice and priesthood of Christ. To whom it is not to be feared that we can attribute too much, seeing he is the Son of God, to whom with God his Father and his Holy Spirit, all that are saved ascribe their salvation, with all blessing, glory, wisdom, thanksgiving, honour, power and might, for ever and ever. *Apocalypse* 7. And where you say, "this definition of priesthood was true in the Patriarchs, Melchisedec and Aaron's priesthood, as it is now in Christ, saying that Christ only was free from sin," I say it is horrible blasphemy. For it was but figurative and a shadow of a priesthood in all the rest, and in Christ only it was true, as the apostle proveth manifestly, *Capitula* 10. 1. &c., beside many other peculiar excellencies that the apostle describeth to be true in Christ, which were figured in the priesthood of Melchisedec, and excelled also by Christ, *Capitula*, 7. 14, to the end of the chapter.

Therefore Theodoret saith well upon this text. "These things the holy apostle hath said, not meaning to show unto us the rule of a high priesthood, but preparing a way to speak of the high priesthood of our Lord." Ambrose saith, "The apostle placeth here certain things common to Christ with the priest, but certain things higher. Among which he maketh more peculiar excellencies of

Christ than that one which you do. The same not only in sense but also in words, hath Chrysostom, *Hom. 13*: the like hath Primasius. But what need the testimony of men where the scripture is so plain?

4. Luther, Calvin, Beza, and such like, had both the inward calling by God, and the outward calling by the church to their ministry. But if you examine the pope and all his priests which claim a priesthood equal to Christ in all things, saying that they offer for their own sins, a great and foul matter of Antichristian usurpation will appear. For where have they any testimony of the scripture, either for their Papacy, or for their priesthood?

5. The pope and his priests do glorify themselves, for their priesthood is not of God's appointment, but of their own usurpation. For where hath God commanded them to sacrifice the body and blood of Christ for the sins of the living and of the dead?

6. Note the intolerable pride of these popish interpreters, that challenge to themselves all learning and knowledge in Divinity, and condemn all other men of ignorance, and mere ignorance in the grounds of Divinity. So playeth Bristow with the bishop of Sarum, whom in the place by them quoted, I reprov'd in these words. The like impudent cavil he bringeth against Jewel, whom no man I think without laughter can read, to be charged with ignorance by blundering Bristow, for affirming Christ to be a priest according to his deity, whom the apostle expressly saith by his eternal Spirit to have offered himself. *Heb. 9. 14*. But that you may the better understand this controversy between us, we deny not that Christ was a priest according to his humanity, but we affirm, that whole Christ is a Priest, as he is both God and man. For in the office of priesthood, two things must be considered, a ministry and an authority. In respect of the ministerial part, our Saviour Christ performed that office, as man, but in respect of authority of entering into the holiest place, and reconciling us to God, and presenting us unto God, which was the principal part of his priesthood, he did perform it, as the Son of God, as the Lord and maker of the house, and not as a servant, but as God which hath created all things, *Heb. 3. v. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6*. Against this sound doctrine, let us examine what the Heretics allege. They charge it most odiously with Arianism, but without all spark of reason, seeing we distinguish plainly the authority of God the Son, which is equal with his Father, from the ministry of the man Jesus Christ, inferior to his Father as touching his manhood. They charge us that we stick not to say, Christ was a priest, or did offer sacrifice according to his godhead. But we say he was a priest, and did offer sacrifice, both according to his godhead and according to his manhood. And the same saith the apostle in effect, when he saith: The blood of Christ, which by his eternal Spirit, offered himself irreprouvable to God, shall purge your conscience, &c. *Heb. 9. 14*. For not the blood of beasts, nor of any man, though

he had been innocent, but the blood of that man which was God, was the price of our redemption, in which respect the apostle, *Acts 20. 28*, saith, that God purchased his church unto himself by his own blood. For by the eternal Spirit is understood that infinite power of the Divinity united to the humanity, by which the sacrifice of Christ was consecrated, that by the same lively or quickening virtue by which he created us, he might also restore us. Whereunto our Saviour Christ had regard, when he said, *John 6*, "It is the Spirit that giveth life, the flesh profiteth nothing. But this," say the Papists, "is to make Christ God the Father's Priest, and not his Son." Nay rather this is to acknowledge Christ to be both his Father's Son and his Priest, even as the apostle saith: "The Law appointeth priests, men that have infirmity, but the word of the oath, which is after the Law, the Son forever perfecteth," *Heb. 7. 23*, where, by the opposition of men having infirmity, with the Son perfected forever, it is most clear, that the word of the oath maketh Christ, as he is the Son of God, a priest after the order of Melchisedec. Where I cannot omit the shameful corruption of this text in your popish translation, which to hide this opposition between men, and God the Son of God, hath altogether left out this word *men*, although it be in the Latin expressed manifestly: *Lex enim homines constituit*, &c. which they translate thus: "The Law appointeth priests, them that have infirmity." Our accusers add further, that our assertion is to make Christ to do sacrifice and homage to God his Father, as his Lord, and not as his equal in dignity and nature. I answer, no more than when Paul saith, that Christ "when he was in the form of God, and thought it no robbery to be equal with God, made himself of no reputation, took upon him the shape of a servant, and became obedient to the death, even to the death of the cross." For I have sufficiently before distinguished, that all parts of his priesthood that required obedience, service, homage, ministry, subjection, he performed as man: but the authority of reconciling men to God, he wrought as God and man, even as the apostle writeth: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." *2 Cor. 5. 19*. Therefore, that he might be a priest, able and worthy to make atonement with God, he was God: That his reconciliation and satisfaction might extend to men, he was man; and so being God and man, he is a perfect Mediator between God and man, and a High Priest forever after the order of Melchisedec. All this notwithstanding they oppose against us the authority of the fathers, who doubtless had no other meaning than we to keep this distinction. Augustin, *Ps. 109*, is produced to say: "that as he was man, he was priest, as God he was not priest." But Augustin's words are otherwise: "The Lord hath sworn, &c. for to this end thou wast born out of the womb before the day star, that thou mightest be a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec. For according to that he is born of God the Fa-

ther, God with God coeternal with him that begetteth, he is not a priest, but a priest for his flesh assumed, for the sacrifice which being taken of us, he might offer for us." In these words Augustin's meaning is plain enough, that Christ according to his divine and eternal generation could not have been a priest for us, except he had taken our flesh, and been born a man, which we do always confess. But that our redemption by his sacrifice was the mere work of his manhood only, he saith not, but the contrary if he be marked. For he saith that the Son of God was a priest for the flesh, which he took of us, that he might offer for us that sacrifice which he took of us. Here it is plain, that Christ as God offereth sacrifice, but he offereth as a priest, for to offer sacrifice pertaineth to a priest, therefore Christ as God is a priest, yet not as God only, but as God and man. Whereupon Augustin saith, "O Lord which hast sworn and said, thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec. The same priest forever is the Lord on thy right hand, the very same, I say, priest forever, of whom thou hast sworn, is the Lord on thy right hand, because thou hast said to the same, my Lord, sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy foot-stool." Here he affirmeth that the eternal God, David's Lord as he is God, and David's son as he is man, is that eternal priest. And to what end, but to perform those parts of a priest which were proper to God? that is, to reconcile us to God, to have authority of himself and of his own nature and worthiness, to come before God, and to remain in the favour of God always, which no creature hath but through his worthiness and gracious gift. The next authority brought against us, is Theodoret, in Ps. 109, who is cited thus, "As man he did offer sacrifice, but as God he did receive sacrifices." Verily we say as much and more also, that he offered sacrifices as God also, reconciling the world to himself. But in truth the words of Theodoret are otherwise, and to another end. "Christ," he saith, "is now a priest, which is sprung of Judea, according to the flesh, not offering any thing himself, but is the head of them that offer, seeing he calleth the church his body, and therefore he exerciseth the priesthood as a man, and he receiveth those offerings that are offered, as God. And the church truly doth offer the tokens of his body and blood, sanctifying every leaven by the first fruits." In these words Theodoret speaketh not of the sacrifice that Christ offered himself, but of the spiritual sacrifice of thanksgiving which the church offereth to him, in celebrating the memory of his death. Not of the priesthood which Christ did exercise in earth, but of the priesthood which he doth exercise in heaven, not now offering any thing, but as God receiving oblations. And where he saith that now he exerciseth the priesthood as man, he denieth not but that he doth exercise it as mediator, God and man, which is more plain in his exposition of his epistle to the Hebrews, *cap. 8*, where he

inquireth how Christ doth both sit at the right hand of majesty, and yet is a minister of the holy things. "For what priestly office doth he exercise," saith he, "which hath once offered up himself, and doth no more offer any sacrifice? And how can it be that the same person should both sit and exercise the priestly office? except perhaps a man will say, that the salvation which he prepareth as Lord, is a priestly office." Neither hath he any other meaning *dalogo primo* where his purpose is to prove that Christ had a body. "It therefore it be proper for priests to offer gifts, and Christ concerning his humanity is called a priest, and he offered none other sacrifice but his own body, therefore our Lord Christ had a body." He saith not here, that Christ is a priest according to his humanity only; whereas the excellency of his person, being both God and man, caused his priesthood and sacrifice to be acceptable and available for the redemption of man. He saith also upon the seventh chapter, "it is the part of a man to exercise priesthood, and of God to receive those things that are offered. But yet the only begotten Son of God being made man, was made our priest also after the order of Melchisedec, not with any increase of dignity, but concealing his divine dignity, and taking upon him a base estate for our salvation." You see in these words he acknowledgeth him to be a priest, as he is both God and man. Primasius saith, "It is the office of the high priest to stand between God and the people, to entreat God for the sins of the people, this did Christ, by that he is man and God also, offering up himself for our sins, always living to make intercession unto God for us." *Fulg. de fide ad Peter, cap. 2. Gregor. Bat.* But to make the matter clear, beside that which the apostle writeth, *cap. 3 and 9*, these arguments may plainly be drawn out of the seventh chapter, where he speaketh expressly of his priesthood after the order of Melchisedec. Christ as he is without father and mother, is a priest after the order of Melchisedec. Christ as he is God and man is without father and mother, therefore Christ as he is God and man is a priest after the order of Melchisedec. Christ according to his divinity hath no beginning of his days, nor end of his life, according to his whole person; therefore Christ according to his divinity, and according to his whole person, is a priest after the order of Melchisedec. Except you understand Christ to have been a priest according to his divinity, he was tithed in the loins of Abraham as well as Levi, but according to his divinity he was not in the loins of Abraham, and therefore paid no tithes in Abraham as God, though as man he was subject to the law; but received tithes of Abraham in his priest and figure Melchisedec. For the priest receiveth tithes in the name of God, as he blesseth in the name of God. Therefore if Christ give priestly blessing in his own name, he giveth it as he is God, and not as man only. To say that Christ was a priest in respect of his manhood only, savoureth rankly of Nesto-

rianism, whereas our assertion that Christ is a High Priest, both according to his deity, in which he is equal with his Father, and also according to his humanity, in which the Father is greater than he, is as far from Arianism as Papists are from honesty and sincerity, to charge us with such open blasphemy, which we detest more than they.

7. Christ offered but that one sacrifice propitiatory on the cross, and that but once, neither doth he make any other sacrifice in any external creatures. Neither hath he any sacrificing priests to be mediators between God and the people, as Parmenian the heretic placed the bishop between God and the people. Therefore the prayers of the ministers of the church, which he conceiveth or pronounceth in the name of the congregation are not more effectual in themselves for any such office of mediation or legation, but they are acceptable because they are according to God's ordinance, the prayers of the whole church uttered by a minister thereunto appointed. For the prayer of one private man, praying with hearty affection and true faith, is more agreeable to the will of God, than the prayer of a thousand priests void of faith and good affection, yea and shall have better effect than the faithful prayer of the minister, conceived for a careless and faithless people. Therefore Christ's prayers and other actions of his priesthood were of another and a more excellent kind, than the prayers of the best priest that ever was. His office of preaching and ministering of sacraments, he hath by his word committed to the ministers of his church, to exercise in his name, therefore they be as effectual being done by his servants, as by himself. But his High Priest's office he retaineth to himself, and hath not committed it to another. Therefore none may presume to offer sacrifice as he did, nor to pray, watch, fast, or do any thing meritorious for other as he did.

7. The Greek word signifieth both fear, reverence and piety. Therefore that translation is not corrupt, which giveth that interpretation which the word will bear. "But it is contrary," say you, "to the version and sense of all antiquity." That is not so, for Beza allegeth a most ancient Latin version, which he calleth *Claremontanus codex*, where it is translated *a metu*, from fear. Primasius allegeth the sentence of Cassiodorus, that the word is taken sometime for love, and sometimes with fear, *Greg. Nazian.* also *orat. 2. de filio*, reckoning *ελαβεις*, that is, fear, among the infirmities of Christ's manhood, declareth that he followed this sense; seeing this word signifieth fear, is nowhere in the scripture applied to Christ but in this text. Theodoret also manifestly followeth this sense, writing upon this text, and saith, "who, except he were out of his wits, would say that these things are spoken of his divine nature? For if blessed Paul feared not death, but desired to be dissolved and to be with Christ, and said to them which foreshowed unto him those things which should befall unto him at Jerusa-

lem, and assayed to keep him back, why weep you and afflict my heart? I am ready not only to be bound, but also to die for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; how did God the word, the Creator of the world, which cannot be turned or changed, and is free from all affection, fear death?" He interpreteth the prayer here spoken of, to be that "which he made in his passion, saying, Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." The Syrian translation is also from fear. *Idacius Clavus propter timorem, lib. 3. Cont. Varinadum.* By all which it is manifest, how untruly you say, that our interpretation is contrary to the version and sense of all antiquity, as also to the ordinary use of the Greek word, which not only of profane writers, but also in the holy scripture, is taken for fear, *Acts 23. 10.* and even in this epistle, *Heb. 11. 7.* witness your own Latin text, which for *ελαβηθεις* translateth *timens and metuens*, fearing. Neither doth Beza say otherwise, but bringeth many examples to the contrary. Likewise, where you say it is contrary to the property of the Greek phrase, you show your great skill in the Greek tongue. For our interpretation is most agreeable to the Greek phrase, because the preposition *απο* doth more commonly signify out or from, than for, as you translate it, though Illyricus help you with some examples, where it signifieth rather, *proæ* than *pro*. That Beza confesseth Calvin to have been the first that found out this interpretation, he meaneth in these days, for he allegeth that Nazianzen and other of the ancient fathers did follow this interpretation before Calvin. Although Chrysostom did not, yet Nazianzen and Theodoret did, which were as perfect Grecians as Chrysostom, and yet Chrysostom doth not altogether abhor from it, though he prefer the other. "Let the heretics be ashamed," saith he, "the Son of God was heard *απο της ελαβειας*, from fear, and what could a man say more of the prophets? And what order is it, that he saith he was heard from fear? and although he were the Son, he learned of those things which he suffered, obedience, who would say these things of God." Here it appeareth plainly, that he understood the word *ελαβεια*, for fear, and not for reverence, because it could not be said of the prophets, that they were heard for their reverence, but from their fear. Wherefore, seeing this commentary was not written by Chrysostom himself, but gathered out of his homilies and writings after his death, it may be the other interpretation was added by some other that liked better thereof than of Chrysostom's first sense. Wherefore, to omit all your ungodly railing meet for such heretics and traitors as Rheims sendeth into England, as our translation is agreeable to the original text, and to the ancient versions and sense of some of the ancient fathers, so is our exposition honourable and glorious to God the Father, and Christ his Son, and to the Holy Ghost, by whom this epistle was ended, and agreeable to the analogy of faith, confirming an article of our faith, that Christ descended

into hell, and suffered not only bodily pains but also great sorrow and anguish of soul, which was necessary for our redemption, according to the manifest scriptures: and obeyed, as the death of his body was a necessary part of his obedience and sacrifice. Therefore you do as ignorantly as maliciously separate the sacrifice of his death from all other his passions, as though his sacrifice was no more but the separation of his body from his soul, and that all that he suffered beside in body and mind, was superfluous, seeing his death only should be enough for our redemption. We be to them therefore, that are led by such blind guides, that either see not so manifest light of truth, or else do so obstinately strive against it to their utter condemnation. Where you exhort men to read Calvin and Beza, in their commentaries and annotations upon this place. I wish that all men would or could follow your counsel, and they should see that they are far from such blasphemies as you ascribe unto them.

9. We confess that Christ's passion profiteth none but such as obey him, and use such means to apply the benefit thereof to themselves, as he hath appointed by his word, without which, the Holy Ghost hath appointed nothing in the church of Christ. Though in the church of Antichrist, that which cannot have a show or colour by wresting of the word of God, is blasphemously ascribed to the appointment of the Holy Ghost. But how are we confuted, that say, faith is the only thing required to apply Christ's benefits unto us? You answer: "For we do not obey him only by believing, but by doing whatsoever he commandeth:" *ergo*, it is not the proper office of faith to apply the benefits of Christ's death unto us. How hangeth this together? For the apostle saith not, that obedience is the only mean whereby we apply Christ's benefits unto us, but that Christ is a cause of salvation to all that obey him, so that obedience is a fruit of salvation, not a cause thereof. Although if you would understand the obedience of faith and truth, whereof the scripture speaketh, and from whence floweth all other obedience to God's commandments, we would not contend with you, but that obedience is the only mean on our part, to apply the benefits of Christ unto us, but on God's behalf, the Holy Ghost is the only mean. Theodoret saith: "By this means he exhorteth them to whom he writeth to continue in faith, and to trust in the mercy and clemency of the high priest." Ambrose also understandeth this obedience to be faith, saying: "He showeth what great gain his passion is, which sufficeth unto all believers for eternal salvation." The very same words hath Primasius. You cannot prove by this place that God chooseth men to salvation, with respect of the merit of their works, obedience, free will or faith itself, but with condition that he will give them grace to obey him, and will to believe in him, and to do that he appointeth. Not leaving it to the freedom of man's will, "which availeth to nothing but to sin," as Au-

gustin saith, *ad Bonifacem, lib. 3. cap. 8.* Prosper meaneth, that the cup of immortality is drunk by faith only. For he said before, that "they which depart out of the world without faith and the sacrament of regeneration, are far from their redemption." Signifying that faith which is confirmed by the sacrament of baptism in all that be of years, is the only mean to drink this cup of immortality. But to infants, the Spirit of God which is also testified to be given by baptism, is sufficient to make them partakers of it.

11. Those things that were hard to be understood of them concerning the priesthood of Melchisedec, after he hath stirred them up to attention in the sixth chapter, are all expressed in the seventh chapter. And therefore here is no place to toist in the sacrifice of your popish mass, as one of the things inexplicable. For by as good reason, the Valentinians, Carpocratians, Manichees, and such other Heretics might say, no doubt all their mysteries of wickedness were principal and pertinent matters to the priesthood of Melchisedec, which were inexplicable. But if the Hebrews were unmeet, in respect of their infirmity, to hear of the mysteries of the mass, were all other churches in the same case, that no mention of that sacrifice is made in all the scriptures? Of the blessed sacrament of Christ's Supper, the apostles and fathers of the most ancient church, have treated as sufficiently and largely as of any other matter, for the instruction of the church. Therefore you do nothing but seek a corner to hide the impiety and blasphemy of your mass which hath no ground in the holy scriptures, nor testimony of the ancient fathers. For we ground not only upon the silence of the apostle in this place, but of the silence of the Holy Ghost in all the scriptures, and not only of the silence of the apostle, but upon those speeches which the Holy Ghost hath uttered in this epistle and elsewhere, which utterly overthroweth your blasphemous sacrifice of the mass.

#### CHAPTER 6.

1. The primitive church had nothing in their catechism and instruction, that was taught by word of mouth, but that which was contained in the holy scriptures, as all the articles of the creed, the doctrine of repentance before baptism, the manner and use of baptism, confirmation by imposition of hands, and such like. Which doctrine must first be preached and taught ordinarily, yet some have been driven to pick their faith out of the scriptures, without such ordinary instruction, and made no mad rule at all. Neither doth Augustin in the place cited, say any thing to the contrary.

4. The wicked pervert all the scriptures to their own damnation, though they be never so plain, much more if there be any difficulty in them. But hereof we may not gather, that all the holy scriptures be hard and dangerous to be read of the unlearned. Chrysostom exhorting the unlearned to read the scriptures,

saith. "All things are clear and plain by the holy scriptures, whatsoever are necessary are manifest." 2 *Thes. Hom.* 3, he saith, "Our merciful Lord knowing the infirmity of our will, and apness to fall, hath left us great medicines in the reading of the holy scriptures." *Gen. hom.* 12, "The holy scripture when it will teach us such a thing, expoundeth itself, and suffereth us not to be deceived." *Gen. hom.* 13, "The holy scriptures hath no need of man's wisdom, that it may be understood, but of revelation of the spirit, that the true sense being taken from thence, great gain may grow unto us thereot." Therefore the Novatians, if they had been willing to understand the truth, might both by the very words of the text, and by conference with other places have seen that not every particular falling into sin after baptism, did exclude from mercy and repentance, but only falling away clean from Christ, which is sin against the Holy Ghost. There be many places indeed, that so stand against the sacrifice of the mass, as it cannot stand with the only sacrifice of Christ which you can never avoid by testimony of scripture, but by impudent begging of the whole matter in question: that you are the church, and this is your determination. But Calvin's heresy, you say, is worse than the Novatians. For he holdeth, that it is impossible for him that is an apostate or a heretic, to be received to repentance or God's mercy. Verily, if he be such an apostate and heretic, as the Apostle here describeth, that falleth wholly away from Christ, not of ignorance nor infirmity, but of wilful malice, and in despite of God and his truth, he holdeth, as the Apostle doth, that it is impossible for him to be renewed by repentance, and so to be partaker of God's mercy, because God hath manifestly pronounced the contrary. Neither is the exposition of any man to be received, that goeth directly against the words of the text, and the manifold testimonies of the scripture, that the sin against the Holy Ghost is irremissible. For it is in vain to offer hope to them, which cannot hope, because God hath denied it unto them. And the ancient fathers, by denying that baptism can be repeated, do mean also, that such cannot be saved, as cannot be saved without a second baptism, although repentance be open to all, that have not so fallen clean away, and humbly desire pardon of their sins. Cyprian, *Epist.* 52, by many arguments proveth against the Novatians, that such offenders as humbly desire to be received of the church, are to be admitted by repentance. "But apostates," saith he, "and revolvers, or adversaries, and enemies that waste the church of Christ, although they be slain without for his name, yet according to the Apostle, they cannot be admitted to the peace of the church, seeing they have kept neither the unity of the Spirit, nor of the Church." The same thing in effect saith Ambrose, "that it is not a hard matter, but an impossible thing, he hath put them out of hope, that they cannot be baptized the second time," and so in process of the matter allow-

eth sinners to repentance, but denieth such as fall away to be renewed by repentance, as in baptism. Augustin, *cont. Par. lib.* 2. *cap.* 13. speaking of apostates or revolvers that return by repentance, meaneth such as have revolted of ignorance and infirmity, not such of whom the Apostle speaketh, that wilfully and maliciously renounce Christ. *Ep.* 50, he showeth the judgment of the sin against the Holy Ghost, which can never be forgiven. "That is hardness of heart to the end of a man's life, whereby a man refuseth to receive forgiveness of his sins, in the unity of the body of Christ, to which the Holy Ghost doth give life." And such hardness of heart is in them, of whom the Apostle speaketh. For if any be truly penitent, and with faith and humility desire pardon, he hath not sinned against the Holy Ghost. Damascen also denying that baptism can be repeated unto renovation, understandeth that they that are utterly fallen from the grace of God testified in baptism, can never be saved. But so hath no man fallen, that is truly penitent for his fall, and humbly desireth forgiveness of his sins, for such shall undoubtedly obtain pardon, according to the promises of God. Whereas they that are fallen clean away, either repent not at all, or else repent as Judas, without faith, or detestation of their sin, but only are sorrowful for the punishment, which they have deserved for their sin. Your popish penance that requireth satisfaction, and which you offer even to them that sin against the Holy Ghost, is far from the Apostle's meaning. *Chap.* 10.

9. Paul meant not, that the elect among the Hebrews either had or could fall away finally from Christ, but he declared before, that some might so fall from Christ, as it was impossible for them to be renewed by repentance. *ver.* 4.

10. These words make it so clear that good works be meritorious, that all the logicians in Rheims, Paris, Lovane, and Rome, are not able to conclude this proposition in a lawful syllogism out of this text. God should be unjust if he kept not his promise, which is to reward good works of his mere mercy, not of the merit of the works. But that he should be unjust if he rendered not heaven for the merit of good works, neither the Apostle saith, nor Hieron in the place by you cited.

#### CHAPTER 7.

2. When the fathers, or any other, have the same assurance of God's Spirit that the apostle had, they may be as bold as he was. Otherwise, to leave the plain truth, and to follow uncertain allegory, cannot be without reprehension, whosoever useth it.

4. The payment of tithes, as it was a ceremonial duty, is abrogated with other ceremonies, by the death of Christ. But as it is a necessary maintenance and livelihood of them that serve in the church, it may be retained, or any other stipend appointed, that may be sufficient for their maintenance, be it more or less than the tenth part. But that there is any sacrificing priesthood, to whom it is due in the

New Testament, the old payment of tithes doth not prove. Neither did Christ himself our High Priest ever make claim unto them: nor his apostles the ministers of the church, but only to a sufficient living by the gospel, to be allowed of their temporal goods, to whom they ministered spiritual goods, 1 Cor. 9. 14. Gal. 6. 6.

7. If all kinds of blessing were the proper act of the priesthood, neither the patriarchs nor parents should lawfully bless their children. But blessing with authority, is not proper to priesthood: yet to whomsoever God hath given authority to bless in his name it is doubtless a great prerogative. But the magical blessing of popish bishops, with shaking their fingers across, is a vain thing, not only because the persons have no authority to bless in the name of God, being the ministers of Antichrist, and not of Christ: but also, because it is without invocation of the name of God, by a superstitious ceremony, whereunto God hath given no power of consecration or blessing.

8. Christ is a priest after the order of Melchisedec, according to his Godhead, and not according to his manhood only.

11. You are not able to prove, that the Hebrews, who were Christians, thought their law of priesthood and sacrifice to be sufficient in themselves, without all relation to Christ's passion, or any other redemption or remission than that which the Levitical office did procure: for if they had so taught, they could not have been any ways accounted for Christians. But their error was, that although there were redemption and remission by the death of Christ, yet their law, ceremonies, and Levitical offices might still continue. Therefore the apostle proving that Christ is that only true Prophet, King and High Priest, unto whom all the fathers looked by faith, and by whom it behooveth the whole church to be taught, governed and sanctified, as it was by him saved and redeemed: both thereupon infer, that all those figures and shadows ought to cease, and that the high priesthood resteth only in the person of Christ. So that there is no need of any other propitiatory sacrifice, seeing Christ by his one sacrifice once offered, found eternal redemption, not of any other High Priest, to be our mediator, seeing Christ continueth forever a Priest after the order of Melchisedec. Therefore the scope of the apostle, utterly overthroweth the popish priesthood and sacrifice. And where you say, "the apostle's scope, being to avouch the pre-eminence, dignity, necessity, and external fruit and effect of Christ's passion, he had not all to treat of the other, which is a sacrifice depending upon his passion." You speak without all reason: for if your pretended sacrifice depend upon his passion, and it was his scope to avouch the eternal fruit and effect of his passion, how could the apostle omit your said sacrifice? but your sacrifice of the mass is no fruit or effect of Christ's passion. Howbeit, the apostle doth not only omit to speak of it, but doth speak much against it, proving by many reasons, that Christ offered

himself but once, and that with blood, and at his death, and by that one oblation made perfect forever all that are sanctified: whereupon it followeth, that there is no such sacrifice as you pretend. Your other reason why he omitteth to speak of it, "because he writeth to the Hebrews, that were to be instructed and reformed, first touching the sacrifice of the cross, before they could fruitfully bear any thing of the sacrifice of the mass," is vain also: except you will confess, that there was no mass said among them since they were converted. For if they had the sacrifice of the mass among them, it was as necessary for them to know the ground of it out of the law and the prophets, as of the sacrifice of Christ's passion: which if order required to be first handled, yet reason would not that the mass should have been altogether omitted; yea the other being so handled, as they could not see what need they had of mass, but rather should be brought into detestation of it, if ever before they had used it. Of like absurdity it is that you say, "the learned and faithful may easily perceive in covert and by most evident sequel of disputation, whereupon the sacrifice of the mass is grounded." For that which may be easily perceived, and by most evident sequel, may be understood of the unlearned, and cannot be said to be perceived in covert. But unto this labyrinth or maze of words you are driven, while you seek to stop the light of so clear disputation as the Apostle maintaineth against your blasphemous sacrifice of the mass. Hierom saith, that "all that followeth in the praise of Melchisedec is referred unto the type of Christ, the profit whereof are the sacraments of the church:" which nothing toucheth the sacrifice of the mass, but all the mysteries of Christian religion. Hierom speaketh of no sacrifice that Melchisedec offered in bread and wine: but saith according to the truth of the Hebrew text, "he brought forth bread and wine, for the refreshing of Abraham and his soldiers." And rehearsing the opinions of Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Eusebius, and others, he saith, that with bread and wine, being a simple and pure sacrifice he dedicated the sacrament of Christ. By which sacrifice, as it shall appear afterward, they understood not the sacrifice of the mass, but the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, that the whole church offereth to God for the redemption of the world, at and in the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

12. All external priesthood that was before Christ ordained by God, was a figure of the eternal priesthood of Christ, and of the spiritual priesthood of all his members. Therefore the translation of the priesthood, whereof the Apostle speaketh, is from Aaron's order to Christ, where it resteth: and from whom it is not translated, or removed unto any other, by succession or any other ways. And the New Testament is established in the sacrifice and priesthood of Christ to be eternal, as he is an eternal priest, and the fruit of his own sacrifice is everlasting. Then let us see where in the protestants are shamefully deceived,

which will have none other external sacrificing priesthood but of Christ, or of Christ's death to have abolished all other priesthood offering bodily sacrifice. You give us a strange kind of demonstration, such as Aristotle never taught: "If Christ have abolished priesthood, he hath abolished the New Testament:" what consequence is there in this demonstration? certain it is by this text, that Christ hath translated all external priesthood of the law, unto his own person, whereby he hath established the New Testament to be eternal, as his priesthood is eternal, and abolished all other external priesthood, which cannot stand with his singular and eternal priesthood. Seeing therefore he hath abolished all external sacrificing priesthood that was before him, and hath instituted none other to succeed in the place thereof, but his own singular priesthood, how doth it follow that he hath abolished the New Testament, which could not have been established, if that old priesthood had not been abolished? but here you seem, for lack of an institution of your popish priesthood, to say, that it "is the old priesthood not abolished by the death of Christ:" for else, what advantage is it to you, if Christ have not abolished all priesthood? we affirm according to the holy scripture, that Christ's death hath abolished the Jewish priesthood, not that there should no priesthood succeed, but that all dignity and holiness of that priesthood is translated unto our Saviour Christ only, where it shall remain forever. Therefore your popish priesthood supposeth an abolishing of the New Testament, or an erecting of a third testament, seeing you affirm, that "there can be no law, testament, or government without an external priesthood, nor no priesthood without a law, testament, or covenant." And your priesthood hath no institution in the Old or New Testament, therefore you must bring forth the tables of the third law or testament, by which your priesthood is instituted or established. For if it had any institution in the Old Testament, it was abolished by the New Testament. If it had any institution in the New Testament, you could bring forth such plain words of institution and consecration thereof, as we see in the Old Testament of Aaron's priesthood, and in the New Testament of our Saviour Christ's priesthood, but that all the world knoweth you cannot do. Therefore it remaineth that your popish priesthood is grounded upon a third law and testament, which is the law and testament of Antichrist, that by your priesthood labourerth to abolish the New Testament, and eternal priesthood of our Lord and Saviour Christ. But let us follow the rest of your reasons. You add, "that if all external priesthood ended by Christ's death, where the new law began, the priesthood were not translated with the law: for so the law should not depend on priesthood, but endure when all priesthood were ended." I can see no light of reason in this mishapen argument, except you make no account of the priesthood of Christ. For the priesthood of Christ, where-

upon the New Testament dependeth, is never ended but continueth for ever: therefore there is no need of your popish priesthood, to establish the new law and testament, which is perfect in the singular priesthood of Christ. You proceed to prove that external sacrifice, is as necessary as external priesthood, "because it is the proper act of priesthood." And we acknowledge that our high priest hath offered external sacrifice of himself once for all, and found eternal redemption: therefore there remaineth now no sacrifice propitiatory for sin, but the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, offered by the whole church, and every true member of the same. Neither is there any other homage of sacrifice external needful for legitimation of the community of the church, which to offer up spiritual sacrifices is made a spiritual house and holy priesthood, *1 Pet. 2*. And you say well, "that the constitution, difference, or translations of states, riseth not upon any change of spiritual priesthood or sacrifice:" for the church of Christ even under the law, was a spiritual priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, *Exod. 19, 5*. Yet had it an external priesthood, to offer up bodily sacrifices, both propitiatory and eucharistical, and hath received only spiritual sacrifices, which are acceptable to God by his external propitiatory sacrifice; in figure whereof, even the external sacrifices that were eucharistical of the law, were offered by the priest. You say most blasphemously, "that the sacrifice of Christ's death cannot be the form of sacrifice, into which the old priesthood and sacrifice were translated, whereupon the Apostle inferreth the translation of the law:" but the Apostle beateth out the brains of this monstrous blasphemy, *ver. 26, 27*, where he saith, that "our high priest which is holy, innocent, unpolluted, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens, hath no need daily, as those priests, first for his own sins, then for the people's to offer sacrifices, for this he did once for all, in offering himself. What can be more plain? That which they did daily and insufficiently in offering the sacrifices of beasts, Christ did once and perfectly in offering himself. Therefore the priesthood and sacrifices of Christ's death are that form of sacrifice and priesthood, into which the old priesthood and sacrifice was translated. That sacrifice and priesthood, whereby the New Testament is established, is that whereunto the sacrifice and priesthood is translated, but the singular priesthood of Christ Jesus, which is made surety of the New Testament, is that whereunto the multitude of priests of the law is translated *vers 22, 23*, and which is established by the bloodshedding of Christ once for all, *Heb. 9*. Therefore the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ's death is that sacrifice and priesthood whereunto the old sacrifice and priesthood



are translated. But let us see upon what ground you dare open your mouth to such dishonour of Christ's priesthood and sacrifice. Your reason why the sacrifice of Christ's death cannot be that form of sacrifice into which the old priesthood and sacrifice was translated, is "because the sacrifice of Christ's death, was made but once, and was executed in such a sort, that people and nations christened, could not meet often to worship at it, nor have their law and priests constituted in the same." But seeing all people and nations christened were redeemed by that sacrifice, once made forever, what need have they that it should be repeated often? or what need have they to be present at it, or to worship at it? when the time is now, that the true worshippers without external sacrifice, must worship in spirit and truth, *John* 4. 23. And Christ being lifted up to the cross, hath drawn all unto himself, *John* 12. 32, so that they need none other sacrifice to approach unto God, but that only sacrifice of Christ's death. As for the honour, duty, remembrance, and representation thereof, in respect of our infirmity, we have sacraments instituted by Christ, and ministers appointed to consecrate, and to deliver the same unto his people: but no sacrifice, nor sacrificing priesthood. Therefore the sacrifices, as they were sacrifices, were translated only into the singular sacrifice of Christ's death, as they were sacraments, into the sacraments of the New Testament. And the sacrificing priesthood, was translated into the priesthood of Christ only, their ministration of the sacraments, into our ministration of the sacraments. But to say, "that the Levitical priesthood is properly turned into the Popish priesthood, and a sacrifice of the mass, according to Melchisedec's rite," is first to deny Christ in denying for us, to be a priest properly, according to the order of Melchisedec: secondly it is to arrogate divinity to every hedge priest. For he only is a priest after the order of Melchisedec, which is the eternal Son of God, the King of righteousness, the King of peace, without father or mother, without generation, having neither beginning of his days, nor end of his life, and is but one, and not many. Wherefore to say, "that the Popish priesthood, is properly the priesthood after Melchisedec's rite," is utterly to deny all that the apostle in this chapter, yea throughout this Epistle maketh peculiar to Christ. But for your Popish priesthood or sacrifice of the mass, you have "Christ's institution in the forms of bread and wine:" yet Christ never instituted any such priesthood or sacrifice in the forms of bread and wine, but a ministry of a sacrament in bread and wine. Neither doth any ancient father speak of a sacrifice "in the forms of bread and wine," although many do call the sacrament which is celebrated in bread and wine, a sacrifice improperly, because it is a remembrance of the one only sacrifice of Christ's death, and because the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving is offered therein,

not by the minister only, but by the whole church that is partaker of it.

17. You might as well say, that all the apostle saith concerning the external priesthood of Melchisedec, is nothing worth without the Popish priesthood and sacrifice of the mass, whereof he maketh no mention. O Antichrist, the Lord rebuke thee! "But according to the judgment of all the fathers," say you, "Christ is a Priest forever, according to Melchisedec's order, specially in respect of the sacrifice of his holy body and blood, instituted at his last supper, and executed by his commission and perpetual concurrence with his priests in the forms of bread and wine." As you neglect whatsoever the Apostle saith of the priesthood of Christ, so you feign most impudently what you report of the judgment of all the fathers: for no one ancient father, before Antichrist had set up his priesthood and sacrifice, ever was of that judgment; although many of the ancient fathers, without all ground of scripture, sought a resemblance of the bread and wine which Melchisedec brought forth, unto the bread and wine, wherein Christ instituted his sacrament. But it ought to suffice us against the judgment of all the world, that the Holy Ghost examining all things most perfectly, that the scripture reporteth of the priesthood of Melchisedec, would not leave out that "wherein the priesthood of Christ most especially consisteth," as you say. Therefore Melchisedec's bread and wine pertained not to his priestly office, neither did he offer it to God, but as Hierom saith, "brought it forth for the refreshing of Abraham and his soldiers," and it pertained to his kingly liberality. Wherein if you would make resemblance unto Christ, that hath not only consecrated us as a priest by his sacrifice, but also hath fed us as a king, with the spiritual food of his body and blood represented in bread and wine, whereby we are bound to give him praise and thanks for evermore: you would say that which all the ancient fathers do mean, in their relation of Melchisedec's bread and wine, to the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. But let us examine the arguments, upon which you say the ancient fathers grounded their judgment. You say, upon this deep and divine discourse of Paul, where there is no word of the sacrament nor of Melchisedec's bread and wine, but altogether he proveth Christ to be a priest after the order of Melchisedec, by those reasons for which you say he is not called a priest for ever without your priesthood and sacrifice, whereof he speaketh no word, but much against it. Therefore the fathers could ground no such matter upon the apostle's discourse. You say, "upon the very nature, property, definition of priesthood." But either you give another definition of priesthood than the apostle knew, or else the apostle discourseth of Christ's priesthood after the order of Melchisedec, beside the nature, property, and definition of priesthood, which none of the ancient fathers would say. Therefore they ground not any such

judgment upon any such pretended definition, which the apostle in all his discourse toucheth not. "Upon the excellent act and order of Melchisedec:" If the apostle knew wherein the order of Melchisedec consisted, his act of bringing forth bread and wine was no part of his priesthood, for if it had been the principal part, as you pretend, he would never have omitted it. Therefore those fathers were deceived, that judged that act to pertain to his priesthood, although none of them counted it the principal part of his order.

You say, they grounded their judgment "upon the state of the new law;" but the covenant of the new law standeth in forgiveness of sins, by the only sacrifice of Christ's death, as the apostle proveth at large, *cap.* 8, 9, and 10. Therefore the ancient fathers, nor any other after them, could justly ground any such priesthood and sacrifice upon the state of the new law, which overthroweth the virtue of Christ's only priesthood and sacrifice. Where you say "Christ instituted such a sacrifice and priesthood at his last supper," you are never able to prove it by any word, or consequence of any word, in the scriptures. Christ, you say, instituted "this sacrament in the forms of bread and wine, in which things only the said high priest Melchisedec did sacrifice." But, Melchisedec brought forth bread and wine, and not the only forms of bread and wine, therefore your sacrifice in the only forms of bread and wine, is not after his order. He offered no sacrifice of bread and wine, but brought it forth, as Hierom saith, for the refreshing of Abraham and his army. Josephus, *Antiquit. lib. 1. cap. 10.* "Melchisedec gave liberal entertainment to the soldiers of Abraham, and suffered them to want nothing to their living." Which Petrus Comest. *hist. schol. in Gen. cap. 45.* approveth, saying, "Melchisedec which was king of Salem, offered unto him bread and wine," which Josephus as it were expounding, saith: "he ministered to his army the duties of hospitality, and gave him great plenty of things necessary, and beside the feast, or at the feast, he blessed God which had subdued to Abraham, his enemies. For he was a priest of the highest God." This writer came not into your mind, when you said all without exception do ground the eternal priesthood of Christ upon Melchisedec's bread and wine. Nor yet Procopius a learned father of the Greek church, who groundeth not the eternal priesthood of Christ upon Melchisedec's bread and wine, but only as the apostle here doth. *Gen. 16.*

As you are not able to prove that he sacrificed bread and wine, so you cannot never prove, that he sacrificed nothing but bread and wine. Because there is no mention of his sacrifice in the scripture. Whereas you say, "that in the judgment of all the learned fathers without exception, the eternity and proper act of Christ's priesthood, and the immutability of the New Testament, consist in the perpetual offering of Christ's body and blood in the church:" it is utterly untrue, for

not one of the ancient fathers is of that judgment, or that the natural body and blood of Christ is offered in the church, but only they speak of a spiritual offering of praise and thanksgiving, and a memorial of that one sacrifice of Christ's death, continued in the celebration of the Lord's supper. Theodoret upon the eighth of this Epistle, declareth this evidently in these words: "If therefore both the priesthood which is of the law hath taken an end, and also the priest which is after the order of Melchisedec, hath offered a sacrifice, and caused that all other sacrifices should not be necessary, why do the priests of the New Testament, celebrate the mystical liturgy or sacrifice? But it is clear to them that are instructed in divine matters, that we offer not another sacrifice, but do celebrate a remembrance of that one and healthful sacrifice. For that our Lord himself hath commanded us. Do you this in remembrance of me, that by beholding of the types or tokens, we might remember those things which he hath suffered for us, and both continue love towards our Benefactor, and also wait for the fruition of the good things to come." By this one among so many, you may see how true it is, that all fathers without exception judge the proper note of Christ's priesthood, to consist in the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ in the mass. Theodoret, *Ps. 109.* saith, that "Christ is now a priest which is sprung of Judah according to the flesh, not offering any thing himself, but is called the head of them which offer, seeing he calleth the church his body, and therefore he exerciseth the priesthood as a man, but he receiveth those things that are offered, as God. And the church offereth the tokens of his body and blood, sanctifying all the heaven by the first fruits." Mark here, that Christ after he hath accomplished the propitiatory sacrifice in his own person, by offering himself once on the cross, is now a priest on earth also in respect of his body, which is the church, to offer the sacrifice of thanksgiving in the sacrament, that the whole church offereth this sacrifice, that it is the tokens of his body and blood, not the same in substance: that which they offer, is the first fruits of his creatures, as Ireneus also saith, for a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, *Ireneus lib. 4. cap. 32. et 34.* Theodoret, fourteenth of *Gen.* saith: "Abraham the patriarch offered to Melchisedec the tenth of his spoils, and being a just man and the friend of God, received blessing of him, for he bare a figure of the priesthood of our Lord. And therefore on the other side, he gave to Abraham bread and wine, and a lump of flour, as it was the manner for every man, to offer such things to the God of all. For he perceived that herein also the figure was manifested." By this place it is evident, that his meaning is, that as Melchisedec gave bread and wine to Abraham, so Christ gave to his church the sacrament in bread and wine, which as it was offered by every man to God for a sacrifice of thanksgiving, so in

the sacrament of the church, the sacrifice of thanksgiving is offered by every true member of the church. But here you say, "we are enforced impudently to cavil upon certain Hebrew particles, that Melchisedec did not offer bread and wine." It is no enforcement nor impudent cavillation, to appeal to the original text, that there is no mention that Melchisedec offered bread and wine, but that he brought it forth. So doth Hierom translate it, and so doth your own vulgar Latin turn it. Hierom showeth to what end he brought it forth, and so do other of the ancient fathers. And whosoever seemeth to say most for you, do make only a figure of the sacrament, and a sacrifice of thanksgiving in the bread and wine that he brought forth. "But when that will not serve," you say, "we are enforced plainly to deny him to have been a priest." Verily, the truth of the Hebrew text will serve to the world's end, to prove that Melchisedec offered not bread and wine. But that we plainly deny him to have been a priest, whom the scripture saith so expressly to have been a priest of the highest God, without shame you do slander us: we never denied it, neither will we ever by God's grace deny it, although we affirm, that his priesthood consisted not in offering of bread and wine, neither doth the apostle or any text of the scripture teach any such thing. Thus have you nothing but monstrous lies to blear the eyes of the ignorant, that you may uphold your blasphemous sacrifice and priesthood, directly against Christ and the apostle's doctrine. But let us see what you can bring out of man's authority: for you are utterly forsaken of God's word both for your priesthood and sacrifice. Arnobius passing lightly over the priesthood of Christ, which is God eternal, meaneth, that he was declared to be a priest forever, among other things, by the mystery of bread and wine, as Melchisedec alone among the priests offered bread and wine: he saith not, that the eternity of Christ's priesthood consisteth in the perpetual offering of Christ's body and blood, which is your exposition.

If Christ were made a priest forever by the mystery of bread and wine, your sacrifice abolisheth the priesthood of Christ: for you say, that Christ offered not bread and wine, therefore not that which Melchisedec offered. Arnobius exponeth plainly what he understandeth by the mystery of bread and wine, namely the sacrament of bread and wine, celebrated in remembrance of the spiritual food of Christ's body and blood. Therefore his words are these, *Ps.* 110, "He that hath made a memory of his marvellous works, saying, as often as ye shall do these things, you shall do them in remembrance of me. When said our merciful and gracious Lord this? Then without doubt when he gave the food of his body to them that fear him, and this covenant the Lord will remember forever, by which he hath declared unto his people the virtue of his works." And lest you should yet dream of the sacrifice of the mass,

and Popish priesthood, whereof he speaketh no word: he saith that all the laws of the New Testament "are fulfilled in Christ Jesus our Lord, and kept in his equity, when he sent redemption to his people by his apostles, saying, go and baptize all nations," &c. Therefore you may as well make baptism a sacrifice as the Lord's Supper, and say that the eternal priesthood of Christ consisteth in baptism. Lactantius, *Just. lib.* 4. *cap.* 14, speaketh nothing that soundeth to the maintenance of your Popish priesthood and sacrifice: his words are these, speaking of the church, "This is the faithful house, this is the immortal temple, in which whosoever hath not sacrificed, he shall not have the reward of immortality. Of which great and eternal temple, seeing Christ was the builder, it is necessary, that he have therein an eternal priesthood. Neither can any man come to the entrance of the temple, and to the sight of God, but by him which builded the temple. David in the 109th Psalm teacheth the same thing, saying: before the morning star, I have begotten thee, the Lord hath sworn, and it shall not repent him, thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." What other thing can be gathered out of these words? but that Christ hath an eternal priesthood in his church, that all true Christians by him may have access to God, and offer there spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by him. For every true Christian, as he is a member of Christ, is a spiritual priest, to offer sacrifice in the church, "in which whosoever hath not sacrificed," saith Lactantius, "shall not have the reward of immortality." Therefore of the Popish priesthood and sacrifice of the mass here is no mention, nor any thing that hath so much as the shadow of such a matter. Hierom's words also you falsify by detraction, as you do the rest. For he saith, "The apostle affirmeth, that the priesthood of Aaron, that is, of the people of the Jews, had a beginning and an end, but that the priesthood of Melchisedec, that is of Christ and his church, is eternal, both for time past, and for time to come, and had no author of it." By these words it is manifest, that Christ only is a priest after the order of Melchisedec, whose priesthood is the priesthood of his church, as Aaron's was of the Jewish temple; and is an eternal priesthood without beginning, and had no author of it, therefore cannot possibly be the Popish priesthood. Chrysostom, *Hom.* 17, *and Heb.* showeth most plainly, that the celebration of the Supper is improperly called a sacrifice. "Our high priest is he, which offered the sacrifice, which purgeth us, the same we offer now also, which was then offered, and cannot be consumed. But this which we do is done in remembrance of that which was done. For do ye this," saith he, "in remembrance of me: we do not offer another sacrifice, as the high priest, but the same always, but rather we celebrate the remembrance of a sacrifice." Therefore the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is not a sacrifice

properly, but a remembrance of the sacrifice of Christ. Cyprian speaketh of the gross error of the Capernaites, which thought they should eat the flesh of Christ roasted, or sodden, and cut in pieces, "Whereas the flesh of his person," saith he, "if it should be cut in pieces, could not suffice all mankind, which being once consumed, it might seem that religion were lost, to which no oblation remained any more." What maketh this for the Popish priesthood or sacrifice? We know that Christ's body was not cut in pieces, but offered upon the cross, to be a sacrifice, whose virtue is always sufficient for the religion of Christ, and hath no need of the Popish priesthood or the sacrifice of the mass. The words of Emissenus are also falsely applied, for that he saith is the virtue of Christ's death, and not of the sacrifice of the mass, or the celebration of the Lord's Supper: "Because he would take away from our sight his assumed body, and carry it into heaven, it was necessary, that as this day he should consecrate unto us the sacrament of his body and blood, that it might be celebrated continually by a mystery, which was once offered for a price, that because the perpetual and unwearied redemption did run or continue still for the salvation of men, and the oblation also of that redemption should be perpetual, and that eternal sacrifice might live in remembrance, and always be present in grace." You see therefore that the redemption which runneth or continueth ever is the effect of Christ's passion, and that the perpetual oblation of that redemption is but a memorial and testimony of the presence of that sacrifice in grace, not in substance. Neither doth Christ in the institution of the sacrament, express any such matter as you pretend. For saying, the New Testament is dedicated in his blood, he speaketh expressly of the sacrifice of his death, where his blood was shed, and not in the chalice. Augustin saying that the sacrifice of bread and wine after the order of Melchisedec hath succeeded all the sacrifices of the Old Testament, meaneth not that the sacrament is that sacrifice properly, but the body of Christ offered on the cross, whereof the sacrament is a memorial in bread and wine. For, *cap. 17*, he saith, "That which Melchisedec offered when he blessed Abraham, is offered every where under Christ our priest." What is that I pray you but bread and wine, as a figure of Christ's body and blood? Therefore he speaketh of it most clearly, *Octoginta, trinum. quest. q. 6. 1.* "He is our Priest forever after the order of Melchisedec, which offered himself a whole sacrifice for us, and hath commended the similitude of that sacrifice, to be celebrated in remembrance of his passion; so that we see that which Melchisedec offered to God, to be now offered throughout the whole world in the church of Christ." What did Melchisedec offer, but bread and wine? not the natural body and blood of Christ. Augustin meaneth plainly, that bread and wine is offered in the church, in remembrance of

his passion, not the natural body and blood of Christ. As also he saith, *De civit. lib. 10. cap. 20*, "He is the priest himself, he is the offerer, he is the oblation, whereof he would have the daily sacrifice of the church to be a sacrament, seeing that of her body he is the head, and of his head she is the body, as well she by him, as he by her, being accustomed to be offered." You see not only, that this sacrifice is a sacrament, that is a holy sign and memorial of Christ's death, but also that the church is as well offered therein by Christ, as Christ by the church, which must needs be understood of a spiritual oblation of praise and thanksgiving, not of propitiation. Leo speaketh manifestly of the death of Christ, and not of the sacrament, as I have showed in *Luke 22, sect. 5*, where also I have answered to the place of Cyprian, *ep. 63*. Ambrose *de sacramentis, lib. 5. cap. 4*, saith, "So often as the sacrifice is offered, the death of our Lord, the resurrection of our Lord, the ascension of our Lord is signified, and remission of sins." These words declare in what sense he calleth the celebration of the sacrament a sacrifice, namely, because thereby is signified the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, and remission of sins. Not that Christ's body is truly sacrificed for remission of sins. Augustin, *Ps. 33. con. 2*, saith, "that Christ did in his body and blood institute a sacrifice after the order of Melchisedec." What that was, you have heard him explain himself in other places. Hierom, *epist. 17*, saith, "in the person of Paula and Eustochium, that Melchisedec offered bread and wine in a figure of Christ, and dedicated the Christian mystery in the body and blood of our Saviour." Here is nothing, but that Melchisedec's bread and wine was a figure of Christ, and the sacrament of his body and blood given in bread and wine, *Epiphani. Heres. 55*, saith of Christ's priesthood, "He offereth to his Father a priesthood having received substance of man's nature, that he might be made a priest for us, after the order of Melchisedec, which hath no succession. For he remaineth for ever, offering gifts for us. And first he offered himself, that he might dissolve the sacrifice of the Old Testament, seeing he hath offered a more perfect and living sacrifice for the whole world, himself being the temple, himself being the sacrifice, himself the priest, himself the altar, himself God, himself man, himself king, himself high priest, himself the sheep, himself the lamb, being made all in all for us, that he might be made life to us by all means, and might perform the immutable steadfastness of his priesthood forever, no more dividing successions according to seed or generation, but granting it to be preserved according to justice, or justification of the Holy Ghost." This place showeth manifestly that Christ is a priest according to the order of Melchisedec, in his own person only, wherein he offered sacrifice propitiatory for our redemption on the cross, and hath no succession in that office; although he say before, "that from Christ until now the translation

of that priesthood continueth in the church, while the seed is not chosen according to succession, but a figure is sought according to virtue." Meaning, that the ministry of the church, is not the priesthood itself, but a figure of it, to dispense the virtue thereof by preaching of the word, and ministration of the sacraments. The rest of the places quoted, be all examined and answered before. By all which you may see how true it is, that these shameless heretics affirm of all the ancient fathers, and what cause they have to bestow their Popish priestly blessing upon us, because they cannot satisfy us with lies and false wresting of the fathers from their true meaning. But their blessing shall return into their own bosom, and the eternal priesthood of Christ, and the state of the New Testament shall always continue, when Antichrist with his blasphemous priesthood and sacrifice shall be abolished.

18. A high mystery revealed, why Thursday before Ea-ter is called Maunday-Thursday. And yet I think you are able to bring little proof of it. For a more Popish name it had being called Shear-Thursday, because priests and clerks must shave their crowns at that day, as the English festival saith. That charity is called Christ's new commandment, we read often in the scripture; that the institution of the supper is so called, the scripture saith not any where. Therefore whether the common people called that day Maunday-Thursday of the Latin word *mandatum*, or of mands and baskets, in which was brought to the church the provision of the feast which they had in the church, or of the word *mando* or *manduco*, that signifieth to eat, or of whatsoever, it skilleth not. But we are assured, that our Saviour Christ instituted his supper as a seal or pledge of the grace of the New Testament, which was confirmed by his blood that was shed on the cross for remission of sins, whereof the cup is a sacrament, and that the old law was not taken away by institution of the sacrament, but by the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. For in the bread and wine of Melchisedec, although we should grant it to have been a figure of the sacrament, there was no shedding of blood, without which there is no remission of sins. Therefore Christ's priesthood according to the order of Melchisedec, consisteth not in the institution or ministration of the sacrament, but in blessing or consecrating of his church by the blood of the sacrifice of his death. For other sacrifice propitiatory the scripture doth not declare that Christ offered. And yet the blasphemous Papists are not afraid to say and write, that "Christ's sacrifice on the cross was not after the order of Melchisedec, but after the order of Aaron." *Heskin. lib. 1. cap. 13.* directly contrary to the whole discourse of the apostle in this chapter.

19. The new priesthood that succeedeth the old, is the eternal priesthood of Christ. The fathers that lived under the law had hope of eternal things as we have, but not by the law, but by faith in Christ, unto

whom the law even then also was an introduction.

21. This oath confirmeth the eternal priesthood of Christ only, which is the eternal Son of God, sitting on the right hand of God the Father. And pertaineth to none other, but only to him of whom the Psalm 110 is made, where the prophet saith, "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Wherefore Antichrist cannot usurp the priesthood of Christ according to the order of Melchisedec, which is to be both a king and a priest, except he will arrogate the whole Psalm to himself and his members. For to whom God sware and said, "Thou art a Priest forever," to him he said, "Sit thou on my right hand," and the rest that followeth in the Psalm; and he is David's son and Lord, which is none other but our Saviour Christ, of whom the same is to be expounded. For although David had many sons, yet Christ only was his Lord, because he was God. Antichrist therefore granting to his shavelings the priesthood of Melchisedec, which is proper to Christ both God and man, and preferring himself so much before those vile creatures of his, advanceth himself above all that is called God, or worshipped. The sacrifice of Christ's death was the act of his eternal priesthood, whereby the New Testament was established, and no Popish priesthood or sacrifice. And here mark the impudency of these heretics, which so boldly avouch, that their pretended sacrifice in forms of bread and wine, was the proper act of Christ's priesthood according to the order of Melchisedec, and that both it, and the immutability of the new Law consisteth in it, yet now are driven to confess, that sacrifice to have been imperfect, without the sacrifice of Christ's death. Which when they affirm to be after Aaron's order, it followeth, that a sacrifice after Aaron's order, establisheth the sacrifice after Melchisedec's order, and so the New Testament doth not take away the Old, but the Old giveth perfection, confirmation, and eternal operation unto the new. But unto these absurdities and blasphemies, they must needs be driven that maintain their own glory, against the glory of Christ.

23. When the scripture is most plain and evident for us, then these wise profound learned men of Rheims do impute unto us foolishness, ignorance, want of learning, for applying them to the overthrow of their heresies. But to the matter, we do not feign, but the apostle in plain words doth make this difference between the old priesthood and the new, that in the old there were many, in the new there is but one, which continueth forever. "But that," you say, "is against the prophet Isaiah, specially prophesying of the priests of the New Testament." You might as well say, it is against Peter, 1 *Pet. 2.* and John, *Apoc. 1.* affirming that all true Christians, as members of Christ their head, are a spiritual priesthood, and are spiritual kings and priests. For of such speaketh the prophet Isaiah, and

not of Popish priests, nor of the ministers of the gospel only; except you will say, that none other appertain to the church of Christ. Neither doth Hierom declare, that he prophesieth of the priests of the New Testament, when he saith, "It signifieth the princes of the churches, or at the least wise it is to be understood of the apostles." For neither the princes of the churches are, nor the apostles were sacrificing priests; but as he saith afterward, "You shall be called priests and ministers of God, such as the sons of David were, of whom the scripture saith, the sons of David were priests of God." Now it is well known, the sons of David were no sacrificing priests. Therefore Hierom meaneth not by priests, sacrificing priests, but spiritual priests, such as all true Israelites are, and the governors of the church especially. So doth Cyril expound the place of the whole church generally, and particularly of the teachers thereof. "This speech," saith he, "is had as it were unto the church, whose sheep may be understood the whole multitude of them that are saved by faith." Then touching the apostle's meaning, you say, the absolute sacrifice of consummation, perfection, and universal redemption, was but one, once done, and by one holy priest. What need then have we of any other sacrificing priest, but that one.

You say, "Paul insinuateth, that Christ never loseth the dignity or practice of eternal priesthood, by death, resignation, succession or otherwise." Then it followeth, that as he was first only one, so he remaineth forever only Priest, and seeing his sacrifice of redemption, was but one, and once done, the practice of his priesthood consisteth not in repeating or often doing thereof. "But," you say, "himself worketh and concurrerth with his ministers, the priests of the New Testament, in all their acts of priesthood, as well of sacrifice as sacrament, blessing, preaching, praying, and the like whatsoever." In acts of their ministry he concurrerth, but priesthood and sacrifice, is the matter in question. For he cannot be the only priest, if they be many, by concurring in the acts of their priesthood and sacrifice. For he did concur in the acts of the priesthood, and all the sacrifices of the law, that were faithfully and rightly offered. Yet were the priests of the law many, beside him. So that if there be many priests of the New Testament, there is no difference between the New Testament and the Old, the priesthood of Aaron, and the priesthood of Melchisedec, in that they were many, and Christ is but one. Therefore this shift of concurrence, cannot shroud the multitude of Popish priests from usurpation of Christ's office and prerogative. For the Apostle writeth, not only against the error of the Hebrews, but against all heresies that go about to derogate any thing from the singular priesthood of our Saviour Christ. Neither will it serve the Popish priests to confess, that their priesthood and all exercises of the same do depend upon Christ's only perpetual priesthood. For the same might the Hebrews

justly confess, as well of the priesthood of Aaron, and all exercises of the same, which were not otherwise available, but as they depended upon Christ's only perpetual Priesthood. Yet the apostle maketh this difference. They were many, Christ is but one, *Hesych. lib. 5. cap. 16.*

25. Upon 1 *Tim.* 2. 5, you said, "No catholic ever can or dare think or speak so basely unto him, as to desire him to pray for us." If you be assured by this text, that he prayeth for us, why dare you not think or speak so basely unto him as to desire him to pray for you?

27. Christ offered but once for sins, and found eternal redemption, therefore he offered not any sacrifice in his supper, for sins, nor instituted any such sacrifice to be reiterated. Wherefore it is impossible for the Popish priesthood and sacrifice of the mass, to stand with the truth of this text.

#### CHAPTER 8.

2. Christ is not minister of his body and blood, by offering the same any more for sins, seeing he performed that once for all, *cap. 7. v. 27.* but feeding us continually with the virtue of that sacrifice, that being incorporate unto him, we might always continue members of his body.

3. The apostle saith not, that Christ must offer sacrifice in heaven: but the truth of the text is, seeing every priest hath gifts to offer, it is necessary that he hath somewhat which he offered, for the verb *προσφέρειν*, is not of the present time, but of the time past, and signifieth the oblation which he offered but once, *cap. 7. 27.* So Theodoret expounds the text, saying: "It is the property of a high priest to offer gifts to God of all things. For this cause, the only begotten Son, being made man when he had taken upon him our nature, he offered the same for us." Chrysostom, *Hom. 14. ad Heb.* upon this text, saith: "Because some asked, wherefore he died. He saith, because he was a high priest. For a high priest is not without a sacrifice."

Ambrose likewise referreth his offering to his only oblation on the cross, saying: "It is necessary that our Saviour in the days of his flesh had something to offer for us. For while in the eternal nature of his Godhead he had nothing which he might offer, he took of us that which he might offer for us, that is, his man's flesh. For what is so apt for sacrifice as mortal flesh, for mortal men?" The same words in effect, hath Primasius; "He took of us, that he offered for us, that is, man's flesh, namely himself, whom he offered in the altar of the cross." Occumenius saith, "He had his own flesh, which also he offered." Theophylact saith, "He hath all things proper to the high priests, as they offer, so he offered himself. Seeing he was a priest, and a priest is not without sacrifice, it is necessary that he also had something to offer, and that was nothing but his own body, therefore it was necessary that he died." Against this general consent of all the ancient interpre-

ters, you feign that Christ offereth a sacrifice propitiatory, now being in heaven. And you do dishonestly slander Calvin and Beza, to hold that Melchisedec's priesthood was only spiritual, as the spiritual priesthood of all the faithful is, for they hold no such thing. But that Melchisedec's priesthood was figurative, having a spiritual relation to Christ's eternal priesthood. As Christ doth not exercise any visible or external act of sacrificing in heaven, so much less doth he exercise any visible or external act of sacrificing on earth. Neither by this text, hath he any such certain most in external or proper manner, to make perpetual oblation thereby in the church. For that which he had to sacrifice for sin, in offering himself he performed once upon the cross, the virtue whereof continueth always, and therefore need not in any sort to be reiterated.

4. After Christ by his own sacrifice, once offered, hath entered into the holiest place, which is heaven, he exerciseth his continual priesthood, in presenting his church before God, and in making continual intercession for us: but not in offering any more sacrifice, for that he did once, and found eternal redemption. By the sacrifice of his death therefore, his flesh and blood are made meat and drink to feed us spiritually, both in the sacrament and without it, but not to be offered in the mass, neither doth Hesychius tell, how his flesh was made fit to be offered, but to be eaten in the blessed sacrament, for these are his words. "The cross of Christ was so strong, that it subdued every creature to him that was crucified: and made his flesh meet for meat by his passion, which before his passion was unfit to be eaten, for who desired to eat the flesh of God? For if he had not been crucified, we should not have eaten the sacrifice of his body: But now we eat that meat, receiving the memory of his passion." You see evidently, that he saith, by crucifying, the flesh of Christ is made apt to be eaten, not to be sacrificed any more. But as in the Old Testament, after the beast was sacrificed, the people were partakers of the sacrifice by eating thereof, so we are partakers of the sacrifice of Christ's body, by eating thereof continually, not by offering it any more.

5. The apostle, *cap. 9* 11, 24, showeth, that the pattern given to Moses to frame the tabernacle by, was Christ, and the kingdom of heaven itself, not the church, which is not properly, but figuratively called the kingdom of heaven: because Christ beginneth his reign in the faithful therein, whom afterward he translateth actually into the kingdom of heaven, where he is present in his humanity. Therefore, those learned men might learn of the apostle, how to take these heavenly things principally of Christ, and his heavenly throne, unto which the heavenly mysteries of the church do serve, and in that respect, are counted heavenly things, although they be done upon the earth. And the excellency of the New Testament consisteth principally in

the excellency of Christ's priesthood, whereby it is consecrated and established.

7. The promises and effects of the Old Testament, were imperfect, though they were of eternal things, without the accomplishment of Christ's priesthood in the New Testament, whereunto they had relation.

10. The sacrifice of Christ's death is sufficient to work this effect by the Holy Spirit, when his word is preached, and his sacraments are administered without any other sacrifice.

10. The New Testament was established only by the death and blood shedding of Christ on the cross, and not by the chalice or cup of the New Testament, which was only a sacrament and figure thereof. *Heb. 9* 11, 12.

11. The prophet and the apostle mean, that all true members of the church shall know God by his Spirit, which is not otherwise to be known, not excluding the external ministry of teaching, by which both the ignorant are brought to knowledge, and they that have knowledge of God, do increase therein, but declaring that there shall be no more such gross ignorance of God as possessed the world commonly before the coming of Christ. But where you say the Anabaptists and other like Heretics, do reject the scriptures and office of teaching, with much like reason and show of scriptures, as the Protestants refuse external sacrifice, it hath no colour of reason or similitude. For the necessity of the scriptures and the external ministry of teaching, is established by very many most plain testimonies of the scriptures, whereas your external sacrifice hath no testimony at all in the word of God, but many articles against it.

#### CHAPTER 9.

4. When we have a commandment for the reservation of such things, as the Israelites had for Aaron's rod, *Num. 17* 10, and for the pot of manna, *Exod. 16* 34, we will likewise reserve them, and believe that they will continue to the world's end. Yet will we not worship them, nor show them, which the godly Israelites did not, because they had no commandment for it. But contrariwise, when the brazen serpent, which was a monument of a great miracle, and a figure of Christ was abused in being worshipped and made an idol, it was broken to pieces by Ezechias, *2 Reg. 18* 14, and thought to be no more privileged than the golden calf, which Moses served with the like sauce, *Exod. 32* 20. Thus think we of the holiest relics abused to idolatry. Cyril you say, against Julian, defendeth the keeping and honouring of that cross or wood which Christ died on, where he speaketh of neither or both: but defendeth the making of the sign of the cross on the foreheads, and painting it before their houses, whereby Julian said, they adored the wood of the cross. Cyril saith, "they used it only to put them in remembrance of the death of Christ, and the fruits of his passion." But as for keeping of the wood itself, or of the honouring of it, which Ambrose saith to be "a

heathenish error, and vanity of the ungodly," *De obitu Theodos.* Cyril speaketh nothing. But by that which Julian objecteth, you may well see they had no images in their churches, no not of the cross of Christ. For if they had, Julian would not have spared to have charged them withal, as he doth with the sign of the cross painted before their houses. Paulinus indeed, if that epistle be not counterfeit, was persuaded that he had a piece of that cross whereon Christ died, brought to him by Melama, and sent by his wife Theoasia to his sister Bassula, who was mother to the wife of Severus, of the gift of John bishop of Jerusalem, but of this matter, *John* 19.

5. It is a fond thing with you to conclude, that God's commandment is not to be observed, which forbiddeth us to make to ourselves any graven images. Because "God himself commanded these images of angels to be made, and set in the sovereign holiest place of all the tabernacle or temple." As though God forbidding us to make any images to ourselves, that is, according to our own fancy and appointment in his service, had restrained himself to command and appoint such figures or shapes as he thought meet for his tabernacle. Or as though by this particular commandment of God, men were discharged of the general law, and were at liberty to do at their pleasure that which God expressly forbiddeth to be done, except at his appointment only. But it is not only a fond, but a wicked conclusion, that because these images of cherubin were made and set up by God's commandment, therefore much more the images of Christ, his mother, and Saints may be made and set in the churches, which God hath not commanded but forbidden to be made to any use of religion. Those cherubin were set in the holiest place, where they were never seen of the people, therefore out of danger of idolatry; your images are not only set openly in churches, but commanded to be worshipped. That only the idols of the Heathen are forbidden, it is a vain cavil: for the commandment is general, not only against the images of the Heathen that were made for any use of religion, but also against the like images of all Heretics, as of Simon Magus, of the Carpocratians and Gnostics, which had the image of Jesus and Paul, Homer, Pythagoras, and others. *Epiph. har.* 24, of the Melchisedecians in Arabia, that worshipped the image of Moses, *Epiph. har.* 55. Of the Colyridians that made and worshipped the image of the Virgin Mary, *Epiph. har.* 79. Of them that hanged up a veil with an image in a church at Anablatha, *Epiph. epist. ad Joan. Hier.* and of the Papists which in idolatry by imagery, exceed all other Heretics, and are as ill as the Pagans.

8. Heaven was not opened by the sacrifices of the first tabernacle, but by the passion of Christ, whose virtue as it extended to the beginning of the world, to take away the sins of the faithful, and to justify them by faith: so it was available to give them rest in heaven in their souls. Which is the reward of righ-

teousness, until the time come, when they shall wholly enter into it with their bodies also, as our Saviour Christ did: which was the first that entered with his body into perfect glory of heaven.

10. The one sacrifice of Christ's death is succeeded instead of all the legal sacrifices, but not instead of the old sacraments, because it is no sacrament, but the thing signified by all sacraments. And this is a sufficient reason why Christ's one oblation on the cross, doth not take away all kind of sacraments, as it doth all kind of propitiatory sacrifices for sin. Neither is the state of the New Testament without sacrifice, seeing that one sacrifice once offered is of eternal virtue to reconcile all the elect of God forever.

12. Seeing eternal redemption is found by that one sacrifice on the cross, there remaineth now no more sacrifice for sin, therefore the Lord's Supper is not a sacrifice for sin, but a thanksgiving, for that only singular sacrifice, in which sense the fathers often call it a sacrifice, and Augustin most manifestly in the place quoted. For his words are these: "The worship of God doth consist most of all in this, that the soul of man be not unthankful to him. Therefore in that most true, and in that singular sacrifice, we are admonished to give thanks to the Lord our God." You see plainly he calleth it a most true and singular sacrifice of thanksgiving, for the only true, and unsacrificable sacrifice of propitiation for sin, proving thereby that religion or the worship of God doth now consist most especially in thanksgiving, which were not true if the Lord's Supper were a sacrifice propitiatory for sins. But the fathers knew no sacrifice propitiatory, but only the sacrifice of Christ's death, whereby all external sacrifices of the law are taken away with the priesthood thereof, which is translated into the person of our Saviour only: not as false sacrifices or priests, but as figures and shadows of the only priest and only sacrifice. Therefore the apostle doth not dispute only against the error of the Jews, that thought their priesthood and sacrifices to be absolute in themselves, and sufficient for redemption without the sacrifice of Christ, for none of the Christian Hebrews did so think, though many obstinate Jews did, of whom Augustin speaketh. But he disputeth also and more properly against them, that thought the Jewish priesthood and sacrifice might stand still and be exercised as they were before, with relation unto Christ's death, and fetching their virtue from the only priesthood and sacrifice of Christ. And therefore you tell a false tale, when you say, that "is the only purpose of the apostle." For he standeth not so much in proving that the old priesthood and sacrifices had no virtue but from Christ, as he doth to declare that they being figures and shadows, must give place and cease, now the body, truth, and light itself is come. Neither are we so gross or ignorant in the scriptures, to turn the whole disputation against the popish priesthood and sacrifice of the mass as



you imagine. But seeing these reasons and arguments by which the apostle proveth that the old priesthood and sacrifices are at an end, do as well, and much rather, exclude your false priesthood and sacrifice, as they did that lawful priesthood with the sacrifices of the Old Testament: we use the apostles' arguments, as it is meet for them that know the right use of the scriptures, to overthrow your blasphemous priesthood and sacrifice. As our fathers by the like testimonies of scriptures overthrow the foolish priesthood and sacrifice of the Colyridians, which they might as well say, were meant only against the Gentiles, as you say the apostle's purpose is only against the error of the Jews. But you have very good reasons to prove that this disputation of the apostle toucheth not your priesthood and sacrifice. By which the Hebrews might as well prove, that their priesthood and sacrifice might still continue. "For you hold not that the sacrifice of the altar is the general redemption or redeeming sacrifice." No more did they that were Christians, nor any faithful Jew before the coming of Christ in the flesh. "You hold that your sacrifice hath relation to Christ's death," so did the Christian Hebrews and all the godly Jews before them hold of their sacrifices. "You hold that it is the representation and most lively resemblance of the same." So were all the sacrifices propitiatory of the law, in the judgment of all faithful and Christian Jews. "You hold that it was instituted and is done to apply in particular to the use of the receivers, that other general benefit of Christ's one oblation upon the cross." And all faithful Jews and Christian Hebrews held the same of the institution, practice, and use of the old sacrifices; therefore they might still use them with as good and better reason than you may set up a new sacrifice without any word of God to warrant it. But notwithstanding they held in these points of their sacrifices, as you say you do of yours, yet the apostle's purpose is to prove that those sacrifices must now no more be used, because Christ hath accomplished whatsoever was by them prefigured by his one oblation on the cross, having found eternal redemption, and made perfect forever those that are sanctified. Therefore your understanding is either very gross, or you are maliciously blind in the scriptures, that can see no arguments of the apostle, for the abrogation of the Jewish priesthood, and sacrifices propitiatory, though they were used according to their right institution, by the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ: but affirm, that the apostle disputeth only against the incredulous Jews, and their false opinion of their priesthood and sacrifices to be sufficient without Christ.

15. The foolish Protestants which know nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified, do unlearnedly, but yet truly believe, that because all sins are remitted by force of Christ's sacrifice once offered on the cross, that therefore there should be none other sacrifice propitiatory for sin after his death. But the

wise and learned Papists, which know much more of this matter than God hath revealed in his word, do think "that we might as well say, that there ought never to have been sacrifice appointed by God." Yes, say we, before that only propitiatory sacrifice was offered by Christ on the cross, God thought meet to appoint divers figurative sacrifices to foreshow the same. Which all were effectual by the death of Christ, to assure them of reconciliation and remission of sins. Neither doth any argument that we make against popish sacrifice, prove that there were no sacrifices of Aaron's order, or the Levitical law. And I have proved before, that the apostle doth not dispute only against the false opinion which the unbelieving Jews had of them, but also against the false opinion that Christian Jews might conceive of their continuance after the death of Christ. "But he doth never in all his discourse," say you, "oppose Christ's sacrifice upon the cross, to the sacrifice of the church," so you call the sacrifice of the mass. And that proveth very well, that the church had no such sacrifice in his time, for if it had, he ought in this discourse to have declared how that sacrifice might stand with the only sacrifice of Christ's death. As the fathers that followed in those times when the Lord's Supper was improperly called a sacrifice, do show that it is a memory of a sacrifice, rather than a sacrifice indeed, and a sacrifice of thanksgiving, not a sacrifice propitiatory. And although the apostle doth not name the sacrifice of the mass, which was not invented many hundred years after his death, yet he doth so often and in so plain manner, prove that the sacrifice of Christ's death is but one, and once offered by himself, and of eternal virtue for full redemption, that the Holy Ghost directing his style, be doth as strongly arm the church against that blasphemous priesthood and sacrifice of Antichrist, as he doth purposely prove the abrogation and ceasing of the Jewish priesthood and sacrifices, by the only priesthood and sacrifice of Christ's death. The difference in manner of oblation will not help you, for the apostle saith expressly, that that once sacrifice could be but once offered, and in that only manner, by shedding of blood, and death of the priest himself. And if Christ should have offered himself often, he should have died often, as it is plain in the five and twentieth verse, and so to the end of this chapter. Therefore your fantastical manner of offering his body and blood in the forms of bread and wine, can never stand with the apostle's words and plain meaning. That the sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, Aaron, &c. were no sacrifices, it followeth not by any deduction of ours, for we confess they were sacrifices, figurative of the sacrifice of Christ, and so doth Calvin always acknowledge in his commentaries, and in the place whither you send men, as it were, to see a miracle. For what deduction is this in your logic? The sacrifice of Christ's death is the only true propitiatory sacrifice whereby God was reconciled; *ergo*, there were never

any sacrifices that were shadows and figures thereof. It is not therefore your railing of Calvin's blasphemous pride and ignorance, without all colour of reason, that will uphold your Antichristian priesthood for which you have no word of God, but many words of God against it. Therefore this argument of Calvin shall still hold against your popish sacrifice, and maketh nothing against the figurative sacrifices of the law.

19. Here is nothing but that which is contained in the scripture. For the book was doubtless laid upon the altar, which was sprinkled, whence Moses took it, *Exod. 24*. Or at least it was sprinkled with the respergion that was cast upon the whole people. Now for the use of sprinkling, there must needs be some instrument, which is described by Moses, *Levit. 14*, to be made of cedar wood and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and the blood to be poured upon water. And this was the order of all such respergions, which is described in the purging of the leper. And that the blood of goats is comprehended under the peace offering mentioned, *Exod. 24*, you may see, *Levit. 3. 12*. Therefore here was no need of tradition for any of these ceremonies.

20. The apostle joineth shedding of blood with death, and therefore the New Testament was not dedicated by the sacrament of the blood of Christ, but by the blood of Christ shed at his death. And although the institution of the sacrament was within the compass of his passion, in respect of the time, because it was in the same night in which he was delivered after he had been betrayed, yet was the sacrament no part of his passion, and therefore the New Testament was not begun to be dedicated by it. Neither do the words pronounced by our Saviour Christ of the cup declare any such matter, but that the cup is a sacrament of the New Testament, which is established by the shedding of his blood on the cross. Therefore he saith, This is my blood of the New Testament, which is all one in sense with these words, This is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you. But neither the cup, nor that which was contained in it, was the New Testament, which is the same that the apostle expressed before, Chapter 8, but a holy sign, sacrament, or memorial of the same. So the sense is clear, that the cup is a sacrament of the blood of Christ, and of the New Testament, confirmed thereby, being no more the blood of Christ itself, than it is the New Testament itself, seeing the like speech is of the one and of the other, This is my blood, This is the New Testament in my blood. The express mention of remission of sins is referred to the blood of Christ shed upon the cross, and not to the sacrament of his blood contained in the cup. Therefore he saith, Which is shed for many unto remission of sins. But the blood of Christ was not shed in the supper, but in his passion. The supper was effectual only to them that received it faithfully, the blood of Christ shed on the cross was available for the sins of all the elect, which were not yet

born. Therefore the cup did not contain the blood itself, but a sacrament of that blood which was shed on the cross. When the apostle saith so expressly, that Christ offered not himself often, but once only, he offered not himself in the supper, except you will say he offered not himself on the cross. Therefore that which is spoken of the sacrifice of Christ's death, cannot be verified of any other sacrifice, nor of the supper, but sacramentally, as it is a figure and remembrance of that only sacrifice.

Hesychius in the place quoted, meaneth no more but that Christ by institution of his supper, to be a memorial of his death, declared that he did willingly offer himself to his Father to die for the people, and prevented the malice of his enemies which sought his death. And alluding to the phrase of filling their hands that were consecrated priests, he saith that "Christ's hands were filled, first in the mystical supper, when he took bread and brake it, and after by the cross, when he was nailed to the tree. For then taking upon him the dignity of priesthood, or rather, then fulfilling it in work, when he always had it, he dedicated that sacrifice, which was for us." Therefore as the filling of the priests' hands was a sign of their consecration unto priesthood, so was the institution of the supper a sacrament of the consecration of Christ's priesthood, which was in work and deed accomplished only on the cross. Hesychius therefore doth not apply those things that were proper to the sacrifice of Christ's death to his sacramental offering of himself in the supper.

23. The offices, places, vessels, and ceremonies of the old law were figures of heaven and heavenly things, which are dedicated and consecrated in the New Testament by the blood of Christ shed and once sacrificed on the cross, as is manifest by that which followeth in the text, and not by any blood sacrificed on the altar, whereof neither the apostle in this place, nor the Holy Ghost in any place doth make any mention. And therefore the sudden passage that you ascribe unto the apostle, is a sudden passion of your own brain, for the apostle was never at your sacrifice of the mass, that he might suddenly pass from thence to Christ's entrance into heaven by his death and bloody sacrifice. Neither doth any of the ancient writers doubt, but that these better sacrifices wherewith these heavenly things are purified, are the only sacrifice of Christ's death, which is instead of all sacrifices. "Therefore saith Primasius: "The heavenly things themselves, that is, those spiritual things which, are now in truth celebrated in the church, are purified by better sacrifices than those legal sacrifices, namely by the blood of the passion of Christ." Oecumenius saith upon this text: "Because these heavenly things had need of a better oblation and sacrifice, according to their worthiness, the Son of God himself was sacrificed. Therefore our Lord's death did profit, and had force not only to confirm the Testament, but also to

this end that he might make a true purification of the soul." The same words hath Theophylact. *Hesych. lib. 5. cap. 16.* The other as Chrysostom, Ambrose, Theodoret, pass it over in general terms, as a matter undoubted, that the death of Christ is the only sacrifice, by which the heavenly things are purified.

25. The apostle's words are plain, Christ could not offer himself any other way than by dying. Therefore he offered himself but once for all, by giving himself to death: and not twice by any fantastical, hidden, invisible, mystical or unbloody manner. But you say, "as Christ died, and was offered after a sort in all the old sacrifices, so he is much rather offered in the sacrifice of the altar of the New Testament. I answer, that in the old sacrifices Christ was not offered in truth, but in figure and signification, therefore in the sacrament he is not offered in truth, but a figure, signification, remembrance, and representation of his only true sacrifice, is made in the sacrament, more nearly and lively expressing the same, than by any figure of the law it was expressed. Yet is not the sacrament a sacrifice properly, but a memory of that sacrifice, and a figure of Christ's body, not the very body itself, but to him that receiveth it spiritually by faith, as the old sacrifices were to the faithful Jews. But what impudency is it to say, that it is most evident by the very form of the words of our Saviour, used in the institution of the sacrament, that it is the same host, oblation, and sacrifice that was done upon the cross? whereas in the institution of the supper there is no word of oblation, host, or sacrifice. You show as great impudency in saying it is so, "by the profession of all the holy doctors:" when even their words which you cite, cry out against you, that they mean no such matter. For Cyprian saith against them that ministered the sacrament without wine, "We find that the cup was mixed which our Lord offered, and that it was wine, which he called his blood." Whereupon it appeareth, that the blood of Christ is not offered if wine be wanting to the cup, and that the Lord's sacrifice is not celebrated with lawful sanctification, except our oblation and sacrifice do answer to his passion." He saith not, that the sacrament which he calleth a sacrifice of holy service is the self-same body and blood, the self-same host, oblation and sacrifice, which was done on the cross, for wine was not offered on the cross, but that this sacrament is not rightly celebrated, except it do answer to the passion of Christ, whereof it is a memorial, that is, that it be celebrated with wine, which our Saviour Christ did call his blood figuratively, to express the shedding of his blood upon the cross.

Cyprian's words are these: "Because we make mention of his passion in all sacrifices for the sacrifice which we offer is our Lord's passion, we ought to do none other thing than he did. For the scripture saith: So often as you shall eat of his bread, and drink of this cup, you shall show the Lord's death until he

come. Therefore as often as we offer the cup in remembrance of our Lord and his passion, let us do that which is certain that our Lord did." What can be more evident than that Cyprian in this place calleth the sacrament, a sacrifice and the passion of Christ figuratively, because it is a commemoration of the sacrifice and passion of Christ not the sacrifice and passion of Christ itself. For Christ is now impassible. Therefore no more properly than Christ is crucified in the sacrament, no more properly is he sacrificed therein. But as the apostle saith figuratively, that Christ was crucified among the Galatians, so we may say he is crucified in the celebration of the sacrament, and sacrificed: because his death and passion, and the virtue thereof, is lively represented by the word that is preached, and the action that is celebrated: but properly we cannot say that Christ is sacrificed or crucified in the sacrament. The words of Augustin, or rather of Fulgentius *De fide at Petrum*, be these: "Hold steadfastly, and nothing doubt thou, that the same only begotten God, the word being made flesh, offered himself a sacrifice, and host of sweet savour to God for us. To whom with the Father and the Holy Ghost by the patriarchs, prophets, and priests, in the time of the Old Testament beasts were sacrificed, and to whom now, that is, in the time of the New Testament, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, with whom he is one God, the holy Catholic church throughout the whole world doth not cease to offer the sacrifice of bread and wine in faith and charity. For in those carnal sacrifices, there was a figuring of the flesh of Christ, which he being without sin, was to offer for our sins, and of the blood which he was to shed for the remission of our sins. But in this sacrifice there is a thanksgiving and commemoration of the flesh of Christ, which he offered for us, and of the blood, which the same God hath shed for us. Of which Paul in the Acts of the Apostles saith: Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to rule the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. Therefore in those sacrifices it was signified figuratively, what was to be given unto us; but in this sacrifice it is evidently showed what is already given unto us. In those sacrifices the Son of God was foreshowed, that he should be slain for ungodly men; but in this he is declared that he hath been already slain for ungodly men, as the Apostle witnesseth, that Christ when we were yet weak, according to the time, died for ungodly men, and that when we were his enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." In this saying, mark that he calleth the sacrament the sacrifice of bread and wine: that the same is offered to Christ by the whole church as a thanksgiving and commemoration of the death of Christ, that the death of Christ is showed therein, and not that Christ is showed as killed, but that he hath been killed. All which is manifestly

against the sacrifice of the mass, in which neither bread nor wine is sacrificed, not to Christ, but Christ himself is said to be sacrificed to his Father, not by the whole church, but by the priests only, not as a thanksgiving only, and commemoration of Christ's death, but as the selfsame host, oblation and sacrifice that was done on the cross. By all which it is evident that he speaketh not of the sacrifice of the mass, but of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which is a spiritual sacrifice of thanksgiving, and not the same sacrifice that was done upon the cross but figuratively, sacramentally, and improperly. And what should Gregory Nazianzen mean by "the priest mingling himself with the great passions of Christ," but his contemplation of them to stir up himself and his people unto thanksgiving for them? For the sacrifice of Christ's death he calleth "that great and unsacrificable sacrifice, or which cannot be sacrificed again." Therefore he speaketh directly against your Popish sacrifice, which you say to be the same that was done upon the cross. The words of Ambrose be these: "Beforetime a lamb was offered, a calf was offered, now Christ is offered, but he is offered as a man, as receiving passion, and he offereth himself as a priest, that he may forgive our sins. Here in an image, there in truth, where he maketh intercession with the Father, as an advocate for us." Is it not manifest in these words, that Christ is not now offered in truth, but in an image and representation of his death, because the sacrament is a preaching or showing of his death until he come?

As to the counterfeit epistle of Alexander, although it deserve no answer, yet the words you cite, do not prove your saying. For the passion of Christ is celebrated by the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ: yet the sacrament is not the same sacrifice that was done on the cross and can never be repeated. Gregory meaneth no otherwise that Christ suffereth again, than Paul when he saith Christ was crucified among the Galatians, *Gal. 3.* that is, his passion and death is plainly showed, not actually renewed, nor Christ suffering any thing indeed, but figuratively and improperly. Hesyehius speaketh undoubtedly of the sacrifice of Christ's death, and his words are these: "Not one sin only, but many sins are forgiven us by the sacrifice of the only begotten Son, that is to say, the pardoning of all mankind, life in perfect philosophy or wisdom, and a singular introduction of the mysteries of the New Testament, to the exemplars and figures of which the sacrifices which are assigned to the person of the high Priest, were offered, most of all showing the shadow of heavenly things, by those things which were done upon earth." Is it now the sacrifice of the mass, or Christ's death, by which all sins are forgiven, all mankind pardoned, the mysteries of the New Testament are brought in? The same father, speaking afterward of the sacrament, saith, it is "both bread and flesh," meaning the one

properly, the other figuratively and sacramentally. Wherefore I say again, that you have cited the sayings of the fathers without all, which make against you very plainly. And that the fathers call the sacrament an unbloody sacrifice, they do plainly distinguish it in kind, and not only in manner of sacrificing, from the bloody sacrifice of Christ's death. For by that was remission of sins, by the other could be no remission of sins, because without shedding of blood there can be no remission of sins. Therefore the fathers calling the sacrament an unbloody sacrifice, did plainly declare that it was no propitiatory sacrifice, but a sacrifice of thanksgiving, and remembrance of Christ's death. Which Calvin knew right well, and therefore saith, that the Papists did wickedly abuse those speeches to maintain a sacrifice of their own invention. Yea he saith it is a devilish invention, that Christ should be often sacrificed, seeing he cannot die often, and without death there can be no sacrifice for sin. These things are so plain in the Apostle, that they need no exposition; yet all the fathers agree, that there is but one sacrifice propitiatory for sins, namely, the death of Christ. Chrysostom saith therefore, that the supper is "rather a remembrance of a sacrifice" than a sacrifice indeed. *Hom. 17.* which is the meaning of the rest of the fathers when they call it a sacrifice. Or if they meant otherwise than the Apostle teacheth so plainly, we may without pride say with Calvin, it is not to be regarded what any man hath said, but what the Holy Ghost saith, of whom all men ought to learn to speak.

#### CHAPTER 10.

1. The sacraments and ceremonies of the old law, were shadows of Christ's only sacrifice and the virtue thereof, not of our sacraments, as it is manifest in the 10th verse. Neither do the sacraments of the New Testament, contain or give grace, justification, and life, to the worthy receivers, but are certain testimonies of grace, justification, and life, given to God, reconciled to us by the only sacrifice of Christ's death. And so were the sacrifices and ceremonies of the Old Testament to the worthy receivers, as effectual to assure the fathers of grace, justification, and life everlasting, by the death of Christ, as our sacraments are to us. Although in respect of more clear, plain, and lightsome signification, our sacraments do far exceed the sacraments of the Old Testament. And so the Gospel, with the sacraments thereof, may be called an express image or firm of good things, in respect of the law with the ceremonies thereof, which was but a shadow of them. The sacrifice of the mass hath no ground in the word of God, and is directly contrary to the only sacrifice of Christ's death once offered for all, is no express form, or representation of Christ's death, but an apish counterfeiting of Christ's actions concerning the ceremonies, and concerning the doctrine of it, a most horrible blasphemy

against the perfection and sufficiency of Christ's only sacrifice.

2. The Hebrews to whom the apostle writeth were Christians, and therefore could have no such gross opinion of the sacrifices of the law, which no faithful Jew had before the coming of Christ. Therefore they believed that all those sacrifices took their effect, only of the death of Christ. Yet they thought they must be still offered, to apply the virtue of his death unto them. But the apostle declareth, that after the sacrifice of Christ once offered, whereby all sins are taken away, there are means by God appointed, to apply the virtue thereof to every person, but all sacrifices for sin must needs cease. Howbeit you say, "That Christ's death being once applied to man by baptism, wipeth away all sins, &c., though for new sins, other remedies be daily requisite." Where your speech is doubtful, whether you mean other remedies than the death of Christ, or other remedies than baptism. In truth not the external act of baptism, but the inward working of God's Spirit, washeth away all sins in the elect, by the virtue of Christ's death, which is testified and confirmed unto us, by the outward sacrament of baptism. The virtue of which application by God's Spirit, in our regeneration, extendeth not only to the sins past, but to all infirmities to come. And the sacrament of baptism is a seal for confirmation of our faith, of remission of our sins committed after baptism received, when we are penitent for them, as well as of sins committed before: seeing it hath relation to the death of Christ, whereby all our sins are forgiven. Therefore although the ceremony of baptism ought not to be repeated, yet the virtue of God's Spirit testified thereby, that we are born again to be the sons of God, remaineth unto our life's end, and unto eternal life. Although, for further confirmation of our faith, and assurance of our perpetual conservation in the body of Christ, whereunto we are engrafted by baptism, the mercy of God hath added another sacrament of our spiritual nourishment and feeding with the very body and blood of Christ crucified. Not as a new sacrifice for sin, nor as a reiteration of that only sacrifice of Christ's death, but as an undoubted pledge of his grace, whereby we are assured that we are not only born again to be his children, but also are fed with the food of life and immortality, that we might always continue in the state of God's children, even until we are put in possession of our heavenly inheritance. Therefore there is none other remedy for sins committed after baptism, but the sacrifice of Christ's death: the virtue and force whereof is inwardly applied unto every person, on God's behalf by his Spirit, on man's behalf, in them that have understanding by faith in his word preached, and testified outwardly, by the holy sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper. That the Jewish sacrifices were no sacrifices, no man in his right wits would affirm, but the repeating of them argueth, that they were

imperfect sacrifices, that did not take away sin. So the repeating of the sacrifice of the mass declareth, that sin is not taken away by it, yea it doth blasphemously imply, that sin is not taken away by the death of Christ. For remission of sins once obtained, "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin," *verse 18*. If therefore remission of sins were obtained perfectly by the death of Christ, the mass is no sacrifice for sins. If the mass must needs be a sacrifice for sins, then remission of sins was not obtained by the death of Christ. "But the popish church's sacrifice," you say, "is of another kind than those of the Jews," and you say right. For they were ordained by God to be holy sacrifices and sacraments of remission of sins, by the only perfect sacrifice of Christ's death, but your sacrifice hath no institution of God, and is blasphemous against the only sacrifice of Christ's death. Where you say, "He maketh no opposition betwixt it and Christ's death or sacrifice on the cross in all his epistle." I answer, he maketh such opposition as is between contradictories, sacrifice and no sacrifice. For Christ's death being the only sacrifice for sin, there remaineth now no sacrifice for sin, whereas between the sacrifices of the Law, and Christ's sacrifice, he maketh such opposition as is between relatives. Because all these sacrifices did signify this only perfect and absolute sacrifice. "But rather," you say, "as a sequel of that one general oblation, covertly always he interreth the same." It is a very covert illation, that by no argument can be deduced out of his words or sentences. And it is a monstrous sequel, that one only sacrifice but once offered, never to be reiterated, after which there remaineth no sacrifice for sin, should draw after it another sacrifice, to be repeated ten thousand times every day. "But it is the selfsame host," you say, "and offering, that was done upon the cross in a different manner, and continually is wrought by the same priest." But the text is plain, that Christ offered himself but once, and that was upon the cross, and by that one oblation, he made perfect forever all that are sanctified. Therefore your device of a different manner, cannot stand with the scripture, by which it followeth that Christ offered not himself once only, but twice in his own person, and a thousand thousand times by popish priests. Seeing you have no ground in the word of God to warrant this your offering in a different manner, you may as well invent ten thousand different manners in which Christ hath or doth offer himself so often, to elude that which the Holy Ghost speaketh so plainly of Christ's one oblation but once offered, as you have invented this one different manner. But seeing the scripture testifieth, that perfect redemption is wrought by that one oblation of Christ on the cross, what need or use is there, that Christ should be often offered in any different manner? where was it ever heard in the scripture that one sacrifice should be offered by two priests? For you say, that your popish sacri-

fiſe "is continually wrought by the ſelfſame prieſt, Chriſt," and yet you ſtoutly defend, that it is offered by the popiſh prieſt that ſaith maſs, who is a prieſt after the order of Melchizedec, to offer up this ſacrifice, as Chriſt himſelf was. How can theſe blaſphemies and abſurdities, with any conſcience be maintained?

4. The fruit of Chriſt's death was never applied to the carnal Jews, which made ſuch account of their ſacrifices, without relation to Chriſt's death. But to them that eſteemed rightly of the ſacrifices of the law, the fruit of Chriſt's death was applied, as it is unto us by the Spirit of God and faith, teſtified and confirmed by thoſe ſacraments.

5. He meaneth, that God would no hoſt nor ſacrifice for ſin, to work ſatisfaction and reconciliation, but only the ſacrifice of Chriſt's body upon the croſs. Whereof the legal ſacrifices were figures and ſhadows. As for the popiſh ſacrifice of Chriſt's body upon the altar, it is a blaſphemous device of Antichriſt, whereof the ſcripture never ſpeaketh.

5. The ſcripture teſtifieth, that Chriſt's body was made for his one and only oblation upon the croſs, and not for any ſecond oblation, or infinite repetitions of the ſame oblations upon the altar. And the neceſſity of his humanity, to be a prieſt, and to have a ſacrifice, God be thanked, we underſtand ſufficiently, as alſo the neceſſity of his divinity, to make his miniſtry and ſacrifice acceptable. "But that Chriſt's body was given him, not only to be the ſacrifice upon the croſs, but alſo upon the altar, Auguſtin affirmeth." It Auguſtin affirm that for which he hath no warrant in the ſcripture, his affirmation is no ground to build our faith upon. But his words being rightly underſtood according to his meaning, which he declareth at large in other places doth nothing avail to confirm the popiſh ſacrifice. For in the former place he meaneth, that the ſacrifice of Chriſt's body, was but once offered by himſelf upon the croſs. Yet he inſtituted in the ſacrament a table, for participation of the ſame body then ſacrificed which continueth to the end of the world, wherein Chriſt is not properly ſacrificed, again, but the feaſt of Chriſt's only ſacrifice, for participation is continued in a holy memorial. For we muſt not think that Auguſtin would apply that ſcripture to the Lord's Supper, which the Apoſtle ſo evidently and properly applied to the death of Chriſt. Therefore he uſeth the word ſacrifice in ſuch ſpeeches improperly, for a ſacrament or holy ſign of that ſacrifice, not for a ſacrifice indeed. As he declareth *De Civit. lib. 10. cap. 20.* ſaying. "By this he is a prieſt, he himſelf offering, and he himſelf being the oblation. Of which thing, he would have the daily ſacrifice of the church to be a ſacrament, ſeeing he is the head of his own body, and ſhe is the body of her own head, as well ſhe by him, as he by her, being accuſtomed to be offered." In theſe words he declareth firſt, that the Lord's Supper is improperly called a ſacrifice, when indeed it is a ſacrament of the only oblation

of Chriſt. Secondly, that in this ſacrament is offered not a ſacrifice propitiatory for ſin, but a ſpiritual ſacrifice of thankſgiving, for the redemption of the church, which is ſpiritually offered by Chriſt in this ſacrifice, as Chriſt is offered by the church. His meaning alſo, of the uſe of this term ſacrifice, he ſhoweth *Epist. 23. Bonifacio.* "Was not Chriſt offered but once only in himſelf? and yet in a ſacrament, he is not only offered for the people, at every ſolemnity of Eaſter, but every day. Neither doth he lie, that being asked the queſtion, doth answer, that he is offered. For if ſacraments had not a certain ſimilitude of thoſe things, whereof they be ſacraments, they ſhould not be ſacraments at all. And of this ſimilitude, for the moſt part, they receive the names of the things themſelves. Therefore as after a certain manner, the ſacrament of the body of Chriſt is the body of Chriſt, the ſacrament of the blood of Chriſt is the blood of Chriſt, ſo the ſacrament of faith is faith." It is moſt clear by this ſaying, that the ſacrament was called a ſacrifice improperly, becauſe it is a ſacrament or holy ſign of the only ſacrifice of Chriſt's death, as alſo it is called the body of Chriſt, becauſe it is a ſign and ſacrament thereof. The place of Auguſtin, *De Trinitat. lib. 4. cap. 14.* is moſt impudently alleged, to prove that Chriſt's body was given him to be ſacrificed upon the altar, where Auguſtin ſpeaketh only of the ſacrifice of Chriſt's death, whereof he ſpake in the chapter before, where he ſaith: "By his death, that one moſt true ſacrifice offered for us, what ſins ſoever there was, for which the principalities and powers held us by right, to ſuffer puniſhment, he purged, aboliſhed, extinguished, and by his reſurrection into a new life, he called us that are predeſtinated, and being called, he juſtified us, and being juſtified, he glorified us." Therefore it is true that it is cited in the decrees of Auguſtin, *de conſec. diſt. 2. cap. hoc eſt.* "That offering of his fleſh, which is made by the prieſt's hands, is called the paſſion, death, crucifying of Chriſt, not in truth of the thing, but in a ſignifying myſtery."

8. By the ſacrifice of Chriſt once offered, all hoſts and ſacrifices are taken away: as the words of the text are manifeſt, ſeeing we are ſanctified by the oblation of the body of Chriſt once offered, *rer. 10.* That which cometh in place therefore of the old ſacrifices of the law, is the one only oblation of Chriſt's body, which was once offered, and neither can, nor need ever be offered any more.

That the Hebrews, to whom the Apoſtle writeth, in that they were Chriſtians, did refer their ſacrifices to Chriſt's only oblation, as all faithful Jews did before Chriſt's coming in the fleſh I have often proved: for elſe they ſhould have been no better than carnal Jews. And this to deny is intolerable, both ignorance and impudence in theſe Rheimiſh Papists. The words of the Apoſtle ſpoken in defence and declaration of the value and efficacy of the ſacrifice of Chriſt's death

once offered, and never to be repeated, do of themselves overthrow your blasphemous sacrifice of the mass: therefore we do no way abuse them. Wherefore, whereas you say, "The Apostle's reasons of many priests, and often repetition of the same sacrifices, concerneth the sacrifices of the law only," it is false, for they make also and much more, against all the false sacrifices of the Gentiles, and all other false sacrifices, whatsoever the devil should afterward invent by Heretics. Therefore Augustin saith. "To this highest and true sacrifice, all false sacrifice have given place," *De civit. lib. 10. c. 20.* Again the Apostle's reasons do so make against the many Priests and often sacrifice of the law, that they must give place to the only Priest and sacrifice once offered by Christ: whereas if there be infinite Priests and sacrifices, or one sacrifice infinitely repeated in the New Testament, the Apostle's reasons make nothing against the multitude of Priests and sacrifices of the law. That "he speaketh no word of the sacrifice of the mass," it is because there is none such, but against that false fiction of such a blasphemous sacrifice, he speaketh often when he speaketh of the singular priesthood of Christ, and of his one oblation once offered, whereby eternal redemption is found, and of the impossibility of reiterating the same sacrifice, because Christ can die no more. Where you say your popish sacrifice and sacrificing priesthood, "is of Christ's institution to be done daily unbloody," you have no word of God to prove such institution or manner of oblation: wherefore it is nothing else but a blasphemous invention of Antichrist, to deface the glory of Christ's only sacrifice. As for the judgment of all antiquity, if it were contrary to so clear light of the truth, as is expressed in plain words and most evident reasons in this Epistle, it were nothing to be regarded. But as I have often said and proved the ancient fathers, although they do improperly use the word of sacrifice, for that which is but a sacrament and commemoration of the only sacrifice of Christ once offered on the cross: yet do they expound themselves at one time or another, that they mean it to be only a sacrament, not a sacrifice propitiatory indeed, or else a spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. That you say our arguments were answered twelve hundred years ago, it is false: for none of the fathers of that age acknowledged your popish sacrifice of the mass. The words that are ascribed to Ambrose, are the same which are found in the commentary of Chrysostom upon the Hebrews, and do plainly declare that the celebration of the Lord's Supper is improperly called a sacrifice, being indeed a commemoration of the only sacrifice of Christ's death: and therefore it followeth, that it is rather a memory of that sacrifice, than a sacrifice indeed. "We offer not another sacrifice, as the high Priest, but the same always, but rather we work the remembrance of a sacrifice." Thus Ambrose and Chrysostom do plainly

confess, that the sacrament is improperly called a sacrifice, which is rather an exemplar, a remembrance, or memorial of that sacrifice of Christ. The saying of Primasius also you do falsify, by gelding out these words which do expound his meaning. For these are his words. "What then shall we say? do not our priests the same thing daily, while they offer sacrifice continually? they offer indeed but for the remembrance of his death. And because we sin daily, and have need daily to be cleansed, because he cannot now die, he hath given us this sacrament of his body and blood, that as his passion was the redemption and absolution of the world: so also this oblation may be redemption and cleansing, to all that offer it in true faith, and have a good intention.

He saith not, that the priests offer a sacrifice propitiatory for sin, but they are said to offer sacrifice improperly: for they offer not absolutely but unto, or for the remembrance of Christ's death.

He saith, that Christ hath given this sacrament of his body and blood, that by true faith we might apply the benefit of redemption by Christ's death unto us, seeing the sacrament is a seal of God added to his word, to confirm our faith. And this is the true meaning of Primasius, howsoever by leaving out and altering his words, you would enforce him to say another thing. Neither doth Bede, although he lived in a superstitious time, long after Antichrist did openly show himself, call the mass, the everlasting redemption of body and soul; but saith, that upon the credit of the report of one Imma, a meet argument for such a conclusion, which said he was delivered of his bonds, wherein he was held prisoner, so often as his brother Tunna caused mass to be said for him, supposing he had been dead: "Men understand, that the healthful sacrifice availed to redemption both of soul and body everlasting." The like fable telleth Gregory, *hom. 37. in Evang.* The words of Primasius that follow do show, that Christ is daily received whole of every one of the faithful, that receiveth the sacrament worthily by his divine power, not altering the nature of Christ's body, but by feeding them with it spiritually through faith. The other saying borrowed out of Chrysostom by Theophylact, Oecumenius, and the rest, doth manifestly declare, that those fathers called the celebration of the Lord's Supper, by the name of a sacrifice improperly, which they confessed to be rather a remembrance of Christ's only once offered sacrifice, than a sacrifice indeed, as that was. Wherefore though they yielded to the term that was commonly received, yet as well in their commentaries upon this epistle as in other of their writings, they declared how they understand that term: the improper use whereof is the only colour that you have in the ancient fathers for your propitiatory sacrifice: but in the scriptures you have not so much as the shadow or colour of the name of sacrifice, ever applied to the celebration of the Lord's supper. And as for the ancient

liturgies, they have not sacrifice in them of the very body and blood of Christ, but only a remembrance of the only sacrifice of Christ's death, for which they offer the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, of themselves and all that they have. The multitude of places that are quoted, are for the most part answered already in Luke, *cap. 22. Sect. 5.* The rest have nothing but the name of sacrifice, which how it was understood, I have often declared. But that which is quoted out of the first Nicene council out of the Greek is this: "In the holy table let us not basely attend the bread and cup set before us, but lifting up our minds, let us understand by faith that Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world, to be set on that holy table, to be nobly sacrificed of the priests, and that we truly taking his own precious body and blood, do believe these to be mystical tokens of our redemption. For this cause we take not much, but little, that we may know we take not to fill us, but for holiness." The very words here used do plainly declare, that Christ is not really offered in the sacrament, but *obtus*, without sacrifice, that is, by a commemoration of his death and only sacrifice. The like words they have of baptism: "Dost thou see water? understand that the power of God is hidden in the waters." Where every man seeth that the words must be understood figuratively, as it is usual in sacraments. In the libel of accusation of Dioscorus, exhibited to the council of Chalcedon by Ischyron a deacon, it is declared, that whereas the Emperors had appointed certain corn to be given to the cities of Lybia, specially that of it the sacrifice might be offered and the rest be bestowed upon the relief of the poor. Dioscorus sold the said corn at excessive prices, so that of it "neither the reverend and unbloody sacrifice was celebrated, nor the poor relieved." Here is nothing but the bare term of host and sacrifice, by which is meant the celebration of the Lord's Supper, whereof the multitude did often communicate. For else a small quantity of corn would serve to offer the popish sacrifice of the mass. In the council of Ancyra, the first canon excludeth priests from exercising their office, if they have sacrificed to idols, among which offices *offerre*, to offer is named: whereby the celebration of the Lord's Supper is signified. In the fourth canon is no word of sacrificing, but to idols. In the fifth canon is decreed, that they which in mourning garments and behaviour, have come into the temple of idols, should after three years' repentance, be received to the communion "without oblation:" that is, their oblation should not be received, as was usual to be received of other Christians that had not fallen: although Balsamon thinketh it to be meant of the participation of the Lord's Supper. In the council of Neocesarea, it is decreed, that in presence of the bishop, the priests should "not offer, nor give the sanctified bread, nor deliver the cup." Which is nothing else, but to offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving in

the ministration of the Lord's Supper. In the council of Laodicea it is decreed, that after the priest by a kiss hath given peace to the bishop, and the laymen one to another, then "the oblation should be offered." Which whether it be the distribution of the Lord's Supper, or some other oblation: certain it is that it was not the sacrifice of the mass, which is done before the Pax be given. In the 2d of Carthage, is nothing but the word *sacrificing*: which proveth no propitiatory sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ. In the 3d of Carthage it is decreed, "that in the sacraments of the body and blood of our Lord, nothing more be offered than our Lord himself delivered, that is bread and wine mixt with water: and that nothing more be offered in the sacrifices, but of grapes and corn." This decree testifieth, that the sacrifice was of bread and wine, not of the natural body and blood of Christ: also, that Christ delivered bread and wine, which overthroweth transubstantiation: as for the name of sacrifice, we have sufficiently declared how it was used. In the 4th of Carthage, is nothing but the name of "oblation," and "the consecration of the oblation:" which proveth that the oblation was not the body of Christ: for the body and blood of Christ is not consecrated, but the bread and wine to be a sacrament thereof. The counterfeit fables of Andrew and Martial, are worthy of no answer. Origen speaking of the bread of proposition, saith: "If these things be referred to the greatness of the mystery, thou shalt find that this commemoration hath effect of great propitiation. If thou return to that bread which came down from heaven, and giveth life to this world, this bread of proposition, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation by faith in his blood: and if thou look unto that commemoration of which our Lord saith: Do this in remembrance of me, thou shalt find, that this is the only commemoration that maketh God merciful to men." In these words he doth not call the sacrament a sacrifice, but a commemoration: which as it is a sacrament of Christ's death, whereby only God is reconciled unto us, so it confirmeth our faith in that reconciliation, and sacramentally reconcileth God to men. Finally the unlearned are to be admonished, that the participle which they translate here in the present time "offering," as though Christ still offered, is in the Greek of the preter tense or time past, and should have been translated after he hath offered, or having offered.

18. The apostle concludeth, that seeing remission of sins is obtained by the sacrifice of Christ's death, there remaineth now no more sacrifice for sin. Thereof it followeth inevitably, that the mass is not a sacrifice for sin; to avoid which most clear consequence, you say most impudently, the full pardon obtained in baptism is called an oblation for sin. So you will bring in the sacrifice of baptism, as you do the sacrifice of the mass. Such monstrous conclusions you invent to obscure the most clear light of the truth. For it is most



manifest, that the apostle out of the text of scripture rehearsed immediately before, concludeth, that all oblation is now taken away, because remission of sins is obtained by Christ's one oblation of himself upon the cross. Chrysostom saith, "Therefore he forgave sins, when he gave the testament; he gave the testament, by his sacrifice; if therefore he forgave sins by one sacrifice, now there is no need of the second." Theodoret saith, "Where there is remission of these things, now there is no oblation for sin; for it is superfluous after remission is given. And he promised remission, saying, Their sins and iniquities I will no more remember." Primasius referreth it to the abolishing of the sacrifice of the law, but the text is general of all oblation, and the same reason extendeth to all other sacrifices that might be invented. Photius upon this text saith, "What need is there of many oblations, when that one which Christ offered is sufficient to take away sins?" The sacrifice of the mass therefore, can never stand with the truth of this text to be a sacrifice for sin.

20. To dedicate is not always to be author and beginner of a thing. We read that divers men have been authors of the building of the temples, which other men have dedicated. The Greek word signifieth also to prepare, and so doth Ambrose translate it. And you falsely belie it, to say we hold with any heresy, that Christ was not the first man that entered into heaven with his body, or whole humanity, as the text is; and that dedicated and prepared the way for all his members to enter into heaven, both with their bodies and with their souls; by virtue of whose death, all the faithful from the beginning, were received into heavenly rest in their souls.

26. By that which followeth in amplification of this sin it is manifest, that the apostle speaketh not of every voluntary trespass, but of wilful, obstinate, and contumacious falling away from Christ, which is sin against the Holy Ghost, and shall never be remitted, either in this world or in the world to come. Therefore this text favoureth not the heresy of the Novatians, which denied repentance after baptism for any offence. "But it is most wicked blasphemy," you say, "to affirm, that wilful and general apostasy can never be forgiven." You must charge the apostle then with blasphemy, and our Saviour Christ, for their words are plain to that effect. "But the meaning," you say, "is only to terrify the Hebrews, that falling from Christ, they cannot so easily have the host of Christ's death applied unto them." His meaning indeed is to terrify the Hebrew, but he feigneth not the danger to be greater than it is, when he saith, it is impossible for them to be renewed, that have sinned against the Holy Ghost. He wanted not words to have expressed his meaning, if it had been only "of the hard sacramental penance, satisfaction, and other hard remedies that Christ hath prescribed after baptism," but never a word of them in scripture. He would not have said, it is an impossible thing,

but it is a hard matter. Yea, if he had known how easily all that hard penance, satisfaction and other hard remedies may be released by a general pardon of the pope, *a poena et culpa*, he could not justly have terrified them with the difficulty of the remedies. For the host of Christ's death is not more easily applied by baptism, than all penance and satisfaction is released by a pope's pardon. Therefore all your doctrine of hard penance, satisfaction, and other hard remedies after baptism, tendeth to non-other end but to advance the pope's pardon above the passion of Christ. That which you allege out of Cyril, is the saying of Iodocus Chetovius, author of those four books of the commentaries upon John, that are inserted in his works, to supply the want of so many books of Cyril that are lost. Wherein you, that so often charge us to write and reason so unlearnedly, so ignorantly, so foolishly, behave yourselves most ridiculously, ignorantly, foolishly, unlearnedly, and declare what judgment you have in the writings of the ancient fathers. We confess with Chetovius, that the apostle doth not take away remission of sins, ten thousand times committed after baptism, but to them that are fallen away, he denieth renewing by repentance, such as is testified by the sacrament of baptism. Which having relation to the only sacrifice of Christ's death, hath always power to assure us of remission of sins, if we do not by wilful falling away, and sinning against the Holy Ghost, make the death of Christ inefficual unto us.

It is no perilous thing to read the scriptures, for then the apostles that wrote them to be read, were authors of the peril, but for ignorant and ungodly men rashly to follow their fancy, in expounding of the scriptures, and to interpret them so as they be contrary one to another, which in the word of truth is impossible.

29. Whosoever dishonoureth the blood of Christ verily shed on the cross, or the sacrament thereof, which is the seal of the confirmation of the New Testament in the same blood, is worthy of death temporal and eternal, *Hezech. lib. 2. cap. 16. Origen in Hierom. The same hath Rabanus Maurus, in Hier. lib. 7. cap. 15.*

31. Let all Christian people be careful not to commit sin, and of such sins, as through frailty and ignorance they have fallen into, let them be truly penitent in this life, and obtain mercy by the only satisfaction of Christ, or else look for eternal damnation, by the terrible sentence of God's justice. The pains of purgatory are but a vain tormentment, to make men pay dear for Popish masses, merits, satisfactions and pardons.

34. To be merciful to the afflicted, for true religion, is a good work, which God will doubtless largely reward of his promise, not of the merit thereof. Therefore no trust is to be reposed in the merit of good works, but only in the mercy of God, which forgiveth our sins, and rewardeth his gifts in us, not our merits or deserts.

35. Good works are good testimonies of faith, by which we have confidence of salvation, by the only grace of God, and not by the merit of our works: yet have good works great reward, grounded upon God's promise, and not upon the worthiness of them. And confidence in this place, is steadfastness of faith, not in the merit of good works, but in the mercy of God, who hath given good works to be fruits of faith. Ambrose, upon verse 19, saith, "Having confidence, brethren, wherein? As sins cause shame, so forgiveness of sins causeth confidence, both that we are made fellow-heirs, and that we enjoy so great love." And upon this text he saith, "Nothing is necessary for you, but that you stand fast, and continue in your strength, which hath great reward with God." Which words Primasius repeating, saith, "Nothing is necessary for you, but steadfastness in your faith."

#### CHAPTER 11.

1. The apostle doth not give here a perfect definition of faith, but describeth it so far forth, as was necessary for his purpose of exhortation to patience. The fulness of the promise, neither the fathers before Christ, nor any since Christ, have yet received in heaven, nor shall before the general resurrection, when all the elect shall be made perfect together.

1. It followeth of necessity of the whole discourse of the apostle, that every one of the fathers believed that his sins were forgiven, and that he should be saved. For no sinner can hope to have reward of eternal life which God promiseth, except he believe that God hath forgiven his sins, which deserve eternal death. That sectmasters of contrary sects believe that they shall be saved, it is no true faith in them grounded upon God's word, but a vain persuasion, as is in the Turks, Papists, and such like, *Damasc. Orthodox. fid. lib. 4. cap. 1.* This faith is a substance of things that are hoped, an argument of things that are not seen, an undoubted and unwavering hope as well of those things which are promised unto us by God, as of the obtaining of our petitions.

1. Faith, is of such things, as God's word teacheth, that are not seen, therefore the Catholic Church, and the perpetual continuance thereof, being an article of faith is not seen. But it is not sufficient that a thing be invisible, to make it an article of faith; but it must be grounded upon the word of God. Therefore that carnal manner of presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament invisibly, being not taught in the Scripture, but confuted thereby, is no article of faith, but a gross heresy. Yet in such sort as Christ saith, the sacrament to be his body and blood, sacramentally, to assure us that we are fed spiritually with the very body and blood of Christ unto everlasting life, because it is taught in the word of God, though it be neither seen with the eye, nor to be conceived with the carnal reason of man, yet we must undoubtedly believe it.

5. Enoch was translated by God out of the world, and died not after the common manner of men.

6. Seeing God hath promised to reward all good works, which be his graces and gifts in us, not for the merit of the works, but for Christ's sake, we must undoubtedly believe that God will reward our good works, yet it followeth not that we are just by them, but only by faith in the justice of Christ imputed to us. Where you say, "that God is not an acceptor or imputer of that which is not:" it is true, if you mean that the justice of Christ which he accepteth and imputeth to us through faith, is true justice; but if you mean that God imputeth not justice unto us, except it be in us, you set yourself directly against the apostle, *Rom. 4.* who proveth by many arguments, that God imputeth righteousness to the ungodly man, by faith without works.

6. Faith causeth our works to be good and acceptable to God of his mercy, but not meritorious of their worthiness, or the worthiness of faith.

21. The apostle doth not here rehearse any text of the scripture, and therefore this question of following the Septuagint is unseasonably moved. It is true that the apostles do allege the scripture divers times out of the Greek text, that was in every man's hands, which though it differed sometimes in words from the Hebrew, yet it did always agree with it in sense. But that the Septuagint translation, where it differeth in sense from the Hebrew, or the Latin when it differeth in sense from the truth of the Hebrew or Greek, is to be received and followed, it is no better than to embrace error instead of truth: and contrary to the mind of Augustin himself, *De Doct. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 11.* though a great patron of the Septuaginta against Hierom, who acknowledged the manifold errors of that translation, and corrected many of them. Neither did all the Latin fathers follow your vulgar Latin translation, as I have proved manifestly in answer to your preface. Neither is the Hebrew and Greek of the canonical scripture that now is, any other in sense than it was always, though some corruption or alteration might be made by the scribes or writers, which of the learned and diligent, where it is any thing material, may easily be perceived. "But Calvin is not only very saucy, but very ignorant, where he saith the Septuaginta were deceived." How much more saucy then was Hierom, that not in one, but in many hundred places, findeth that they were deceived, and reformeth their errors? But wherein trow you, doth Calvin show his ignorance? "Because it is evident that the Hebrew being then without points, might be translated, as well the one way as the other." Indeed it is like the translator of that Greek text had the Hebrew without points, and so was deceived, yet the Hebrew text from the beginning had vowels, without which there could be no certainty in the reading or understanding thereof. Although they that be very

well exercised in the reading of the text with the vowels, can afterward read it without vowels, and give it the points it need be, by their knowledge of grammar, and of the sense of the text. Whereupon many books were copied and written without points, which went abroad commonly among the Gentiles. But where you say the Hebrew being without points might be translated as well the one way as the other, I would say, you show more ignorance than Calvin. Your vulgar Latin translation interpreteth the text whereof you speak, *Gen. 47. 31.* "Turning himself to the bed's head." Which he doth truly, according to the Hebrew, as you will not deny, and there can be but one truth, whereupon it followeth, that the Grecian translating it otherwise was deceived, yet it is manifest to them that have but mean knowledge in the Hebrew, that the Greek translation cannot be true, because it addeth a pronoun *αυτου* where there is no affix in the Hebrew. The apostle therefore in this place doth not rehearse the erroneous translation; but Augustin doth expound it, *Quaest. in Gen. q. 162.* he saith, "that Jacob by faith worshipped God unto the end of his staff," that is, when through weakness of age, and sickness, he leaned on his staff. So also doth the Syrian interpreter translate it. So also did divers other ancient fathers, as Procopius Gazaus testifieth, expound it. To the same effect writeth Theodoret, *Gen. q. 108.* But it is a perilous corruption, that for more plain understanding, we say in our translation, "leaning upon his staff, making Augustin's exposition, the text of holy scripture." This is nothing else but impudent wrangling, for we give the true sense of the text, agreeable to the words thereof, which is not to be liked the worse, because it is Augustin's exposition. Your Latin translation hath this word *Conversus*, which is more than the Hebrew text, yet seeing it is included in the meaning of the Hebrew text, it were extreme folly to cavil upon that word. But you will have it observed in these words, he adored the top of his rod, that adoration may be done to creatures. But that translation of the text is false, for it leaveth out the preposition *επι* which signifieth upon, or at least as Hierom translateth it, over against, or towards the top of his rod. Therefore thus writeth Hierom against your observation, "In this place, some without cause do feign, that Jacob adored the top of Joseph's sceptre, meaning that honouring his son he adored his power, when in the Hebrew, it is read far otherwise. Israel worshipped towards the bed's head, meaning, that after his son had sworn unto him, being secure of his petition, he adored God over against his bed's head." *Quaest. Heb. in Gen.*

But if the adoration of creature may not be proved by this text, you add, "that adoration may be done to God, at or before a creature." Yet that will not be proved by Jacob's worshipping towards the bed's head, or leaning upon his staff, which is the true sense of the text. But the scripture in other places saith, "adore ye his footstool, adore ye towards his

holy mount, or we will adore towards the place where his feet stood, or which the Hebrew phrase," you say, "is all one, Adore ye his holy mount, we will adore the place where his feet stood." But the true translation of these places, according to the Hebrew phrase, is, "bow down at or before his footstool, bow down at or before his holy mount, we will bow down at his footstool." It is not all one therefore, to worship or bow down, at, in, before, or toward a place, where God hath appointed his worship to be kept, as in the tabernacle, temple, mount Sion, or before the ark, which in those places is called his footstool, and to bow down to those places, or to worship those things. Neither doth it follow, that it is as lawful to worship, at or before the crucifix, relics, and images, as it was to worship at, or before the ark. For that was commanded, and appointed by God, this other is expressly forbidden in the second commandment. And Chrysostom, Occumenius, and the rest of the Greeks, that suppose Jacob to have worshipped Joseph, they speak but of a civil kind of worship, in respect of the kingdom of Ephraim, which should be raised of the posterity of Joseph, *Enchr. q. ad Heb.* Damascen, though he seek a colour to defend the idolatrous worshipping of the cross, out of this act of Jacob, yet he denieth that he did worship it with Latria, or the honour due to God. But your pope's pontifical appointing the legate's cross, to be carried on the right hand of the emperor's sword rendereth this reason, "because the honour proper to God," so the Papists define Latria, "is due unto it," *De ordin. ad recip. Imper. Processio.* So that if there were any moderation in the elder sort of them that were deceived in this point, to avoid idolatry, it is all taken away by the impudent doctrine of Antichrist.

Gregory allowed images to be in the church, but denied all manner of adoration of them, *lib. 7. ep. 9.* Damascen allowed them a kind of adoration, called Dulia, but in no wise Latria. The pope will have not only the images of God and Christ to be worshipped with Latria, but even the image of the cross. Thus by degrees, the devil hath brought idolatry in the grossest manner, at length to be allowed for God's service.

22. Joseph gave commandment concerning his bones, to testify his faith in the promise of God, for the inheritance of the land of Canaan. Whereby no superstitious translation of relics, nor idolatrous honour of saint's bones can be proved. Joseph did not command his bones to be worshipped, but to be buried in the land of promise.

26. You falsely belie the Protestants. For they do not deny that men may, or ought to do good, in respect of reward. But that the respect of God's glory, and their duty ought to move them to do good, rather than respect of reward and fear of punishment.

33. The apostle saith not, that men are just in the sight of God by working justice, but by faith they wrought justice, that is, brought forth good and just works, which through

faith were acceptable to God. And that the good works of the patriarchs, are in all this commendation specially recounted, it proveth that faith by which men are justified before God without works, as Paul proveth at large in the epistle to the Romans and Galatians, is always as fruitful of good works, and is no dead or idle faith, against which James in his epistle speaketh. Neither doth Clemens Alexandrinus say, "that the said persons were just in God's sight by faith and obedience, faith and hospitality, faith and patience, faith and humility," but only he sheweth, that faith is always declared by good works which follow it, therefore he saith, "Let us take Enoch, which being found just in obedience, was translated, and Noah which after he had believed was preserved, and Abraham which for faith and hospitality was called the friend of God and the father of Isaac. For hospitality and true religion Lot was preserved out of Sodom. For faith and hospitality Rahab the harlot was preserved. For patience and faith they walked in goats' skins, and sheep's skins, and garments woven of camels' hair, preaching the kingdom of Christ," &c. He saith not, that Enoch was made just by obedience, but in or by obedience, found and declared to be just, so he meaneth of the rest, whose works God accepted, and rewarded through their faith.

Where you acknowledge that the glorious patriarchs and all their works were commendable and acceptable only through faith, we agree with you. For thereof it followeth, that they were not just before God by their works, but only by faith, whereby only, both their persons and their works, were commendable and acceptable to him. Paul to the Romans doth plainly avouch justification by faith without works, by imputation of justice, by remission of sins as it is manifest, *cap. 3 and 4*, &c. What heretics you mean, that ignorantly and brutishly abuse against Christian works, sacrifice, and sacraments, the commendation of true faith and religion, I know not. We acknowledge good works to be the necessary fruits of true faith, yet as Augustin saith, to follow the justified man, not to go before unto justification. We acknowledge such Christian sacrifices, as the apostle teacheth to be acceptable unto God. The sacraments of Christ's institution, we acknowledge with due reverence, wherefore, if your accusation be against us, it is nothing else but malicious railing.

40. By this wrested interpretation, it should follow, that the fathers were not admitted to the heavenly joys, till the apostles were dead; not before the ascension of Christ. But the apostle meaneth that they and all the elect together, shall be consummated in glory at the second coming of Christ, when they shall be received into heaven with their bodies, as they are now in the souls. Wherefore, this place proveth not, that the patriarchs and other just men's souls were not in heaven, before Christ came in the flesh. *Fulg. ad Monim. lib. 1. cap. 15.*

## CHAPTER 12.

9. There is no word in the text, to prove that God's chastisement bringeth justification, although it render to them that are exercised by it, the peaceable fruit of justice, that is, causeth them to fear God, and walk quietly in his commandments, whereby they are not justified in God's sight, but declared to be just.

12. God scourgeth his children, not for satisfaction of his justice, but to bring them to repentance, and to cause them to stand in his fear and obedience. And this chastisement he exerciseth only in this life, which is the only time of their repentance and reformation, which is a sufficient reason, why we acknowledge no chastisement of God's children in the next life. The end of chastisement set forth in this scripture, extendeth not to the next life, therefore neither doth chastisement itself. This apostle also teacheth, that after every man's death, followeth his eternal judgment, *Ileb. 9. 27*: and thereby proveth, that Christ being once dead, can die no more, but remaineth in glory unto eternal salvation of all that believe in him. Seeing therefore after the warfare, which is only in this life, followeth the judgment, either of eternal reward, or eternal punishment, there can be no temporal chastisement after this life. And beside all other reasons and scriptures, that are brought to prove it, this one reason is sufficient, that the scripture teacheth not any chastisement of God's children after this life.

## CHAPTER 13.

2. That Christ in person of his humanity came to Gregory's table is a Heretical fable, being against the articles of our faith, concerning Christ's ascension into heaven, sitting at the right hand of God, and second coming in glory.

4. To make marriage a sacrament of the New Testament, which was instituted in the beginning of the world, is against all reason. But you so honour it, in making it a sacrament, as the Jews honoured Christ, in clothing him with a purple robe, for you say notwithstanding, that by this holy sacrament, "the sacred order of priesthood is profaned." You say it is honourable in all men, which may lawfully marry, or be married, therefore it is honourable in the ministers of the church, whom the scripture alloweth to be married. But in vowed persons, you say, it is damnable; the Apostle saith not so, but that those widows have condemnation or judgment, "which have forsaken the first faith," which is of Christianity, not of continency. But to take it most strongly for your side, that they sin damnable, which break their vow, yet marriage in them also is honourable, as Epiphanius testifieth, *Iler. 61. Hierom. ad Demetr. August. de bono viduitatus, cap. 10.*

"But the Apostle," you say, "doth not say that marriage is honourable in all men, and it is notorious to see how we do falsify the scripture." It is notorious to see how without all shame you do rail and wrangle. For

what saith the Apostle, if he say not so? You say, "We use decent in supplying the verb substantive that wanteth, making it the indicative mood." If you had but half so much learning as you take upon you, you might see that the participle *ἐστιν*, in the words following, declareth the first words to be meant affirmatively. The scope of the Apostle is plain, to dissuade men from fornication and adultery, and therefore showeth the remedy which God hath provided for man's infirmity, to be honourable and void of filthiness, therefore the verb of the indicative is more meet than of the imperative mood. For that which you infer of the exhortation to use marriage honourably and purely, followeth of the affirmative, whereby marriage is approved by God's ordinance to be such, as is also contained therein, as though the Apostle should say, use the honourable and pure remedy of marriage honourably and purely, for God will judge fornicators and adulterers. This text is taken affirmatively by Theodoret, whose words are these. "Thus law God made in the beginning. Let us make a helper for him. Therefore, when he had fashioned her, and brought her to him, he joined them together, and gave the blessing of marriage, saying, increase and multiply, and fill the earth. But intemperate and unchaste cogitation brought in adultery and fornication." Chrysostom understands the words affirmatively, saying: "When he had set down marriage to be honourable in all, and the bed to be undefiled, he showeth that he doth rightly infer those words which follow. If marriage be granted, the fornicator is justly punished." The like saying hath Occumenius, to prove that he taketh the words affirmatively. "If marriage be permitted, and is lawful to the satisfying of the lust without sin, what colour of excuse shall be to whoremongers and adulterers." *Fulg. ad Gallum de statu. vid. Epist. 2. cap. Hesych. lib. 5. cap. 18 Damas. Orth. fid. lib. 4. cap. 26.* We know our Lord blessed marriage with his presence, and him that said marriage is honourable, &c. *Theoph. Alex. Epist. Pasc. 3. Junilius.* Where it is to be noted also, that Hentenius a papist translatheth the text, "marriage is honourable." How do we then restrain the sense to our heretical fantasy, when beside the participle in the latter part of the sentence, these ancient interpreters do all understand it affirmatively. And how can you call it a heretical fantasy, to affirm that marriage is honourable in all men, and the marriage bed undefiled, when the same sense doth follow, if we should read it as words of exhortation: let marriage be honourable in all, &c. Chrysostom understanding the text affirmatively, saith that the Apostle "fighteth against heretics." Primasius saith: "There were some at that time which condemned marriage, saying, that the conjunction of marriage is unclean, and that a man cannot be clean which riseth from his wife's bed. Therefore the blessed Apostle saith, that marriage is lawful which is made for love of children, not to fulfil filthy lust, and he doth not only permit it, but also saith,

that it pleaseth God. For it is honourable marriage to marry a wife lawfully for love of children. The marriage bed is undefiled, and they that rise from it are undefiled, that is, not deriving from thence any spot of sin. It is manifest therefore, that you would avoid the plain sense of the scripture, which every way must be, that marriage is honourable, and the bed undefiled, to hide your heretical and devilish fantasy, where by you hold that "the sacred order of priesthood is profaned thereby."

Another corruption you note in our translations, "that we translate among all men, whereas the Greek may be as well of the neuter, as of the masculine gender, as Erasmus doth take it, and the Greek doctors also." But that which followeth of whoremongers and adulterers, declareth that it is to be referred to the persons, rather than the things. Although it you translate it in all things, it is more general, comprehending all persons, all states, and all offices and conditions of men. Theophylact uses these words. "Consider how great regard he hath of temperance and continency. For before making mention of holiness, he spake of it, and again after these words he will speak of fornicators and adulterers. In all therefore is not only in men of riper age, and not in young men also, but in all men, or in all means and times, not in affliction only and in rest otherwise: not honourable and precious in this part, in that part otherwise, but the whole throughout is honourable. Here heretics are made to blush, which slander matrimony. For behold he nameth marriage precious, matrimony honourable, which preserveth a man in temperance, but fornicators and adulterers God will judge. Here also with a penalty adjoined, fornication is prohibited, for God will judge them, that is, condemn them, and not unworthily. For if matrimony be permitted, the fornicator and adulterer are justly punished." The rest of the Greek interpreter's sayings are already set down, by which you see what vain quarrelling and wrangling you make to deny the due honour to matrimony.

"But the third corruption you say is most impudent, that translate, to signify all orders, conditions, states, and qualities of men." And yet that is the plain meaning of the Apostle, as appeareth by the punishment of fornicators and adulterers that followeth, and so is the judgment of all the ancient fathers that expound the text, when they say, if matrimony be permitted, the fornicator and adulterer are justly punished. Else how can fornication and adultery in all orders, conditions, states and qualities of men be justly punished, except marriage be permitted in all orders, conditions, states, and qualities, and what greater impudence can there be than this? to say, marriage is honourable in all things, and yet to except some orders, conditions, states and qualities of men, as though they were nothings, because marriage is not honourable in them. The papists therefore in their impudent quarrelling against the truth, to maintain the doctrine of devils against the honour and pu-

urity of marriage, do not only pass all heretics, but even the devils themselves: who because they have understanding, would be ashamed to grant a universal, and deny the particulars thereof. And also in flying from the masculine gender to the neuter, they are as ridiculous as Æsop's fishes, which leapt out of the frying-pan into the midst of the fire.

7. We acknowledge with the Apostle how great regard is to be had of those holy doctors and pastors that have spoken the word of God to us, or to our forefathers in the church of Christ. But neither the Apostle, nor Augustin meaneth, that we should acknowledge any for lawful bishops, that speak not the word of God. Neither that we should admit whatsoever the ancient fathers, that were lawful pastors, did say or write, beside or against the word of God. We use them therefore for confutation of heresies, as Augustin did, who also when their authority was alleged by heretics, acknowledged that there were none otherwise to be received, but as they were consonant to the holy scriptures. Therefore when Cyprian's authority was alleged by the Donatists, he said, "We do no injury to Cyprian, when we distinguish any writings of his whatsoever, from the canonical authority of the holy scriptures. For not without cause with such healthful diligence, the ecclesiastical canon is appointed, to which certain books of the prophets and Apostles do pertain, which we dare not judge at all, and according to which we may freely judge of other writings, either of faithful men or infidels." *Cont. Crescen. lib. 2. cap. 31.* And when he was pressed by his authority out of his epistles to Jubaianus, he answereth: I am not bound by the authority of this epistle, because I do not account the writings of Cyprian, as canonical scriptures, but I consider of them out of the canonical scriptures, and whatsoever in them agreeth with the authority of the holy scripture, I receive with his praise, but whatsoever agreeth not, I refuse it with his leave." So likewise when Pelagius alleged the authority of Ambrose against him he saith, "Blessed Ambrose the bishop," saith the heretic, "in whose book especially the Roman faith doth shine, which glistered as it were a certain flower, among the Latin writers, whose faith and most pure sense in the scriptures, not so much as his enemy, durst reprehend. Behold, with what and how great praises, he setteth him forth, who although he was a holy and a learned man, yet is he not in any wise to be compared with the authority of the canonical scripture." *De grat. Christi. contr. Pelag. cap. 43.* When he hath rehearsed the judgment of divers godly fathers, concerning original sin, he concludeth, saying, "I have not rehearsed these things, because we lean to the opinions of any disputers as unto the canonical authority, but that it may appear from the beginning unto this time, in which this new sect sprung, that this article of original sin was kept with such constancy with the faith of the church, that of them which handled the holy scriptures, it was

brought forth as most certain, rather to confute other errors, than it was assayed to be confuted as false, by any man." *De peccat. mer. et in remiss. lib. 3. cap. 7.* Against the Pelagians he saith he could use the testimonies of the ancient fathers, more than he doth, but that it would be too long. "And perhaps he might be thought not to have presumed so much as he ought of the canonical scriptures, from which we ought not to be removed." *De nupt. et concupis. lib. 2. cap. 29.* This judgment of Augustin we hold and follow concerning the writings of doctors.

"But this place also," you say, "is rightly used to prove that the church of God should keep the memories of saints departed, by solemn holidays and other devout ways of honour." Indeed this place showeth how we should honour saints departed, namely by imitation of their faith, but that we ought to keep holy days or any other popish ways of honouring of them, this place proveth not, neither doth any of the ancient interpreters use it to that end.

9. To preserve us from new and strange doctrines, we must look to Christ Jesus and his apostles' doctrine not to the pope's apostles or any other fathers, that teach any thing diverse or different from Christ and his apostles.

9. Christian fasts are not meats. He speaketh not only against the Jews' distinction of meats, clean and unclean, but also against all other heretical and devilish prohibition of meats, and preferring one kind of meat before another, for holiness' sake.

10. The Apostle speaketh expressly of participation of the sacrifice of Christ's death, as it is manifest in the two verses next following, which is Christian faith, and not in the sacrament only, whereof none can be partakers that remain in the ceremonial observation of the Levitical sacrifices. Therefore this place is brutishly abused, to prove that the Christians have a material altar, as the papists have many. The Apostle meaneth Christ to be this altar, who is our priest, sacrifice, and altar, and not the table whereon the Lord's Supper is ministered, which is called an altar, but improperly, as the sacrament is called a sacrifice. For he saith, "we have an altar," which is but one, whereas the popish altars and communion tables are many. "But Hesybiussaith this altar is the altar of Christ's body." You abuse Hesybius, for he saith that the altar is the body of Christ itself: such a one may not come neither to the veil nor to the altar, that is, to the body of Christ, to do the ministry thereof. For that hath Paul written to the Hebrews, taught to be the veil and the altar." The same he saith, *lib. 1. cap. 4.* "Know thou that Paul understandeth that the intelligible altar is the Lord's body, for he saith, we have an altar whereof they have no power to eat, which serve the tabernacle, namely, the body of Christ, for it is not lawful for the Jews to eat of it. This altar of necessity is in the entrance of the tabernacle of witness, that is the entrance of the heavens,

because we have entrance into the heavens by him." It is manifest therefore that Hesy-chius meant not the popish altars, but the body of Christ in heaven, the mystery whereof is celebrated on the Lord's table, which of the ancient fathers is called indifferently a table, as it is indeed, and an altar, as it is improperly. But that it is called of them a table, and was indeed a table made of boards, and removeable, set in the midst of the people, not placed against a wall, I have showed sufficiently, by the testimonies of the ancient fathers before.

15. We acknowledge that among other sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving, the celebration of the Lord's Supper, is a special sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for the only sacrifice for sin, offered by Christ himself upon the cross, without the gates of Jerusalem. And so did the ancient fathers mean, when they called it a sacrifice as appeareth by those sentences taken out of Augustin, which you recite, and many other in him and the rest of the fathers; who never meant that the natural body of Christ was offered in sacrifice for sin, or made present by the words of the priest, but unto the worthy receivers spiritually by faith. Therefore they found neither the mass, nor the Popish sacrifice propitiatory in any text of the scripture, where they speak only of a common thanksgiving, nor yet the Popish order of sacrificing priesthood for sin, when Augustin saith, "That the sacrifice according to the order of Melchisedee is "the sacrifice of praise." And doubtless, if Melchisedee did sacrifice that bread and wine which he brought forth, it was not for sin, but a sacrifice of praise for the victory granted to Abraham. So that these sayings of Augustin do manifestly overthrow your Popish propitiatory sacrifice of the mass, and do expound his meaning in other places where he calleth the communion a sacrifice that he meaneth not a sacrifice for sin, but a sacrament and a sacrifice of praise or thanksgiving only.

16. *Promeretur* passively taken, as it is by your vulgar interpreter, is no Latin word, but a barbarous term, the Greek word signifieth to be well pleased, and not God's favour to be procured by works of alms or charity, as by deserts or merits of the doers. "But the Greek maketh no more for us than the Latin," you say, "for if God be pleased with good works, and show favour for them, then are they meritorious." But where doth the text say that God showeth favour for good works. God is pleased with good works, because they are agreeable to his commandments, and he accepteth our obedience as an acceptable sacrifice and thanksgiving, for Christ's sake, by whom we offer the same. And he rewardeth good works for his promise sake, but he showeth favour, or giveth grace freely, and for his own mercy's sake in Christ our Redeemer. The antiquity of this term cannot make it a true translation, when it differeth

from the original tongue. Primasius though he used the term after the vulgar translation, yet he understandeth it according to the truth, as among the vulgar people it was taken in his time. Therefore he saith: "By such sacrifices and gifts of alms," *Deus promeretur adipisci*, "God is pleased to receive them," that is, God vouchsafeth to accept such sacrifices of alms and beneficence: he saith not that God showeth his favour, or giveth his grace for such, or that they be meritorious, or procure God's favour, as by the deserts and merits of the doers. So that Primasius hath your term, but not in your heretical meaning.

17. The obedience which the apostle here requireth, we acknowledge that it ought to be yielded by Emperors and Kings to the overseers or pastors of their souls. But hereof it followeth not, that priests and prelates are exempt from obedience of civil powers, for if they have souls, Paul biddeth every soul submit himself to the higher powers: *Rom. 13.* Nor that emperors and kings may not subscribe and give laws of religion to bishops and priests, whom also in matters of religion they ought to obey. But the authority and obedience of each is established, and one ought not to hinder another. For neither the prince must prescribe such laws of religion to bishops as he listeth, but such as may require the only true religion of God, to be exercised according to his word. And these laws the bishop is bound to obey in pain of damnation. Neither must the bishop require what doctrine soever he teacheth to be accepted and believed of the prince, but only that which is agreeable to the holy word of God: which true doctrine the prince is also bound to believe and follow, in pain of damnation. And if any priest or prelate teach or do otherwise, he is to be punished by the prince's authority, who hath charge to see both the tables of the law to be observed and kept of all his subjects, and to punish the offenders. Therefore there is nothing more agreeable to the word of God, and the law of nature, than that the prince should be obeyed of all his subjects, specially in matters pertaining to religion and godliness. For if he command or decree anything against true religion, it is no more to be obeyed, than the false doctrine of a priest or prelate is to be believed. That princes, in matters of soul and religion may command prelates, we have manifest examples in the scripture, of Moses, David, Solomon, Jehoshaphat, Ezechias, Jasias, who all commanded the high priests, and other priests in matters of religion, according to the word of God. Therefore it is no heretical confusion of the different states, but the avoiding of Antichristian tyranny, that we teach, when we affirm that the prince is to be obeyed in all causes, and of all persons, which notwithstanding, the obedience here commanded remaineth wholly untouched.

## ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT OF THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

The error of only faith, against which Augustin writeth, was of them that thought the profession of Christian religion, how wickedly soever they lived, was sufficient to salvation: against which this Epistle and the other were written. But of justification by the mere grace of God, through faith without works, Augustin is a most earnest defender against the Pelagian heretics that sprang up in his time. And even in that book *De fide et operibus*, where he speaketh of the former error, when he saith, *cap. 11*, that good works "do follow him that is justified, they do not go before him that is to be justified," he showeth plainly, that a man is justified before God by faith only, and not by good works. Nevertheless, we acknowledge that not faith only, but good works also are necessary for them that are justified, to declare that they are just. In which sense the apostle teacheth that good works do justify before men, as faith only doth justify before God. But that it is possible to keep all the commandments of God,

and to abstain from all mortal sin, the apostle saith not, it is the devilish heresy of the Pelagians, against which Augustin writeth his book *De perfectione justitiæ contra celestium*, especially after the sixteenth reason. We deny God to be author of sin, or of temptation to sin, as the apostle doth, yet as a just judge he leadeth the reprobate into temptation, from which Christ hath taught us to pray. To convert them that go astray, it is a good work, greatly acceptable to God, but the apostle doth not teach it to be meritorious. He exhorteth to repentance, and acknowledging of our sins one to another, but not unto Popish penance, or auricular confession. Though James had special oversight over the church of Jerusalem, yet he had not that power and charge over the Jews that the old high priest had, but such as Christ gave to every one of his apostles. Yea the primacy of the circumcision was specially allotted to Peter, though James had also a fatherly care over all Christian Jews.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

This title is no part of the word of God, though it be in the Greek copies, no more than that which is written under the Epistles of Paul, showing whence they were written, which sometimes is found to be untrue, and is of yourselves controlled in the argument upon the First to the Thessalonians, where the Greek postscript is from Athens, which you hold was from Corinth. Therefore the omission of this title is no offence at all. And seeing you confess it is not wholly the same in sense as it is in the creed, to translate it as we speak in the creed, were willfully to give occasion of error to the ignorant, which by translating it truly, according to the meaning of the word, is easily avoided. But in truth it signifieth the same here which it doth in the creed, that is, general and universal. So doth Oecumenius expound this title, saying: "These Epistles are called Catholic, that is, universal or general, because the company of our Lord's disciples do not dedicate these Epistles to one nation or city, distinctly, as Paul doth to the Romans or Corinthians, but universally to the faithful, either to the Jews that were dispersed, as Peter also doth, or else to all Christians living under the same faith." By this it appeareth, that this title is improperly given to the seven Epistles, which agreeth only to five, for the two latter Epistles of John are inscribed to two singular persons, or unto their families at the most. But where you say we abhor the word Catholic, it is a rotten and frivolous cavil: for how can we abhor that word which we teach our children to say in their English creed, and repeat so often in our prayers?

## CHAPTER I.

6. The Protestants prove, that men must pray for nothing, but according to God's will and promise, and not to doubt of God's truth, in performing his promise. But in respect of our own worthiness, we ought to ask nothing. Oecumenius upon this text, saith, "If he have faith, let him ask, but if he doubt, let him not ask, for he shall not receive, which distrusteth that he shall receive. When thou askest any thing of God, do thou not doubt at all, saying with thyself, how can I ask and receive of the Lord any thing, which have sinned so often against him? Think not these things, but be converted unto the Lord, with thy whole heart, and ask of him without doubting, and thou shalt know the multitude of his mercies."

13. God is no way the author or mover of men to sin: but as a just judge he not only permitteth, but also leadeth unto temptation, these whom he giveth over unto Satan, therefore he hath taught us to pray, "Lead us not into temptation."

13. The Apostle's conclusion being plain of itself, is more plain, when the word is translated passively. For then a reason is given why God tempteth no man to evil, because he is so pure from evil, that he cannot be tempted thereof, much less be a tempter and inciter of other men unto it. Therefore it is nothing else but a devilish surmise, that the Protestants translate the word passively, because they would diminish the force of the Apostle's conclusion. But why then doth Hentenius a Papist, in his translation of Oecumenius translate the word in the text passively?



and Oecumenius out of the consent of the Greek fathers interpret it passively! but that the right signification of the word, doth require it so to be understood. "God," saith he, "cannot be tempted of evil according to that which is said of one, although he be a stranger from us, and a stranger from the faith, the divine and blessed nature neither suffereth troubles, nor offereth to another." Beside this, except the word be taken passively, the Apostle saith one thing twice immediately together, without any cause of such vain repetition. Whereas taking it passively, there is good reason and perfect coherence with the words going before and after. For God is so far from tempting unto evil as his divine nature is incapable of any temptation of evil. For temptation to evil cannot come from God, except it were first in him, but seeing it cannot be in God, it cannot proceed from him.

15. We see there is distinction of concupiscence from actual sin, as of the mother from her daughter, but yet as one serpent conceiveth and bringeth forth another serpent, so both the mother and daughter are sin, and Paul plainly testifieth that concupiscence is sin. *Rom. 7. 7.*

15. It cannot be concluded out of this place, that concupiscence, or any other sin deserveth not damnation, when of all sin in general, it is said, the soul that sinneth shall die, and the wages of sin is death; *Ezek. 18. Rom. 7.*, but that there be degrees of sin, and that actual sin bringeth unto more grievous damnation, except there be repentance. Our Saviour Christ condemneth lust of the eye for adultery, and anger for murder. *Matt. 5.*

25. Unto eternal beatitude or salvation, well working is necessary, in them that hear the Gospel: yet David saith, the beatitude of a man to whom God imputeth justice, is without works. *Rom. 4. 6.*

25. The Pope is such a libertine as refuseth to be under any temporal ruler, or spiritual; yea, he refuseth to be under the whole church of Christ on earth, but will be head and ruler thereof.

27. We teach also, that pure religion standeth not only in words, but in faith, and in works also, yet Christ only is our justice, and through him we are justified before God by faith without works. *Rom. 3.*

#### CHAPTER 2.

10. All men that look to be justified by the works of the law, are bound to keep the law in such perfection as God's justice requireth, which is not possible for any mortal man in this life to perform. Therefore by this text it is proved, that no man can be justified by the works of the law, because no man can fulfil the law perfectly. *Aug. de pecc. merit. et remis. lib. 2. cap. 12. De sp. et liter. cap. 2. Hensch. lib. 4. cap. 13.*

13. Faith in the merits of Christ giveth us more hope of mercy in the next life, than the works of alms, charity, &c. although these works being testimonies of true faith, shall

undoubtedly be rewarded in the life to come, with everlasting salvation. And that is the meaning of Augustin, *De pecc. merit. et remis. lib. 2. cap. 3.* But that the pains of purgatory are to be avoided, or mitigated by such works, he saith not in either of the places. And because you say, he declareth that venial sins be washed away in this world, with daily works of mercy, you shall hear what he saith, *De Civit. lib. 21. cap. 27.*, against the persuasion of them, which thought that no sins should hurt them, if they gave alms, as though there were such merit therein: "Even those just men, which lived in so great holiness, that they received others into eternal tabernacles, to whom they are made friends of the mansion of iniquity, that they should be such were delivered of mercy, by him which justifieth the ungodly man, imputing reward according to grace, and not according to debt. What manner of life that is, and what be those sins which do so let the attaining to the kingdom of God, that yet by the merits of their holy friends they obtain pardon, it is hard to find out, and most dangerous to define. I for my part, unto this time, having busied myself much about them, could never come to the finding out of them, and perhaps they are unknown for this cause, lest the desire of going forward to avoid all sins should wax slothful."

Thus Augustin teacheth neither Purgatory nor the merit of good works in this place, nor yet the washing away of venial sins by alms, when he cannot define what sins they are that are purged by alms, or obtain pardon by other men's deserts.

14. The whole passage of the apostle maketh nothing against justification by a lively faith only, which worketh by love, but against a vain persuasion of a dead faith, that is void of good works and not available to salvation. Therefore there was no cause why Luther should reject this Epistle, as he did in a manner at the first, but afterward upon better consideration, did acknowledge it, which fault was not so great in him as in Eusebius, who doth absolutely reject it as a bastard, and none of the apostle's writing. *Hist. lib. 2. cap. 29.* Yet is Eusebius, notwithstanding that his error, allowed for a Catholic writer. That Calvin followeth not Luther in this matter, is because he acknowledgeth no master of doctrine but Christ. It is for Papists to defend all blasphemies of Antichrist, to whom they are sworn: true Catholics love truth only in their dearest friends, and in their own writings so well, that they are ready to retract them, if they find by the word of God, that they have erred from the truth. That we use no impudent shifts or vain glosses, but good and sound distinctions, to declare the doctrine of this Epistle not to be repugnant to the holy scripture in other place, it shall appear when we come to the matter. But the other, you say, would not have denied the book, if they had thought those vulgar evasions could have served. According to your own wicked hearts you judge

of other men's intents which you know not. Might they not be deceived by so clear a censure of Eusebius, that it is a bastard, with other reasons that he legeth? But by denying the Epistle you conclude, "that they show themselves to be Heretics." As though Eusebius by denying the Epistle, showed himself to be a Heretic: if Eusebius by denying the Epistle, did not show himself to be a Heretic, why more they? Hierom did not receive the Epistle to the Hebrews absolutely, and many other of the Latin church, as he saith, doubted thereof; *Ergo*, they were Heretics. *Matt. 26.* "If any man," saith he, "will receive that Epistle, which is written under the name of Paul to the Hebrews." *Epist. ad Tit. cap. 1.* But it is not sufficient for you to amplify the error of Luther, which he himself afterward reformed, in refusing this book, but you are offended also with Calvin, Beza, and other for defending the authority thereof, and of the Apocalypse against them that allege vain reasons to discredit them. But why so, I pray you? "They sit as it were in judgment of the scriptures, to allow or disallow at their pleasures." So doth Antichrist your king, not only to give authority, but also to give what sense it pleaseth him, to the books of holy scriptures. These men defend the Canonical books, and discern them from the Apocryphal, not only by the consent and judgment of the church of God, both before Christ and after: but also by the Spirit, wherewith the true books of God are endited, which when it is always consonant unto itself, discovereth the erroneous spirit of man in the Maccabees, and such other Apocryphal writings.

14. The apostle teacheth in this chapter, that such a faith as is void of good works shall not justify any man; and that as a man is justified in the sight of God by faith only, so he must be declared to be just or justified before God and man by good works, which are the necessary effects of justifying faith.

20. Then he speaketh not to Paul, which saith a man is justified by faith, without works, *Romans, 3.* Nor to all the ancient fathers, which hold the same doctrine, among which many have affirmed in the same sense, that a man is justified by faith only. And so do we say; therefore he speaketh not against us. But he speaketh to those heretics and Libertines, old and new, that held that a man was justified by a faith void of good works, such as is in the devil's, and such as Papists count to be the Catholic faith, namely, to acknowledge all the articles of the creed to be true, though a man have no trust in the mercy of God, neither doth apply them to his own benefit and comfort.

21. The apostle writeth against them, that thought to be saved by such a faith as is void of good works, and so is dead, and no true faith, but a feigned faith, or else such a faith as is in devils, namely an acknowledging that there is one God, and so likewise of all the rest of the articles of faith to be true, without

trust or confidence in God. Their vain error therefore the apostle confuteth, and showeth that faith, whereby a man is justified before God without works, though it have no good works going before; yet it hath good works following, by which the justified man's faith is showed, and he declareth to be just, or justified before men.

Therefore whereas Paul showeth, that Abraham was justified before God, by faith without works, James showeth, that Abraham was justified before men also through works, that is, declared to be just, when he offered his son. Where the scripture saith, that God tempted or proved Abraham, not that he might know any thing whereof he was ignorant, but that Abraham might by his obedience and works declare before all the world, that he was a just man, and was justified, that is, declared or showed to be just by works, as he was before just in the sight of God by faith, without works.

Now Augustin saith, that the heresy of only faith justifying or saving, was in the apostles' time, &c., he declareth plainly, that the heresy was of them that thought they might be saved or sanctified by such a faith as is void of good works. "Let us see therefore that point," saith he, "which must be beaten from religious hearts, lest with evil security they lose their salvation, if they shall think that only faith doth suffice to obtain, and shall neglect to live well, and to hold the way of God in good works." This is the opinion of only faith, against which Augustin writeth, and which we, as much as Augustin detest, and accurse unto the deepest pit of hell. But that we are justified before God, by faith only without works, in the same chapter he teacheth most plainly, "When the apostle saith, that he thinketh a man to be justified by faith, without the works of the law, he meaneth not that after faith is received and professed, the works of justice should be contemned, but that every man may know, that he may be justified by faith, although the works of the law have not gone before; for they follow him that is justified, they go not before him that is to be justified." And this is the doctrine of justification by faith only, that we teach with Augustin.

Neither do the apostles, James, John, Jude, or Peter, require good works as necessary to be done of all that shall be saved, more than Paul himself doth in every one of his epistles, and namely in the epistles to the Romans, Galatians and Ephesians, where he treateth most of justification, by the mere grace of God, and faith only without works. Therefore those libertines wickedly took offence at his writings, where he gave none. Abraham therefore was justified before God, by faith without works, not that his faith was void of good works, but that God respected not the merit of his works, but only his mercy in Christ Jesus, imputing his righteousness to him through faith. Abraham was also justified by good works in the sight of men, when he brought forth the fruits of God's grace

freely given unto him, and of justification before God by faith without works. For in one kind of justification it cannot be said, that he was justified both by faith and by works, seeing the apostle saith he was justified without works. Therefore there be two several kinds of justification, whereof these two apostles speak, the one whereby God justifieth the ungodly man, imputing faith to him for justice without works, as he did to Abraham; the other whereby man declareth himself to be just by the fruits of faith, which are the works of obedience.

22. No man that I know, holdeth that good works are pernicious to salvation or justification. But that the trust and confidence in the merit of good works is pernicious to salvation, our Saviour Christ teacheth, *Luke 18. 9.* Therefore they be not meritorious, nor the causes of justification, yet necessary to salvation, as the way wherein God hath prepared that we should travel unto salvation, and be necessary effects and fruits of a godly faith.

Augustin, *epist. 85.* "A godly faith will not be without hope, and charity." *De fide. et oper. cap. 23.* "Good life is inseparable from faith, which worketh by love. Faith and charity cannot be severed asunder," saith Bede upon this chapter. "But all these fictions, falsehoods, and sleights are refuted by these words of the apostle." How I pray you? he saith faith worketh together with good works. The-reef we might rather conclude, that justifying faith is never void of good works: but where you say, "both jointly concurring as causes and workers of the same kind of justification before God." You say it of your own head, the apostle saith it not, neither can it be concluded of his words, yet go you on and say, "that he maketh works the more principal cause, when he resembleth faith to the body, and works to the soul." But that the apostle doth not, but resembleth works to the fruit, which declareth the body to have a soul in it: the life of our justification therefore is faith, the fruits are good works. The apostle therefore saith not, that faith wrought with his deeds in the act of justification before God, but that after he was justified before God by faith imputed to him for justice, his faith wrought by and with his deed, declaring the same before men.

This showeth Bede of the two kinds of justification before God by faith without works, and before men, where faith is showed by works writing upon this text, "Of this testimony Paul to the Romans reasoned most strongly, showing manifestly, that the virtue of faith is so great, that it is able immediately after he hath understood the mysteries thereof, to make of an ungodly man a just man: for because Abraham with great and fervent faith believed God, that he was ready in his mind to do all things that God commanded, his faith was worthily reputed of God, which knew his heart for justice. And that we also might know his faith, by which he was justified, God tempted him, commanding him to offer his son, and his faith was perfected by

his deeds, that is to say, by perfect execution of works, it was proved to be in his heart." Oecumenius upon this place saith, "that Abraham was an image of justification, which is by faith only, when it was imputed to him for justice that he believed, and of that justification which is of works, when he offered his son upon the altar." Therefore, the two apostles speak of two diverse kinds of justification, the one by faith only, the other by works, which is a declaration and trial of the other.

23. The apostle saith not, that Abraham by his works was made the friend of God, but that he was so known to men, and therefore truly called the friend of God. Neither do we say, that Abraham by his works was approved or declared to be just before men only, for he was so approved by God also. But he was justified or made just by God through faith only, and not by his works, when God imputeth faith to him for justice without works, *Rom. 4. Anselm. de excel. 6. Virg. Marie.*

24. This proposition is not directly opposite or contradictory to that which we hold, no more than those two sayings of Christ. "The Father is greater than I, and I and the Father are one." No more is this saying of James, Abraham was justified by works, contrary to that which Paul saith, that he was justified by faith without works. For both the sayings are true in divers respects, and we believe both: for where the respect is not the same, there is no opposition or contradiction. We say therefore with Paul, a man is justified by faith without works, which is all one as it he said by faith only. And we say with James, a man is justified of works, and not of faith only, which saying in divers respects and acceptations of this word, justifying, are true. In Paul it signifieth to be made just by God's imputation. In James it signifieth to be declared just, as well before men, as in the sight of God.

Neither is it possible to reconcile the appearance of opposition, which is between the two apostles' sayings, but in this manner. For to say, as the Papists do, that a man is justified both by faith and works, cannot possibly stand with that which Paul saith: A man is justified by faith without works. But James saith not, that a man is justified by works without faith, which he might as rightly say as Paul, without works, if he meant of the same justification, but he saith, a man is not justified by faith only.

Therefore he meaneth, that a man is not justified before God for a solitary faith, which is void of good works, but by a living and working faith, inasmuch that by works also, he is declared to be just, which is one signification of that term of justifying usual in the scriptures, *Matt. 11. 19. Luke 7. 29, &c.*, and therefore is justified by works, and not by faith only. But you say, there is not the like contradiction between the two apostles, because Paul never saith, a man is justified by faith only. But when he saith, a man is just-

fied without works, it is the same that we mean when we say by faith only.

And these words of James, Abraham was justified by works, are in form of speech directly contradictory to that Paul defendeth, Abraham to be justified by faith without works, or not of works, though in sense they be not, because the one useth the word justify in one sense, the other in another sense.

Where you say Paul never meaneth, that by faith which is alone a man is justified, we agree with you; for we hold, that a man is justified by faith, which worketh by love, yet not of the merit of works, but of the free grace of God. "But concerning works also," you say, "there is a difference betwixt the first justification whereof Paul speaketh specially, and the second whereof James specially treateth." This difference will never discharge the apostles of contradiction, that a man is justified by works, and that a man is justified without works, yea, saved not of works, but of grace, so long as you mean both these justifications to be before God in one acceptation of the word justification. Beside, that the scripture teacheth but one justification unto glorification and salvation, which is that which you call the first.

For that you allege out of the Apocalypse 22, "He that is just, let him be more justified," though it were meant of the same kind of justice, yet it cannot serve you to ground a second kind of justification upon it, because comparison of greater or lesser doth not make a several kind. It declareth therefore an increase in the same kind of justification, and not a new kind of justification. It is an exhortation therefore, that he which is just, declare himself more and more to be just, and increase in the works of justice.

"The fathers, you confess, do sometimes say, we are justified by faith only, or faith only doth justify, &c., but they have a far other meaning than we," and then you say, they exclude this and that, which is true, for only faith justifying, excludeth all those things, but they exclude also the merit of good works, which the apostle doth exclude, and that is it which we would have. But to follow you in particulars, "they never exclude," say you, "from justification and salvation, the co-operation of man's free will."

To pass over your pelting sophistry, in joining together justification and salvation, of which although the latter do follow of the former, yet they are diverse things, and in reasoning are to be distinguished: I say only faith doth not exclude the consent of our will. Which of unwilling by the grace of God is made willing, to accept justification and salvation, but it excludeth the merit or power of man's captive will, which without the grace of God, "availeth to nothing, but to sin," as Augustin often teacheth. And especially he handleth this point of purpose, that our will in believing unto justification and salvation, is not of that natural freedom of will, but of God's grace. *De sp. et liter. cap. 33 and 34.*

You say further, "they do not exclude the dispositions and preparations of our hearts by prayer, penance, and sacraments." I answer, they acknowledge but one justification before God unto salvation, even that whereby God justifieth the ungodly, which you call the first justification: for of the second they never heard, nor any Papist, till within these few years, therefore they exclude all disposition and preparation of men's hearts by prayer or any other means, of which nothing can be good that proceedeth from an ungodly man, therefore can have no co-operation with God, in justifying the ungodly man by faith only without good works.

You add further, "they do not exclude the virtue of hope and charity, the purpose of well working, and the observation of God's commandments." Neither do we exclude them from following justification, and the justified man, but "they go not before unto justification, or the man to be justified," saith Augustin, therefore in justification they exclude them. You say, "much less they exclude the works and merits of the children of God proceeding of grace and charity, after they be justified, and are now in his favour." Seeing they acknowledge justification by grace, by faith only without works, although they exclude not the works of God's children to follow justification, to the reward of eternal life, which God hath promised: yet in the very act of justification, which goeth before such works, they must needs exclude such works from justifying, or being meritorious of justice, which is God's free gift in Jesus Christ. A few sentences of the fathers I will rehearse, that their meaning may appear to be clearly as ours is, against all your cavils. *Origen. Rom. lib. 3. cap. 3.* "The apostle saith, that the justification of faith alone doth suffice, so that he which believeth only, is justified, although he have fulfilled no work: wherefore it standeth us upon, that take in hand to defend the apostle's writing to be perfect, and all things therein to stand with good order, to inquire who hath been justified by faith only, without works. Therefore for example's sake, I think that these is sufficient, which being crucified with Christ, cried to him from the cross, Lord Jesus remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom. Neither are there any good works of his described in the Gospel, but for this faith only, Jesus said unto him, this day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Where it is to be noted, that although this thief had no good works going before faith, yet proceeding of faith, he had as many, as the time and case wherein he was permitted, namely, the fear of God, acknowledging of his sin, invocation, reprehension of his fellow, &c. *Hilarius Matt. Can. 8.* "It moved the Scribes, that sin was forgiven by man: for they beheld a man only in Jesus Christ, and that to be forgiven by him, which the law could not release: for faith only doth justify." Here you see justification by remission of sins: the like assertion he hath, *Can. 21.* Gregory Nazianzen af-

firmeth the same, *de modest. in descept. Car. de rebus suis*, speaking in the person of the Publican, that prayed with the Pharisee, saith, "Works shall not save me, but let thy grace and thy mercy drop upon me profligate man, which only hope, O King, thou hast given to miserable sinners." Here you see, grace and mercy the only hope of sinners. *Basil. de Humil. Hom. 51*, "This is a perfect and full rejoicing in God, when a man doth not boast himself of his own justice, but knoweth himself to be void of true justice, and to be justified by only faith in Christ." Ambrose among a great number of places hath these words, in *1 Cor. cap. 1*. "It is so appointed of God, that he which believeth in Christ, shall be saved without works, receiving forgiveness of sins by faith alone." Chrysostom oftentimes affirmeth the same, and speaking of Abraham he saith, *Gal. c. 3*, "If he before the time of grace were justified by faith, and that when he flourisheth in good works, much more we." *Tim. Hom. 3*, he saith, "If thou trust unto faith, why bringest thou in other things, as though faith alone sufficed not to justice?" Hierom against the Pelagians saith, *lib. 1*, "We are just, when we confess ourselves to be sinners, and our justice consisteth not of our own merit, but of God's mercy." In the commentary upon Paul's Epistles ascribed to Hierom, justification is often attributed to faith only, and to show that he excludeth all merit of works, he saith, *epistle ad Gal. cap. 1*, "By grace alone you are saved through faith;" and *chap. 2*, "Grace is cast away, if faith only suffice not."

25. Rahaò was justified as Abraham was, before God by faith only, through which faith she brought forth that work which is here commended, whereby she was declared to be just. Paul to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and others, writing to Christians, how they are justified and saved, doth not only confute the errors of the Jews and philosophers, but of the Pelagians, Papists, and all other heretics, that teach a man to be justified before God by his works, and not by the only grace of God through faith.

26. We feign no such fables as you dream. We say the apostle speaketh partly of a feigned faith, which how vain it is, he proveth by feigned charity: partly of that faith which is an assent, that the principles of religion are true, which is a kind of faith, but such as is in devils, which tremble at God's justice, but do not embrace his salvation, and this is void of good works, and is a dead faith, not a justifying faith. It standeth you upon to make much of this faith, for this is your Popish faith, not differing from the devil's faith, therefore you charge us with impudency, in "saying that the faith of which the apostle disputeth, is no true, or properly called faith." Whereunto I answer, that if a dead man may truly and properly be called a man, then this is a true and properly called faith, which the apostle calleth a dead faith: yet is it not that faith which Paul affirmeth

to justify without works, though it be not without works after it have justified. But it is the same you say, that "Paul defined and commended, *Ibb. 11*, and the same which is called the Catholic faith." That it is not the same that the apostle commendeth, nor the true Catholic faith, it is manifest by this reason. That faith which the apostles commendeth, is it by which all the patriarchs pleased God, who pleased him not with a dead faith, nor with such a faith as is in devils: therefore it is not the same faith. That faith hath trust and confidence in God, that he is a rewarder of them that seek him, this faith hath not, nor without this trust can have that information or life by charity, of which you speak. For no man can love God, except he first believe that he is, and that he will be good unto him. And that faith indeed doth justify which worketh by love: but love and charity is not the form or life of it, but a fruit and effect of it. For the apostle in this similitude doth not make faith the body, and works the soul: but works the argument of the life and soul of faith, which is trust in God, that is lacking in the devils, in whom is knowledge of the truth, that you call the Catholic faith, which is the body only without life, except there be trust and confidence, which is the life of it, declaring itself by the works, as the life of a tree by leaves, flowers, and fruits. Didymus Alex. upon this text saith, "It is to be noted, that when faith is dead without works, it is also no faith, for a dead man is not a man. But here some men saying, that the spirit is the cause whereby the body liveth, say it is more honourable than the body, and consequently affirm, that works which give life to it, are more honourable than faith. I have studied more earnestly to set forth what I think. For though without doubt the spirit is better than the body, yet without controversy, works are not to be preferred before faith, seeing a man is saved by grace, not of works, but of faith." Out of this fragment of Didymus, it appeareth, that he accounted that to be no true faith which was void of good works, and that he esteemed not works or charity to be the soul or form of faith. *Dimas. de orthod. fid. lib. 4. cap. 9*. Faith without works is dead, and so likewise works without faith are dead. For a true faith is tried and approved by works. But you are well assured, that the "apostle speaketh not of the special faith which we hold only to justify." This confession, though from the devil's mouth, is true. For that faith which we teach to justify, is no dead faith, is not in devils, is not void of good works. But neither "Paul, nor any sacred writer," you say, "ever spake or knew of any such forged faith." What say you, is it a forged faith for every man to believe the general promises of God to pertain unto him? when Christ saith, "He that believeth and is baptized," &c. Did not Peter and every one of the apostles that believed and were baptized, firmly believe that they should be saved? Yes verily, they believed all, and every one

said with David, "I have believed, therefore I have spoken," and they taught all Christian men so to believe, and your general faith is nothing better than infidelity. Judas after he had betrayed Christ, believed that he was just, the devils believed that he was the Son of God. What lack is there in the devils' faith? You will say love, which is true, but it is not all the truth. For how they love him of whom they look to receive no benefit but condemnation? Therefore the devils lack faith, that is trust and confidence in God, that he is their merciful Father to save them: which faith whosoever hath, cannot but love God, and all that God hath commanded to be loved for his sake. This is therefore the only true justifying faith of all Christians, not only to know God to be, and Christ to be a Saviour; but to believe that God is their God, and Christ is their Saviour, according to whose most certain and comfortable promises, they look steadfastly to be saved.

#### CHAPTER 3.

1. Luther, Zuinglius and Calvin were all scholars of Christ, and therefore might not follow one another further, than they follow Christ. They are not many masters who all teach the doctrine of Christ, at least in the chief and necessary articles unto salvation.

#### CHAPTER 4.

8. It is no heretical boldness to add a word to supply the sense, which needs must be understood.

8. Man hath no free will to endeavour to come to God, without the grace of God. The Apostle speaketh to Christians, whose will by grace is begun to be enlarged, that they may endeavour to come daily nearer and nearer to God. Although the will of man, is always free from constraint, but not from thralldom and bondage to sin.

8. Man working by the grace of God, derogateth nothing from his honour. But he that thinketh he cleanseth his heart by any strength of his own, and not by the grace of God only, derogateth from the grace of God which is the only author of goodness in us: for of ourselves, as of ourselves, we are not apt to think any thing, 1 Cor. 3. 5. Therefore papists do manifestly derogate from the glory of Christ's death, when they attribute such effects to their own works, or other helps whatsoever, as the scripture maketh the proper effects of Christ's death, as satisfaction for sins by merits and penance, propitiation by masses, release by pardons, &c.

#### CHAPTER 5

14. We translate the Greek word here, as we do in other places, truly for the elders by office, and not in age, as your own vulgar Latin translator calleth them divers times *seniores*, and *majores natu*, which you call ancients and seniors. Therefore this is a rotten cavi, not worth a rotten nut. And although Chrysostom following the usual manner of

speaking, called them *sacerdotes*, yet if he had translated this or any like text out of the Greek into the Latin tongue, he ought not to have used that word *sacerdotes*, neither doth your vulgar Latin interpreter whom you hold to have known the sense and signification of that word, as well as any papist alive, in any place translate the word here used by the Apostle, *sacerdotes*, but either *seniores*, or *majores natu*, or *presbyteri*. And Bede in his commentary on this place, calleth them *seniores*. But admitting that we mean elders by office, "you demand, whether the Apostle mean here, men of that function which in our churches we call elders," I answer he meaneth such. But that you think cannot be so: because "elders are not deputed specially to public prayers and administration of the sacraments." I answer, although in some churches there be some elders appointed only to govern, yet is there no church in which there be no elders appointed specially to public prayers, and administration of the sacraments: and therefore our elders are such as the apostle requireth to be sent for, saving that they have not the gift of healing, as those had in the primitive church of the Jews, and therefore your quarrelling as well at our orders, as at our translation is vain. But admitting that the ministers of our church be such as the apostle speaketh of, you demand why we translate not *presbyteros* ministers. I answer, because the word signifieth elders and not ministers. I might by as good reason demand of you why you translate not *seniores*, priests, rather than ancients. "But we might as well translate so, as call them so, you think," but we know not: for in translation, we must look as near to the phrase of writing will bear, to the proper signification of words, else why call you them priests, whom in translation you term ancients? in common speech we may use common words but when we are examined so straitly of our terms, we answer that we call them not ministers, meaning largely and absolutely, but ministers of God and of his church, as Paul calleth himself and his fellow ministers, 1 Cor. 3. 5. and chap. 4. 1, who was, I trow, of the highest order. "But the deacons," you say, "should more properly be called ministers." We call not the elders ministers, as though the word were proper to them, which we acknowledge to be general to all inferior ministers and servitors of the church: but because they are the principal ministers of God and the church. And yet we contend not for the term, nor refuse the name priest, when it signifieth the same whom the apostle calleth *presbyterum*: but when by abuse and vain cavillation of papists, it is taken to signify a sacrificer. Therefore, according to the true etymology we confess the name to be good, and do use it, knowing that it implieth no sacrificing, as you most fondly and ridiculously would enforce out of it. But in translation, because by common speech a priest was taken for a sacrificer, and the translators had no other name, whereby to call the sacrificers of the law but priests, to make and observe that

difference which the Holy Ghost always observeth in the New Testament, they call the one priests, the other elders. But if they had called the one sacrificers, and the other priests, that priests might have been known to differ from sacrificers, it had been a small matter, and perhaps hindered you of this vain quarrel.

14. There is no cause, why any man should deny this epistle, as maintaining the popish sacrament of extreme unction, for that it doth not, but speaketh of the use of the gift of healing, which was in the primitive church, in the elders of the congregation, expressed by the outward sign of anointing with oil, as it is manifest, *Mark 6. 13.* Whereof, as Bede thinketh, came the custom of anointing them that were possessed with devils, and the sick with oil, which he confesseth might be done not only of the priests, but also of every Christian in their necessity, as Innocent teacheth. Therefore, although he allow the ceremony, yet he alloweth not your sacrament, which may be ministered by none but by a priest, and unto none, but them that be in extremity of sickness, when health is despaired: yea, Bede understandeth it, to pertain not only to them that are sick in body, but also to them that are weak in faith, though they be whole in body. "Commanding," saith he, "him that is weak in body, or in faith, that he which hath sustained a greater wound, should remember to cure himself with the aid of more men, and them of the elder sort, neither should refer the cause of his weakness to the younger sort, and less learned, lest he receive by them, any hurtful speech or counsel." You see therefore, that even the custom and use of the ceremony is greatly changed from the days of Bede, which is but seven or eight hundred years ago. For in the popish church one priest is sufficient, young or old, who cometh not to give any ghostly counsel, but commonly when a man is past his senses. It is certain therefore, that in Bede's time, this anointing was not taken for a sacrament. But you say, what dishonour is it to God, that a sacrament should be instituted in oil more than in water, &c. Verily if God had instituted any such perpetual sacrament in oil, as he doth in water, we would nothing doubt of it. But this sign of anointing was temporal, as the gift of healing whereunto it was annexed was but for a season, and that doth this scripture tell us sufficiently, seeing experience testifieth, that the gift of healing doth not now remain. Where you say the church of God hath always used it, it is false: for the Greek church never received it to this day, as a sacrament, and for many hundred years it was counted a free ceremony in the Latin church, as appeareth by the epistle of Innocent, and that which Bede writeth, that it was lawful for all Christians to use it. But when we say, it pertained to the gift of healing, you ask, "whether Christ appointed any certain creature or external element unto the apostles generally to work miracles by." I answer no: for with external sign and without, they did miracles. Yet it appeareth, *Mark 6. 13,* that he appointed them

to anoint the sick with oil that they might recover health, though it were not necessary so to do at all times, when they healed the sick. Where you say, "that Christ would have miracles in the beginning wrought by sundry sacraments which remain, the miracles ceasing," we find no such matter, which it were so, the institution and commandment of the perpetuity of them were sufficient for their continuance. You demand, "whether ever we read or heard that men were generally commanded to seek for their health by miraculous means?" We read that men were commanded generally to seek all spiritual and miraculous gifts, as long as God gave them, and not health only, but the gift of healing also, *1 Cor. 12. 31. cap. 13. 1,* under the general rule of submitting all our requests and whole will to God's will.

You demand, whether all priests or elders had the gift of miracles in the primitive church." We answer, it is not necessary that every one had the gift of healing, yet among the company of elders, that were in every church, some doubtless had when others had which were not elders of the church. Or the gift might be given to the whole number, which every one had not, as Paul speaketh of the gift of prophecy, given by laying on of the hands of the elders, *1 Tim. 4. 14.* Neither would the apostle promise health, if the gift of healing had not been general in every congregation. But "though the apostles had the gift to cure men and revive them, yet there was no such general precept, to call for the apostles, to heal men or restore them: so long as that gift continued in the church, it was all men's duty to seek the use of it, so far as it would stand with God's pleasure. Therefore as Paul setteth down an order for the right use of the gifts of tongues, *1 Cor. 14. 27,* so doth James here for the gift of healing. "You ask if any external element, or miraculous practice unless it were a sacrament, had promise of the remission of all kind of actual sins joined to it?" But neither hath the element of oil any such promise annexed unto it, but the prayers of the faithful, as *1 John 5. 6:* "You ask whether James could institute such a ceremony of himself?" &c. We say he did not institute any such ceremony as you speak of, nor mentioneth any such, but willett the gift of healing, to be used according as God had appointed. As for the promise of remission of sins, he annexeth it not to the element, but out of the general doctrine of prayer, he showeth the fruit thereof to be the obtaining of remission of sins. But at "other times," you say, "we rail at the popish church, for annexing of remission of sins, to the element of water. Here we are driven to hold, that James prescribed a miraculous oil, which had much more power and efficacy." Concerning your popish holy water, although it be conjured to be health of body and soul, which includeth not only venial but all sins: yet even your doctrine of venial sins, is intolerable. For who gave you authority to annex any remission of sins, to that or any other creature?

But that you say, we are driven to hold, is false, for we hold no such thing, either that James of his own authority prescribed a miraculous oil, or that any such power or efficacy to remit sins, was in the oil, or annexed to it. Therefore you are driven to the straits, that without shame feign a sacrament of a ceremony used only for health of body, and are bold to slander the universal church of Christ, with such a practice as never was received in the church of Christ, for a sacrament. How the ceremony was used in Bede's time I have showed before. The testimony of Innocent and *De visitat. infirm.* I have answered before, *Gal. 4. sect. 2.* Bernard writeth no more, but that Malachi was anointed, according to the ceremony used in his time. The other councils that follow, being of later years, are according to the epistle of Innocent. Who because he saith, that this anointing may be used, not only of the priests, but also of all Christians, you are driven to a poor shift, in saying they used it not in that sacramental sort which the apostle prescribeth; but Innocent saith plainly, they might use it lawfully, without any distinction of sacramental sort, as his words are manifest, which with small learning, may easily be understood. But where you say, "they use it as Christians do now the water of baptism, to take it home with them after it was hallowed, and to give it to their diseased to drink;" no doubt it was a vile superstitious abusing of the sacrament of baptism, as there have been many by conjurers and idolaters, but never used of well instructed Christians.

The hallowing of the water of baptism, is in God's church, but to the only use of baptism, and for the only time of the ministration thereof, as is manifest by John baptizing in Jordan, and the apostles of Christ in every water, without any superstitious hallowing or estimation of the water, after it had served for the use of baptism.

15. Chrysostom understandeth it generally of prayer, *De Sacerdot. lib. 3.* Hesychius, *Lev. lib. 1. cap. 2.*, saying, "Prayer worketh many things, for especially it healeth the passions of the soul, it cureth the wounds of the intelligible or mystical eyes, absolving from ignorance and that which is sickness indeed; that is, it saveth the tears that come out of sin. For is any sick among you? saith James, let him call for, &c., rehearsing this whole text. Wherefore these ancient fathers know neither your sacrament, nor the formal words thereof.

15. The apostle ascribeth no saving to any sacrament, but to the prayer of the faithful, which how effectual it is, he declareth afterward.

15. This pertaineth to the gift of bodily healing, for which end your anointing is not used, but in desperation of bodily health, when death is even at hand, neither is any man healed by your anointing.

15. Chrysostom ascribeth not this effect to your sacrament, nor to the ceremony of anointing with oil, but to the prayers of the priests, as is manifest by his words going

before, wherein he preferreth priests as spiritual fathers before bodily fathers. "These," saith he, "have often saved the soul that was sick and ready to perish, causing to some a more gentle punishment, othersome not suffering at the first to fall: and this not only by teaching or admonition, but also by helping with prayer. For they have authority to forgive sins, not only when they regenerate us, but afterward also: For is any sick among you, saith the apostle, &c.

You see Chrysostom, even as the apostle, doth refer this effect only to prayer and not to the anointing with oil, whereof there was no use in his time. For the name of priests, I have answered sufficiently before. Bede acknowledgeth that this ceremony of anointing with oil, might be done not only by priests, but by all Christians: but the remission of sins, he referreth to the priests, after they be confessed by the sick with purpose of amendment. "For sins," saith he, "cannot be remitted without confession of amendment:" whereby it is certain that Bede separating remission of sins from the ceremony of anointing with oil, did not acknowledge the anointing with oil to be a sacrament. His words are these: "This we read in the gospel, that the apostle did, and now the custom of the Church holdeth, that the sick may be anointed by the priests with oil consecrated, and prayer going with all, that they may be healed. Neither is it lawful for the priests only, but as Pope Innocent writeth, it is lawful for all Christians to use the same oil by anointing, in the necessity of themselves or other friends: which oil yet ought not to be made, but by the bishops." For that he saith with oil in the name of the Lord, signifieth the oil consecrated in the name of the Lord, or at least, that when they anoint the sick, they ought to call upon the Lord's name over him.

16. The apostle exhorteth both sick and whole persons, to acknowledge their trespasses one to another, which they have committed one against another. He showeth how excellent and good a work it is to convert a sinner, but of merit he speaketh nothing.

16. Our translation is true, and agreeable to the apostle's meaning, as for the word of confession, and the thing itself, when it signifieth true confession, we can well abide, and use. But you imagine that the very word confession, is sufficient to prove the necessity of auricular confession, with all the popish tyranny incident thereunto.

16. The scripture never speaketh of sacramental confession, as you call it, and the apostle here speaketh of mutual confession or acknowledging of our trespasses one against another, not of our sins to a priest. Neither doth Origen expound this text of confession, but the two verses before of remission of sins by hearty repentance, and confessing of sins before God, or at least openly before the church. "There is yet," saith he, "the seventh kind of remission of sins, though very hard and laboursome when the sinner wash-



eth his bed with tears, and his tears are made his bread day and night, and when he is not ashamed to declare his sins to the priest of the Lord, and to seek medicine according to him which saith: I have said, I will pronounce mine injustice against myself to the Lord, and thou hast remitted the impiety of my heart. In whom also that is fulfilled which the apostle saith: If any be sick, let him call the elders of the church, and let them lay their hands on him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and if he have been in sins, they shall be remitted to him." That which Bede saith of opening our greater leprosy unto the priest, and abiding his judgment, proveth not the necessity of auricular confession to be of God's law, nor of this text, which he acknowledgeth to pertain to mutual confession. And so the word *ἀλλήλους* doth plainly signify, whereby we may as well prove that the priests are bound to confess themselves to the laymen, as you can prove that the laymen are bound to confess themselves to the priests. Therefore this text pertaineth to mutual acknowledging of men's trespasses and reconciliation and prayer. We like well the text, when it is not poisoned with your Heretical glosses of sacraments, of anointing and shrift, which are far from the apostle's words and meaning.

17. When Elias denounceth to Ahab that there shall be neither rain nor dew, but according to his word, *1 Reg. 17. 1*, it is easy to gather his prayer both before and after the drought. Although many things are true that are not written, yet those things that are written in the scripture are sufficient for our instruction.

20. The apostle saith not that he shall cover the multitude of his own sins, but rather of his whom he converteth in such sense, as he saveth his soul from death, namely, as a profitable instrument of God's grace and mercy, which properly converteth and saveth sinners, and covereth sins. *Dortheus doct. 6.*

20. We cannot abide your blasphemies ascribing to the Virgin Mary that which is proper to Christ. So far forth as she was a mean of our salvation, by conceiving or bringing forth the Saviour of the world, we acknowledge it. But that she or any other creature, is now "our life, our salvation, our hope, our mediator," or any such thing, we abhor as blasphemous against the glory of our only Mediator and Advocate, life, hope, and salvation Jesus Christ. Wherefore, when you cannot prove that God hath made her or any other Saints, instruments of our salvation by their intercession, these forms of speech will not serve to excuse your idolatry and blasphemy.

## ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT OF BOTH THE EPISTLES OF PETER.

We never read that Christ made Peter his vicar. Matthew calleth him *first*, in order of the catalogue, not in authority or dignity. The ancient fathers also ascribe to him a primacy of order among the apostles, not of power or authority. And all the apostles joined together in planting the church among the Jews in Jerusalem, and the Gentiles abroad according to Christ's commission, *Matt. 28.* But whether from Rome, as it is not like, or from Babylon, as the words, either in Syria or Egypt, being the chief apostle of the Jews, he writeth to them that were dispersed in the east parts of the world, in such provinces as he nameth. To prove that he writeth from Rome, it is a simple argument, that he sendeth salutation from Babylon, and

as simple a commendation of Rome, to be figuratively called Babylon. True it is, that most of the ancient writers are of that mind, following the received opinion that Peter was at Rome, but there is no reason why Peter writing from Rome should send salutations from Babylon, seeing Paul writing to the Romans, did not call them Babylonians, but Romans, or the saints at Rome. The seducers whereof Augustin speaketh, taught that good works were altogether needless for Christian men, as though they might be saved by a vain profession of faith. But he never findeth fault with them that hold good works not to be meritorious of salvation. But contrariwise writeth many books against the Pelagians that hold that error.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER THE APOSTLE.

### CHAPTER I.

6. The apostle never teacheth the constancy of faith, nor any fruit of faith to be meritorious, but he showeth the reward of constancy to be according to God's promise, by the merit of Christ only.

17. God will judge every man according to his works, which are evident tokens either of true faith, or of no faith, or of false and erroneous persuasions.

18. You said in the argument of the epistle, without controversy, that he writeth to the Jews: now you would gladly fly from it, so ill you love to have the traditions of your fathers reproved. What sense your evil hath of our corrupting the text, you know not how to express: we say, "Tradition of the fathers," you say, "Your fathers' tradition," your Latin is, *Paterne traditionis*, fatherly tradition, indifferent to the third person, and to the

second, yea and to the first. Our fatherly or fathers' tradition. So that I know not what you have found, unless it be a knot in a rush.

#### CHAPTER 2.

5. He speaketh of the sacrificing priesthood which remaineth now in the church, not of the ministering or governing priesthood of the church, which is not properly the office of sacrificing, but of preaching, ministering of sacraments, praying and such like exercises.

9. We acknowledge that all Christians be as well spiritual kings, as spiritual sacrificing priests, under Christ their head, the only king of glory, and eternal priest after the order of Melchisedec.

13. The Protestants mean not by "all manner ordinances of man," every law made by a man, but every ordinance or creation of the prince, or the prince by what ordinance or human creation soever he do reign, as you yourselves interpret it, either by succession, election, or howsoever.

13. Although there be great difference between the government of princes, and of ecclesiastical governors, yet the apostle calleth not princes human creation, as though they were not also God's creation, for there is no power but of God, but that the form of their creation is in man's appointment: the other is only of God's assignment, and according to his institution. But that Christ made one chief in authority over all the church, and placed Peter in that supremacy, it is false, and can never be proved out of the holy scripture. And the power of princes is so of God, that beside his ordinary concurrence and providence, it is by his law commanded to be obeyed, and the prince appointed how he should govern. Not only to procure the earthly commodity of his subjects, but much rather to extend his authority to the spiritual benefit of their souls, in establishing, by his power and laws, the true religion, and the right exercises thereof, and punishing the offenders. As all godly princes, of whom we read in the scripture, have done to God's glory, and their immortal praise. Although the spiritual superiority be in another kind much more excellent, yet even all spiritual superiors are bound to obey the prince, not only in things temporal, but much more in matters of religion, so long as they be agreeable to the law of God. Against which, if any thing be decreed or commanded, either in the commonwealth, or in the church, it is not to be obeyed of any man. But if civil princes, though they be Heathen, command any thing agreeable to God's law, as Cyrus, Darius, Artaxerxes, they are to be obeyed, much more being Christians, as Constantine, Valentinian, Theodosius, &c.

13. The king is called most excellent not only in respect of his dukes, or other governors his vicegerents, but also in respect of all his subjects; and therefore might be called chief head of them, although the translation

be more proper, The chief or most excellent. Therefore Peter calling the king the chief, submitteth himself also, and all his fellow Apostles under his authority, neither doth he write to the people only, but to all the church in general. Therefore neither popes, bishops, nor any priests, can have exemption from the obedience due to their civil princes and supreme lords. But you think to have a starting hole, that the "clergy could not be under such princes as the Apostles speaketh of," as though he spake not of all princes that then were, and should be to the end of the world. Or else, belike, because he speaketh only of heathen princes, there is nothing due by this text to Christian princes. But he speaketh of the authority not of the persons, or their virtues or vices. "But the kings and emperors then," say you, "could be no heads of the church, being heathen men, and no members thereof, much less the chief members." Although the metaphorical name of heads did not agree to them, because they were no members, yet were they by God's ordinance, and ought to have been Governors and protectors of the church, as all Christian kings ought to be. But Ignatius, *ad Smyrnenses*, exhorteth to honour the king after the bishop, correcting the saying of Solomon, which he allegeth, *Prov.* 24. 21, as though Solomon had forgotten the high priest. "My son," saith he, "honour God and the king. But I say, honour God indeed, as the cause and Lord of all, and the Bishop, as *high Priest*, bearing the image of God, according to government of God, but according to priesthood of Christ: and after him it behooveth also to honour the king." These words show out of what shop this Epistle of Ignatius came, who was a man of greater religion, than that he would have corrected the scripture in Solomon, or in Peter: both commanding the king to be honoured next unto God.

Although it might seem to be excused by the different authority and excellency of the bishop, yet it is not tolerable, after the Holy Ghost hath said, "Honour God and the king," to say, "but I say, honour God and the bishop, and after him the king." But this is as you write, "an invincible demonstration that this text maketh not for any spiritual claim of earthly kings, because it giveth no more to any prince, than may or ought to be done unto a heathen magistrate." As though obedience is not to be given to a heathen magistrate, if he command or decree any thing, even in religion, agreeable to the true honour and service of God, as Cyrus did for building up the temple, *Ezra.* 1. As Darius, both for continuing of the building, and for sacrifice to be offered in it. *Ezra.* 6. As Artaxerxes did for reformation of the church, according to the law of God, by the ministry of Ezra the learned and godly priest. *Ezra.* 7. and *cap.* 8. As Nebuchadnezzar, for the glory of God, after he was restored to his kingdom, *Dan.* 4. As Darius the Median did, that men should reverence the God of Daniel, *Dan.* 6. As Maximianus and Diocletian, that Christians

should exercise their religion, build oratories and possess them, *Euseb. lib. cap. 7. 19.* As Licinius that Christ should be worshipped, *lib. 9. cap. 9.* So invincible be Popish demonstrations. "But there is not any thing in the New Testament," you say, "that proveth the Christian prince to be supreme governor in ecclesiastical causes more than heathen emperors." What if there were not? is not the authority of the scripture of the Old Testament sufficient? Where both the duty of a king is described, to govern according to the Law of God, and the practice is declared in David, Solomon, Jehoshaphat, Ezechias, Josiah, which exercised supreme government in causes ecclesiastical, and over the high priests themselves; beside so many prophecies of the authority of kings to be protectors of the church, and setters forth of true religion. But even those places of the New Testament that require obedience to princes, do prove their sovereign authority in all causes, and specially the prayers appointed to be made for kings, that under them we may lead a peaceable life in all godliness and honesty, declare that it is their duty to procure religion by their authority, as well as civil honesty. Therefore though heathen princes abused their authority, to persecute the church and religion of Christ, yet were they set up of God, as well to maintain by their laws and authority, true religion and the church, as public honesty and the commonwealth. For they are appointed "for the praise of them that do well, and for the punishment of evil doers," therefore for the advancement of true religion and the suppression of heresies. Augustin also testifieth, that Christian kings serve God, both as they are Christians, and also as they are kings, in making laws of ecclesiastical matters, *ep. 50.* And so held all the ancient godly fathers, as we have declared in other places.

16. The pope's laws that are contrary not only to Christian liberty, but also to God's commandment, are not to be obeyed of any man.

18. This was a lewd slander against Wicliff, who held no such doctrine. For both he obeyed, and taught obedience to the kings Edward the Third, and Richard the Second, in whose time he lived, which two princes all men know to have committed deadly sin, yea some heinous and notorious sins. So is it a detestable slander against us, whom you call followers of Wicliff, for none of us ever held or taught any such seditious and traitorous opinions. But your heresy cometh nearest to this opinion, which holds that the pope hath authority to depose lawful kings from their thrones, at his pleasure, which hold them for no princes *de jure*, that by the pope's bull are declared to be deprived; which finally send and suborn daily most hellish traitors to murder their sovereign and most lawful princes, and stir up foreign states to invade their dominions.

19. The apostle saith, it is thanks with God, or a good commendation, if they suffer un-

justly, and suffer patiently, but he saith not that it is meritorious.

## CHAPTER 3.

19. The apostle saith not that the soul of Christ after his death preached in hell, but he came in his spirit, and prophesied in the days of Noah to the disobedient, whose souls are now in hell.

19. This place we confess to be hard, but yet not so hard of itself, as it is to them that have a prejudicate opinion in their minds, of Christ's descending into hell after his death. But first here is no mention of the soul of Christ, nor of descending, but of his spirit coming and preaching: not to the godly that were in prison, but to them that were sometimes disobedient, which are still in prison: not to their deliverance, but to their destruction. The apostle therefore meaneth by this most ancient example, to show that Christ had always care of his church, and therefore in the same spirit, by which he was raised to life after he was dead, he came of old time, and preached destruction to the reprobate, even in the days of Noah, who for that they condemned his preaching, are now damned spirits in prison. And at the same time appointed Noah to make the Ark for safeguard of himself, and the small company of the church, and in the same preserved his church from destruction by water, wherein is also a notable figure of our salvation by baptism. And that he speaketh of Christ's divine spirit, and not of his human soul, is manifest by that he saith, he came in the same spirit by which he was made alive, or restored to life, which was not his human soul, but his divine power, by which his soul was joined again to his body. As Paul concludeth, that he was declared to be the Son of God in power, according to the spirit of sanctification, by his resurrection from the dead, that is, by raising himself from death by his divine spirit and eternal power. For his human soul did not return to his body of itself, but by power of his divine and eternal spirit. But now, let us see what you bring to clear the place from difficulty. You say, Augustin confesseth the text to be hard to understand; but his doubts, and other ancient fathers' judgment have helped us somewhat to the right understanding. But where you say, that Augustin findeth him sure of this, that Christ's descending into hell in soul after his death, is proved thereby, it is false.

For although he do acknowledge, that the soul of Christ after his death was in hell, yet that he was so in hell, as you define, and for that purpose, to deliver the patriarchs, he doth not affirm. But contrariwise he saith: "I could never find the word hell in the scripture, taken in good part, which if it be never read in the divine authorities, verily that bosom of Abraham, that is, that habitation of quiet rest, is not to be believed to be any part of hell." The descending of Christ into hell, to be according to the scriptures, there is no doubt, but in what sense and sort, and to

what end or benefit of the church, the question is. Therefore Calvin and his followers are no infidels, which both acknowledge the descending of Christ into hell, and show the use and end thereof, to extend to the whole church of God.

Athanasius, *apud Epiphanium*, saith: "That the Word himself went and preached to the spirits," that is, the divine nature of Christ, and not his human soul. *De incar. verbi Veri*, he saith: "That wicked one the devil, which is wont to assault us with the force of death, the sorrows of death being loosed, is left alone altogether dead."

Cyril upon this place gathereth Christ's descending, not by power of his divinity only, but also in soul unto hell. Oecumenius doth not so conclude: but showeth, that the effect of Christ's death and resurrection, extended to all that are dead before Christ. Whereas it seemeth he doth hold that Christ's preaching to them after their death, supplied that which they lacked in their life, it hath no ground in the text, which speaketh only of Christ's preaching in spirit to the disobedient.

Augustin therefore doth better no doubt of the understanding of the text, than to gather more than the words thereof will yield. Yet where he saith, he "doubteth not, but that Christ performed the benefit of salvation, to some that were in the pains of hell," he affirmeth not purgatory, whereof he affirmeth in other places that it may be doubted of, or else be still unknown. *Enchir. cap. 9*. But Bede, no doubt out of more ancient fathers, peradventure out of Athanasius, whose judgment of this text also he citeth, thus interpreteth these words of Peter: "He which in one time coming in the flesh preached the way of life to the world, even he himself came before the flood, and preached to them which then were unbelievers, and lived carnally. For he even by his Holy Spirit was in Noah and the rest, of the holy men which were at that time, and by their good conversation, preached to the wicked men of that age, that they might be converted to better manners." You see therefore that our exposition is not new, which so many hundred years ago was delivered by Bede, who though in some things he were carried away with the errors and corruption of his time yet had he a care to interpret the scriptures as near as he could, according to the writing of the elder fathers that were before him.

20. They that take these words of Christ's descending into hell, and add further, that Christ by his descending delivered the captive souls, are driven to invent many things, beside the book, of their own head. The apostle speaketh only of the unbelievers and disobedient in the days of Noah, not to show their deliverance, but their just damnation, affirming that eight persons only were saved by water, the rest perishing, which is to be understood both of their bodies and of their souls. Bede rejecteth the opinion of one man, that thought some comfort should come to them that had been unbelievers in the days

of Noah, as contrary to the Catholic faith: because "Christ by his descending to hell, delivered none but the faithful, neither preached to the souls that are out of their bodies, and shut up in hell prison, for their wickedness, but in this life, either by himself, or by the examples and words of the faithful, he daily showeth the way of life." Oecumenius also out of Gregory, showeth, that their disobedience and condemnation were testified by the scripture, before Christ came in the flesh, and that salvation was preached to men from the beginning, but despised, because of their declining unto vanity and pleasure.

21. There is no necessity so extreme, that should drive men to seek baptism of heretics, who are out of the church. For we must not do evil, that good may come. Neither is baptism an efficient cause of salvation unto infants, but a seal of God's Spirit, regenerating them to eternal life. Hierom, in the place quoted, compareth the church, and not the See of Peter, to the ark of Noah. And that he desired them to communicate with the See of Rome, it was because Damasus was a true Catholic. But in the days of Liberius his predecessor, that subscribed to the Arians, and held councils against the Catholics, he was in the ark of Christ, that was out of the communion of the See of Rome, at least of him that sat in it.

21. Beza acknowledgeth, that the apostle alludeth to the interrogatories of the catechists, and the answers of them that were baptized. Which stipulation and solemn promises are necessary to be acknowledged, that baptism be effectual in them that are of age. Although they be not always necessary to be expressed in the form of baptism, yet are they included in the doctrine thereof.

#### CHAPTER 4.

6. As Christ shall judge all that are dead, so the Gospel hath been preached to them that are dead in all ages, unto mortification of the flesh, and renovation of the spirit. Bede understandeth it of them that are spiritually dead. "So great care and so great love, and so great desire, hath God to mortify us in the flesh, and to quicken us in the spirit, that he commanded to preach the word of faith to them also, which being wrapped in greater crimes, and are worthy to be named among the dead, in riot, lust, drunkenness, gluttony, bibbing, and unlawful worshipping of idols, that they which have judged, that is, contemned, and cast away carnal desires, may live spiritually, and wait for life everlasting with them whom the grace of the Gospel found living innocently." The same interpretation of divers ancient fathers, hath Oecumenius.

8. The apostle saith not, that charity doth cause remission of sins, but that it is the property of charity, as Solomon saith, to hide and cover the multitude of our neighbours offences, as on the contrary side of hatred to stir up brawling, and discovering and open-

ing of many offences, that otherwise should be hidden. *Dorotheus, doctrin. 6. Prov. 10.*

12. Augustin *Euch. cap. 69.* saith no more, but that Christ pronounceeth, that he will impute the fruit of alms only, in the last judgment; which is nothing to the question of justification, seeing men come to the last judgment, justified or condemned: the effects whereof appear in their lives, charitable or uncharitable. The same meaneth Bede, that they shall obtain mercy which have showed mercy, as we are taught to pray: "Forgive us as we forgive." Neither doth the scripture any where commend alms or mercy, for redemption of our sins by the merit thereof. The saying of Solomon is plain of another matter. The text of Daniel is not "redeem," but, "break" off thy sins, that is, change thy cruelty into mercy. The son of Sirach promiseth reward unto charity and mercy, but no redemption from sin by the merit of the work: therefore these places were idly quoted.

18. The just, though he be assured of the favour of God through faith in his promises, yet cannot be saved without great labour and contention against sin, which he knoweth to be necessary for him. Not that he is in danger to fall from God, or the state of justice, or afraid of purgatory: but because God hath made the way to eternal life strait and hard, through continual mortification of the flesh, and bearing the cross of Christ, patiently. This is nothing contrary to the doctrine of the Protestants, who although they think a man to be justified before God by faith without works, as the scripture teacheth, *Rom. 3.* yet they acknowledge, that there is also a justice of works, though imperfect, which is a necessary fruit and effect of justification by faith only. They teach also, that men are just indeed and in truth, yea and perfectly in sight of God by Christ's justice imputed to them by faith, and given unto them by God, by virtue of which gift they claim it as their own, and that men are in part declared to be just by good works, or justice inherent. They teach none other assurance of salvation, but that which is grounded upon the promises of God, which can never fail. Concerning him that hath lived wickedly, and repenteth at his death, they teach according to the scripture, that if he believe with his heart, and confess with his mouth, he shall be saved. *Rom. 10.*

Christ saith, he that believeth in me, cometh not into condemnation, but is translated from death to life. *John 5. 24.* Yet they teach no man to defer repentance which is the gift of God, and therefore men cannot be assured that God will give it at their death: seeing commonly as men live, so they die, and it is a rare example, as of the thief on the cross, that men shall have repentance and faith at their death, which have neglected them in their life. But to imagine purgatory for such without the authority of the scripture, they dare not: seeing they know the Lord of the vineyard may do with his own what he will, and give unto those last, as much as unto the

first, though the hypocritical Papists repine never so much at it. *Matt. 20.*

#### CHAPTER 5.

1. The apostle speaketh of elders by office, and yet your vulgar Latin interpreter calleth them *scenores*, that is, elders. Which justifieth our translation from your childish cavilling, which is to no end but that under the vain shadow of applying the word priest, to signify a sacrificer, you might bear the ignorant in hand, that the elders or priests of the New Testament be sacrificers, as your Popish priests are.

3. The word signifieth properly the heritages or lots, and the apostle meaneth the several divisions over which the elders had charge, and not the ministers of the church only, commonly called the clergy. As for the name of clergy and clerk, when it is not a proud excluding of the rest of Christians from the Lord's inheritance, but signifieth the special lot and charge of them, that serve in the ministry of the word and sacraments, we can well abide and use it. But where you say, we will have no difference between the laity and the clergy, it is an impudent slander without any colour: but that the apostle meaneth the whole congregation committed to their charge, by this word, Bede declareth plainly. *Oecumenius* saith, it signifieth "the holy company or congregation," and the text is plain, adding that they should be an example to the flock, and not exercise tyranny over it.

Concerning their shaven crowns, Bede in the place quoted, rehearseth an epistle of Coelfrid, an Abbot, unto Naitan, King of the Picts, wherein without any great contention, he reasoneth of the diversity of shaving used in the Romish Church, and in the Scottish Church, before it received the Romish rites: calling the Romish fashion, the form of Peter, the Scottish, of Simon Magnus, without any testimony of antiquity to warrant that he saith, either of the one or the other. But that any such shaving is necessary for distinction of the clergy or the laity, neither Bede nor Coelfrid doth teach in that place, nor showeth any good causes why it should so be.

4. The faithful preachers shall have their crown of glory, not for the merit of their works, but of the mercy of him that promiseth to the greater labourers, great reward.

13. The Protestants are more your friends than they have thanks for their labour, that would deliver Rome from so infamous a name. But you are content that Rome be the See of Antichrist, so you may have Peter at Rome. Concerning which point we strive not much, but yet we must needs say that the scripture proveth it not, nor this place, although the ancient writers agree, that Babylon is here, as in the Revelations, taken for the city of Rome? For why should not Peter date his epistle at Rome? or send salutations from the church of Rome, as Paul writeth his epistle to Rome. But seeing you will needs have Rome to be Babylon in this place, as

*Apoc. 16 and 17*, you cannot avoid the See of Antichrist from the city of Rome. For the Holy Ghost in the revelation speaketh not only of the persecution of the heathen emperors, but also of the whorish enticements unto false doctrine, and of the persecution raised by the false prophet from Babylon, which without controversy signifieth the cruelty and craft of Antichrist, sitting in the temple of God. That Peter was at Rome, it maketh nothing to prove his supremacy, which you cannot ascribe to the pope, more than to the bishop of Antioch, if Peter had any such in his person. The uncertainty of the time of Peter's coming to Rome, and his continuance there, must needs make the matter doubtful, and no article of our belief. But you object, that "there is as great uncertainty of principal things contained in the scriptures, as of the time of Christ's fleeing into Egypt; yet may we not thereof infer, that those things never were." The scriptures do plainly testify, that those things were, but the time when, is not material. But of Peter the scripture doth not testify that he was there, for if it did, we would not regard the diver-

sity of opinions concerning the time when. Where you ask whether we can accord all the histories of the holy scriptures that seem to have contradiction? we can. Where you further ask, whether we can tell when David came first to Saul? we can tell so much as the Holy Ghost hath set down of his coming to Saul, if he came to him before, we have not to do with it. Your other questions of the creation of the world, of paradise, and such like, are vain and frivolous, when we have the most certain testimonies of scripture that they were. Show us the like that Peter was at Rome, and we will as certainly believe that Peter was at Rome, as we believe that Christ is in heaven. But if you have nothing but this allegorical surmise, to prove a matter of fact and story, you must pardon us for not taking it as an article of our faith, and yet as an indifferent matter we admit it for the testimony of ancient writers. That our religion standeth only upon destruction and negatives, it is a senseless slander: for it standeth as true religion ought to do, in affirming and building of all that is true, and in destruction and denial of all heresy and falsehood.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER

### CHAPTER I.

10. There is no question but God's eternal predestination consisteth with good works; though God predestinated us freely without regard of the merit of our works, which are an effect and end of God's election, not the cause that moved him to choose us. For he "chose us," saith Paul, "that we might be holy." *Ephes. 1*. Not for that we were or should be holy. And this place showeth that the election of God, which is most certain in him, and in itself, is made known and certain to us by good works, whereunto God hath appointed us. Not that it is grounded upon our will or works, which are good because God of his grace before the world was made hath chosen us, and in time called us, and given his Spirit by which we are not only willing, but most thankfully embrace his grace, and know his fatherly love toward us. For if by his Spirit we know that God is our Father, as the apostle teacheth, *Rom. 8*, we know also that we are predestinate to his inheritance in Christ, which knowledge is confirmed by the works of obedience, which are the fruits of the spirit of adoption. But if we cannot know it, as you say, but only hope with such a hope as is uncertain, and may be confounded, in vain should the apostle exhort us to make our election sure by good works. If in any translation good works be left out, it is because they were left out of the text which we translated, yet we always confess, that the circumstance of the place, doth of necessity require that good works be under-

stood, though they be not expressed in the text.

15. The apostle's meaning is plain, and need not to be drawn into divers senses, that he performeth in writing this Epistle, that they may have remembrance of these things after his departure, and not that he will make intercession to God for them after his death. Neither doth Oecumenius speak of such a sense, but rehearseth only the opinion of him, "that would show out of this place, that the Saints after their death do remember those things which they have done here for them that are alive." Where it is manifest, that he speaketh no word of intercession. For of the true sense of the text it followeth: "Other men handling that which is spoken simply, do thus understand it: I will do my diligence that you may have always after my departure, to remember these things. That is, marvel ye not, neither think much of the continual mention of these things. For I do it not condemning your rudeness, but by continual doctrine of these things, I give you a continuing and unmoveable aid of them, that being confirmed therewith, you may have even after my death, a lively and indelible or perpetual doctrine of them." Now whether the Saints in heaven do pray for us, the scripture doth nowhere teach us, and therefore it is a point whereof without danger we may be ignorant. That the counterfeit Clemens writeth of the matter, it is as much to be regarded, as his charge in the second Epistle, that mice dung be not found in the Pix. For who would

think that Clemens would write of such fables to so high apostle, of whom he was more meet to learn and to be admonished? Leo indeed 500 years after ascribeth much to the prayers of Peter for him, which proveth not the matter whereof the scripture doth not inform us. That many of the ancient fathers held this opinion, that the Saints departed do pray for us, we deny not: but we require upon what authority of the holy scripture they grounded this their opinion? For the opinion of good men without the word of God, is not sufficient to ground our faith upon, seeing it is certain, that every one of those fathers held some one private opinion or other, which all men confess to be erroneous. As Cyprian's opinion of rebaptism. Hierom of Peter unjustly reprehended. Augustin of the necessity of the communion for infants. Chrysostom of procuring help to the damned, &c. All which errors may be defended with this argument of yours; "They know the meaning of the scriptures, and the sense of the Holy Ghost better than these new interpreters." But if it were proved, that the Saints departed do pray for us, yet have we no warrant out of the scriptures to pray to them. Neither can it be proved that any of the fathers for 300 years after Christ did make their prayers to any, but only to God by Jesus Christ. But in them of later time, there is some mention of praying unto them. Yet doth not Augustin pray to Cyprian in that place, where you say he desireth to be holpen by his prayers, but desiring to be joined to his charity, he hopeth that being aided by his prayers, he shall learn by his writings, in what great peace God governed his church by him. Hilary, in Ps. 124, speaketh neither of Saints praying for us, nor of praying to them, but saith that the church hath no small aid "in the apostle, or in the patriarchs and prophets, or rather in the angels, which compass about the church with a certain guard." The aid therefore he meaneth, is the example and doctrine of the Saints departed, and the ministry of the angels. In Nazianzen, Basil, and Chrysostom, there is some mention of the invocation of Saints, to help with their prayers. But that which is alleged for Athanasius and Ephraim, is false and counterfeit stuff. Theodoret also speaketh of prayers unto martyrs: but where is either commandment, example, or allowance of such prayers out of the scripture? Therefore this is nothing else, but dross of human fragility, which can be no prejudice against the truth. And it is no marvel, if those fathers being exercised in confuting both of the Gentiles, and also of great Heresies, did not at the first espy what the spirit of Antichrist went about in those matters of invocation of Saints and prayer for the dead, which had a show of piety, and yet proceeded of the efficacy of error: when our Saviour Christ prophesieth, that the illusions of Antichrist should be so great, that if it were possible, the very elect should be deceived. It is a small glory for the Papists to join with some of the fathers, in one or two

errors not of the greatest weight, when they have all the fathers against them, in so many articles of chiefest importance, as is declared throughout these annotations. For invocation of Saints, 1 *Tim.* 2.

18. We see not that the holiness of places continueth any longer than Christ's presence is in them.

20. The Spirit wherewith the scriptures were written, is to be found in the scriptures themselves, by which the spirit of the church is to be tried whether it be true or false. "For nothing," saith Augustin, "is darkly spoken in any place, which in other places of the scripture is not uttered most plainly." *De doct. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 6.*

#### CHAPTER 2.

2. Our doctrine is far from carnal liberty, which daily teaches mortification, even of our lusts and sinful desires. What our life is, God and the world doth know: if it were not honest-er than the lives of many Popes and Cardinals, it were pity we lived. But the Popish doctrine that teacheth the sinful lust of the flesh to be no sin, and great sins to be venial sins, that hath so many easy ways to purge and pardon mortal sins, yea the sin against the Holy Ghost, and general apostacy, and obstinate contumely of God, not only in this life, but after men be dead, is the very doctrine of carnal liberty: and their life agreeth thereunto. For to whom treason, rebellion, and murder of their sovereign Queen, is not only lawful, but also meritorious, what kind of impiety will their cauterized conscience be afraid of?

3. The words of Papists, the holy church, the Catholic Church, orders of religion, chastity, fasting, &c., are such sweet words.

19. Who ever taught less carnal liberty, than Luther and Calvin? which taught mortification according to the scriptures, wherof the people never heard in popery. Who take not away repentance, but require it to be continual. Who exhort to fasting, though they teach not the doctrine of devils by prohibition of meats. Who require chastity of all men, either in holy matrimony, or in true and not feigned continency. Who take away no keeping of vows that be lawfully made, and possible to be kept. Who teach good works to be necessary effects of a justifying faith, without which no man shall be saved, that is justified by faith only. Who teach obedience unto ecclesiastical pastors and Christian councils, and teach ecclesiastical pastors, also to be obedient to civil powers, stir not up the people to sedition, treason, and murder of their sovereign, as the Papists of Rheims have done, following their forefathers the ancient heretics, that despise authority and would be rulers themselves, but subject to no man.

#### CHAPTER 3.

16. This is a plain matter, to convince the Papists of impudent lying and slandering. For which of the Protestants doth not ac-

knowledge, that there be certain places in the scripture hard to be understood? and who doth say that the scriptures may be expounded boldly, as well of the unlearned as the learned? How impudent a slander it is, that we expound the scriptures without respect of the exposition of the learned fathers, beside all other experience, let these annotations testify, wherein it is plain, that the ancient fathers do avow in a manner, all interpretations of ours, that you mislike. That all the people should have no regard of their pastors' judgment, or the church's authority, it is a falsehood, without any colour or show of truth. Yet all this, you say, is partly our saying, partly the necessary sequel of our foolish opinion, which admitteth nothing but the bare scriptures. We admit nothing indeed of man, as equal in authority with the holy scriptures, which are the word of God. But his Holy Spirit, by which they were written, and which speaketh in the scriptures, and in the godly interpreters agreeable to the scriptures, we humbly admit. Also we admit no doctrine which hath not authority and ground, and which may not be proved, either by manifest words, or by necessary conclusion out of the words, of the holy scriptures. And in this our foolish opinion, which we have gathered of the foolishness of preaching of the gospel, we esteem to be more true wisdom, than all vain knowledge falsely so called of infidels and heretics. Of this opinion we are sure, that such absurdities as you object against us, you are never able to conclude in any good and lawful form of argument. If Luther said the scriptures be more clear than all the fathers' commentaries, he said no more than the scriptures say of themselves, which in themselves are light, not darkness to our feet. Yet it followeth not, that all commentaries of the fathers are superfluous, which are framed to take away the darkness from our eyes, that we may see the light of the scriptures. But concerning the hardness or easiness of the scriptures, we say: there are many things in the scriptures hard to be understood, yet whatsoever is necessary to be known is plainly set forth and easily to be understood, of them that will read diligently, mark attentively, pray heartily, and judge humbly. You slander us of devilish and seditious arrogancy, to make the people esteem themselves learned, or sufficient without their pastors, to guide them in all matters and doubts of religion. For we plainly protest, that whosoever despiseth the ordinary ministry of the word, which God hath established in his church for the direction of us in truth and love: shall never attain to true knowledge, no, though he were otherwise never so well learned, much less, if he be ignorant and unlearned. And yet ye say nutruly, that the apostle here affirmeth all the scriptures, or even Paul's Epistles to be full of difficulty, or that he would in respect of the difficulty of them, discourage or dissuade the people, from reading and studying of them. For in the first chapter, he commended the faithful for

their diligent attention unto the scriptures of the Old Testament, which are more obscure in the chief mysteries of salvation than these of the New Testament, and yet he compareth them to a candle, shining and giving light in a dark place. He forbiddeth not therefore the right use, but the rash abuse of the scriptures, by proud, unlearned, and inconstant men, which pervert them when they are never so plain, to their own destruction. Augustin, you say, saith, "that the special difficulty in Paul's epistles, which Peter meaneth, is his hard speech and much commendation of that faith which he saith doth justify, as though he meant that only faith without good works could justify, or save a man." Augustin saith not so. "But that Peter knowing that some wicked men took occasion of certain somewhat dark sentences of the apostle Paul, that as though they were secure of salvation which is by faith, they cared not to live well, he saith that certain things in his Epistles are very hard to be understood, which men perverted, as they did other scriptures to their own destruction: whereas that apostle was of the same mind that the rest of the apostles were concerning salvation, which is not given but to them that live well." By this it is manifest, that Augustin speaketh not against the doctrine of justification before God, by faith without works, which the Apostle Paul doth so largely, so purposely, so diligently set forth and confirm by so many arguments, that no doctrine is more clear in all the scriptures: but he speaketh against the perverseness of them that abused this doctrine, as though the apostle had meant, that good works were needless for a justified man, and that the faith whereof he spake, were such a faith as is in devils, which is, or may be void of good works. For he himself in the same chapter acknowledgeth, that a man is justified by faith without works, as his words are manifest. "When the apostle saith, he thinketh a man to be justified by faith, without the works of the law, he meaneth not that faith being received and professed, the works of justice should be contemned, but that every man may know that he may be justified by faith, although the works of the law have not gone before. For they follow the man that is justified, they go not before to justify him." Wherefore to root out the error of them that thought a dead faith which is without works, was sufficient to justify, he saith these general epistles of Peter, James, John, and Jude were written, which we do not deny. But yet it followeth not thereof, that those hard places whereof Peter here speaketh, "were his hard speech and much commendation of faith," unto which every one of the apostles doth ascribe as much as he, and Paul to good works, as much as they. But you say, "we shift off the matter, in answering that Peter saith not that Paul's epistles be hard, but that many things in them are hard," wherein you use your accustomed manner of creeping away, by impudent lying and slandering. For we say not, that Peter affirmeth that



many things in them are hard, but some things, which may be true of a few things. And it is not all one to say, such a writer is hard, and there be some things in that writer hard to be understood. And as concerning the argument and matter of the scriptures, we confess, that for the most and chiefest matters, it is not only hard but impossible to be understood of the natural man: yet to the spiritual man, which is taught of God's spirit, all the deep mysteries of God are opened and made plainly known. *1 Cor. 2.* But we speak of the understanding of the words, which in some places is hard, yet in many very plain and easy to be understood, though not believed, even of the natural man that seeketh not wilfully to pervert them to his own destruction. Wherefore it is no dangerous thing for ignorant men or for wild wicked fellows to read the scriptures, out of the which they may learn to have true knowledge, and become staid in their wits. But it is dangerous for such, proudly, rashly and irreverently to judge of the scriptures, and to draw them to their own fantasies, for that breedeth heresies even in the learned. But that not only the matter, but the style of the scriptures is hard, you quote divers ancient fathers, which proveth not that all the scriptures are hard, though some be, or that they are all written in so high a style, as the unlearned cannot attain to the understanding of any of them. Whereas contrariwise, they are for the most part written in a low and vulgar style, the Holy Ghost condescending to the weakness of our understanding, so that the great and high mysteries of God, are often expressed in very plain and simple phrases of words. But to come to your testimonies. Augustin speaketh directly against you, saying, "The Holy Ghost hath magnificently and wholesomely so tempered the holy scriptures, that by open and plain places, he might provide against hunger, by more obscure places he might wipe away loathsomeness. For nothing almost is found out of those dark places, which is not found elsewhere to be uttered most plainly." Against which saying, it is not contrary that in his epistle to Januarinus, which supposed that he knew all things, he saith humbly of himself, there were more things in the scriptures which he knew not, than which he knew. For he meaneth not of things necessary to salvation, of which he could not profess so great ignorance, but of other by questions which may be moved infinitely, and not always easy to be determined out of the scriptures. Ambrose saith, "The scripture is a sea, having in it deep senses, the height of propheticall mysteries, into which sea many rivers have run. Therefore there be also sweet rivers and clear, there be also fair springs that yield forth water unto eternal life, there be also good speeches, as honeycombs, acceptable sentences, which may refresh the mind of the hearers with spiritual drink, and delight them with the sweetness of mortal precepts, divers therefore are the streams of

the holy scripture. Thou hast that thou mayest drink first, and second, and last." It is manifest therefore that Ambrose acknowledgeth not only the hardness of some things, but also the easiness and clearness of all things necessary to eternal life. Hierom to Paulinus noteth certain difficult places in the Prophets: and who will mislike him, that he desired to learn of Didymus? the best learned may increase in knowledge. David prayed for understanding. The eunuch required an interpreter. We also affirm, that prayer is necessary for all men, and an interpreter requisite for the unlearned, that will come to the right understanding of the scripture: and that study, watching, fasting, and praying be good and necessary means to attain to the understanding of such matters as be difficult in the scriptures. But further you object that we say, "The fathers did commonly err." We say indeed they did sometimes err; and except you say they did commonly err in exposition of the scriptures, you must acknowledge that you do commonly err in expounding them, for their expositions are commonly contrary to yours, and agreeable to ours, as I have showed in very many of these annotations. But hereof you infer, that the scriptures were hard, or else they being so wise and learned, could not have erred. We deny not but the scriptures are in some places very hard, yet all error ariseth not of the hardness of the scriptures, but oftentimes of the weakness of men's understanding, especially when they will not seek the meaning of the scriptures in the scriptures, but bring a prejudicate opinion not grounded on the scriptures, to expound them according to that opinion, and so the fathers sometimes do err. "But if they were hard to the fathers, how are they easy to us?" They are made so much the more easy to us, as they have searched out the true sense of them before us. Sometimes also by their going awry, we may better see the right path. In some things the knowledge of the tongues, which many of them lacked, helpeth us.

We see how dangerous it is to follow man's judgment in the scriptures, we build upon no sense, as certain in the scriptures which is not proved by the very text itself, or conference of other places of scripture, to be the true and proper sense of the Holy Ghost: so are we scholars of the scripture, and not arrogant masters, which command the sense of the scriptures to serve their own fantastical opinions, as the Pope doth, who neither acknowledgeth the sufficiency of the scriptures, nor will have them expounded any otherwise, but that he may retain his Antichristian authority, though it be never so contrary to the plain and evident sense of them, yet to the very express words, which be so plain, as that they need no interpretation. As for the multitude of commentaries, though some might well be spared, it is not because the scriptures are hard in all places, but because God's gifts are divers in many men, all which conferring their study to the

interpretation of difficulties, do the more explain the scriptures to the unlearned or unexercised: and also in profitable collection out of places easy to be understood, do confirm the faith, and instruct the faithful in many particularities, which are not always observed of every one that readeth the text, and yet are necessarily deduced out of it.

Concerning the disagreement between Luther and Zuinglius, it is not in many things, nor those the principal, so that if it grow

upon some difficulty of the words of the scripture, as partly it did, the whole scripture is not thereby proved to be difficult, although a prejudicate opinion did more hurt in that case, than the difficulty of the scriptures. The hardness of the scriptures is not the cause of so many heresies, but the malice of Satan, that stirreth up such proud and contentious instruments. In which number instead of Wicliff and the Protestants, we rightly place the Pope and the Papists.

## ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT OF JOHN'S THREE EPISTLES.

John in none of his epistles doth speak any word against justification by faith only, as we teach it according to the scriptures, but against the impiety of them that thought a justifying faith could be separated from good works. That he declareth to be impossible, yet ascribeth our salvation wholly to the mercy of God in Jesus Christ apprehended by faith, which overcometh the world, where-

by we know that we have eternal life, which believe in the name of the Son of God, 1 John 5, and therefore are justified before God by faith only without works, not by faith which is void of good works, from which the justifying faith can never be separated, but because works which follow a justified man, cannot be the cause of his justification.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN THE APOSTLE.

### CHAPTER I.

3. That church can prove itself to descend from the apostles, which can prove that it holdeth with the doctrine and faith of the apostles, and none other. But that church hath no communion with the apostles which hath only succession of persons and places, without continuance in the doctrine of the apostles. Such is the popish church, and all heretical assemblies, what other descent from the apostles soever, they vaunt that they can prove. And if the popish church could justify her faith and doctrine by the scriptures, she would never fly to such vain arguments, of succession of persons, and apostolic chairs, which she knoweth well to be other churches, which yet she doth not acknowledge to be catholic or true churches.

7. The scripture doth no where ascribe the purging or cleansing us from our sins to any of these things which you name, but only to the merit of Christ, his death, and bloodshedding; the benefit whereof is applied to us by faith only, and not by fastings, alms, or any work of charity. Our faith is planted and confirmed, as by God's instruments, by the preachers of his word, who testify and assure us in his name, that our sins are forgiven us by Christ's sake; and for more confirmation of our faith, do add the sacraments, which are the seals of his grace, by which faith we call upon God, now that we are reconciled by Christ, our most merciful Father to obtain remission of our sins, and all his other benefits in the merits and worthiness of Christ's death only. All other works proceeding of faith, as love, alms, fasting, and all the spiritual sacrifices that we offer, be acceptable to

God by Jesus Christ, and not by merit of the works. But as for sacrifice for sin, we have none, but the Lamb of God once offered, whose blood purgeth us from all sins. And therefore the papists setting up another sacrifice than that which Christ himself did offer once for all, and beside seeking remission of sins by so many other means as God hath never appointed, to apply the benefit of Christ's death by them can never excuse themselves of derogating from Christ's blood, or seeking remission otherwise than by it. To omit all other blasphemies, what Christian heart doth not tremble, to hear them defend this prayer of the popish church: "By the blood of Thomas which he for thee did spend, make us, Christ, to climb whither Thomas did ascend." Is this nothing else but "humbly to use the means appointed by Christ, to apply the benefit of his blood unto them?"

7. If the blood of Christ do cleanse us from all sin not only committed before baptism, but also committed of frailty since baptism, as Bede saith rightly, where be our satisfactions by works or pains suffered in this life, or in purgatory after this life, to purge men of their sins, or to satisfy God's justice? But you add a condition: "yet so, if we use for the remission of them such means as be requisite, and as Christ hath appointed, whereof Bede reckoneth some." To apply the remission of our sins by Christ's death, are not required any merits or satisfaction of our works nor sacraments of the work wrought, but the sacraments to confirm faith, of which followeth necessarily repentance and faith. The words of Bede are these, "whatsoever after baptism by daily frailty we have committed, the guilt

of the same our Redeemer remitteth unto us, especially when among the works of light which we do, we do humbly every day confess our errors unto him, when we receive the sacrament or mysteries of his blood, when forgiving our debtors we pray that our debts may be forgiven us, when being mindful of his passion, we do willingly suffer any adversity." These doth not Bede say to be means for the remission of sins, but to be used of all them that obtain remission of sins by the blood of Christ, as duties of thankfulness, not as merits of forgiveness. Augustin also upon this text acknowledgeth all sins committed before baptism, and after to be purged by the bloodshedding of Christ upon the cross, but of the means to apply the same unto us he speaketh not. Hierom saith, "That which is written, and the blood of Christ doth cleanse us from all our sins, is to be understood, as well in the confession of baptism as in the mercy of repentance." Therefore the blood of Christ without our merit and satisfaction, or other purgation doth cleanse us from sin, as well in repentance, as in baptism. The contrary of which doctrine, is the ground of your meritorious and satisfactory works, popish penance, satisfaction, purgatory, pope's pardons, masses, and such like matters derogatory to the blood of Christ.

8. The Apostle maketh not the popish distinction of mortal and venial sins, but exhorteth us to strive against all sin.

8. The scripture saith plainly, that the reward of all sin is death and the curse of God; therefore as heretics you gather, to confirm your heresy, that which the scripture teacheth not. For all sins are pardonable to the penitent and faithful, and without faith and repentance, even the least and lightest sins are damnable and deadly. Therefore by works no man can be just, but by faith only in Christ, and through remission of sins, seeing all have sinned and are justified freely: and that doth Augustin teach of all that ever were just before God, not excepting the Virgin Mary, although in contention with the heretics, he will have no question concerning her, for the honour of Christ. For he acknowledgeth the scripture to be true without exception, that saith, "all have sinned," *cap. 39. De Gen. ad liter. 10. cap. 18.* he affirmeth that her body came of the "propagation of sin." Whereas Pelagius affirmed that Abel is called just in the scriptures, and no sin is mentioned that he committed; Augustin proveth that it is vain argument against the scripture, which pronounceth generally that all men have sinned, and are destitute of the glory of God, to say, Abel had no sin, because there is none particularly mentioned. Therefore, although he had no heinous sins, yet he might have less sins, such as he rehearseth, which prove that he was not just by works before God, but by faith. For seeing the love of God is the only justice of the law, and that was not perfect in Abel, because it might be increased. Augustin concludeth, that Abel was not perfectly just, and therefore he had

only grace of God, whereby Abel was just in his sight, and not by the merit of his works. By which the rest of the patriarchs also were just, whose great sins are rehearsed, that you cannot deny to be mortal, as drunkenness in Noah, lying in Abraham and Isaac, infidelity in Moses, cursing of his day in Job, adultery in David, denying his master in Peter, and forsaking of him in all the rest of the Apostles. Augustin therefore doth not serve your pelting distinction, by rehearsing what small sins might be in Abel, although the scripture calleth him just, because he was a man in whom the flesh did rebel against the spirit. For although by the grace of God he abstained from the most grievous sins, yet declareth that he was not void of sin, and therefore not just by works before God, but by grace and faith in Christ. Therefore he affirmeth, "that this is the only hope of all the godly, groaning under this burden of corruptible flesh, and in the infirmity of this life, that we have one Mediator Jesus Christ the just, and he is the propitiation for our sins." *Con. 2. Epist. Pel. ad Bonifac. lib. 3. cap. 5.* Therefore he setteth down as one of the three principles which the catholic church doth hold against the Pelagians: "That no man doth live in this corruptible body, in how great justice soever, without any sins whatsoever." *De bono vel dono persever. cap. 2.* Augustin therefore acknowledgeth that there be some sins greater than others, as we do, but he acknowledgeth no sin so small, but it deserveth death, if God should deal in justice against us. For why did the catholic church hold, that no man in what justice soever, was void of sin? But to confute the Pelagians, which taught justification before God by good works. Which they did with more show of reason than the papists, when they held that a man might live without sin. Where the papists confessing that a man cannot live without sin, nevertheless do affirm, that he is just before God by his works, which are every one imperfect, and short of the love of God, in which only that kind of justice doth consist, as Augustin saith. And think to shift off the matter by a vain distinction of mortal and venial sins, which the scriptures know not, and it is invented for nothing else, but to obscure the grace of God, by which only we are justified through faith in the death and merits of Christ. Fulgentius in his book *de fide ad Petrum*, excepting infants newly baptized, as living without sin, meaneth of such sins as are committed by deliberation and purpose, not such as rise of their corrupt nature, which are also sin, though not imputed to the elect: but of the distinction of mortality or veniality, he speaketh nothing.

#### CHAPTER 2.

1. The words of Bede are these: "He is not contrary to himself, which said before, that we could not live without sin, and now saith, he writeth unto us that we should not sin. But there he admonished us necessarily, prudently, and wholesomely of our frailty, lest any man should please himself, as though he

were innocent, and by extolling himself of merits, should the rather perish: here consequently he exhorteth, that if we cannot be without all fault, yet we should endeavour as much as we are able, lest we ourselves should live negligently, after the frailty of our condition: but should fight watchfully and manfully against all vices, especially the greater and more open vices, which by the Lord's help we may more easily overcome or avoid.

1. The scripture never calleth any angel, Saint, or creature living or dead our advocate with the Father, but only Jesus Christ, therefore none can be so called without derogation to his office to whom it is proper. Augustin saith, If John had offered himself to be a mediator or advocate, "as Parmenian placed the bishop mediator between the people and God," he should be no true apostle but Antichrist, *Cont. epist. Parm. lib. 2. cap. 8.* But forasmuch as the word advocate is borrowed of lawyers, and signifieth him that is to plead the justice of his client's cause, not every one which may or doth pray for us, can be called our advocate, but he only that can plead his justice, which he hath given us before God his Father, to obtain mercy for us. Therefore if angels and saints departed do pray for us, which we know not by the scriptures, as we know that our brethren alive do pray for us: yet are they no advocates of ours, but petitioners and entreaters for us, nor no mediators by whose worthiness we may look to obtain remission of our sins. Neither doth Augustin say any thing against us, when he saith that the Saints living, the bishops or pastors do pray for us. For they pray not as advocates, but as fellow members, nor yet the Saints departed, if they do pray for us, dare usurp the office of Christ, to be advocates to plead their justice or merits for us, as you in your blasphemous prayers do often require them. And therefore you labour in vain, by seeking out certain places of the fathers, where the word advocate is used in another sense, to cover the wickedness of your multitude of advocates set up to obtain mercy by their merits, either with Christ, or without him. Augustin calleth not the bishops the people's advocates absolutely, which reproveth Parmenian for calling the bishop the people's mediator, understanding mediator for the same that is called advocate in this place: but he saith the "prelates, as it were advocates, do offer to the most merciful power of God, those whom they have undertaken by imposition of hands.

You see he doth not call them absolutely or properly advocates, but showeth wherein they resemble advocates, not in that principal point of the advocate's office, whereof the apostle here speaketh. Neither doth your popish church call the Virgin Mary your advocate, in such sense as Ireneus or his interpreter, calleth her the advocate of Eve. For Ireneus meaneth, neither in respect of her merits, nor of her prayers, that Mary is made the advocate of Eve, but that by her obedience unto the word of God, she conceived

Christ the Saviour of all men, as Eve by her disobedience deceived Adam, in whom destruction came upon all men. "But to confound the Protestant plainly, Christ acknowledgeth angels to be deputed for the protection of infants, and in other places the protection of all the faithful is ascribed to them." A plain confusion. The angels are appointed to the protection of the faithful, therefore not only they, but Saints departed also be our advocates. As though the angels could not protect the elect against their adversaries, except they were their advocates also with God the Father, to purchase remission of sins for them. But the Protestants themselves, you say, pray for the protection and advocacy of angels. Indeed we pray to God that he will protect us by the ministry of his holy angels, because we read in the scriptures, that the angels are God's ministers for the defence of the chosen. But for the advocacy of angels, that is, that they may be our advocates, we pray not, neither are you able to prove that the ministry of defence or protection is all one with advocacy: not that although protection of us be deputed to angels, that it is also deputed to Saints departed, who as they are of divers natures, so they are not deputed to the same service or ministry. "Christ therefore," as Augustin saith upon this place, "is our advocate: endeavour that thou sin not: but if of infirmity of this life, sin have crept upon thee, immediately look to it, immediately let it displease thee, immediately condemn it, and when thou hast condemned it, thou shalt come securely to the Judge, there thou hast an advocate, be not afraid, lest thou shouldst lose the cause of this confession. For if a man in this life doth sometime commit himself to an eloquent tongue, and perish not, thou committest thyself to God the word, and shalt thou perish? Cry, we have an advocate with the Father. Behold John himself keeping humility, certainly he was a just man, and a great person, which drunk the secrets of mysteries of our Lord's breast: he, even he, which by drinking of our Lord's breast, uttered his Divinity, saying: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, even he, being such a man, said not, you have an advocate with the Father, but if any man shall sin, saith he, we have an advocate: he said not you have, nor you have me, neither saith he, you have Christ himself, but he set Christ, not himself to be an advocate, and said, we have, not you have. He had rather place himself in the number of sinners, that he might have Christ his advocate, than that he should place himself to be an advocate instead of Christ, and to be found among the proud that are to be damned. Brethren, we have Jesus Christ the just himself to be our advocate, he is the propitiation for our sins: he that held this hath made no Heresy, he that held this hath made no schism. For when are schisms made? when men say, we are just, we sanctify the unclean, we justify the ungodly, we ask, we obtain: but what said John? If any man

have sinned, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just. But some man will say, then do not holy men ask for us? then do not bishops and overseers ask for the people? But mark the scriptures, and see that overseers also commend themselves to the people. For the apostle saith to the people: Praying also for us. The apostle prayeth for the people, the people prayeth for the apostle: we pray for you brethren, and pray you also for us, let all the members pray one for another, let the head make intercession for all." You see then, that the mutual duty of the members, praying one for another, doth differ from the advocacy of Christ, which is the head, and who only pleadeth justice for us, as an advocate with the Father, to whom we may be bold to come without mediation or advocacy, and much less merits or satisfaction of any other.

2. As the Donatists would drive the church into Africa, so the Papists into Europe, in a part whereof only their popish doctrine reigneth.

4. A vain cavil, we affirm that we neither keep, nor possibly can keep God's commandments perfectly, for then we might truly say we have no sin, which no man can say. Yet by his grace, not of our strength, we keep his commandments, which are charity, saith Augustin, though not in such perfection as his justice requireth, yet in such measure as his mercy in Christ accepteth. If Papists affirm that they keep God's commandments so perfectly that they sin not, they deceive themselves, and the truth is not in them.

18. We learn by this, that Antichrist is no singular man, but the greatest heresy and pride maketh that great and special Antichrist, of whom the apostle speaketh, 2 *Thes.* 2.

19. The text saith, "They were not of us," you say, they were of us, which the scripture never saith, but to maintain your heresy of the sacraments giving grace *ex opere operato*, even to the reprobate, you dare speak contradictory to the Holy Ghost. The reprobate therefore are in the visible church, but never be members of the body of Christ which is the Catholic church. "They should not have gone out," saith Augustin, "if they had been of us, before they went out: therefore they were not of us: many that are not of us, receive the sacraments with us."

19. The Pope and Papists are gone out from the Catholic church of Christ, into the malignant and Antichristian church of Rome, because they abide not in the ancient fellowship of the Christian religion taught by the apostles, and received in the Primitive church: whence Boniface the Third went out manifestly, and by Gregory's judgment, became Antichrist, when he bought for a great sum of money of Phocas the traitor and murderer, that usurped the empire, the title of universal bishop, and head of the church, which profane and Antichristian title, none of his predecessors, as Gregory testifieth, would ever use before him. From that time, the pope hath openly exercised tyranny in the church of God, and

daily more and more increased in pride and rapacity, until he had utterly obscured the doctrine of salvation in the greatest number of men, the remnant only excepted, which according to God's election, were always preserved. Luther and Calvin therefore went not out of the Catholic church, but being called by the Spirit of God, and his word in the scripture, "they came out of Babylon" into the church of Christ. *Apoc.* 18. 4. "They came from the Papists therefore, as Augustin came from the Manichees, and many other godly men, that have been reclaimed out of heresies, wherein they had been born and bred, and noseled up from their youth. Which Heretics with as great equity as you, might abuse this text against them, and say, they went out from them. That you can tell the year, the places, and the ringleaders of our revolt, is a vain brag. For we have not revolted from Christ and his church, but from Antichrist and his slavish army of popish priests, prophesied of by Gregory, which was performed in his successor, 2 *Thes.* 2. The pope is proved to be the great Antichrist, unto whom the revolt was made from Christ and his faith.

19. Heretics and other reprobates, may be in the outward society or fellowship of the Catholic church, but they can never be true members of the Catholic church of Christ, which is the number of God's elect, the members of the body of Christ. Augustin saith, "Many that are not of us, receive the sacraments with us. They receive baptism with us, they receive with us that which the faithful do know, the blessing and eucharist, and whatsoever is the number of the holy sacraments. They take the communication of the altar itself with us, and yet they are not of us, trial proveth that they are not of us." You see that neither the receiving of baptism, nor of the Lord's Supper, can make them of us, which are none of us, therefore the sacraments are seals of God's grace in the elect, they do not give grace of the work wrought. Oecumenius, expounding this place, saith, "They were not of us, that is, of the lot of them which are saved." Augustin in the other places which you quote confirmeth it, "There are some, which are called of us the sons of God, for the grace which they have received but temporally, yet they are not of God," of whom John saith, "they went out from us, but they were not of us, &c., that is, when they seemed to be among us, they were not of us. They were in good, but because they continued not therein, that is, they continued not to the end, they were not of us, even when they were with us, that is, they were not of the number of the sons, even when they were in the faith of the sons: because they that are the sons indeed, are foreknown and predestinated to be conformable to the image of his son, and are called according to his purpose, that they may be elect. For the son of promise perisheth not, but the son of perdition. These men therefore were of the many that are called, but of the few that are chosen, they were

not." You see therefore the Catholic church, which is the body of Christ, consisteth only of the elect and predestinate unto eternal life, of which number they are none that believe for a time, and after fall away, for such were never of the church, though they were in it. In the other place, *De bono persever. cap. 8.* he understandeth them only to be of us, which are predestinate to life. The Pelagian proceedeth and saith, "Why hath he not granted to some which worshipped him with a good intent or faith, to continue to the end? Why thinkest thou? But because he doth not lie, which saith, they went out from us, but they were not of us, for if they had been of us, they should or would have tarried with us." Augustin never saith, that the reprobate are truly members of the Catholic church or body of Christ, although they be for a time in the visible church, partakers of the sacraments, have some taste of the grace of God, and some temporal faith for a season, but never continue therein to the end.

20. Augustin understandeth this, of the inward teaching by the Holy Ghost, which must concur with the outward ministry of the church, that it may be profitable. "It is the inward master," saith he, "that teacheth, Christ teacheth, his inspiration teacheth, where his inspiration and unction is not, words sound in vain outwardly. Except the Spirit be present in the heart of the hearer, the speech of the teacher is vain. No man therefore ascribeth to man which teacheth, that he understandeth out of the mouth of him that speaketh. For except there be one that teacheth within, the teacher's tongue laboureth in vain without." John meaneth not therefore, that the implicit faith of the Papists is sufficient, but that true Christians have distinct knowledge of all things necessary to salvation, both by the outward preaching of the word, and by the inward unction of the Spirit.

24. All that they heard of the apostles is contained in the holy scriptures, which is able to make a man wise unto salvation, by faith in Jesus. 2 *Tim. 3. 15.*

29. We see that no man doth justice but he that is born of God, that is, which is justified by faith, and regenerated by God's Spirit without his merit or works. But we see not, that by the merit of this justice, any man is just before God, but only by the justice of Christ imputed to him, of whose grace he hath power to do this justice. Of both these justices Augustin speaketh upon this text. "Our justice is now of faith: perfect justice is not but in angels. The beginning of our justice is the confession of our sins. Hast thou begun not to defend thy sin? Now thou hast begun justice, and it shall be made perfect in thee, when thou shalt delight to do nothing else, when death shall be swallowed up in victory."

### CHAPTER 3.

3. Augustin meaneth, that our will being enlarged by God's Spirit, consenteth to the

grace of God, not that it is free by nature: his words are these, "Thou seest he has not taken away free will, when he saith he sanctifieth himself, who doth sanctify us but God? But God doth not sanctify thee being unwilling. Therefore in that thou joinest thy will to God, thou dost sanctify thyself. Thou dost sanctify thyself, not by thyself, but by him which came, that he might dwell in thee." He doth not therefore set out the strength of man's will, but showeth, that the consent thereof to God's grace, is wrought by God, and is not in the power of man. "For it doth not help the Pelagian heresy," saith Bede, "that it is said, of a man, he sanctifieth himself, as though any man without God's help, by free will could sanctify himself."

4. If sin be every transgression of the law, it followeth that every transgression of the law is sin, and so meaneth the apostle by the word *adikia*, as well as by the word *anomia*. For all sin is injustice, and all injustice is sin: therefore your vulgar interpreter translateth both the words by one Latin word, *Iniquitas* Augustin upon this text saith, "Let no man say sin is one thing, iniquity is another thing, I am a sinful man, but I am not unjust, every one that doth commit sin doth commit iniquity, for sin is iniquity, what then shall we do with our sins and iniquities?" Augustin taketh iniquity to be as large as sin, and all iniquity to be sin, as all sin is iniquity. Bede hath not only the same words of Augustin, but he addeth, "All that sin are guilty of prevarication or transgression of the law, that is, not only they which condemn the precepts of the written law, given unto them, but they also, which either of infirmity, or of negligence, or of ignorance, corrupt the innocency of the natural law, which we all received in the first man that was created." Bede not only taketh all to be sin, which is iniquity, and is contrary to the equity of God's law, but also that he counteth even the corruption of innocency, which is of infirmity, to be sin, therefore all concupiscence that is contrary to the law of God, which Paul expressly called sin. *Rom. 7. 7.* Which seeing the scripture never denieth to be sin in them in whom it is pardoned, what heretical madness is it to wrest the scriptures, to maintain your own false positions? Oecumenius, both in this place, and in 1 *John 5.* interpreteth iniquity to be the same that sin, as sin is iniquity. "We must know," saith he, "that *anomia*, that is, sin, is a falling from that which is good, *anomia* that is, iniquity, is a transgression of the law that is given. And both of these has his beginning, namely, sin is a degenerating from that which is good, iniquity to do against the law that is set. And they agree the one with the other, and are about the same thing. For he which sinneth, erreth from the mark, which is according to nature, and in nature itself. For the scope or mark of man's nature, is to live according to reason, far from unreasonable-ness. Likewise, he that doth unjustly, of-

fendeth about the law given in nature, being affected intemperately. Therefore the apostle of our Lord hath rightly changed the one into the other, or used them both for one.

1 John 5, he saith, "The apostle maketh a plain division of sin, as it were from the general sin, and saith: All iniquity is sin, whether it be unto death or not." Bede upon that place saith, "There is so great diversity of sins, that whatsoever disagreeeth from the rule of equity is numbered among sins. Augustin, *cont. Jul. lib. 5. cap. 3.* saith, "Concupiscence of the flesh, against which the good spirit lusteth, is both sin, because there is in it disobedience against the government of the mind, and also a punishment of sin, because it was rendered to the merits of the disobedient, and it is also the cause of sin, by defection of him that consenteth, or by contagion of him that is born." You see Augustin saith expressly, it is sin, and wheresoever he seemeth to deny it to be sin, he meaneth either because it is sin of another kind, than that whereto consent is given, or else because it is not imputed to them that be regenerated. Ambrose in *Apologia David*, saith nothing to this purpose. But in his book *De Paradiso cap. 8.* he saith out of this text, "What is sin, but a transgression of the law of God, and disobedience of the heavenly commandments?" And touching concupiscence, that it is sin, he saith in his commentary upon the epistle to the Romans, *cap. 7.* "He hath not discerned this concupiscence from sin, but joined it to, signifying, that when there was not so much as any suspicion, that this thing was not lawful before God, I knew," saith he, "that it is sin."

6. Understanding mortal sin as you do, for every transgression that deserveth death, as every act of adultery, &c., your exposition is heretical, as any that Jovinian or Pelagius made: whereof it should follow, that David was not the Son of God, when he committed adultery, and consequently none of the predestinate. Therefore Augustin and Bede do briefly expound this text, saying, "Insomuch as he abideth in him, in so much he sinneth not," but no man abideth in him perfectly, therefore no man is free from sin, but in part. Augustin saith, "Hath not this man believed which sinneth? If he have believed, as pertaining to his faith, he sinneth not." Didymus saith, "He that consisteth in Christ which is justice and sanctification, offendeth not." Augustin, *verse 9.* saith, "There is a certain sin, which he cannot commit, which is born of God, which being not committed, other sins are loosed, which being committed, other sins are confirmed:" meaning that he which is born of God, cannot be void of love toward his neighbour, though he sin particularly against the rule of charity. The same meaneth Hierom against Jovinian, that inasmuch as we are the children of God, we neither commit sin, nor can commit sin, though in respect of our frailty, because our renovation is not perfect, all the children of God, do sin often. Therefore he sinneth not

according to the apostle's meaning, in whom sin doth not reign, although he fall often, and have need to say every day, forgive us our trespasses.

7. But no man doth justice perfectly, therefore no man is just in God's sight by doing justice, but by faith. So saith Augustin upon this text, "He sanctifieth and purifieth us, as he is holy or pure, he is holy by eternity, we are holy or pure by faith. We are just, as he is just, but he is just in unchangeable perpetuity, as we are just by believing in him, whom we have not seen, that we may at length see him. And even when our justice shall be perfect, when we shall be made equal to the Angels, neither then shall we be equal to him," &c. Oecumenius also saith, "God providing for his creature, being made justice and sanctification, was manifested in the world, that he might take away the works of the devil which are sin."

8. To continue in heinous sins is devilish, and not beseeming the children of God. Yet by every grievous fall they are not known to be the sons of the devil. David, although by the devil's suggestion, he had committed adultery and murder, yet was he not thereby known to be the devil's son, but a disobedient son of God, whom by his mercy and chastisement, he called to repentance.

22. The apostle doth not attribute the granting of our requests to the merit of our works, or keeping of God's commandments, but showeth that charity, or the keeping of God's commandments is inseparable from faith, by which we have confidence to be heard in our prayers for Jesus Christ's sake. Therefore Bede saith upon this text, "When John had said, whatsoever we shall ask, we shall receive of him, because we keep his commandments: he addeth immediately:—And this is his commandment, that we believe in the name of his son Jesus Christ, and love one another as he has given us commandment. He setteth down his commandment in the singular number, and then consequently he addeth two commandments: namely, faith and love, because these two cannot be separated one from the other." Where you note further, "that God's commandments are not impossible to be kept, but were then, and now observed of good men." We confess they are not impossible to be kept in some measure, but perfectly there was never any that kept them, nor never any that could keep them, but only Jesus Christ. Hierom against the Pelagians, saith, "God commanded things possible, and that I confess: but all those possible things every one of us cannot have, not through weakness of nature, lest thou shouldst slander God, but through weariness of mind, which cannot have all virtues together, and always." *Conc. Pel. lib. 1.* Augustin saith, "No man in this life hath been, is, or shall be of perfect justice." *Desp. et lib. cap. 35.* "The greater our knowledge is, so much the greater shall be our love: therefore look how much there wanteth now to our love, so much we must

believe to be wanting to perfect justice," *cap.* 36.

23. We teach not, that only faith is commanded, but that only faith justifieth before God, and that by faith all works of charity please God, and not by the merit or worthiness of them. *Ileb.* 11.

#### CHAPTER 4.

1. The apostle meaneth, that not only the whole church together, but that every man for himself, though not of himself, or by himself only, but by such rules as the scripture setteth down, ought to try whether the spirit be of God, before he give credit to it. But you object that Paul saith expressly, the gift of discerning spirits and doctrines is not given to all, but to some. And I answer, that miraculous gift is given to none that I know in these days, more than the gift of healing, of interpretation of tongues, &c. But here the apostle delivereth a general doctrine that concerneth every one of the faithful, as he will avoid seducing and deceits of false teachers. Where you add, every one must prove the spirits by obeying the church, it is a very uncertain trial, when the question is, where and with whom the church is, for all heretics make as great claim to the church, as to the truth. But you would make sure work, that men without further trial should receive and obey you, because you say you are the church, and in the church, you only have the gift of discerning spirits and doctrines. But they that would have every man to try the spirits by such rules as the apostle setteth down, do not bring men from their pastors' and church's judgment: but to approve the judgment of their pastors, if they be true pastors, and of the church, if it be the true church. Yea they seek to bring all men to such certainty of their belief, that they may know it is grounded upon the holy scriptures. And if the decrees of the councils were not to be examined by this rule also, we should, as Calvin saith, accept many errors instead of truth: seeing many councils both provincial and general have erred. And what company of men since the apostles are of greater credit than the apostles themselves? yet the Holy Ghost commendeth them in the Acts of the Apostles, which examined the doctrine of the apostles by the scriptures. *Acts* 17. 11.

2. The apostle speaketh for all times, giving a general note to discern all false doctrine concerning Christ, which either is in denial of his person or of his offices. This mark will serve for all times, and in case of all false doctrine, which is against the true faith of Jesus Christ. And by this all Christians may discern the pope to be Antichrist, and the Papists to be heretics. Because that although they confess in words the person of Christ, which divers heretics denied, yet they denied the offices of Christ, for which end he did become that person God and man: namely, to be our only spiritual King, Prophet, and Priest, Saviour, Mediator, Advocate Re-

deemer, Justice, Sanctification, Wisdom, &c. Augustin understands this mark to convince all heretics and schismatics, because not only the person that came, but the end for which he came must be considered, or else all heretics, will after a sort, in tongue and words confess, that Jesus Christ came in the flesh. "But let us inquire," saith Augustin, "wherefore Christ came in the flesh, and we shall find who they are which deny him to have come in the flesh: for if you give heed to their tongues, you shall hear many heretics confessing that Christ came in the flesh, but the truth convinceth them, wherefore Christ came in the flesh," &c. The like in effect saith Didymus upon this text. And the text is plain that the apostle teacheth to discern the spirit of Antichrist, which was not proper to his age, but was to be revealed after his time. Therefore your example of him that teacheth Christ to be really present and sacrificed in the mass, is a note to discern an Antichristian teacher, not a true spirit: for it is both against the truth of his body, and also against the dignity of his eternal priesthood.

3. It cannot be proved by this place, that the Greek text which here differeth from the Latin, is corrupted. Although Socrates report that Nestorius did thus corrupt it, yet his report is proved false, because Cyprian, who was almost two hundred years before Nestorius, did read as the Greek copies are now. So did Didymus Alexandrius in his comment upon this text. How Irenæus did read it is not certain, because his interpreter being of later time doth follow for the most part the vulgar Latin text in his allegations of the scripture. Augustin readeth according to the Greek and the Latin also. Didymus also interpreteth after both. For Leo and Bede, that were of later times, it is not so material if they follow the vulgar Latin, the sense whereof is contained in the Greek.

6. They succeed not the apostles that teach not their doctrine, but they that are the true prophets, which are able to justify all that they teach by the writings of the apostles, did teach the same doctrine that the apostles taught. Contrariwise, they hear not the apostles, whose doctrine agreeth not with the scripture of the apostles. And by this mark we know undoubtedly, that the Papists are spirits of error and not of truth.

17. Confidence whereof the apostle here speaketh, is a necessary effect of justifying faith, whereof the apostle saith: being justified by faith: we have peace with God by our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have access through faith, &c. *Rom.* 5. 1. For want of which justifying faith and confidence, the devils, although they believe, yet they do tremble, *Jac.* 2. And by this we ought to be as certain of our salvation, as of any other thing that God hath promised, or which we are bound to believe. Seeing the same truth is in the performance of God's promises, concerning our salvation, which is in the report of things done by God, or Christ toward our salvation. Therefore to doubt thereof in



respect of God's truth, is blasphemous against the immutability of his truth. And therefore though the godly be assaulted of their infirmity and of Satan's temptation, to doubt oftentimes of their salvation, yet they must oppose the certainty of God's truth against such assaults, and holding fast the promises of God, assure themselves of the effect of them. But with you it is only a hope, whereby you mean an uncertain hope that may be deceived, and confound him that so hopeth.

This may well be the hope of the Papists, but the hope of Christians is most certain and confoundeth not, because the love of God is poured forth into our hearts by his spirit which he hath given us, *Rom. 5. 5*: but to examine the other part of your definition, "you say it is well corroborated, confirmed, and strengthened, upon the promises and grace of God, and the party's merits." We see now what maketh the insufficiency, what maketh uncertainty, not the promise or grace of God: for the gifts of God are without repentance, but the party's merits, according to which the promise and grace of God with God is effectual. And so you deny the promises of God to be founded in his mere grace, and his grace also you deny to be grace, seeing it is not effectual but by merit of works: for grace is no grace saith the apostle, if it be of works, *Rom. 11. 6*. So are you no less enemies to the grace of God, than the Pelagians. And here we see what a poison of true faith men's merits are, that though a man's "hope be well corroborated, confirmed, strengthened, not upon them only, but upon them and upon God's promises and grace, yet it is but only a hope," and no certainty or assurance of salvation. "But the words both following and going before, prove evidently against the protestants that our confidence and hope in the day of judgment, dependeth not only upon apprehension of Christ's merits by faith, or upon the grace and mercy, but also upon our conformity to Christ in this life, in charity and good works." Verily if it depend not only upon Christ's grace, but upon our works, it dependeth not at all upon his grace. "If of grace," saith the apostle, "it is not at all of works: for else grace is become no grace, if of works, it is not at all of grace, for else work should be no work," *Rom. 11. 6*. Wherefore except we will exclude the grace of Christ altogether, we must hold that our confidence and hope depend only upon his grace and mercy. "My whole hope," saith Augustin, "is nothing else but by exceeding great mercy." *Conf. lib. 10. cap. 29*. What saith the apostle then in this place against the protestants? He saith that by this, charity is perfected in us, that as he is, such should we be in the word, that we may have confidence in the day of judgment: because charity is an argument of faith, by which we conclude that we have true faith, as we may conclude the cause by the necessary effects thereof. Not that this imperfect charity which we have in this life, is a cause of this security or confi-

dence, but an argument of faith, by which we have confidence in the mere grace and mercy of God exhibited to us in Christ, and not in the merit of our imperfect charity. And so meaneth Peter, that we should make sure our election and vocation by good works, that is, confirm our faith of God's election by the effects of faith, and so make it sure to ourselves and our own knowledge, which is most certain of itself, and is of mere grace and not of works, as the apostle said, *Rom. 11. 6*.

Neither doth Paul trust in the merit of his works to receive a crown of glory, but in the certainty of God's promise, which he is most just to perform, as he is most gracious in promising. Our conformity therefore with Christ in this life in charity and good works, though far from comparison in equality or perfection of justice, is a thing necessarily adjoined to our salvation, but no cause thereof, being a fruit of the spirit of adoption, which is given us according to God's election and predestination, as Paul testifieth saying: "Whom he hath foreknown he hath predestinated to be conformable to the image of his Son, *Rom. 8. 29*. And those are the children of God, which have not received the spirit of bondage to fear, but the spirit of adoption, to cry boldly, Abba, Father, and to be assured of the heavenly inheritance with Christ, with whom they are conformable in suffering, that they may be partakers with him in glory, *Rom. 8. 15*. Therefore the apostle in the 13th, 14th, and 15th verses before, showeth the cause whereupon this confidence is grounded: namely, the spirit of adoption and faith in the merits of Christ: in this verse and that which followeth, he showeth the effects of the same spirit and faith, by which we may know that we have the spirit and true faith, and so have confidence in the day of judgment.

18. The very context doth show, that fear is contrary to confidence in the day of judgment, whereof he speaketh in the former verse. Augustin understands it, saying: "Now of the same confidence, see what he saith, Whereby is charity understood to be perfect? fear is not in charity: What shall we say to him which began to fear the day of judgment? If charity were perfection in him, he should not fear." Nevertheless, he showeth this fear to be first necessary, as to make way for charity to enter, as a bristle or needle doth for a thread, which thread being entered, driveth out the bristle. He acknowledgeth also the continual fear and reverence of God, which is never separated from God's children, and very well agreeth with charity, whereunto pertain these texts of scripture, which without cause you heap up against us, as though we denied that fear to be necessary for all God's children, whereas we speak of that fear which bringeth perplexity and anxiety of conscience, which is contrary to confidence in the day of judgment. For he that is not assured that his sins are forgiven by the merits of Jesus Christ, can have no quietness of conscience, or confidence in the day of judgment. But he that by God's Spirit, through a

lively faith which by unfeigned charity he knoweth that he hath, is assured of the remission of his sins by the merits of Christ's death, and that the righteousness of Christ is given to him by God, whereby he is justified before God: he trembleth not at the day of judgment, in which he is sure he cannot be condemned, but loveth and desireth the coming of Christ unto judgment. Wherein he is certain to receive the crown of eternal glory due to the justice of Christ, and freely given to him by God, whom as an obedient child he loveth and his brethren, as he hath commanded. Contrariwise, he that trembleth at the judgments of Christ as the devils do, neither loveth God unfeignedly, whom he feareth as the devils fear him, and not as his children fear him, nor hath a true and lively faith, of which cometh true and perfect love which casteth out fear, that hath torment in it. And here is to be marked, that the apostle in this and such like places by perfect charity meaneth not that which hath no defect, but that which is unfeigned and accomplished in the effects of love, and is like to the love wherewith God loveth us. Which hath showed itself indeed, by giving his Son to die for us, so that the comparison, as Augustin often showeth upon the like text, is not in quantity or equality, but in similitude and quality only. For else no charity can be perfect, no not the charity of angels, as Augustin showeth, *John, Tr. 4.*

## CHAPTER 5.

3. Seeing our English word *grievous* cometh of the Latin word *græce*, which is not only weighty, but also troublesome, it better answereth both the Greek and Latin, than the word *heavy* which is properly that which is of great weight. The same word being both in the Greek and Latin, *2 Cor. 10. 18.* You yourselves translate sore, his epistles are sore and vehement, but in effect there is no great difference. We acknowledge that God's commandments are not heavy to him that is born of God, which overcometh the world by faith. Otherwise the yoke of the Law is such a burden, as the apostle confesseth, as neither we nor our fathers were able to bear, but believe to be saved by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, *Acts. 15. 10, 11.* Who having taken away the curse of the Law, and satisfied for our transgressions of the Law, hath also given us grace to love the Law and commandments of God, and in some weak measure to observe them. So that the curse being taken away, our transgressions answered in Christ, and our hearts framed by his grace to love his commandments, and some strength given us to keep them, they are not heavy, they are not burdensome or grievous, and the yoke of Christ is sweet, and his burden light unto us. Who chargeth us not with the intolerable burden of the Law, but easeth and refresheth all them that labour and are heavy laden with it. And therefore the Protestants still affirm, that in such perfection as the justice of God requireth, God's commandments

cannot possibly be fulfilled in this life by any man, except our Saviour Christ. Yet to him whose sins are pardoned by his grace, and he is born again by his Spirit, his commandments are not burdensome. Not because they can be perfectly fulfilled, but because strength is given to keep them in part, and the transgressions of frailty, are pardoned through Christ. Augustin, *de perfect. instit.* whither you send us for the understanding of this text, saith, "For none other cause the scripture affirmeth that God's commandments are not heavy, but that the soul which feeleth them to be heavy, may understand that it hath not yet received strength, to which the Lord's precepts are such as they are commended, namely, light and sweet, and that he might pray with groaning of his will, that he may obtain the gift that maketh them easy." Again, "they are commended not to be heavy, that to whom they are heavy, he may understand that he hath not yet received the gift by which they may not be heavy, and that he should not think he doth fulfil them, when he doth them so that they be heavy. For God loveth a cheerful giver, and yet when he feeleth them to be heavy, he may not be broken in despairing, but be compelled to seek, to ask, to knock. Therefore let us hear in these testimonies which he hath set down afterwards, God commending his precepts not to be heavy, that the commandments of God, saith Celestius the Pelagian heretic, are not only not impossible, but also not heavy or burdensome." Then follow those texts in order which the Papists abuse against us, as their fathers the Pelagians did against Augustin, among which this text is one. To which Augustin thus answereth, "If they did understand that in Deuteronomy, as the apostle Paul allegeth it, that with the heart men believe to justice, with the mouth confession is made to salvation, because the whole have no need of the physician, but the sick, they should be admonished by this testimony of the apostle John, which for this purpose he hath placed last. This is the charity of God, &c., that to the love of God the commandment is not heavy, which is not poured forth into our hearts but by the Holy Ghost, not to the will of man, by giving to which more than they ought, they are ignorant of the justice of God, which love yet shall then be perfected, when all painful fear is departed. *De Natura et gratia. cap. 69. August.*

7. You are never able to prove, that we have altered or corrupted any text of scripture, but contrariwise we have laboured to bring the scriptures from your alterations and corruptions, unto the original truth.

16. The apostle meaneth of sin against the Holy Ghost, for which no man ought to pray, because Christ hath testified that it is irremissible. And although final impenitency be also a sin to death, and followeth the other, yet the apostle speaketh not thereof in this place, but of such a sin as we see a man commit in this life. Bede thus writeth upon this text, "Here ariseth a great question, because

John showeth plainly, that there are certain brethren for whom we are not commanded to pray, whereas our Lord commandeth us to pray even for our persecutors, which question cannot otherwise be answered, except we confess that there are some sins in the brethren, which are more grievous than the persecution of enemies. Therefore the sin of a brother to death, is when after the acknowledging of God, which is given him by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, a man doth oppugn or fight against the brotherhood, and is stirred and tossed by the firebrands of envy, against the grace itself, whereby he is reconciled to God. A sin not unto death is, if any man hath not estranged his love from his brother, but by some infirmity of the mind hath not showed the offices due to the brotherhood. Wherefore our Lord said upon the cross, Father forgive them, because they know not what they do. For having not been made partakers of the grace of the Holy Ghost, they had not yet entered into the fellowship of the holy brotherhood. And blessed Stephen prayeth for them by whom he was stoned, because they had not yet believed Christ, neither did they yet fight against the common grace. But the apostle Paul for this cause I believe, prayeth not for Alexander, because he had been a brother, and had sinned to death, that is, by the firebrands of envy, he had fought against the brotherhood. But for them which had not broken off their love, but fainted through fear, he prayeth that it may be forgiven them. For so he saith, Alexander the coppersmith hath done me much evil; the Lord reward him according to his works. Whom thou also avoid, for he hath greatly resisted our sayings. Afterward he addeth them for whom he prayeth, saying thus, In my first defence no man stood with me, but all forsook me, let it not be imputed to them. Sin unto death also may be taken for sin continuing to death, for which he forbiddeth any man to ask. For that sin which is not corrected in this life, the pardon thereof is in vain asked after death. But if we look diligently to those words that follow, the former sense seemeth to agree more to the tenor of this text." And this former sense in the very same words is given by Augustin, *De sermone Domini in monte, lib. 1. prope finem*. Wherefore that he saith, *De corrupt. et gra. cap. 12.* is thus to be understood, that to forsake faith which worketh by love, is a sin unto death, for he saith in the same place, that seeing that sin is not expressed, many and divers things may be thought of it. *Hierom comment. in 13. Pacian. epist. 2.*

16. By that which is said before in the last section, it may appear upon how weak a foundation prayer for the dead is grounded. The sin whereof John speaketh, is not that only nor specially which Augustin saith to be a sin unto death, but that which Christ saith to be the sin against the Holy Ghost, which shall never be forgiven, such as was the sin of Judas, of the Pharisees, and of Alexander the Coppersmith. And yet it is a sorry argument

that should be drawn of this place. Some of the dead may not be prayed for, as they that die without repentance, *Ergo*, all the rest may be prayed for. Which is as good as this, Alexander the Coppersmith might not be prayed for after his death, *Ergo*, Judas and the Pharisees might be prayed for after their death: which might not be prayed for when they were alive. But that the text cannot be understood of praying for the dead, is manifest by the very words. For he saith not, If any man shall see that his brother hath sinned not to death: but if any shall see his brother sinning, which proveth that his brother is alive, for he sinneth not when he is dead, neither can a man see him sinning when he is dead. So the text is. He shall give life to them: that do sin not unto death, therefore the plain words of the text are, that the man sinneth to death, or sinneth not to death, which is not to be prayed for, or which is to be prayed for. But who so not only sinneth, but also is seen to sin or sinning, whether to death or not to death, is alive and not dead, therefore prayer is to be made by this text, for him that is alive, and not for him that is dead. Now let us see how you convince that this place is most properly, or only meant of praying for the dead. "Because," say you, "neither the church nor any man is dehorted here from praying for any sinner yet living, nor for the remission of any sin in this life." A proper conviction and a learned argument, when that is taken for a reason, which is the whole matter in question. But how prove you that no man is dehorted from praying for any sinner yet living? You answer, "All sinners are pardonable, so long as the committers be alive, for so long they are in case to repent." But our Saviour Christ saith, That he that sinneth against the Holy Ghost, and the sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be pardoned in this world, nor in the world to come. And the apostle saith, It is impossible for them that fall away after they have been enlightened, &c. to be renewed by repentance, *Matt. 12. 31. Heb. 6. 4. &c.* Therefore that you say is false.

You add further, "That the church prayeth, and is often heard for Heretics, Jews, Turks, Apostates, and other wicked whatsoever during their lives." The true church prayeth not for them that sin against the Holy Ghost, or be such apostates, of whom the apostle speaketh, by any general entendment of her prayers, nor for any special person known to be such, and if she should pray for them, she should not be heard to obtain pardon for them, which cannot and will not repent. "But it is a great blasphemy to say," say you, "that apostacy, and certain other sins of the reprobate, cannot be forgiven at all in this life." If it be a blasphemy to say that Christ himself and his apostles said, What is it to speak contradictory to them as you do? The sin of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall never be forgiven saith Christ; it shall sometimes, say you. It is impossible for such to be renewed by repent-

ance, saith the apostle; it is not impossible for any say you. And if we hold this only to avoid the sequel or praying for the dead upon these words, Why did not Paul pray for Alexander the Coppersmith, but against him? Why do Augustin and Bede interpret the text of them, that of envy and malice oppugn the grace of God and the brotherhood? Why doth Oecumenius expound it of them that show no conversion, though they be living? Yea of them that be mindful of injuries. "Besides this," you say, "we must take upon us presumptuously to know and discern of God's secrets, who be reprobate and who not." But it is no presumption in the intention of our prayers, to except all the reprobate, as our Saviour Christ doth expressly, 17. 9. And if any do manifestly show himself to be such a one, by blaspheming the Holy Ghost, or by wilful and malicious obstinacy, it is no presumption to cease praying for him, but it is lawful to pray God to confound them, as David doth the malicious enemies of Christ, Ps. 109. Paul prayeth against Alexander, 2 Tim. 4. 14. The church prayed against Julian the apostate, *Theodoret Hist. lib. 4. cap. 9. et 17. et 19.* By which it may appear how vainly you cavil about Jeremy, who was forbidden to pray for the people, for as their obstinacy was revealed to Jeremy, so the wickedness of some showeth itself openly, of whom John speaketh, that they sin unto death. That he was not forbidden to pray for remission of their sins, but for release of their punishment, is a vain distinction: for if they would or could have repented of their sins, the prophets might assure them, that they should escape the punishment, and so he doth assure them, cap. 26. 13. Augustin in the place before mentioned, *De Serm. Dom. in mont. lib. 1.* "The difference of sins, distinguisheth Judas betraying, from Peter denying: not that we must not pardon him that repenteth, lest we come against that saying of our Lord, wherein he commandeth that we must always pardon our brother, desiring that his brother would forgive him: but because there is so great a filthiness of that fault, that he cannot submit himself to the humility of entreating although he be compelled of an evil conscience, both to acknowledge his sin, and also to utter it. For when Judas had said, I have sinned, in that I have betrayed innocent blood, he ran sooner of desperation to the rope, than of humility to ask pardon. Wherefore it is much to be regarded, to what kind of repentance, God giveth pardon. For many much sooner do confess that they have sinned, and are so angry with themselves, that they would vehemently that they had not sinned: but yet they lay not down their life, to make their heart humble and obedient, and to desire pardon: which affection of the mind, it is to be believed, that they have already of their condemnation, for the greatness of their sin. And this peradventure is to sin against the Holy Ghost, that is, after grace of the Holy Ghost received, to oppugn the brotherly charity, by malice and envy, which sin our Lord

saith, is not to be forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come."

21. It is well known, to them that have but mean knowledge in the Greek tongue, that the word which the apostle useth, when the apostle did write, was taken for the same that we call an image, and hereto all the dictionaries old and new bear witness. Therefore it was no corruption to translate in this place, and much less in many other places of the scripture, out of the Hebrew tongue, images or idols, indifferently, as I have showed at large in my defence of our translations against Greg. Martyn. *cap. 3.* throughout. Therefore saith Tertullian upon this text, "Little children," saith John, "keep yourselves from idols, not now from idolatry, that is, as it were from the service, but from the idols, that is, from the very image of them." *Ahipsa effigie eorum.* Origen, in *Exod. II. 8. non solum idolum fieri vetat, sed et similitudinem omnium, &c.* Seeing you worship your Popish images, as grossly as the Gentiles worshipped their images, that which is spoken against heathenish idols and idolatry is rightly applied against popish idols and idolatry. And therefore we regard not the curses of that blasphemous and idolatrous Council of Nice the second, but oppose against it, and all the defenders of it, the curses of God himself. *Deut. 27. 15.* "Cursed be he whosoever shall make a carved image," &c., and *Ps. 97. 7,* "Confounded be all they that worship graven images."

*Ad hoc necessariam est vocabuli interpretatio eidos Græce formam sonat ab eo per diminutionem εἰδωλον deductum æque apud vos formulam fecit. Igitur omnis forma vel formula idolum se dici exposcit. Omnia igitur colit humanus error præter ipsum omnium Conditorum. Eorum imagines idola imaginum consecratio Idolatria. De Idolatria.*

Where you say in our latter translations, we have corrected our dishonest dealing, it is false: for we have freely used the one word or the other, as there is no difference of them in those places. Although the use of our English speech, had made the name of idol odious, and of image indifferent: yet neither the Greek word εἰδωλον, nor the Latin word *Simulachrum*, which your vulgar Latin interpreter useth in this place, hath any such odious signification, as the word idol hath in the English. Lactantius calleth men, *Vra Dei simulachra*, "the living images of God." *De vero Dei cultu. lib. 6. cap. 13.* And *de Orig. err. lib. 2. cap. 2,* he hath the whole chapter, "Of images, and of the true image of God." Arnobius, or Minntius Felix, *cont. Gent. lib. 8,* saith, "Man himself is the image of God." Ambrose also in *1 Cor. 10,* "A similitude is nothing indeed, because it seemeth to be an image of a dead thing." *Ps. 45,* he saith, the prophet did not "compare God to images or similitudes made of earth or stone." Augustin useth the word image and *simulachrum* for all one. *Cont. Faust. lib. 22. cap. 17.* "When for desire or love of the dead, images were made whereof the use of simulachres

or images did arise." Octogint, *quæst. Q. 78*, which is entitled, of the beauty of images, ascribeth to God the cunning by the which they are made beautiful. Isidorus Originum, *lib. 8*, saith, "They made the counterfeits or images men, that they might have some comfort in beholding their images." By these and many other testimonies of Latin writers, it is manifest, that *Simulachrum* is not taken always in the evil part, but signifieth an image, which is indifferent to an image lawful and unlawful. Therefore you professing to translate the Latin, and not the Greek, to colour your shameful worshipping of idols, do betray your dishonest dealing, in rendering for the word *Simulachris*, idols, where you should have said images, as some of our translations have.

For having the images of holy things in churches, you say God himself doth warrant us, who commanded the Jews to make the cherubin. So that by that commandment belike, he abrogated the second commandment, in which he forbade all making and worshipping of images. But we must not so think: for that second commandment, is the eternal law of God, wherein he forbiddeth us to make to ourselves any graven image, yet denieth not but he may command what images he thinketh good himself for the use of religion. By the same reason you may say, and the old idolaters defended their horrible murder and idolatry. That God doth warrant us to kill our children, and to offer them in sacrifice, because he commanded Abraham so to do: or God warranteth every private man to kill an offender, because he commandeth the magistrate to put to death heinous offenders: but of this argument see more, *Ihb. cap. 9*. Hierom addeth great force to this argument, "saying that in respect of those sacred images partly, they did so great reverence to the holy place, called *sancta sanctorum*." Paula and Eustochium indeed say, "that the Jews did in times past, reverence the holy of holies, because there were the cherubin, and the propitiatory, and the ark of the Testament, manna, the rod of Aaron, and the golden altar." The meaning is, they had great estimation of that place, because there were so many holy mysteries of their religion. Not that they worshipped the place, in respect of the images which they never saw, but because all those things were sacraments of God's presence, and monuments of his great works and mercy towards them.

But if they were commanded to make these resemblances according to such form as was prescribed by God, it followeth not that we, which are forbidden to make images

in any use of religion, are warranted contrary to that general commandment to make any images, by that special precept which pertained only to them and that time, and for those images only not to be worshipped, nor to be seen of any, but only of the high priest, once in the year. As for the Second Council of Nice, that was gathered by an idolatress and wicked woman, to overthrow the godly Councils of Constantinople and Ephesus, by the which the having in churches and worshipping of images was condemned: it can be no warrant for so foul an abuse, so expressly contrary to the manifest word of God. And that false council was condemned in the west, by a Council held at Frankford, as Carolus Magnus in his book against images doth testify. The same witnesseth *Ado Viennensis in Anno 727*, toward the end. "The false synod which the Greeks called the seventh, was there also," meaning at Frankford, "utterly abrogated." The same is testified by other ancient writers. For the story reported by Eusebius see *Matt. 8*, section the ninth. For the images of Peter and Paul mentioned in Augustin, the truth is, they were neither in the churches, nor set up to be worshipped, but painted upon walls in divers places of Rome, whereupon certain heathen sorcerers feigned that books were made of magic by Christ and delivered to Peter and Paul. "But so," saith Augustin, "they were worthy to be deceived, which sought Christ and his Apostles, not in holy scriptures, but in painted walls, and no marvel if they being such feigners, were deceived by painters." *De consens. Evang. lib. 1. cap. 10*. You see therefore how Augustin accounted of such images in his time.

But in Gregory's time, which was about two hundred years after, they were got into the church to be laymen's books, which the scriptures call "the doctrine of lies," as Augustin said they were to those sorcerers. And then the people began to worship them, for which cause Serenus bishop of Massilia in France brake them in pieces in his diocess. For which fact he was reproved by Gregory, who yet commendeth him, that he forbade the worship of images, *lib. 7. ep. 119*, and *lib. 9*, where he saith: "That you forbade them to be worshipped, we have altogether commended you, but that you brake them, we did reprehend you." That the Lutherans retain images, cannot be defended by the word of God, though they detest the worshipping of them, and it cannot be without danger of idolatry, if the pastors be not diligent to teach their people to beware of it. *Matt. 6. Acts 17. Ihb. 9*.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE SECOND EPISTLE OF JOHN THE APOSTLE.

5. We can have no certain knowledge, what was the faith and worship of God in the beginning but by the holy scriptures. Nor what was the tradition of the Apostles, but by the writing of the Apostles, which Ignatius in his time affirmed, for certainty, to be committed to writing. *Euseb. lib. 3. cap. 35.* For there can be no certainty in receiving from man to man, from bishop to bishop, seeing a doctrine may be so received for a thousand years and more, and yet be short of the beginning. Yea, there were heretics even in the apostles' time, as Cerinthus, Ebion, the Nicolaites, Simon Magus, &c. whose heresy, if it had been delivered from man to man ever since that time, yet was not from the beginning, but is confuted by the writings of the apostles, not to have come from the Apostles. They therefore teach new doctrine, which are not able to prove their doctrine by the holy scriptures, and the doctrine of the holy scriptures is ancient, though men cannot show by what succession of men it came unto us.

10. The doctrine whereof John speaketh is that which he and the rest of the apostles preached: the sum whereof is contained in the holy scriptures. "The apostles," saith Ireneus, "preached the gospel, and after by the will of God, they delivered it unto us in the scriptures, which should be the foundation and pillar of our faith." *Lib. 3. cap. 1.* Therefore whatsoever the ministers of the church that have succeeded the apostles have set down in councils, or otherwise, is so to be taken for true doctrine, as it agreeth with the preaching of the apostles contained in their writings. For not all that is set down in council is true, seeing councils both provincial and general may err and be corrected, the latter of the former, as Augustin saith, "when by any trial of things, that is opened, which before was shut, and that is known, which before was hidden." This writeth he, when by the Donatists he was pressed with the authority of a council holden in Africa, for rebaptizing them, that had been baptized by Heretics. *De bapt. cont. Donat. cap. 2.* But you say "it is not the apostle's rule, that a Heretic should be convinced by the scriptures." Yes, verily, for the doctrine whereof he speaketh is the doctrine of Christ, as it

appeareth in the ninth verse, and the doctrine of Christ is contained in the scriptures, as he himself saith: "Search the scriptures, for they bear witness of me." *John 5. 39.* The apostles which taught the whole doctrine of Christ, taught nothing concerning Christ but that which is contained in the scriptures. *Acts. 26. 22. Rom. 1. 2. 2 Tim. 3. 14, 15.* Therefore it is the apostle's rule, that a Heretic should be convinced by the holy scriptures, seeing we have no other certain testimony, what was the doctrine of Christ and the apostles, as Augustin showeth, in the place above noted. That many an honest shepherd knoweth a wolf, that cannot define him, is a fond argument to prove that a Heretic is not to be convinced by the scriptures. For a natural and bodily wolf, may be known by certain marks though not by the scriptures or definition, but a spiritual wolf or Heretic must be known by such marks and notes as are set down in the holy scriptures, though every man be not able to make a scholastical definition of a Heretic.

Therefore he that bringeth not the doctrine of Christ, set down in the scriptures is a seducer, not he that bringeth not such doctrine as the pope hath not set down in his decrees, or in his counterfeit councils. Neither doth the holy church say now, Christ is really present, &c. but the profane synagogue of Satan and the church of Antichrist maintaineth that heresy, contrary to the holy scriptures, and the articles of Christ's incarnation, ascension, and sitting at the right hand of God in heaven.

10. That church which decreeth any other communication with Heretics and Infidels, than the scripture here alloweth and elsewhere to be lawful, showeth itself to be the church of Antichrist. And here you may gather, what good subjects the Papists be to our sovereign the queen, whom they take by the blasphemous bull and Antichristian authority of Pope Pius the Fifth, to be excommunicated; and what loyal duty they yield unto her majesty, by the devilish dispensation of Pope Gregory the Thirteenth, procured by two errant traitorous Jesuits, Campion and Parsons, of which the one hath suffered according to his demerits, the other remaineth, for what purpose God knoweth.

## ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT OF THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

Paul doth not signify that the Lord's brethren were in authority, somewhat more than the apostles, or less in authority than Peter, when he saith that the other apostles, and the brethren of our Lord and Cephas did lead about their wives. But he signifieth that in respect of their carnal alliance or kindred,

they were also specially regarded, and Peter in respect of his primacy over the circumcision. And whereas you will not grant that the apostles carried their wives about with them, but other strange women; Hegesippus testifieth of Jude that he was a married man, and had children, when he showeth that his

children's children or nephews, *videlicet*, the sons of his sons, were persecuted by Revocatus in the days of Domitian. *Euseb. lib. 3. cap. 20.* Then who would think that Peter and Jude both proved to have wives, the one by scripture, the other by good story, would carry strange women about with them, and not their own wives? which could not be but offensive, both to the Jews and to the Gentiles, and to the church of God, which giving of offence the apostles condemned and forbad in all other. "That which Augustin hath told us that he writeth against those

which unconstrued Paul's epistles, and held only faith," pertaineth not unto us, for we hold not only faith to be sufficient which hath no good works, but that faith only doth justify without works, although it be never void of good works. And this doctrine taught so largely by Paul, and so plainly, none of the other apostles doth gainsay, nor Jude in this epistle. The old faith which he exhorteth the Christians to keep, is not the Popish faith, which is of later invention, but the faith and doctrine of Christ set forth in the holy scripture.

## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE EPISTLE OF JUDE THE APOSTLE.

### CHAPTER I.

8. Such a heretic and worse than a heretic is Antichrist the Pope, which will not be subject to any superior, and which refuseth to obey any law, either of spiritual or temporal rulers, no not the decrees of a general council, although he himself have once approved of them, as Martin the Fifth did the council of Constance, and Eugenius the Fourth the council of Basil. Yet both refused to obey the law or decree of the council, which defineth that the general council is above the Pope, such a heretic is the Pope, and so greatly despiseth dominion, and blasphemeth majesty, that with most vile terms he doth take upon him to deprive kings of their royal dignity, which they have by lawful succession and election, and approbation of all their subjects, and dischargeth their subjects of their loyalty and obedience unto their sovereigns. As Pius the Fifth did in that heretical and Antichristian bull, given out against Queen Elizabeth. Such heretics are the Pope and the Rhemish Papists, as suborn horrible traitors and murderers to murder their sovereign: and that with such abominable hypocrisy, that they did set out a printed book, declaring it unlawful to kill her majesty, for none other end, but to make her majesty and the council secure and out of suspicion of them, that they might with more opportunity accomplish their traitorous devised murder. This was openly confessed and proved, at the arraignment of Babington, Ballard, and the rest of those hellish monsters. Also the letters of Cardinal Como written to Parry do testify the Pope's approbation of that most vile and detestable treason, and murder intended.

9. The body of Moses was buried by God, as appeareth, *Deut. 34. 6.* that no man should know where his sepulchre was. Therefore it is like, that this alteration was immediately before that time, when the devil desired to have the body of Moses discovered that it might be abused to idolatry. As it hath always been the practice of Satan to persecute the saints while they live, and to make idols of their bodies when they are dead. That ancient father which wrote the book *De mirabilibus sacre Scripturae*, which goeth under

the name of Augustin, *lib. 1. cap. 35.* writeth thus of the body of Moses, "For two causes, as wise men say, no man was privy of his death, nor of his sepulchre. That no man should see that face, which had shined through the familiarity of the Lord's speech unto him, stricken down or dimmed with the heaviness of death. And lest the people of Israel, if they had known where his sepulchre was, should have adored it. Wherefore as most men think, he carried away with him the rod wherewith he had done wonders, lest it should have been adored: seeing the children of Israel, did afterward adore the serpent which he made."

Where you gather "that many truths and stories were kept in the mouths and hearts of the faithful, that were not written in the scriptures canonical," it is true: yet that proveth not that the scripture canonical did not contain all doctrine necessary to salvation. Even the doctrine here taught is expressed in the canonical scriptures, *Deut. 31. 6.* and *Zachariah 3. 2.* though some circumstances might be received of tradition, as the names of James and Jaubres, *2 Tim. 3. 8.* Yet Bede thinketh that the body of Moses in this place might be taken for the people of Israel, of whom Moses had been head, whom Satan desired to retain in captivity, when Jesus prayed for their deliverance, *Zach. 3.* and so do some late interpreters think.

10. Such heretics are the Papists, which when they cannot reprove by the scripture, the heavenly doctrine taught by Luther, Calvin, and other godly and learned teachers, they invent such monstrous slanders and lies against them, to deface their persons, as no man of reason can think they should ever have been suffered to live in any society of men, being no tyrants, but mean subjects, if their manners had been so ungodly as these shameful heretics do blasphemous. Beside that, some of their slanders are impossible, as that Luther should be begotten of a devil, &c., which yet the proud censurer of Chark is not ashamed to defend. As their common scolding, execrations, and slanders of the true church, and faithful pastors of the same, with the sacraments and whatsoever is really and necessarily to the holy scriptures,

as the communion table the marriage of the ministers, the singing of psalms, &c., are so well known, that I need not stand to repeat them.

The cruelty of Camb, the covetousness of Balaam, and the usurpation of the priesthood of Core, did never agree to any heretics more properly than to the Papists. Who in murdering God's saints, far pass all other heretics: in covetousness had prevailed so much, that they became lords of the earth: in usurpation of the priesthood far pass the arrogance of Core. They make claim to the priesthood according to the order of Melchisedec, which is peculiar to the person of our Saviour Christ, of whose priesthood, Aaron, whom Core and his fellows would have displaced, was but a shadow and figure. And as pride was the cause of Core's revolting from the obedience of Moses and Aaron, so much more is it the cause of the Pope's arrogating to himself to be Christ's own vicar, without any scripture of deputation from Christ. Howsoever Bernard being deceived by his enchantments, in his book of consideration, doth inconsiderately call the Pope, Aaron in dignity, yea in order Melchisedec, in unction Christ, yet in the same book he saith, he is not made superior to have dominion, yea he biddeth the Pope learn, that he had need "of a ploughstall, not of a sceptre. Dominion is forbidden the apostles. Go thou and usurp it if thou darest, either exercising dominion the apostleship, or exercising the apostleship dominion. Thou art plainly forbidden from either of both, if thou wilt have both alike together, thou shalt lose both. Or else think not that thou art excepted from the number of them, of whom God complaineth thus, they reigned, but not of me, they were princes, but I knew them not.

This and much more writeth Bernard

against the Antichristian tyranny and usurped authority of the Pope, although he yielded to his Antichristian titles, and thought also more highly of his dignity than the scripture doth allow him. Jude therefore, describing all heretics, doth comprehend especially Antichrist and his ministers, as Bede hath said: "Who shall justly be cast into eternal darkness of torments, because they brought unto the church of God the darkness of errors under the name of light."

19. We have not segregated ourselves from the church as heretics, but from heretics, as true Catholics always have done. We have gone out of Babylon as the Holy Ghost hath commanded all the faithful, after her wickedness is openly discovered, *Apoc.* 18, that we should not communicate with her sins, nor be partakers of her plagues. The Pope therefore and his ministers have separated themselves from the unity of the Catholic Church, to maintain his Antichristian primacy, as Bede saith of the rebellion of Core. "Whosoever through desire of undue primacy do divide themselves from the unity of the holy church, knowing and foreseeing how great mischief they take in hand, do go down to the hell of wickedness." So did Pope Boniface the Third, which not ignorantly, for by his predecessor Gregory he was taught how great mischief he took in hand, but of Antichristian pride, bought the primacy for a great sum of money, of the murdering usurper of the empire, Phocas, and separated himself from the unity of the Catholic Church, and so descended with the rest of his successors, and all their ministers into a hell of wickedness. Behold these are they among others in our days, which do segregate themselves, as their predecessors did before them, being sensual and void of the Spirit of God.

## ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENT OF THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN.

As this book containeth a prophecy of the state of the church until the end of the world, so it is no marvel if many things seemed obscure to the ancient fathers, before they were fulfilled, which are now clear and evident to us, after they be accomplished. Yet concerning Antichrist and his city where he shall reign, the apostle doth so plainly describe them, that many of the ancient fathers did see plainly that he should be a Roman tyrant, and have his chief See at Rome, as I have declared upon *2 Thess.* 2. And the description of Babylon, *cap.* 17, with the angel's interpretation, is so evident of Rome, that it is extreme impudency to deny it, or to shift it off unto the whole multitude and corps of the wicked, as more plainly shall appear when we come to the annotations upon that chapter. That Elias shall come any more in person, is a vain surmise upon the eleventh chapter, where it is said, that notwithstanding the

greatest tyranny of Antichrist, yet God will give strength to his two witnesses, which signifyeth the small number, and yet sufficient to be accepted of them that shall oppose themselves against the cruelty and pride of Antichrist. And even as the Pharisees deceived the Jews, concerning the coming of Elias, that they should not acknowledge Christ to be come, because Elias was not come in person, though he were come in spirit and office, so their successors the Papists deceive the ignorant, that they should not acknowledge the manifestation of Antichrist, under pretence that Elias is not yet come in person, with his fellow Enoch. Of whose return the Scripture speaketh nothing, but of two witnesses representing the small number, yet the lawful testimony of them that gave their lives for the gospel of Christ, and for admonishing the church of the deceits and tyranny of Antichrist.



## ANSWER TO THE ANNOTATIONS ON THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN THE APOSTLE.

## CHAPTER I.

1. Among those things that are so evident by Augustin's confession, in this prophecy, there is nothing more clear than Rome to be that whore of Babylon, and the chiefity of Antichrist's dominion. Inasmuch that Augustin calleth Rome the western Babylon, the second Babylon, another Babylon, the daughter of the former Babylon, the earthly city, as it is opposite to the city of God, *De Civit. lib. 16. cap. 17. lib. 18. cap. 2. 22 and 27.* The same was acknowledged by most of the ancient fathers, Irenæus, Tertullian, Victorin, Ambrose, Hieron, Primasius, Arethas, Ambrose, Anbert. Which if it were evident by the words and circumstance of the text, when the prophecy was not yet fulfilled, how much more manifest is it now, when we see the performance of that which so long before was described?

4. That certain numbers in the scripture are noted to be significative and mystical, we acknowledge by many places in the scriptures, especially in the prophets. But hereof it followeth not, that there must be a superstitious respect of numbers in our prayers, fasts, or other actions, which is not prescribed or appointed to us by the Holy Ghost. For albeit the number of seven, of ten, and some other, are often repeated in this prophecy, and other, to describe some mysteries of godliness, and some also of wickedness, it is no reason that we should imagine that prayers, or fasts, numbered by sevens and by tens, or any like numbers, shall be more acceptable to God, which smelleth more of heathenish Pharisæical and Pythagorean vanity, than of the Christian religion. For one prayer, or other action of piety, or two, or four, or eight, or nine, performed of faith and true devotion, are more acceptable than all the rosaries, lady psalters, and other like superstitious repetitions, consisting upon sevens or tens, or any other mystical numbers, which God regardeth not, but the faith and charity, out of which such actions of religion or love do proceed. But that in prayers, fasts, and other actions, a religious respect is to be had, you prove out of Augustin, which saith, that seven which is a number of perfection, the church knoweth to be especially dedicated to the Holy Ghost, and to appertain to spiritual munition. Augustin saith, *De Gen. lib. 5. cap. 5.* "That the scripture commendeth, and the church loveth, that the number of seven is after a sort dedicated to the Holy Ghost," which he speaketh of the rest of the seventh day, which the church observeth according to the scripture. What is this to commend a religious respect of this number, in praying, fasting, or other actions? *Quæst. Num. cap. 33.* speaking of Eleazer's sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifice propitiatory seven times; he saith, "Therefore it was seven times, because that number itself pertaineth to cleansing."

Whereby he meaneth, that the number of seven, used in the ceremonial cleansing of the Law, did signify perfect cleansing by the sacrifice propitiatory of Christ, not that there is any virtue of cleansing in the number, or that our prayers and fastings numbered by seven, be more pure, than if they be numbered by six, or nine, or than if there be no respect of the number, but of the affection of him that prayeth or fasteth. *Quæst. Dent. lib. 3. cap. 22.* He showeth that the number of seven is a perfect number, consisting of three and four, the first whole odd number, and the first whole even number. But he saith no word to approve this religious respect of numbers, in praying, or fasting, or other actions whereof you speak. Therefore in these allegations and quotations, you do nothing else but abuse your reader, for Augustin hath no such meaning, of the superstitious observation of numbers, to commend prayers and fastings, or other Christian actions.

4. All the ancient interpreters in a manner understand the seven spirits to be the Holy Ghost, who in his sevenfold gifts or operations, is known in the church. But to admit, that they signify the whole number of the blessed angels that wait upon the throne of God, as *cap. 5.* as Arethas and some Protestants, as you say, in their commentaries upon this text do take it; yet it followeth not, that we must confess, that the apostle here giveth, or wisheth grace and peace, not from God only, but also from the angels, as authors of this grace or peace, together with God, or any means to procure it by their merits or worthiness, but as ministers of God's will and pleasure, appointed for their sakes that shall inherit salvation, *Heb. 1. 14.* Therefore thus writeth Arethas upon this text, "Some have taken the seven spirits to be the seven operations of the Holy Ghost, but it is more probable, to take them for angels, not that they are comprehended with the Almighty Trinity, or that we must think them to be of equal honour with it, but because they serve and obey him, if we must believe the prophets, testifying that all things serve him, and David the progenitor of God, saying, Bless God all ye angels, being mighty in power, which fulfil his word. And certainly to say, that to comprehend the divinity and the nature of angels, is to show an equality of honour, between the Almighty Trinity, which is the author of all creatures, and a ministerial substance, is not the part of one that hath understanding, or but mean understanding, but of him that is ignorant, as I think, that this creature delighteth to stand by the Lord, and to minister unto him, which form of speech Paul also using in his Epistle to Timothy, speaketh in this manner, I charge thee in the sight of God and his elect angels. And this saying is of one that followeth the same. But also to add in this place, which

are in the presence of the throne of God, it is a speech of him that testifieth their ministerial order, not their equal honour." Therefore the apostle giveth no grace or peace, but prayeth for grace and peace, to be given only by God for Jesus Christ's sake, though in dispensing of the same, for the salvation or preservation of the elect, he use the ministry or service of the angels, and therefore prayeth for the God's benefits to be bestowed upon the church, by such ministry of the holy angels, as he hath appointed; who continually wait upon the throne of God, to receive and execute his commandment, for the benefit and preservation of his church. Therefore they are adjoined as servants unto their Lord, for their ministry's sake; in which respect they are named also before our Saviour Christ, for that they be only ministers, and not meritorious causes of God's blessings unto his church, as our and their Lord Jesus Christ is. Therefore God only is author of grace and peace, dispensing the same in some manner by the service of his angels, but not for their merits or worthiness, but only for the worthiness and merits of Jesus Christ, who hath loved us, and washed us from our sins, &c., as it followeth in the text. Therefore those superstitious prayers of the Papists, "God and our lady help, our Lord and his saints help, or bless," are nothing like to this prayer of the apostle. For although God use the ministry of the angels, in dispensing of his graces and blessings, for the preservation of his church, as he doth also the ministry of men upon earth, yet he useth not the ministry of the Virgin Mary, or of the saints departed out of this life, for any such purpose; and much less doth he grant his graces or blessings, for the merits or worthiness either of angels, or of saints, as Papists in their prayers desire to obtain them, not by the ministry of angels, nor by the prayer of saints only, but for their merits and worthiness. Therefore the angel whereof Jacob speaketh, whether it signifieth Christ, as Precopius saith expressly in *Gen. cap. 48*, or the minister by which Christ did protect him, is nothing like to the Popish prayers which desire grace, blessing, and salvation, "by the merits of blessed Mary, by the merits of such a saint, by the blood of Thomas," and such like.

6. As the Spiritual kingdom and Priesthood of God's children, taketh not away the eternal kingdom and priesthood of Christ, so neither the earthly kingdoms of the world, nor the Ecclesiastical eldership of ministry of the church. And yet all true Christians are priests alike, because there is none other sacrificing priesthood left but the eternal priesthood of Christ, and the spiritual priesthood of all his Saints. Wherefore you do nothing but cavil in this place, as in many other, upon the ambiguity of this English word priest, and priesthood; which according to the etymology from the Greek word whence it is derived, signifieth the eldership and elders of the church; but according to the common use of speech, is taken for a sacrificer, and the office of sa-

crificing. Wherefore if you did write these notes in Latin or Greek, every child might see your unlearned collection. The word which the Holy Ghost here useth, is *upais*, in Latin *Sacerdotes*, in English sacrificers: this office of sacrificers and sacrificing, we say, and boldly say, is either singular to Christ in respect of his sacrifice propitiatory, and all other parts of his holy office, pertaining to our perfect reconciliation and redemption, or else it is common to all true Christians, in respect of their spiritual sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving. Neither is this word ever applied in the New Testament, to any Ecclesiastical order and function of men, but they be called "Episcopi, Presbyteri, Diaconi, Ministri, Præpositi, Doctores," and such like, that is, overseers, elders, ministers, governors, teachers, &c. But never they are called more than any other Christian men or women, *upais*, *Sacerdotes*, that is, sacrificers, or sacrificing priests. Therefore if the scripture speak properly and truly, all Christians are sacrificers alike, and only Christ is our eternal high sacrificer or sacrificing priest. Wherefore they that usurp that sacrificing priesthood, which is peculiar to him, do much more show themselves seditious rebels, than Core, who challenged the figurative and temporal sacrificing priesthood of Aaron, which was but a shadow of the true and eternal sacrificing priesthood of Christ. As for the holy Ecclesiastical offices, or ministry and government of the church, we know they be not common to all, but unto those only, that are lawfully ordained unto them.

10. That the Lord's day was sanctified instead of the Jewish Sabbath, for the assemblies of the faithful to the public exercises of religion, we learn by this place. But that there were any other holydays beside this, we find not in the scriptures.

The apostles did not abrogate the Jewish Sabbath, but Christ himself by his death, as he did all other ceremonies of the Law, that were figures and shadows of the things to come, whereof he was the body, and they were fulfilled and accomplished in him, and by him. And thus the apostles knew, both by the scriptures, and by the word of Christ, and by his Holy Spirit. By the scripture also they knew, that one day of seven was appointed to be observed for ever, during the world, as consecrated and hallowed to the public exercises of the Religion of God, although the ceremonial rest and prescript day according to the Law were abrogated by the death of Christ. Now for the prescription of this day, before any other of the seven, they had without doubt, either the express commandment of Christ, before his ascension, when he gave them precepts concerning the kingdom of God, and the ordering and government of the church, *Acts 1. 2*, or else the certain direction of his Spirit, that it was his will and pleasure it should so be, and that also according to the scriptures. Seeing there is the same reason of sanctifying that day, in which our Saviour Christ accomplished our redemption, and the

restitution of the world by his resurrection from death, that was of sanctifying the day, in which the Lord rested from the creation of the world. Where you say, "it was otherwise prescribed by God himself in the second commandment;" I marvel what account you follow of the ten commandments, when this commandment of the Sabbath, both in the twentieth of Exodus, and the fifth of Deuteronomy is the fourth commandment. And although you leave out the commandment against idolatry, because it should be too manifest a conviction of your impiety, yet I see not how you can make the commandment of the Sabbath, the second commandment, except you will also exclude the third commandment against the taking of the name of GOD in vain. The prescript of the day, as of the manner of rest, and other rites in observing thereof, was a ceremonial, as circumcision, blood, strangled, and the sacrifices instituted from the beginning of the world, and therefore abrogated together, with the ceremonies first instituted in Mount Sinai. Wherefore this abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath and institution of the Lord's day, doth not prove any power in the church, to abrogate any thing prescribed by GOD in the scriptures, or to institute any thing of like nature, and necessity of observing, beside the scriptures. For although the church in days or times, which are indifferent, may take order for some other days or times, to be solemnized for the exercises of religion; or that the remembrance of Christ's nativity, resurrection, ascension, or the coming of the Holy Ghost, may be celebrated either on the Lord's day, or any other time: yet there is great difference between the authority of the church in this case, and the prescription of the Lord's day by the apostles. For the special memories of those things are indifferent of their nature, either to be kept on certain days, or left to discretion to be celebrated as any other occasion shall be offered. Neither if they be assigned to certain days in the year, is it necessary they should be kept on those days which they are now used, rather than on other days, in which they have of old been used. The pope hath taken upon him of late, to alter all those festival days, that for many hundred years have been observed otherwise. But to change the Lord's day, and to keep it on Monday, Tuesday, or any other day, the church hath no authority. For it is not a matter of indifference, but a necessary prescription of Christ himself, delivered to us by his apostles. The church therefore hath promised to be led into all truth, so she follow the rule of truth, which is the word of God, expressed in the holy scriptures. Not that she hath the same assurance of God's Spirit, which the apostles had, who were so directed thereby, that although they were frail men, by nature subject to error, yet they could not decline in their writings and ordinances for the church, from the truth or the holy scriptures. Wherefore the church hath not now the same warrant of the Spirit which the apostles had, nei-

ther may she alter any thing that they, as the ambassadors of Christ, have prescribed to be perpetual, nor make any thing necessary by nature, which they have left indifferent.

The cause of this change, was not our estimation that either we have, or ought to have of our redemption above our creation, but the ordinance of God, who as first he sanctified the rest from creation, for the glory of that work: so now also he sanctifieth the day of the restitution of the world, for his glory of the accomplishment of our redemption. Moreover, as the name of Sunday and the rest is of Heathenish beginning, and therefore were better to be otherwise termed, as the first, the second, the third from the Lord's day, as the Jews called their days from the Sabbath: so your term of *feries*, is no less Heathenish than the common English names, being taken not out of the scriptures, but from the Heathenish term of *Feria*, and *Feria*, as witnesseth Isidorus, *Orig. lib. 6. Sextus Pompeius de verbis veteribus*, saith: "that *Feria* was called a *ferendis victimis*, of striking the Heathenish sacrifices.

Your last observation, that God revealeth such great things, rather upon holydays, or giveth grace at holy times, is frivolous; for not in respect of the holiness of the day or time, he giveth revelations, or his graces, but according to his pleasure. Times of prayer, contemplation, and other godly exercises, he chooseth often, not for the worthiness of the times, but for the better disposition of his servants in such exercises, to receive them. Yet there is nothing perpetually observed in this matter. God appeared to Moses, keeping of sheep. *Exod. 3.* To Amos following his herd. *Amos 7.* To the prophets commonly in their sleep.

13. John was an elder of the church, as he calleth himself. *Epist. 2. 3.* But he was no sacrificer, or sacrificing priest. Neither is he noted for his priestly garment: for Petalon signifieth a plate, or brooch, and not a garment, except you will say a brooch is a garment. Now Petalon which Polycrates, as Eusebius reporteth, saith, that John did wear, is not to be understood grammatically, as though John did wear such a plate in his cap or hat, but it is a figurative allusion unto that plate of gold, which the high priest of the law did wear upon the ornament of his head, in which was graven these words, "The Holiness of the Lord."

Eucherius, *instruct. ad Salon. c. de vestibus*. Therefore he saith, in respect of the divine knowledge and holiness that was in this apostle John, that he leaned upon the Lord's breast, and was made the priest that bare the Petalon or plate. Which if the Papists will have to be literally and absolutely understood, that John was a priest, and wore the priestly garment, they must acknowledge that he was the high priest. For this Petalon or plate, was for none other to wear, but only for the high priest, as it is manifest by *Exod. 28. 3. and cap. 39. 30.* Then if John were the high priest of the Christian religion, as Aaron and his successors were of the Jewish people, it

followeth that John was above Peter, and all the apostles in this dignity of the high priest's office. Which thing rather than the Papists will grant, they will acknowledge, that John was not a sacrificing priest, nor did wear that priestly ornament, which was proper to the high priest only.

20. The ordinary means of continuance of the truth, though not the only means, is by the teaching of the elders of the church. Therefore when the bishops and priests of the Popish church, were for the most part dumb dogs, and ignorant asses, that had no knowledge to teach, or else were teachers of error and darkness, rather than of truth and light, no marvel though the golden candlesticks were removed from Rome, and other places, where in ancient time they were set; so that ignorance and heresy so mightily prevailed, as in the kingdom of Antichrist. John by the angels of the churches, meaneth not all that should wear on their heads, mitres, and hold crozier staves in their hands like dead idols; but them that are faithful messengers of the Lord's word, and utter and declare the same. Not the angels of Satan, though they be transfigured into the angel of light; but the angels of God and Christ. The Popish church therefore hath neither stars nor candlesticks in which true religion should shine, but either idols of bishops, or wolves instead of shepherds.

20. The whole church hath Christ himself, which is the true Michael, to be her protector, and not one but many holy angels to defend her under him. That earthly kingdoms have their special angel protectors, is not proved out of Daniel. For the princes of the Persians and Grecians, spoken of *cap. 10*, were no angels, but earthly princes. Angels do not resist Christ and his angels, the defenders of the church, as the prince of Persia did, *ver.*

13. Hierom, upon that place of Daniel, doth affirm that he was an angel, and upon *Ezek. 24*, "that the shepherds of Israel, according to mystical understanding, were the angels of every church, to whom John doth write in the Apocalypse, and whose angels daily see the face of God." But the text is so plain against the shepherds of Israel, that a man might marvel what Hierom meant to draw it to the angelic spirits, against whom the Holy Ghost setteth forth no prophecies, neither do they neglect any charge that is committed to them.

Wherefore among many other reasons this is one invincible, to prove that they are not heavenly spirits, to whom John writeth, but ministers of the church, that some of the angels are reprehended for their offences and exhorted to repent and amend, which pertaineth not to the heavenly spirits. But whereas you make the bishops and priests our intercessors, the carriers and officers of our prayers, and mediators unto God under Christ, you gather more than the place will afford. For they are called the angels of the churches, because they be God's messengers unto the churches, not intercessors, carriers, or me-

diators under Christ. For that was Parmenian's error, who placed the bishop mediator of intercession between the people and God, condemned by Augustin, who would not allow John himself to be mediator between God and us. *Cont. ep. Parm. lib. 2. cap. 8.*

The ministers of the church therefore do pray for the people, either of common charity, as the people pray for them, or else as the mouth of the people to conceive or utter the public prayers in the name of the people for order and comeliness to be observed in the church. But any office of mediation, advocacy, or intercession, to present the prayers of the people unto God under Christ, that they may be acceptable, they have not by the holy scriptures, which teach, that all our prayers are accepted by the only mediation and advocacy of Christ, *John 2.*

#### CHAPTER 2.

1. The whole prophecy was commanded to be sent to the churches, certain special admonitions and instructions to the angels of the church, yet pertaining to the whole church: but heretofore it followeth not that every church, and the head and governor thereof is all one.

1. Christ preserveth and guideth the church and all the true shepherds thereof in all truth, so long as they will humbly obey his voice, and be ruled by his word, which is the truth: from which, if they will negligently or wilfully decline, they cannot look that Christ shall preserve them in truth.

4. Although the elect can never finally fall out of the grace and favour of God, whereby he loved them in Christ, before the world was made: yet they may decay in particular graces, as in zeal of faith and fervency of love for a season, and be renewed again by repentance.

5. If burning charity, and zeal of popery, could have kept your popish prelates in their seats of tyranny, they were not behind in the time of your last possession of them. But God be praised that hath removed those cruel wolves, the wasters of his flock, and hath set up again the golden candlestick of his church.

6. The names of Lutherans and Zuinglians are but malicious slanders, as of old time, Alexandrians, Athanasians, Joannites, &c. which were true catholics so nicknamed by heretics. The bread and wine which we bless, according to the institution of Christ, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and the communion of the body and blood of Christ: therefore he that calleth them idolatrous meats, except he repent in time, shall one day find the reward of this blasphemy. Hierom against the Luciferians speaketh against them that were justly called after any other name than of Christ, because their doctrine was of latter invention than the doctrine of Christ: as the Marcionites, Valentiniens, Montanists, and Papists, and such like. Our religion hath not Luther or Zuinglius for the authors, but Christ, as we are able to prove by the holy scriptures: so are not the papists able to

prove their doctrine, therefore they deny the sufficiency of holy scriptures.

9. The true catholic church when it is persecuted, is often in tribulation and poverty. But the papists which are punished for their obstinacy and contempt of godly laws are no more like the church here punished, than the Donatists, that for their like obstinacy, were punished by pecuniary mulets in Augustin's time. The English papists are for the most part the richest and wealthiest persons in the counties where they dwell: therefore nothing resembling the angel of the church of Smyrna, whether it were Polycarp or whosoever he were.

11. Not only martyrs, but all other true Christians, that by faith overcome the world, are sure to escape the second death which is damnation: for there is no damnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, *Rom. 8, 1.*

14. We offer no liberty of meats, other than the scripture offereth, which condemneth the prohibition of meats, to be the doctrine of devils: we allow no liberty of women, but in holy and lawful matrimony: the forbidding whereof the scripture maketh to be a note of the devil's apostacy. As for the liberty of church goods, we offer not to any man, but if you mean the converting of lands and goods abused to maintain popish idolatry, to the maintenance of the crown and the realm, you may well remember they were your own prelates that committed Abbey lands in king Henry's days, unto the prince's disposition. If you think it carnal liberty to possess any such church goods, you may do well to persuade a number of your favourites to renounce the possession of their Abbey lands, and other riches of the Babylonical church, and to restore them into the prince's hands. If you refuse so to do, it is you that grant liberty of church goods more than we. For we do not account the goods and lands of idolaters abused to the maintenance of idolatry, to be the goods consecrated to the necessary and lawful uses of the church. As for breach of vows, we offer no liberty, but as the ancient fathers, Cyprian, Epiphanius, Hierom, and Augustin taught according to the scriptures; we affirm the marriage even of them that have rashly made a vow of continency, which they are not able to keep, to be lawful marriage, and to be better than the burning celibate and abominable life of the popish clergy. *Epiph. Her. 61. ad Demet. August. de bono viduit. cap. 10. Cyprian ep. 62.*

20. Bede maketh no question, but that there was a woman which contrary to ecclesiastical order, was permitted, not only to teach, but to teach false doctrine. So the text is plain, not only that she usurped the name of a prophetess, but also that she had time of repentance granted unto her. Which cannot be applied to Ahab's wife, who took not upon her to be a prophetess, neither had time of repentance granted to her, so many hundred years after her death. Ambrosius Ansbert saith, that according to some translation, she was the bishop of Thyatira's own wife whom

he so tolerated. Neither is the angel of Thyatira commanded to kill her, as Elias by God's special and extraordinary commandment slew the false prophets. But your late practises do interpret what you would insinuate, if you thought it convenient to utter it in plain English.

21. It is no freedom but miserable captivity, to be obtruded in sin and wickedness. Notwithstanding, whosoever God hardeneth, he enforceeth not their will, but yet as a just judge, not as an evil author, he doth properly harden them, which wilfully and obstinately harden themselves. That God giveth time of repentance, maketh sinners more inexcusable, but it proveth not that they have power to repent of their free will, without the grace of God.

22. They that receive the holy communion as hypocrites are guilty of the body and blood of our Lord, and shall not escape vengeance unless they repent: although in outward show they seem to communicate, not with heretics but with the church of Christ.

23. Neither do you see here, that good works deserve salvation, neither can you by any good and lawful argument make any other men to see it. That it is none other faith that God rewardeth, but that faith which worketh by charity, we agree with you; and by that faith we are justified before God without works, *Rom. 3.*

25. It cannot be proved that angels have power and regimen over several countries under God, but as they are appointed to serve God according to his pleasure, without any such certain limitation of places or countries. But much less it can be proved out of the scriptures, that the Saints departed have government over men or provinces, or any thing to do with our affairs in this world. For the power that our Saviour Christ promiseth to give to every Christian that overcome, is the participation of his kingdom and heavenly inheritance over all the world which God giveth him, as it is in the second Psalm: and not a special commission to one saint over one country, and to another over another country; as George for England, Denis for France, &c., but participation of his general inheritance to every one of his saints. That is, spiritually to overcome the world by faith in this life, and after this life when they are perfectly united to him at the time of the universal judgment, he will actually put them in full possession of his royal inheritance. The author of the commentaries that go under the name of Augustin doth thus expound this text, *Rom. 2.* "The church in Christ hath this power, seeing with him God hath given us all things, as the apostle saith, He crieth the rod of iron for the rigour of justice, and by the same rod the good are corrected, and the wicked broken in pieces." Such Peter upon this text. "The church hath this power in Christ as the body in the head. In whom according to the apostle, God hath given us all things." Arethas understandeth it partly of the government of the church in this life, partly of the

reward in the day of judgment. "To him which shall get a price by fighting and wrestling, I will for a triumph of victory give power over the nations, as our Lord saith in the gospels, to him which had rightly dispensed his pounds and talents, be thou ruler over ten cities, and to another over five cities: for these things signify a certain government and power given to the saints over them that are weaker, and them that have need to be directed: therefore it is written, 'The rod of thy kingdom is a rod of direction, for that which is said is wont to be signified by the rod of direction, meaning, that it bringeth not such correction as punisheth, but such as reformeth. But the iron rod no man saith to be given to any other end, but to break in pieces by the punishment of those which are clothed with disobedience, and are like to earthen pots. As also the rod of power was not sent out of Zion for any other end, but to rule. And because an iron rod is promised to every one that overcometh, and they were those which by ready obedience were purchased to God, they also shall be judges of the unbelievers, because the Lord saith: that even the Niveites shall raise up unto judgment or condemnation of the irward generation.'" Victorius saith, "It is much to say, as he shall make him a judge among the rest of the saints." Ambrosius Ansbert who wrote about 700 years ago, interpreteth this reward to be promised to all the elect: "That power which the only begotten Son of God, being made man in time, received of his Father, he promiseth to give to his elect, but in himself, by whom the whole body is ruled, and unto whom the whole body of the church is united. For he, as the apostle saith, is the head of all the elect. If any member therefore shall be worthy to continue with the head, he is truly said to have that which the head himself is proved to possess by right of inheritance." More especially he applieth it to the preachers that govern the nations, whom by preaching they convert with the word and discipline in this life, whom after the end of their labours, they shall not govern, but rest with them for ever. "It is certain that whosoever shall come to the end of his labour, shall now no more govern the people, but with them whom he hath studied to govern, shall rest with them." Rupert understandeth it only of the doctrine and discipline of the church. Richard, *de sancto Victore*, not only of the doctrine and discipline of the church in this life, but also of the judgment and condemnation of the wicked, with Christ in the end of the world. Haymo expoundeth it, of the reward that all the elect do possess by inheritance, as the members of Christ, to whom it belongeth principally, and of the doctrine and discipline of the church. So that this is a new and enforced interpretation never heard of before in the church, that the saints deceased should have government over men and provinces, and to do in the affairs of this world, &c. Which was never heard of, neither in the ancient church or of the elder sort of writers in

the Romish church, neither can it be proved out of the text. Therefore your prayers to saints, or other sovereign dignities ascribed to them by the papists, have no ground in the scriptures, either upon this text, or upon any other

### CHAPTER 3

4. There is no man which liveth after baptism, but he committeth sin worthy of death every day: yet they are said not to defile their garments which do not yield unto grievous sins, and continue in them. Arethas expoundeth it of them which have not defiled this garment of the flesh with filthy actions. Rupert likewise which have kept their bodies uncorrupted. Richard de Victore, of them that have not committed heinous offences, or else have washed their garments clean by daily repentance. So doth Ambrosius Ansbert understand it.

4. They are worthy by the worthiness of Christ, and not by the merit of their own works. Richard de Victore saith, in the person of Christ: "I take them that are worthy to be my companions, the unworthy I leave. But they that are worthy, should by no means be worthy, except they received their worthiness from me." Ambrosius Ansbert saith likewise in the person of Christ, of them that have not sinned grievously after baptism: "Either because they are clean, or because they are worthy by my acceptance."

4. A false slander: Calvin would have men to be encouraged to do good in hope of the reward, but not only nor chiefly in respect of reward, but rather for the glory of God, and of love and duty towards God.

9. The word which the apostle useth, signifieth to do reverence by bowing the body. And this may be done to creatures, when civil reverence is only intended: as to princes, magistrates, and other men in any dignity. And so have angels, appearing in the shape of men, been revered without offence by holy persons, as three angels by Abraham, before he knew they were angels, or that one of them was Christ, or represented the person of God. But religious reverence is due only to God, and not to be given either to holy men or angels. Therefore Peter forbiddeth Cornelius to worship him, who did not worship him as God, but as a divine man with religious worship, *Acts 10*. And the angel forbiddeth John to worship him, *Apoc. 19*, who knew that the angel was not God, and purposed not to worship him as God, but yet to give him religious worship, which is due only to God. Therefore if the adoration be meant here of the bishop of Philadelphia, as it is not unlike, it signifieth such reverence as is due to a godly bishop, and as the Shunamite and the sons of the prophets did to Elizeus, not any religious worship which is wholly due to God. Yet Arethas seemeth to take it otherwise: "He saith they shall run to the church not after a common sort, but with great fervour and contrition, for that he meaneth by adoring, and shall choose to

be placed among them that are lowest or least in the church. But though he meant they shall acknowledge him to be the true pastor, and yield unto him that honour which is due to them that govern well, yet this place proveth not that any religious worship is to be given to any creature. Ambrosius Ansbert understandeth this adoration to pertain to the whole church, and sheweth whereon it consisteth: "What is it for the Jews to adore before the feet of the church, but by imitating to worship, and by worshipping to imitate the example of her action."

11. Exhortations to perseverance, do not take away the certainty of God's election, who hath chosen those that continue to the end. The heavenly crown due to the well using of the apostolic function, is due by the promise of God, not of the merit of man's work of labour. Judas persevered not to the end, because he was from the beginning a reprobate, and the child of perdition," *John 17.*

20. There is nothing in this chapter to prove that man hath such freedom of will, that he can give any consent to God's calling, but as of unwilling, he is framed and turned by God's grace to be willing.

20. It lieth not in the freedom of man's will, to give consent to God's calling, before his captive will be enlarged by the grace of God. "The grace of God therefore doth not only help, but wholly convert man a coiding to the scripture: "Convert us, O Lord, and we shall be converted." *Ps. 80. et 85. Jer. 31. 18, 19.*

#### CHAPTER 4.

6. Ezekiel himself, *cap. 10. 19.* saith expressly, they were cherubim. They signify not only the glory that is given to God by all true preachers, but more generally by all creatures of the world. So doth Arethas take it also, and Hierom, *Ezek. 1.* doth not mislike that understanding.

8. The popish church applying this heavenly celebration of God's holiness to their idol of the mass, do commit horrible sacrilege and blasphemy. Chrysostom affirmeth, that the Angels are present at the celebration of the holy mysteries, and always yield due honour to God and Christ. But of popish consecration or adoration of the sacrament, he speaketh not, although he amplify the dignity of the mysteries, by the excellency of him that is represented by them, and is spiritually received of the faithful, in which respect he saith, in the former place by you quoted, and the common Lord of all, is "touched or handled continually. That the Angels are present with the priest, and the whole order of heavenly powers crieth out, and the place round about the altar, is filled for the honour of him that lieth thereon." Against them that came irreverently to the Lord's table, he saith in the other place, "Dost thou not consider that the Angels are present at this wonderful table, and do compass it about with reverence?" This proveth not that Christ is present, after any corporal

manner of presence, but spiritually to the faith of the worthy receivers. For otherwise he is no more touched than he is seen, and is neither lying nor standing, nor after any bodily gesture upon the table, but present by his grace and spirit, to assure the faithful of their spiritual incorporation with him, and nourishing by him.

#### CHAPTER 5.

1. He speaketh generally of all creatures, either in the word, or without, "before you have corruptly translated it, "no man," whereby it might be thought, that some Angels could read it, though no man could. Neither can you prove, for limbo or purgatory out of this place, "farther than the Gentiles their elysian fields. You say there could be no question of the damned in hell; and what question is there made of them, that are under the earth? You might as well say, seeing none in heaven was able, it was but folly to add, or in earth, seeing there could be no question that any in earth were able to do that which none in heaven could perform. By your own doctrine, Abraham before this time was removed out of hell into heaven, with all the faithful that were in his bosom: therefore they were not at the time of this vision under the earth, unless perhaps in respect of their bodies. Therefore when neither the Angels, nor the souls of the faithful in heaven could read the book, what question could there be of the souls in purgatory? All men therefore see, upon how vain a surmise you would gather purgatory or limbus out of this text.

8. This place proveth not that the saints in Heaven do offer up the prayers of the saints in earth. For the four and twenty elders, do represent the church militant here on earth, whose conversation is in heaven, as it is plain by the tenth verse following. And so do all the interpreters old and new commonly expound it. Therefore you come too late with your gloss, to prove that saints in heaven offer up the prayers of the faithful on earth. For the text is, that all the faithful do offer up their prayers and thanksgiving for their redemption. Bede upon the tenth verse saith, "Here it is more plainly declared, that the beasts and the elders are the church, which is redeemed by the blood of Christ, and gathered by the nations. Also he showeth in what heaven they are, saying, they shall reign upon the earth." Hayno saith, "All the elect are kings, because they suffer not the tyranny of vices to rise up in themselves, &c., while they do thus, they are kings upon the earth, because they beat down carnal and earthly desires, and by the law of virtue, reign as it were over the earth, that is subdued to them."

9. This proveth not, that Christ did merit his glory which is due to him in respect of his divinity, but that by the glorious work of redemption, he hath declared himself to be a person worthy of all honour and glory.

10. The speech is true, though it be of a

spiritual kingdom and sacrificing priesthood; not of an earthly kingdom, nor of a carnal priesthood, such as was the priesthood of Aaron, which figured the eternal sacrificing priesthood of Christ, which he accomplished in one sacrifice of eternal virtue.

13. All creatures are bound to give honour to Christ, God, and Man, for the inseparable union of the two natures in one person. This note savoureth somewhat of *Nestorianism*, be-like as though the meaning were, that if honour be not due only to God, but to Christ as man, it is due also to other men. As Allen defendeth Christ to forgive sins, not only as God, but as man also, that he might prove that the priests forgive sins as properly as Christ.

13. That which the apostle saith of every creature you do violently restrain to angels and saints, of whom he spake before. The four and twenty elders, and the infinite thousands of angels. And now followeth the glory of God and Christ, acknowledged generally by all creatures of the world. Therefore here is no place for limbo or purgatory.

"Of all creatures," saith Arethas, "as well intellectual as sensible, as well living, as having only their being by natural means, God is glorified as the beginning and author of all things, and his only begotten Son of the same substance, and his most holy and quickening Spirit." Rupert also, after he had showed that all creatures in general, and not angels and saints only praise God, because you say the damned in hell cannot speak in this case, saith thus of them, "the power, even the creature that is under the earth, namely, that which is inclosed in the prison of hell, doth ascribe unto him, yet not with voluntary confession, but by constrained concession of obedience. For even the malignant spirits, whether they will or no, shall acknowledge the power of him that sitteth on the throne, and of the Lamb." Ambrosius Ansbert also understandeth it of the bowing of all knees, even in them that are in hell, according to the apostle, *Philip 2*. Haymo likewise understandeth it of all creatures generally, even of the devils in hell, which are subject to the power of Christ, and must acknowledge his glory. Neither is there any ancient interpreter that restraineth this creature to reasonable and holy creatures only. The text is manifest of all creatures in all parts of the world, and not of angels or men only. Therefore limbo and purgatory cannot be foisted into this text.

#### CHAPTER 6.

9. Your Popish laying of the martyr's bones, if they were martyr's bones hath no correspondence with the laying of their souls under Christ, the heavenly altar. For your laying of their bones, is to have them in a readiness, for them that will commit idolatry unto them, and offer a reward unto you. Your altars, on which you offer the sacrifice of the mass, are so many blasphemies against the only spiritual altar Christ. Where

you say, that "your church hath a special proviso, that no altar be erected or consecrated without some part of saints' bodies or relics," and allege for it the decree of the 2d Council of Africa, *cap. 50, and 5 Carth. cap. 14*, you abuse the reader, for there is no such proviso in that decree. But that such superstitious altars as were set up in every corner of the country, by dreams or like superstitious conceits, for memories of martyrs, should be removed. And that no altar should be erected as the memory of a martyr, except there were some certain tokens of such memory, as their bodies, or the place of their dwelling, &c. I will set down the decree, that the reader may see how strong superstition was at that time, toward the revelation of Antichrist, that the fathers of the church could not quietly repress it:

"It is decreed, that the altars which are set up every where in the fields, or in the ways, as memorials of martyrs, in which no bodies or relics of martyrs are proved to be buried be overthrown by the bishops of those places. But if by means of tumult of the people, that cannot be suffered to be done, yet let the people be admonished, that they frequent not those places, that they which be well advised, be not there holden and bound with any superstition. Let no memory of martyrs be allowed and accepted, except the body or some undoubted relics be there, or that some original of their habitation, possession, or suffering be there, delivered from a most faithful beginning. As for those altars that are set up in every place by dreams and vain revelations of any men, let them be by all means disallowed." You see of what altars the decree speaketh, namely, such as were vaunted to be the memorials of martyrs, where either was none, or but counterfeit monuments of the martyrs, such as be most common in Popery. Hierom against Vigilantius defendeth the immoderate estimation of relics, yet he utterly denieth adoration of them, or of the martyrs themselves, which you defend. Augustin also denieth that the priest standing at the altar, over the body of any martyr, doth offer sacrifice to the martyr, but to God only, and saith, "that all religions services used in the place of the martyrs, are to the ornaments of their memories, not things consecrated, or sacrifice of the dead men, as of Gods." Gregory living so near the revelation of Antichrist, it is no marvel, though he be more superstitious in relics, yet he alloweth no such worship of them, as is in Popery, but laying of them up about the altars. That the prophet alludeth to such custom of burial of the martyrs under the altar, is a fond imagination when there were neither such churches, nor altars in his time.

"That which you cite out of the author of the *serm. de sanctis*, is of their souls in heaven: and concerning the burial of their bodies, he saith afterward: "Therefore conveniently, and as it were for a certain company or fellowship, the burial of the martyrs is decreed to be there, where the Lord's death is daily celebrated, as





10. Vigilantius perhaps maketh not this argument the only ground of his opinion, if his book were extant, that the saints pray not for us. But Hieron chooseth for his advantage, that which he saw was most easy to confute. Neither doth Hieron prove by any testimony of the scripture, that the saints pray for us. Neither hath he any arguments more than one, which hath no necessary conclusion: That the saints prayed for us while they lived, and were to be careful for themselves, *ergo*, much more, after their victory and reward in heaven. Thus he amplifieth by the examples of Moses, Stephen, and Paul, which prayed for men while they lived, and were heard. But this conclusion doth not follow. For while they lived, they had commandment and promise for mutual prayers. But we know none out of the scripture, that the souls departed have to pray for them that are living. And therefore we will not take upon us to determine, what they do in that respect. But knowing by the scriptures, Christ to be our Mediator and Advocate with God the Father, before whom we have commandment to come, and to pray to him, and promise to be heard, we satisfy ourselves, with that which God hath revealed unto us, not doubting but it is sufficient for us.

## CHAPTER 7.

3. It is the sign proper to God's elect, therefore not the sign of the cross, which many reprobates have received, nor any allusion to it, seeing there can be no allusion of that which is common to many hypocrites, unto that whereby the true servants of God are discerned.

4. Though no man can number the elect of the Gentiles, yet their number is as certain as the number of the Jews and as undoubtedly known to God.

## CHAPTER 8.

3. He alludeth to the sacrificing priesthood of the Old Testament, where incense was offered at the altar, which now is the sweet savour of the death of Christ, wherein the prayers of the saints are acceptable. But if the priest standing at the popish altar be a figure of this vision, what was Christ sitting at the table with his disciples when he instituted the holy mysteries? whereof the mass is nothing but a profanation. Howbeit, this heavenly altar is the altar of incense not of slain sacrifices, therefore no resemblance of the popish altar.

4. The commentary in Augustin saith, this angel is our Lord Jesus Christ himself. So doth Bede and Ambrosius Ansbert take it. But if it signify the ministry of Angels, in presenting prayers of the church, which are acceptable to God by the abundance of the incense or sweet savour of the merit of Christ's death: it followeth not that the same office is deputed to the souls of the faithful, nor that the angels or saints are to be prayed unto. That of the twenty-four *chaps*, chap. 5, we have there showed how this is under-

stood of the church militant on earth. Where you say it is not against the scripture, that the inferior saint or angel in Heaven should offer their prayers to God by their superiors, it is an idle fantasy: for so we may imagine infinite tables, and say they be not against the scripture. But seeing the Virgin Mary, by your doctrine, is lady of the angels, why doth not she stand at the altar, and do that which is here ascribed to the angel? Yea, if this angel offer the prayers of all saints in heaven, he offereth the Virgin Mary's prayers also, and so should be superior to her. But howsoever that be, you say, "You conclude against the Protestants; that it derogateth not from Christ, that angels or saints offer our prayers." Indeed any ministry appointed by God to angels or men, doth not derogate to Christ. But we read no where in the scriptures, that the offering of our prayers is committed to the souls of them that are departed: it is not without controversy, that the angels do offer our prayers, seeing you cannot affirm that this angel doth not represent Christ: if it be granted, that this is the ministry of an angel and not the mediation of Christ: yet it is manifest that the angel in this ministry commendeth not the prayers of all saints by his merit, or by the dignity of his own person, but by the much incense that was given unto him to add to the prayers of saints, that they might be acceptable, and so it maketh nothing for Popish invocation of saints or angels. For the text is, that "much incense was given to him, that he might give or add to the prayers of all saints: for the word *προσευχαις* is the dative case, without any preposition; *de* is not in all copies of your vulgar Latin translation. The sum is, that in the midst of the hellish troubles raised by Antichrist and his ministers, the elect have their prayers heard for their preservation by the merits of Christ, which is showed by the vision of the angel: to whom much sweet incense was given, that he might add it to the prayers of the saints, the smoke whereof ascending with the prayers of the elect, causeth them to be heard and accepted of God. Other curious speculations may breed many more frivolous questions than the text doth serve to assail.

## CHAPTER 9.

1. Bede, Arethas, and Ambrosius Ansbert understand this star to be the devil. But if it be an arch-heretic, it is the Pope, which is Antichrist, and therefore a destroyer, as Christ is a Saviour. Who hath the efficacy of error given to seduce the reprobate; who is filled from heavenly doctrine to earthly traditions; who hath this guard of locusts and lions, with all subtlety and cruelty to maintain his wickedness. To whom all things in this prophecy agree most aptly, which by no means can be drawn to Luther and Calvin, which bring forth no old condemned heresies, but teach the truth against the heresies both old and lately invented by Antichrist. The loosing of the Angels that were

bound at the great river Euphrates, signifieth whence the tyranny cometh, even whence the false doctrine floweth, namely from Babylon, which, by the consent of all ancient writers, in this prophecy signifieth the city of Rome.

4. If the sign of the cross were God's mark here spoken of, it could not be imprinted on the foreheads of so many reprobates. Therefore it is not that sign, whereby the elect are discerned from the reprobate. But rather confession of Christ, proceeding from a lively faith, which is given according to God's election. The seal whereof, as Paul saith, is this. The Lord knoweth who be his, and let every one that calleth upon the name of the Lord Christ, depart from iniquity. *2 Tim.* 2. 19. So doth Ambrosius Ansbert understand it, saying, "They have not the sign of God in their foreheads, which are not endued with that faith which worketh by love."

20. This phrase signifieth no popish penal satisfaction, but true repentance with sorrow for their sins past, which causeth men not only to depart from them, but to amend their lives.

20. The Greek word signifieth images, *1 John* 5. 21; and what are these idols, but images of gold, silver, brass, stone, and wood, which the reprobate worship, and will not leave worshipping? But this text presseth the Papists sore, and dischargeth Luther and Calvin from being the arch-heretic here described, for they teach men to abhor all worshipping of images or idols, made of any kind of matter. But the Pope from the true worship of God hath brought his people, by false doctrine and tyranny, to worship the work of men's hands, which can neither see, hear, nor walk: and consequently, to worship devils, and not God. For though they pretend to worship God and his saints, by such images, as the heathen did to worship God and his Angels, and not devils, yet the scripture saith, they did worship devils. Because idolatry is the service of the devil, and not of God, though idolaters pretend and think to worship God, and not the devil. Where you say, "The place is plain against the portraits of the heathen gods:" you forget that this is spoken of men, living after the opening of the seventh seal, and under the sound of the sixth Angel's trumpet. Now the idols or portraits of the heathen gods are abolished long ago. You are wont to hold, that there are no idols of gold, silver, &c., since the church hath been spread over all nations. There is no known people in the world, living in the time here specified, that doth worship, or hath worshipped images of gold, silver, brass, stone, and wood, but Papists.

#### CHAPTER 10.

4. The things which the seven thunders spake, John is commanded to seal up in silence, and not to utter. Therefore they were not Popish mysteries, to be delivered by tradition, but certain secret judgments of God,

which were revealed to John, for his confirmation in the faith, but not to be expressed for the instruction of the church, "For that it should not be profitable to make them known," saith Arethas, "before the last times, seeing Daniel also was willed to seal up such sayings." Therefore this place will not serve to give credit to your unwritten verities.

9. The word of God is also sweet in practice, to them that are endued with the Spirit of God, although mortification be most bitter to the flesh, and outward man. But it is said here to be bitter in the belly, because he might not keep close the knowledge of those things, that were to be revealed, but publish it and preach it abroad, as *Ezek.* 3.

#### CHAPTER 11.

2. That is a short time in comparison of the eternal reign of Christ. The same season is called a time, and times, and half a time, chapter *12.* 14, and in this chapter 1260 days, and three years and a half. Therefore cannot be meant of three common years and a half, more than of three usual days and a half. But it is numbered by the months and days, for the comfort of the faithful, that they may be assured it is limited by God, and but short in comparison of the everlasting kingdom of Christ. Hentenius, a Papist, in his preface to his translation of Arethas, saith: "It is not possible, that Antichrist in so short a time of three common years and a half, should obtain so many kingdoms and provinces." Yet our Rhemish Papists force not of impossibilities, so they might have an argument to prove that the pope is not Antichrist.

3. Christ shall have his two witnesses always, even in the hottest persecution of Antichrist. Therefore there is no need of Enoch and Elias, neither doth the text speak of them. The coming of Elias was prophesied by Malachi before the coming of Christ, and accomplished in John Baptist, as our Saviour Christ testifieth. *Matt.* 17. 12. Bede in this place understandeth "the church, lightened with the doctrine of the New and Old Testament." So doth the commentary that is in Augustin's works. Ambrosius Ansbert saith, "In these two witnesses, we do so take Enoch and Elias, the one before the law, the other in the law, that in their special persons we consider the whole general, that is, the holy church in her preachers." And concerning the common opinion of Enoch and Elias, it hath no ground in the scripture. The prophecy of Malachi was fulfilled in John the Baptist. Arethas confesseth that there is no testimony of Enoch in the scripture, but that he was translated, which proveth not his coming again. Where you say, that they live in Paradise, you shall hear what Victorin, an old writer, saith upon this text. "Many think this is to be Elias, or Elisha, or Moses, but they are both dead; but the death of Jeremy is not found. For all our ancestors have delivered by tradition, that

this is Jeremy." You see what credit is to be given to ancient tradition, without the scripture, and how certain it is that Enoch and Elias shall come again. Augustin saith not, "it is a most notorious known thing." But that the Jews shall be converted to Christ, before the day of judgment. "It is a matter very common in the speech and opinion of the faithful, or commonly said and thought of the faithful." But that opinion true or false pertaineth not to this text, where the Jews are not converted; but Antichrist confuted by the testimony of Christ's witnesses. It is the same opinion of Elias, to come before the judgment. He saith, "I think that Enoch and Elias remain in the body:" but of their coming to preach against Antichrist, he speaketh not. Hierom also thinketh they are not dead: but of their coming to prophesying, he saith nothing. *Epist.* 61. But *Ps.* 20, he saith that the remnant of the Jews, shall believe in the end by Enoch and Elias, which toucheth not our text in hand. Amorosius indeed understandeth these witnesses to be Enoch and Elias. *Ps.* 45. But Hilary contendeth that they must be "Moses and Elias. And these two prophets," saith he, "we understand to be they that shall prevent his coming, whom the Apocalypse of John saith, that they shall be slain by Antichrist, although there have been divers opinions of many men, either of Enoch or of Jeremy, because that one of them must die as Elias. But we cannot corrupt, with the opinion of our sense, the faith of the truth which our Lord hath revealed to the three forenamed witnesses, neither think that any other shall come, than they which were seen to come for the confirmation of faith." You see that certain judgment is to be taken of the authority and opinions of the fathers, without the scripture. On the other side, Prosper maketh no question, but they shall be Enoch and Elias. Gregory, and Bede in *Mark* 9, speaketh of the coming again of Elias, but never a word of Enoch. Chrysostom also thinketh, that Elias shall come again to convert the Jews: but of Enoch he is so far from affirming that he shall come, that he condemneth it of curiosity to inquire what is become of him, or to what end he was translated. *Hebr. Hom.* 22. *Gen. Hom.* 21. The later writers, Oecumenius and Theophylact, follow Chrysostom for Elias, but of Enoch they say nothing; Damascen will have them both. Thus the matter is not so clear in the opinion of antiquity, as the Papists would have it seem by the multitude of their quotations.

But you will prove "that they be alive in Paradise." But what place is Paradise but Heaven? as the apostle declareth, *2 Cor.* 12, 2, and 4, for earthly Paradise, either by the flood, or before, was defaced. Now, what doctrine is it to affirm, that men in mortal bodies ascended into Heaven, before the ascension of Christ, I leave it to the learned to consider. Your proofs are like your doctrine: for *Ecclesiasticus* is no canonical scrip-

ture, neither if it were, is it truly translated in your vulgar Latin text: for in the Greek there is no mention of Paradise. It is evident indeed that Elias was taken up alive. Yea because it was said expressly, that he was taken up into Heaven, it is certain that the body was not carried into Heaven: for Christ was the first, that in his whole humanity ascended into Heaven. That which Ireneus saith cannot be true, because he saith they were translated into the earthly Paradise, where Adam was first placed, and that Paul was rapt up into that Paradise, who saith expressly, that he was rapt into the third Heaven, which is figuratively called Paradise, because it is a place of felicity, as was that earthly garden which God planted in Eden. The testimony of the ancients, which he allegeth for a proof, is no better than the like tradition of theirs, that our Saviour Christ "was above fifty years of age." *Lib.* 2. *cap.* 39. Justin, or whosoever was the author of those questions, thinketh not only Enoch and Elias to be alive, but also all those whose bodies arose at the resurrection of Christ, to be changed together at his coming: by which opinion he overthroweth your opinion, who hold that they shall be slain by Antichrist. The testimonies of scripture which you allege are altogether against you. Malachi speaketh but of one coming of Elias, which the Angel, *Luke* 1. 17, and Christ himself, *Matt.* 11. 14, and *cap.* 17. 12, interpret of John Baptist. So doth Hierom upon Malachi, ascribing the opinion of his coming in the flesh to Jews and Jewish heretics.

That which deceived Chrysostom, and other of the ancient fathers, to think that he should come in person, was the corrupt translation of the Septuagint, where instead of Elias the prophet, as it is in the Hebrew, they did read "Elias the Tishbite:" upon which addition, Chrysostom groundeth that opinion in *Matt. Hom.* 58. As though the prophet must needs mean Elias in person, and not in spirit and office only, because he nameth his country, whereas Malachi hath not that addition, "the Tishbite:" neither in the Hebrew nor in the vulgar Latin, nor in Hierom's translation. In the latter he must be understood according to the prophecy of Malachi, expounded of John the Baptist, or else he hath no ground of his saying. Hippolitus hath more fables than that of Enoch and Elias, for he holdeth that Antichrist shall be a devil incarnate, and that not only Enoch and Elias, but "John the Divine," the writer of this Apocalypse, shall also come with them before the second coming of Christ. Let the reader therefore judge, whether we be contentious and incredulous, because we yield not to these various, inconstant, and fabulous opinions of many of the ancient fathers; or rather whether you would not make the world secure of the second coming of Christ, which confirm such fantasies, that it might be thought Antichrist is not yet come.

8. Jerusalem is not the city of Antichrist, but Rome, by authority of which city, Christ

himself, as you confess, *cap. 17*, was put to death, so also he is often crucified in his members. Hieron, *Ep. 17*, contendeth, that this place cannot be understood of Jerusalem. The comment in Augustin, interpreteth the streets of the great city, the midst of the church. Bede, the city of the ungodly; but all the ancient interpreters agree, that the chief reign of Antichrist shall be at Rome.

18. God repayeth the reward which he promiseth of his mere mercy, not which men deserve by the merit of their works. For all his Saints are justified freely by his grace through faith, without respect of the merit of their works. *Rom. 3. 24*. "There is no hire," saith Hilary, "of a gift, because it is due of the work, but God hath given a free reward to all men, by justification of faith." *In Matt. cap. 20*.

#### CHAPTER 12.

6. The author of the comment in Augustin saith, that the time mentioned in the 14th verse, signifieth a year and a hundred years, by whose account, the persecution of Antichrist should be three hundred and fifty years. And indeed from the time of the chasing away of the church into desert places, when the pope by cruel wars and tyranny banished the faithful whom he persecuted by the names of Waldenses, Albigenes, Panperes de Lugduno, Picardi, &c. unto the time that the gospel began again to be openly professed by Wiclif and others, it is about the time of 350 years: but thereof we may not rashly judge. Bede saith: "By the number of these days which maketh three years and a half, the Holy Ghost comprehendeth all the times of Christianity, because Christ whose body the church is, preached so long in the flesh." 14th verse, "He designeth the whole time of the church comprehended before in the number of days." Ambrosius Ansbert saith: "The number of 1260 days, in which the woman trieth and is fed in the wilderness, doth so signify the course of preaching or end of persecution, in which the old enemy is permitted to rage against the holy church by that damned man whom he shall possess: that nevertheless it comprehendeth the beginning either of the preaching or of the persecution in which Christ began to preach and suffer: yea the whole time of this present life which is between the beginning and the end." Rupert expoundeth these days for so long time, as the church being a stranger in the world, suffereth persecution. Haymo saith, it may be referred unto all the time from the ascension of Christ to the end of the world. But in this desert you say, the true church "shall not decay, &c. in faith or degenerate and follow Antichrist." No verily, the true church of God's elect, shall always continue constant and sound in faith, in all articles necessary to salvation: neither do we ever say otherwise. But the greatest part of the visible church, shall be seduced by Antichrist, as it is manifest here, and 2 *Thes. 2*. Where you say, "the hid company that we speak of was for

some worlds known neither to their friends nor foes." it is false, for the true members of the church were known, though not always to their enemies. For this flight into the wilderness is granted to the church for her persecution from the tyranny of Antichrist, who would not cease to persecute her, if she were within his reach and knowledge. But that there were such companies, it is manifest by this, that they have been openly known in these days to have had their continuance in Moravia, Bohemia, Calabria, Piedmont, and other places. If you follow other allegorical senses, you must be enforced to give over your fantasy of three vulgar years and a half, to be the time of Antichrist's reign, which yet before you make to be so plain, that you count us exceedingly blind with malice that will not see it.

7. Michael both here and Daniel 10, signifieth Christ, which is Lord of the angels: for the angels cannot be said to be any other Michael's angels, but only the angels of God and Christ. The author of the commentary under Augustin's name saith: "By Michael understand thou Christ." But it is a weighty note, "to mark the cause why Michael is commonly painted fighting with a dragon." But if it be of this vision, your painters have forgotten the dragon's seven heads with diadems and ten horns: for they paint the dragon with one head only. And they give Michael a pair of scales or balances in his hand to weigh souls in, which I marvel if you can defend also by the scriptures.

14. You may as well say that Antichrist's reign shall be but three days and a half. But the vision comprehending generally all the persecution that Satan shall raise against the church, from the ascension of Christ to the end, doth manifestly conlute that fantasy of three common years and a half, which the Holy Ghost meaneth of half a mystical or prophetic week, the measure whereof is known only to God. And therefore it is sometimes numbered by 1260 days, sometimes by 42 months, sometimes by three days and a half, and here indefinitely a time and times, and half a time.

15. When the devil cannot prevail against the whole church, to root her out of the earth, he assaulteth the several members of her, which are her seed in every age: and so doth Bede expound it.

#### CHAPTER 13.

1. This beast by consent of the most ancient interpreters, and other fathers of the primitive church, is the "Roman Emour," as it is enemy to God and Christ: one of the heads whereof is Antichrist. "The whore of Babylon, *Apoc. 17*, is the city of Rome, upholden by this beast, where the seven heads be also expounded to be seven hills upon which the woman sitteth, which woman is there also said to be the "great city, which hath dominion over the kings of the earth," which can be none other but the city of Rome: for Rome only had the kingdom at that time.

These seven kings are the seven principal heads of government of the Roman Empire, whereof five were abolished before Christ, one, which was of the heathen Emperors, was present, and the seventh then to come is the Pope which is Antichrist. They that worship Antichrist, worship the devil, not in their intent, for Antichrist boasteth himself to be God, but because they worship him who hath his power of the devil, and serveth the devil in deceiving the world.

3. This is the universality that the Papists brag of, when all the earth is in admiration of the lying signs and false miracles of Antichrist: whereas the doctrine of the gospel, being confirmed by the miracles of Christ and his apostles, hath no need of any other miracles.

6. The whole religion of popery, is nothing but blasphemy against God and Christ, and his church, and the blessed angels and saints, that dwell in heaven: while they teach that God only doth not properly remit sins, is not only to be served, Christ is not our only High Priest after the order of Melchisedec. The Mass is a sacrifice propitiatory for the quick and the dead, the angels and saints are mediators and advocates, the Virgin Mary may command her Son by her motherly authority. The blood of Thomas is meritorious of the kingdom of heaven for all men that will pray to ascend thither by it: with innumerable like blasphemies. The true church of God that ascribeth all honour and glory of our salvation to God only and Christ our Saviour, the Antichristians blaspheme to be heretical, and persecute with fire and sword.

11. You know that Calvin and the rest, whom you call Arch-heretics, do work no miracles, therefore they cannot be this false prophet.

14. They that refuse to worship Christ's image, because God hath forbidden to worship any images, *Ex. 20*, will never worship the image of Antichrist: no though it be not a dead image, but have a spirit and do speak, as the Pope's legates and deputies in every city do, which be nothing else but the image of Antichrist. But it is a very strange argument that you make in defence of the worshipping of Christ's image: "As the making and honouring of Antichrist's image, is not against the honour of Antichrist, but wholly for it, and likewise of Nebuchadnezzar's image: so is the honour of Christ's image, the honour of Christ himself, and not against him." A very good similitude, if Christ had commanded, and not forbidden such honour to be given unto him: "You shall not do so to the Lord your God," *Deut. 4. 23*, and *cap. 12. 4*. Therefore you might better conclude, As the worship of Antichrist's image, and of Nebuchadnezzar's image is idolatry and false worship, so the worshipping of the image of Christ, or of any of his saints. It is therefore a mad imagination of the Papists, to think that Christ will be worshipped with images, which he hath expressly forbidden to be made in any use of religion: and if they were not

made like to those things which they worship, as the prophet denounceth to idolaters, that is void of sense and understanding, as their images be which they worship, they would not for shame defend such gross idolatry, to be the true worship of God.

17. Antichrist by his triple crown, signifieth the triple honour he usurpeth against the honour of Christ. The triple honour of Christ, is that he is our only Sovereign King, High Priest, and Prophet in Religion. Of all which honour the Pope doth so go about to spoil him, while he challengeth that he himself is the supreme head of the universal church, the highest priest in the same, and the only prophet that cannot err. Instead of which triple honour due to Christ only, he assigneth to him a rood or crucifix, a superstitious mark of his Cross, and the wearing of the name of Jesus in men's caps, the power and virtue whereof he hath driven out of their hearts. So usurping the true honour of Christ, he scorneth him rather than honoureth him, with dead images, vain signs, and superstitious abusing of his Holy and Mighty name: as the soldiers did when they crowned him with thorns, clothed him in a robe of purple, and gave him a reed in his hand instead of a sceptre. Yet the Pope alloweth none of these counterfeit honours to be proper to Christ. For every saint hath his image, many saints have their characters, especially Peter his cross keys, and Mary hath her name commonly, where Jesus hath his. He brought the world to that state, that no man might have any worldly affairs therein, except he acknowledge the Pope's cross keys, that is his authority or his sovereignty, or himself to be a member of the Romish, Italian, or Latin church. In which is contained the number of his name. But the protestants in defacing the idols, and abolishing the superstitious abuse of the sign of the Cross and name of Jesus, have taken away the derision and mockery of Antichrist, which is contrary to the word of God, that they might restore to Christ his true honour that is due to him, as King, Priest, and Prophet, according to the holy scriptures.

18. As rashness is always condemned, so are we here exhorted with wisdom and understanding to count the number of the beast, which is not innumerable, but the number of a man, such as by man's understanding may be found out, especially when we see the prophecy in all other notes of Antichrist, to be fulfilled in the Pope.

It cannot be proved that Antichrist must be one particular person, and not a number or succession of men in one degree; because his name, and the particular number and the characters thereof be insinuated. But contrawise, it is manifest by this place, that Antichrist is not one particular person. The beast by all reason and circumstances, by the description in Daniel, and by the consent of the best and most ancient Interpreters, is the Roman Empire, the number of whose name is here offered to be counted. But

taking the beast as you do, for the universal company of the wicked, which hath seven heads, whereof Antichrist is the last: seeing you confess six of them to be no singular persons, but whole states and successions of men that have persecuted the church, and the sixth to be the state of the Roman Emperors; how can the seventh be taken for a singular person, more than the other six? Therefore there is no way for you to avoid, but as the Heathen Emperor of Rome was the sixth, so the apostatical Pope of Rome is the seventh.

That you say the Pope is Christ's Vicar, and successor of the chief of the apostles, is nothing but beggarly demanding of the whole matter in controversy. Neither doth the description of Antichrist, 2 *Thess.* 2., prove that he is one singular man. Neither can the abolishing of idolatry and superstition, whereby Christ's honour is defaced, make a way for Antichrist, who hath invented such means to dishonour Christ, and to advance himself. "But if the Pope had been Antichrist," you say, "and revealed so long ago, we should have known the number of his name agreeing unto him." So we do, as it was found out soon after this prophecy was written, as it is testified by Ireneus. That Antichrist shall set up his name in every place, as you set up the name of JESUS, is a vain fantasy, and hath no proof out of the scriptures. We have found indeed the whole order of popes since they have usurped that Antichristian name, to be Antichrist, even by the judgment of Gregory Bishop of Rome; and many of his predecessors, foreworkers toward his kingdom, especially those that forged the decree of the Bishop of Rome's primacy, which was discovered in the council of Africa. Yet that all the rest from Peter were foreworkers toward the kingdom of Antichrist, we neither say nor think, for many of them doubtless were true bishops, faithful teachers, and constant martyrs.

18. It is true that many names may be invented, whose letters make this number, but the Spirit of God speaketh not of feigned names, nor biddeth men to feign names that have this number in it, for thereof can come nothing but uncertainty. But he willet him to count the number of his name, which then the beast had: which name many of the faithful before Ireneus' time judged to be *λατίνος*. Ireneus affirmeth that "it was very like to be so indeed, because the most true kingdom hath that name: for they be Latins," saith he, "which now do reign," *lib.* 5. By which we note, that his judgment was, that Antichrist should be no singular man, but an order and succession of men: that the beast then reigned in the heathen emperors which afterward should reign in Antichrist. The toy of Luther's name is worthy to be laughed at, seeing it is no hard matter to draw any man's almost to it: if you change the letters at your pleasure, and take upon you to know a man's name better than himself. But you say it is most absurd folly to apply the word *Latēinos*

to the pope. And why so I pray you, is not he a Latin as well as the Roman Emperor? Your reason is, that neither the whole order, nor any particular Pope was so called. For any particular Pope we strive not, but is not the Pope head of the Latin church, as the Emperor was of the Latin Empire? Therefore if the Emperor might be called *Latēinos*, by Ireneus' judgment, much more the Pope, who is so much a Latin, that he will allow no exercise of religion, but in Latin; that he condemneth the Greek church, because it will not be subject to his Latin law; which hath caused all private men to pray in Latin; which alloweth no translation of the scripture as authentical, but his Latin, no not the original of Hebrew and Greek, which he blasphemeth to be corrupted; and therefore must give place to his Latin. Inasmuch that the setter forth of the Complutensian edition, in his preface to him, saith, "He placed the Latin text between the Hebrew and Greek, as Christ between two thieves." It is so notorious that he is the head of the Latins, that the ignorant people know no other proper difference of his religion but that it is Latin. That Ireneus applied that name to the state of the Heathen Emperors, it was right, for then the sixth king reigned: and Antichrist the seventh head of the Latin beast was not come, as he is now in the Papacy. That he preferreth the name *Titan*, it was because he saw not the fulfilling of the prophecy in the coming of Antichrist, the accomplishment whereof, he willed men to wait for, that they be not deceived by the conjectures of divers names. But now that Antichrist is come and discovered, we see plainly that *Latēinos* is his name. Yea we see that *רמבס* the Hebrew name of the beast signifying Roman, hath the same number: and it is not by chance that *Ecclesia Italica* in the account of the Greek letters fulfilleth the same number. The time of his manifestation also falling about that year of our Lord 666, especially the composition of the Latin service by Pope Vitalian to be observed in all regions subject to the Romish tyranny. What time also Constantius the Emperor having removed the chief ornaments of the ancient Empire of Rome to Constantinople, left the city of Rome to the Pope's pleasure, maketh for the better understanding of this number. That you discharge Luther of his dignity of Antichrist, he is much beholden to you. But if you will make him undoubtedly one of his precursors, you must prove his doctrine against Popery, to be contrary to the scriptures.

CHAPTER II

1. This place proveth not one state of life more excellent than another; for all the elect are such virgins as be here spoken of, as you confess in your note.

8. Rome is the second Babylon, saith Ansbert, as is plainly declared in chapter 17, which is the city of Antichrist.

12. Faith without works doth justify before

God: yet the keeping of God's commandments is necessary for them that shall be saved after they believe, though no man in this life fulfil them perfectly.

13. Though Beza doth translate it so as it seemeth to pertain only to martyrs, yet the phrase doth not necessarily import so much, for then he would have said rather, which are killed or slain for the Lord. To live in the Lord, or in Christ Jesus, is a phrase of scripture, signifying to live godly, and in the faith of Christ, 2 *Tim.* 3. 12, so to die in the Lord, signifieth to die in the faith of Christ, as 1 *Thess.* 4. 16, the dead in Christ, are called all that have died in the faith of Christ before his coming to judgment. Therefore they that die in the Lord, are not they only that die for the Lord's cause, but all that die in the faith of Christ, who are to be comforted against the troubles of this life, and the persecution of Antichrist, and not they only whom Antichrist shall kill and murder, but even they also that for the Lord's cause are killed all the day long, and accounted as sheep of the slaughter, which is the condition of all God's children in this life. Seeing then this blessedness pertaineth to all that die in the faith of Christ, there is no purgatory pains for them after this life, nor any need of prayers. By that which Augustin saith of the memory of martyrs used in his time, if we compare it with the elder usage, in which they offered sacrifice for patriarchs, prophets, martyrs, and all the elect departed: as appeareth by Cyprian, *Ep.* 38. *Epipha. hæc.* 74, and the old liturgies: it is easy to gather, that the ancient memories and oblations for the dead, were neither masses nor prayers, but praises and thanksgiving, though afterward by little and little, the superstition of praying for the dead, and the opinion of purgatory began to be received. Purgatory was not confirmed in Augustin's time, as appeareth by his doubting thereof in some places. *Ench. ad Laurent. cap.* 69. *De fide et oper. cap.* 16. *De octo Quæst. Dulc. q.* 1, and his utter denying of a third place: *Hypognoctic. lib.* 5. *De verb. Apost. ser.* 14. You confess the place may be understood of all that die in the favour of God: you say, that though they be in purgatory, they rest in peace according to Augustin's words. But those words of Augustin do confute your purgatory, where there is no more rest than is in hell, if we believe your fables of your torments of purgatory, which tell us that they differ only, in that the one is temporal, the other eternal. They that prayed for the dead therefore in Augustin's time, counted them to rest in peace, yet to be delayed of their blessed felicity for a season: as the Greeks do at this day which deny your purgatory, yet pray for the dead. But you say, they rest in peace, because "they be discharged of the trouble of this life;" &c. A miserable rest, to be discharged of the common afflictions of this life, whereof they suffer least, whom you affirm to go to purgatory, to be tormented with hellish pains after this life, and that for so many thousand years as the Pope's par-

dons are able to release them, and yet will not of his charity give them, but covetously selleth them. "But it is more," you say, "that they are discharged from daily danger of sin and damnation, and put to infallible security of eternal joy, with unspeakable comfort of conscience." Verily, the elect that are justified by faith, though they be subject to sin of infirmity, yet are out of danger of damnation, even while they are in this life, *Rom.* 8. 1, and of sinning unto death, 1 *John* 5. 18, and the infallible certainty of eternal joy, with unspeakable comfort of conscience, they have also in this life by the testimony of God's Spirit. *Rom.* 8. 16. Therefore although their state were such in purgatory, as you say, yet it were worse than the state of this life, in which be all the good things that you can say of purgatory, and yet there is not that terrible flame and torment which you say is in purgatory.

But seeing they be souls and not bodies that be in purgatory: I marvel how they can have such unspeakable comfort of mind, wherein they suffer such intolerable torments, as you hold their pains to be, or what pains they can suffer in their souls, which enjoy unspeakable comfort in their conscience. For the unspeakable comfort of conscience, will overcome all other griefs of body or mind: and the discomfort of conscience, is the greatest torment that the soul can suffer. As for your fables of burning, and scalding, whipping, and racking, yea, freezing of souls in the ice, and such like, whereof your legends and promptuaries are full, you may tell to old wives on winter nights by the fireside: but men indued with knowledge and understanding will not be persuaded that the conscience feeling unspeakable comfort, as you say, can be tormented with any such things. Seeing therefore the Holy Ghost saith, that the dead in Christ do rest from their labours, it is certain they feel no purgatory pains which are infinitely greater than any labours of this life, if they be such as you would make men believe they are. You say, "the adverb doth not signify properly from this time forward, but it noteth though the time past with the time present." John useth it to signify from this time forward, not only in this place, but also in his gospel. *John* 1. 51. Where Christ saith to Nathaniel, henceforth, you shall see heaven open, &c. where he doth not note and join the time past with the time present, but speaketh altogether of the time to come: so he meaneth, that from their death forward they are blessed, and rest from their labours. *A modo tum id est a tempore mortis requiescere. Bede in hunc locum.* But that the apostle doth not mean they should be blessed because they go not into *Limbus patrum*, is manifest by this reason, that all that went to *Limbus patrum* by your own confession were blessed, were in Abraham's bosom, and in happy rest, and rested from their labours, therefore they enjoyed that happiness, which is here pronounced of the dead in the Lord. That you end *Limbus patrum* at Christ's ascension, and hold



that Christ by descending into hell, delivered the fathers thence; I marvel where you place them, for those forty days that were between his resurrection and ascension.

If any of the elect died in that mean time, how they were delivered out of *Limbus patrum*, except you feign that Christ descended to hell after his resurrection. But you say further, that "such as have died since Christ's ascension, are in case to go straight to bliss, except the impediment be in themselves." But the Spirit acknowledgeth no impediment of bliss of them that die in the Lord, but saith they are blessed, that are dead in the Lord. Whereas if there had been any other impediment, he could not have pronounced them absolutely blessed: but should have added the exception of that impediment, which might keep them from blessedness. Which seeing the Spirit neither here, nor any where in the scriptures hath declared, it is but a forged impediment that taketh away the joy and comfort which the Spirit giveth to all them that die in the Lord. This blessedness therefore is absolute, and not in comparison nor with exception: and the reason of their blessedness is added, for that they rest from their labours and troubles. And their works follow them unto everlasting reward, according to God's promise, by whose grace they have been justified by faith, exercised in good works, and ended their course in the Lord.

#### CHAPTER 16.

6. This revenge is before the latter day, whereof let the bloody Papists make their account to taste.

9. He speaketh of the reprobate limbs of Antichrist being alive, for they that are dead, are not in case to repent.

19. The city is Rome, and the commonality of Papists, that hold their faith and religion of that city.

#### CHAPTER 17.

1. The final damnation of the whole company of the reprobate is described, *cap.* 20. 14. &c. Therefore the great whore in this chapter signifieth the congregation of Antichrist, the members whereof be all spiritual citizens of Rome: their whole faith and religion, depending upon the See of Rome, and their head usurping all his tyranny, by pretence of right of that city. A lively image of which vision God made manifest to the whole world, when a whore was made head of the Romish Church, called John the Seventh, and of some the Eighth, commonly Pope Joan. Which so wringeth the Papists at the heart, that they have no way to shift it off, but by impudent denying of that which is so notorious, even in their own stories of their Popes' lives.

4. In the end of Peter's epistle, for a poor help to prove that Peter was at Rome, you will needs have Babylon to be taken for Rome, whereunto indeed the consent of ancient writers, moved with the light of this chapter, agreeth. Yet can it neither neces-

sarily nor probably be gathered but of that epistle, seeing there appeareth no reason why he should not call it Rome, being that city whereof he was bishop, if we believe the papists, and which should be the head of the Christian religion, and the Jerusalem of Christians, as the papists affirm. There appeareth no reason why he should refuse to call it Rome: especially seeing there is no other testimony in the Acts of the Apostles, of his coming thither, and why he should call it by the odious and infamous name of Babylon, which was the old enemy of the church, and the seat of Antichrist, rather than Paul writing to the Romans, or to Timothy of his persecution at Rome. Except perhaps the spirit of prophecy he did foresee how his successors in that place should abuse his name, to set up the kingdom of Antichrist there: and for that cause would admonish the faithful, that they should take Rome not for the Jerusalem of Christians, but for Babylon the city of Antichrist, which in time to come, was to be revealed in that place. But in this chapter where Rome is most plainly described under the name of Babylon, the papists by all means would avoid that exposition, because they see manifestly that Babylon, which is Rome, is here described to be the seat of Antichrist.

These are the fellows that in exposition of the holy scriptures, be led only by their prejudicate opinions and heresies to which, without any reason and sincerity, they draw all things. If you mark their notes from the beginning to the end, you shall see that in very few they have any colour out of the words of the text, to conclude their notes, but for the most part they bring their prejudicate opinions to the text, and so draw not their notes out of the scripture, but draw the scriptures to their opinions, which can never be concluded out of the scriptures. As for Peter's being at Rome, we affirm it cannot be proved out of the scriptures: yet for the consent of ancient writers, we yield unto it, as to a matter of story, but no article of our faith. If Peter's being at Rome were as certain out of the scriptures as Paul's coming thither, and being there: it could make nothing for the Antichristian authority, which the Pope claimeth under colour of his being there. Who if he were there, was the chief apostle of the circumcision, and not of the Gentiles, as is manifest by the holy scripture, *Gal.* 2. What prerogative soever he had, being an apostle, it ceased with the death of his person, as the apostleship of Paul, and of the rest: although the fruit of their labours in preaching and writing shall continue to the end of the world.

Augustin, you say, and Arethas expound not this place of Rome, but of the society of the ungodly. Augustin indeed saith often, that Babylon representeth the society of the ungodly, as Jerusalem the church of the faithful, but yet he acknowledgeth the old city of Babylon in Assyria to have been the head city of that society before Christ, and Rome

to be the head city of the same society since the coming of Christ: and this he doth commonly insinuate in his books, *De civit. Dei*. Among which this one testimony shall serve us to repeat. "We ought where need is to make report of the Assyrian kings, that it may appear how Babylon which was the first Rome, cometh forth in the world with this stranger the city of God. The affairs which we must enter into this book, for the comparison of both the cities, the earthly and the heavenly, we must take out of the Greeks and Latins, where Rome itself is, which is the second Babylon." Therefore most evidently, as old Babylon of the Assyrians was the head of the society of the impious, against the church of the Jews: so Rome of the Latins is the head of the society of the ungodly, against the church of the Christians. For this cause he calleth Rome another Babylon, the second Babylon, the Western Babylon, the daughter of the elder Babylon.

Concerning Arethas, as he took his commentary out of the ancient Greek writers, so he cannot dissemble their judgment, that by Babylon is signified old Rome. But being a Grecian, living far from Italy, and out of the tyranny of the Romish Antichrist, and knowing more disorder in Constantinople, in his time, than he did in Rome, he declareth that in his opinion, it signifieth rather Constantinople, which was called new Rome, than old Rome in Italy. Yet because all things could not agree to Constantinople, he inclineth to that opinion, that Babylon signifieth the world of wicked men. Nevertheless he confesseth: "That other writers having discussed this revelation, have interpreted it to be old Rome, or a universal kingdom, which extendeth to the second coming of our Lord." In the end he leaveth it to the reader's discretion to take it for old Rome or new Rome, or the time of the life of Antichrist. Therefore neither Augustin nor Arethas deny it to be expounded of Rome, but rather confirm that most ancient exposition, which also is clear by the text itself, *verse 9, and 18*. Later writers, that lived under the tyranny of the Romish Antichrist, were glad to wrest it any whither, rather than to incur the hatred of Rome, by decyphering it to be the city of Antichrist. Yet sometimes there have not wanted they that have been bold to tell the Pope openly, that Rome is Babylon. The church of Leodium being miserably afflicted by Pope Paschal the second, doth thus write against him. "In times past I was wont to interpret, that Peter by Babylon would signify Rome, because Rome at that time was confused with idolatry and all filthiness. But now my sorrow doth interpret unto me, that Peter calling the church gathered together in Babylon, foresaw by spirit of prophecy the confusion of dissension, wherewith the church at this day is rent in pieces." The poor men of Lyons, whom they called by the name of Waldenses, Leonists, and such like opprobrious names, did plainly affirm and constantly believe, that the church of Rome is this

whore of Babylon, and the Pope Antichrist, as Reinerlus an inquisitor witnesseth of them, which lived more than three hundred years ago: and saith they were more pernicious to the Romish church, than all other sects, for three causes: "The first, because it hath been of longer continuance. For some say it hath endured since the time of Sylvester. Others say it hath endured since the apostles' time. The second cause is, because it is more general. For there is almost no land in which this sect doth not creep. The third cause, for that all other sects do bring in a horror with the heinousness of their blasphemies against God. This sect of the Leonists, hath a great show of godliness, because they live justly before men, and believe all things well concerning God, and all the articles which are contained in the creed; they blaspheme and hate only the church of Rome." This is the testimony of a cruel enemy and persecutor of them, by which you may see, that Antichrist alter he was disclosed, was acknowledged by many true Christians, to be that he is, although many also were deceived by him, though none of the elect finally to their destruction.

The author of the commentary in Ambrose's name, and Tertullian's, you confess to understand this Babylon to be Rome, to whom afterward you add Hierom: so might you have done Primasius, and Victorin, older than Hierom, and Ambrosius Ansbert, who did write about seven hundred years ago. But you say Rome was Babylon when it was heathen, as in Tertullian's time, and when John wrote this. Very good, that which was Babylon in John's time, is the same that he prophesieth to be the chief city and seat of Antichrist, as it is manifest to all that read the prophecy. But Rome was then Babylon, *ergo*, Rome is the city which he prophesieth should be the seat of Antichrist. But in the days of Victorin, Ambrose, Augustin, Hierom, Primasius, &c., Rome was not heathen, yet of them taken to be Babylon, therefore of them taken to be the city where Antichrist, when he was revealed, should sit, and not a resemblance only of it. *Fucherius, de spiritualibus formulis cap. 10.* "Babylon" aut mundus, aut Roma in Apocalypsi: et Babylon magna venit, &c. *Paulinus Epist. 10, ad Severum*, calleth Rome Babylon, and the daughter of Babylon, *Epist. 31. Poteras Roma intentas sibi illas in Apocalypsi: minas non timere, si talia semper ederunt munera Senatoris tui. Ad Alothium.* "But to apply that to the Roman church, and apostolic See, either now or then," you say, "is most blasphemous and foolish." Indeed to apply it to the true Roman church, or the right succession in the apostolic See, which was in the days of John, or in the time of the Christian Emperors, it were both folly and blasphemy: but to apply it to the present church of Rome, and counterfeit succession of Popes, is wisdom and holiness. John prophesieth not only of the cruelty of the terrene estate of that city, but also of the false prophet and Antichrist, which should usurp an ecclesiastical

state and dignity in that city. The church of Rome indeed was one thing and Babylon in Rome was another thing, while the church of God was at Rome, and was persecuted by heathen emperors. But when the emperor of Rome was Christian, one of the heads of the beast was wounded to death, *cap. 13*, even that sixth head, which was the persecutor in the time of John. But this head was healed in Constantius the heretic emperor, Valens, and Julian the apostate, &c., and still the seventh head was to come. But great preparation was made for him, while the bishop of Rome grew beyond the limits of a Christian minister, into foreign and heathenish dominion, as Socrates testifieth, *lib. 7. cap. 11*, in the time of the Christian emperors. When the mystery of iniquity wrought not so closely in that See, but the forgery of the bishops was discovered in the African Council, unto which they obtruded a counterfeit canon of the council of Nice for their primacy. While Leo bishop of Rome will not obey the decree of the general council of Chalcedon, which gave equal privilege of dignity to the bishop of Constantinople, which was new Rome, with those which the church of Rome before had claimed as peculiar to her alone. *Sess. ultim.* In the best and most Christian times of Rome therefore, when the head of the heathen empire was wounded to death, it was conated of the ancient fathers to be Babylon here spoken of, because of the seventh head, which is the kingdom of Antichrist, that was looked for, to come in place of the sixth head, which was the terrene state of heathenish, heretical, and persecuting emperors. Therefore not the true church in Rome, but Rome the persecutor of the saints, first in the heathen and heretical emperors, afterward in the proud Popes and the kings subject to them, is Babylon the mother of all abominations. So great is the force, and so manifest is the light of truth, that you are compelled to confess in the end, that Antichrist shall have his seat in Rome, though in the eleventh chapter you were resolute of Jerusalem. But that you would discharge the Pope and the popish church, to whom all the prophecies do so aptly agree to be Antichrist and his city, you labour in vain. For the blasphemous pride and heresies of the Pope and his church, with the most abominable lives of both, will easily convince that he is the seventh head of the beast which was to come, and we are not to look for any other. That you add out of Hierom, proveth that he judgeth not the church of Rome in his time to be the whore of Babylon, but yet you cannot avoid but he judged the city of Rome to be the whore of Babylon spoken of in this prophecy, in which Antichrist should have his chief seat of tyranny. But *advers. Jovin. lib. 2*, you say, he signifieth that the holiness of the church of Rome had wiped away the name of blasphemy, written in the forehead of her former iniquity. Indeed he saith to Rome, that she had by confession of Christ put away the name of blasphemy written in her forehead, which in his epistle

to Algasia, *quæst. II*, he saith was *Romæ æterna*, to Rome eternal. But that he meanth this in respect of the true church only that was there in his time, and yet looketh for this prophecy of the kingdom of Antichrist, and the fall of Babylon to be fulfilled there; he saith to Rome in the same place: "The curse which our Saviour hath threatened to thee in the Apocalypse, thou mayest escape by repentance, having the example of the Ninevites." He doth acknowledge the damnation of the great whore of Babylon to be behind, not yet accomplished in his time, when the dominion of the heathen was altogether subverted. The sermon of Leo extollet the conversion of Rome from Gentility to Christianity, by the preaching of Peter and Paul, but this question of Antichrist and his seat, he doth not once touch.

5. Bede saith, "It is declared that this name is mystical, because it is discerned only by wisdom. The mark of reprobation is not openly carried in the forehead, where this mystical name is written, which Hierom interpreteth to be that inscription, *Romæ æterna*, to Rome eternal. So the heathen writers called the city commonly, *Urbs æterna*, the eternal city, supposing that the empire of Rome should be eternal. Whom the Papists succeeded when the civil empire was removed from thence, setting the ecclesiastical tyranny of Antichrist under the colour of Peter's See, and the eternal rock of the church, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. So blasphemously perverting the most comfortable promise of Christ touching the perpetuity of his Catholic church, builded upon the doctrine, faith, and confession of Peter and the rest of the apostles, to the bishops' personal succession of Peter in the Pontifical See of Rome. Where neither the doctrine nor example of Peter's life is to be found, nor any such power was ever in Peter's person. That prerogative which he had, descended not by succession to any other, more than Paul's prerogative, or that which James, or that which John enjoyed in their Apostleship did descend to any of the bishops that afterward succeeded in those churches which they planted or instructed.

6. The great abundance of blood that Rome hath shed, first under the heathen emperors, and then under the Antichristian Popes, more than ever Babylon of the east did pour out, is sufficient to make her drunk with the blood of the Saints. For which cruelty she deserveth as well as Jerusalem, that all the righteous blood that hath been shed since the blood of righteous Abel, should be imputed to her, and required at her hands. They whom you call heretics for the most part, and that are in any great number put to death at Rome, and by the tyranny of the Romish Inquisition, are the true Christians and saints here spoken of, whose godly way you call heresy, as the persecuting Jews called it in Paul, *Acts 21. 11*. We abhor the cruelty of Antichrist and his church, which condemneth true Christians, and murdereth them under

colour of heretics, himself and his false prophets being the greatest and most blasphemous heretics that ever were.

8. The reign of Antichrist is short in comparison of the eternal reign of Christ. He speaketh of the Roman empire which had been glorious, but then was in declining, and yet was not abolished, but should be abolished in the emperors, and raised out of hell by Antichrist.

9. The angel doth not expound those seven hills to be all one with the seven heads, and the seven kings, but showeth most plainly, that the seven heads of the beast do signify seven hills, upon which the woman sitteth, that is, the city is builded. For the woman, *verse* 18, is interpreted to be a city. Also these seven heads do signify seven kings. Therefore hills are taken literally for hills in one signification, as kings are in the other. For both these words hills and kings, are in the interpretation of this word, heads. And it had been very superfluous to have added, they are hills, and upon which the woman sitteth, when he should mean nothing thereby, but they are kings, upon which the city doth not sit, but rather kings upon the city. For every interpretation must be more plain and clear than that which is interpreted. Therefore it should be a monstrous interpretation, to say the seven heads do signify seven hills, when he meaneth no hills but kings, for it is more plain to understand that heads are kings, than that hills are kings. This is therefore a brutish wrangling against so clear light of truth, seeing you have confessed, that "it may well be that Antichrist shall have his seat at Rome." If we be blinded with malice against the church of Rome, and so mad to take them for seven hills literally, what were so many of the ancient fathers, as affirmed Rome to be the see of Antichrist, by the clear description of her in this chapter? Especially Victorin and Hierom, "The seven heads," saith Victorin, "are seven hills, upon which the woman, that is, the city of Rome doth sit." The other saith, *ep. 17*, "I suppose this place is holier than the Tarpeian rock, which having been so often stricken with thunder and lightning from heaven, showeth that it displeaseth the Lord. Read the Apocalypse of John, and consider what is there said of the woman clothed in purple, and the blasphemy written in her forehead, the seven hills, the many waters, and the departure from Babylon." Were these ancient fathers also unlearned? that thus understood and taught the city of Rome to be the seat of Antichrist, and the seven hills to be taken literally for those famous hills by which Rome hath been notoriously discerned from other cities, even when it hath not been named, as Virgil in his *Georgics*, saying *Septem quæ una sibi muro circumdedit arces*: "She being but one, hath compassed seven hills within her wall, is understood of all men, to be the city of Rome, although the poet doth not there express her name. But in old time, you say, Rome did stand upon those hills, whereby you would in-

simulate, that Rome doth not now stand upon them, but for fear of another sequel, &c.

Saunders not fearing that consequence, for what would he fear that was not afraid to raise war against his sovereign in Ireland? counteth it a childish argument, by the seven hills to prove the See of Antichrist to be at Rome, "because the city is now gone from the hills, and standeth in the plain of Campus Martius, and the pope sitteth on the other side of the river, upon the hill Vatican hard by Peter's church, by whom he holdeth his chair, not at all deriving his power from the seven hills," &c. But if the pope sit now in another Rome than Peter the apostle sat, how will Saunders persuade us that he sitteth in the chair of Peter? For that Rome where Peter sat, was builded upon the seven hill, and not gone down into the plain of Campus Martius, nor over the river. Therefore, if the pope do not at all derive his power from the seven hills, he deriveth it not at all from Peter's seat, for that was in the city builded upon seven hills. Besides this, it is plain that although many of the people of late time have removed their habitation from the hills into the plain, and the pope his palace of pleasure unto the other side of the river, yet hath he not removed his seat from them, for on them be still to this day his churches, monasteries, and courts. For on the mount Celius is the monastery of Gregory the First, builded by himself, where his father's house stood, and the church of John and Paul, where was a stately palace inhabited by divers popes in times past. There is the hospital of the Saviour, and the church of Mary in Dominica. The church of Stephen the round. The church of the four crowned, with a notable palace belonging to it. The monastery of Erasmus. The great cathedral church or minster of Lateran, which is said to keep the heads of the apostles Peter and Paul, where are the goodliest buildings of the world. "And that palace," saith Blondus, "as it is the principal seat of the popes of Rome, so of most of them it was in times past inhabited, even until the days of Pope Nicholas the Second," which was almost 1100 years after Christ.

On the same hill did Eugenius the Fourth build a most sumptuous monastery, and repaired the old palace, as the principal seat of his popedom. There is also a house of Charterhouse monks, with the church of the Cross in Jerusalem. Besides this, there is not one of the hills at this day, in which the pope's religion is not practised in churches and abbeyes. The mount of Aventine hath three monasteries, of Sabine, Boniface and Alexius. The mount Equilinus, hath the famous minster of Maria Major, the churches of Antoine, Praxidis, Vitus, Eusebius, the forty martyrs, Clemens, Peter *ad vincula*, and Martin *in montibus*. Besides the old ruins of Cyriac's church, which is yet a title of cardinalship. The mount Viminalis hath the churches of Laurence in *Palisperna* and *Potentiana*. The mount Tarpeius or Capitoline

hath a house of friars called Ara Carli, and a brickhouse builded by Boniface the Ninth, for keeping courts. The mount Palatine hath the churches of Nicholas and Andrew. To the mount Quirinalis, belongeth Maria De Populo, &c. "But if we had any consideration, we mig<sup>t</sup> mark," you say, "that the prophet's visions are by sevens, and that he alludeth not to the hills, because they were just seven." We know seven to be a mystical number of perfection as ten, signifying universality of the thing spoken of; but when the prophet himself expoundeth the number of heads, of seven hills, and knowing that the said great city sat upon seven hills, we must understand that he calleth them seven hills, because they were just seven, as the seven candlesticks, and the seven stars do signify the seven churches, and the seven bishops of them to whom he writeth, because they were just seven, as they be rehearsed by name, *cap.* 1. 11, and *cap.* 2. 3.

Likewise the seven kings or kingdoms, which is another interpretation of the seven heads, are called seven because they are just seven in number, as is manifest by the account that the angel maketh of men, saying, "five are fallen, one is, and the seventh is yet to come. And although some take it for seven special kingdoms that persecuted God's people, yet it is manifest by the whole discourse of the chapter, that the apostle meaneth of seven heads, or principal rulers of the Roman empire, as kings, consuls, Decemviri, Tribuni militum, dictators, emperors, popes, whereof five were fallen before John's time, the emperor then was, the pope was yet to come, which is the tyranny of Antichrist long since discovered, and is now not a little consumed with the Spirit of the Lord's mouth, which is his holy word, preached in these days, and shall be utterly abolished by the coming of our Saviour Christ to judgment, as Paul did prophesy, 2 *Thess.* 2.

11. The kingdom of Antichrist being one of the seven that is a Roman tyranny, yet for that it is after another sort than the other six, persecuting the true church under the colour of the head of the Catholic church, is also called the eighth kingdom.

12. When the Roman empire was abolished to make room for Antichrist, these kingdoms were erected which were made subject to the Pope, but at length shall hate the whore of Babylon, and make her desolate, &c., as in *verse* 16, which is begun to be accomplished in these days.

18. Without all peradventure the great city, which in John's time had the dominion over the kings of the earth, was none other but the city of Rome, and so is expounded, not only of Greeks, but of most of the Latin writers, as Ireneus, Tertullian, Ambrose, Victorin, Hierom, Augustin, Primasius, as hath been showed before. Prosper, also a Latin writer. *De prom. et præd. cap.* 7, saith, "Who cannot understand what city he saith doth carry a cup full of abominations of uncleanness, and fornication of the whole earth? when it is

called eternal which is temporal, verily it is a name of blasphemy, when mortal men, though kings, therein are called *Duci*, that is, Gods, and their suppliants say unto them, to your divine power, to your altars, to your eternity," &c. This the learned know to be the city of Rome, which was called "The eternal city," and wherein the emperors were called gods, and the people flattered them with altars and blasphemous titles of divine power and eternity, as they do now their popes with the like blasphemous terms of the most holy, and your holiness. Who have also as blasphemous tokens of divinity, as any of the heathen emperors had, in their triple crown, their riding upon men's shoulders, their attendance of kings and emperors, their thrones in the churches higher than the altars, and such like blasphemous pomps of heathenish and Antichristian pride. Ambrosius Auber, also a Latin writer 700 years since, in his commentary upon *cap.* 11. *ver.* 8, calleth Rome the second Babylon, and upon this chapter, *ver.* 3, he writeth thus, "The angel admonished us to know, that by the sense of wisdom following, the seven heads are seven hills, and seven kings, that he might show that unto the similitudes of those kings, he had brought Rome, which sitting aloft upon seven hills, sometimes governed the monarchy of the whole world, that in the name of that city he had figured the power of the whole earthly kingdom.

Seeing therefore the consent of most ancient writers and your own confession added to the clearness of the text, acknowledgeth that the city here spoken of, is the city of Rome: you cannot avoid but the same city is the seat of Antichrist the seventh head, as well as it was of the heathenish persecutors that were the sixth head. Although these heathenish persecutions did cease while Constantine reigned, in whom the sixth head was wounded to death, yet were they renewed in his son Constantius the Arian, and his nephew Julian the apostate, who raised persecution afresh against the Church of God, though not so cruel as before. Where you say that Constantine yielded the city of Rome to the Pope, in your meaning it is false, for he and his successors for many years after held the dominion of that city. But in truth, by removing the seat of the empire partly to Constantinople, he yielded place for the mystery of iniquity, to work more easily, toward the open manifestation of Antichrist. But "the Pope," you say, "holdeth not the kingdom or empire over the world as the heathen did, but the fatherhood and spiritual rule of the church." That the Pope hath held the empire over the kings of the earth, and practised as great pride and tyranny even against them that bear the name of the Roman emperors, and against other kings of the earth, the stories are full of examples. And that he still claimeth the same empire and kingdom, his blasphemous bull given out against the Queen of England, with other his Antichristian practices against her, do

manifestly declare. It is not therefore a fatherhood and a spiritual rule, which he claimeth most blasphemously over all the church, but under colour and pretence thereof, a temporal kingdom, and an earthly empire over the kings of the earth. And as his predecessors the heathen emperors, under title of their earthly empire, usurped the authority over all religion, and were called *Pontifices maximi*, that is, the chief governors of religion: so the Popes under the title of the chief government of religion, usurp all sovereignty of earthly dignity and temporal dominion. And seeing you confess that by the authority of the Roman empire Christ was put to death, it is easy to conclude, that not Jerusalem, but Rome which is spiritually called Sodoma and Egypt, is that great city spoken of chapter 11, which as it crucified our Lord, so also killeth his prophets and saints. Therefore without controversy Babylon is Rome, the head and chief of all persecutors of the Church of Christ, as old Babylon was of his people the Jews, as Augustin himself plainly teacheth. So may the author of those homilies in Augustin be understood: that one city is principal in persecution of the church, though the church hath many enemies beside that city, and them that hold of it.

#### CHAPTER 18.

21. The angel showeth, that whereas Babylon boasted that she was eternal, she shall be utterly destroyed, and never rise again. Therefore here is nothing to prove, that he meaneth not any one city, but rather that he meaneth the city and kingdom of Rome, the See of Antichrist, of whose utter destruction the angel specially prophesieth. For the destruction of the universal company of the reprobate, in the day of judgment, is described afterward, chap. 20. 11. Jeremy, cap. 52, doth nothing else but historically describe the captivity of Babylon, by Nebuchadnezzar and his power, and the advancing of Jehoiachim by Evilmerodach, King of Babylon, as every man will confess, that readeth the chapter.

#### CHAPTER 19.

3. The Popish repetition of Alleluia, is but a mockery of the saints in Heaven, when neither the priest commonly, nor the people, understand what they mean, by that often repetition of Alleluia.

4. The Latin text is not to be regarded, nor the Greek of the Old Testament, how it pleased the interpreters to leave these words untranslated. But in the Greek of the New Testament, which is indited by the Holy Ghost, it is material to consider, that these words, as commonly understood, and easy to be understood of all Christians, are many times kept in their natural sound, and not translated into Greek. Partly because they were as well understood of them that professed the religion, either of the Jews or Christians, as the Greek words themselves: partly to express in relation of things done

more lively the zeal of them that either affirmed any thing, or praised God in these terms. But where you say, "they be not translated unless it be once or twice in the Psalms," it is false. Amen is used but in the end of four Psalms, which are according to your account, Ps. 40. 17. 88. 105. In every one of these places it is translated in the Greek *γλωσσον, γλωσσον*, in the Latin *Fiat, Fiat*, which is in English, So be it, So be it, where in the Hebrew it is Amen, Amen: except in the last, where Amen is but once in the Hebrew. So is Alleluia twice at the least translated into Greek and Latin, Ps. 134. 3, and 146. 1, *αλλελου τον κυριον*, in Latin *Laudate Dominum*, in English, Praise ye the Lord. We also retain those terms in many places of the New Testament, where they cannot conveniently be translated, because they are so left in the original. Why we translate Amen sometimes verily, in the place by you quoted, I have declared enough to stay your marveling. "But in your service books," you say, "we translate Alleluia into praise ye the Lord, as though it had not as good a grace in the act of serving God, as in the text of the scripture." Surely we are persuaded, that praise ye the Lord, which every man understandeth hath a better grace, and more agreeable to the doctrine of Paul, 1 Cor. 14, in the act of the public service of God, than Alleluia not understood but of the learned, although it be in the text of the scripture. We think of all other Hebrew words, which are to be translated into the vulgar tongue, that the church may take edifying by them. We may rather marvel what moved the Greek and Latin translators to leave it so often in the Psalms untranslated, and yet sometimes to translate it. If Alleluia in the act of serving God, have such a grace above praise ye the Lord, it hath the same above *Laudate Dominum*, which you yourselves use in your daily service. But it is a great matter that you use this holy word Alleluia, to join with the church triumphant, between Easter and Whitsuntide: by which reason you are disjoined from the church triumphant, from Septuagesima to Easter, in which time you may not use it, as Durand saith. But what a vain reason this is, that you join with the church triumphant by using this term, we may consider a little. Arethas, Bede, and other interpreters, understand the praise given to God, to be of the church militant in this world, and not of the church triumphant. Which church militant is said to be in Heaven, because the conversation of the faithful living on earth, is notwithstanding in Heaven. Admit it should be meant of the church triumphant, seeing the angels and holy souls use no sound of words in praising of God, why should you think you join with them in the sound of Alleluia, rather than in the sound of *Laudate Dominum*, or praise ye the Lord? If the angels and blessed spirits did use the sound of the Hebrew word, yet they use that speech which they all understand. But most times your priests and bishops are ignorant of the

understanding of that word, as appeareth by Durand, which hath so many fond interpretations of it, as would move laughter to any man that has but small sight in the Hebrew tongue. How much more therefore are your people ignorant thereof? Wherefore using that term which you understand not, you join not with the church triumphant, which understandeth the tongue of the angels, and praiseth not God without understanding: Augustin *ad Ian*, maketh a greater matter of it than we do.

Verily he showeth that it was used in his time, being as commonly understood as the rest of the public service, but other necessary matter he maketh not of it, neither thinketh the sound to be holier in Hebrew, than in Latin. If Vigilantius thought Alleluia might never be sung but at Easter, he held a superstitious opinion: but the matter is not of such weight to make a heresy of it. More like it is, that Vigilantius misliked the invocation attempted to be brought in by Hierom, who as some write, brought the common use of Alleluia from Jerusalem. "But the truth is," say you, "that by the use of the holy scriptures, it hath more in it than praise ye the Lord;" which if it be true, your vulgar Latin translation hath erred as much as the Protestants, translating it *Laudate Dominum*: for that hath no more in it than praise ye the Lord. And whereas this word hath but two words in it, the verb and the noun. Your vulgar translator doth commonly, and for aught I know, always translate the Hebrew verb, by the Latin verb. *Laudo, Laudate, Laudet, Laudent, Laudat*, &c. In all which he hath shamefully erred, if our translation of Alleluia be not right to say, praise ye the Lord. As for the joy wherewith the praise of God ought to be set forth in his church, it must be taught by preachers, but cannot be expressed by translators. If you would reply, because it cannot be expressed, therefore the word must not be translated, so often as it is used in the scripture, that were too great an absurdity. Whereof this is nothing else but a malicious, foolish, and unlearned quarrel, against the usage of praising the Lord in that sound of words, which the people understand. As for your superstitious and childish difference between Alleluia and *Laus tibi Domine*, the one for the Lent the other for Easter, I leave it to yourselves, as meet for your hypocritical service, which is in sound of lips and outward show, not in spirit and truth.

The new found sermons of Augustin, *de diversis*, are matter meet for such a question. *Ps. 148*, he maketh no such fond difference, between *Laus tibi Domine*, and Alleluia, but showeth that the church before Easter, spending the time in fasting and prayer, did celebrate the state of this life, but in praising God at Easter, did signify the life to come, which yet was not in possession: "For this is Alleluia, which we sing," saith he, "which is interpreted as you know, *Laudate Dominum*, praise ye the Lord." Here you see all the people understood Alleluia, as well as *Lau-*

*date Dominum*, and as well as our people understand praise ye the Lord. But it is a question to be asked, why we leave it out altogether, no less than nine times in the bible of 1577, in the six last psalms. To answer you, for my part, I know no such translation, that leaveth it out as you say: for that Bible which I have, printed 1577, hath praise ye the Lord ten times in the five last Psalms: for so many times Alleluia is in the Hebrew. But in Psalm 143 it is not in Hebrew, and therefore not in the English: except peradventure in some books of Psalms, printed for the special use of reading and singing in the church, it is omitted by the printer, as all other titles and inscriptions of the Psalms, which are not usually read or sung in the church service. Which if it be so great a matter, we must ask the Papists, why they left out Alleluia altogether in their Portuis *secundum usum Ecclesie Sarum* in every Psalm where it is both in the Hebrew, and in their own vulgar Latin translation, not only in those six last Psalms, but also in twelve other Psalms. *Ps. 101, 105, 106, 140, 111, 112, 113, 144, 115, 116, 131, and 135*. Augustin, you say, "affirmeth that Amen and Alleluia be not translated into any other language for the more holy authority of the words so remaining." Indeed he saith, that the knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek tongues is needful for men of the Latin speech, to understand such words which are often found untranslated, as Amen, Alleluia, Racha, Hosanna. Of which he saith, the antiquity of the two former is kept for a more holy authority: meaning that they do set forth more lively the godly affection of them that used them in the scriptures: as if men in English will tell a story of a Frenchmen or German, when it cometh to his speech, they will express a word or two of his country language to make the narration seem more lively. But he doth not affirm that they be not translated into any language, for then he should speak untruly, as I have proved in the beginning, seeing they were in his time translated into Greek and Latin, and he himself, *Ps. 148*, translateth Alleluia, *Laudate Dominum*. Eucherus *Alleluia in Latinum sonat, Laudate Dominum. Just. lib. 2. cap. 2. Amen, ecce sive fideliter*. Remigius in *Ps. 101, Interpretatur Alleluia, Laudate Dominum*. Neither doth he mean, that there is more holiness in the sound of Hebrew syllables, than of the Latin. But as the Hebrew tongue is called the holy tongue, because the holy scriptures of the Old Testament were first written in it, which yet may be and have been in all good times of the church translated into any other languages. *Epist. 178*, answering the like quarrels of the Arian Pascentius, which cavilled that the Greek word *Homonition* was not found in the scripture, Augustin proveth, that the sense and meaning thereof is found in the scriptures, and this term he useth, because it was agreed upon in the Council of Nice, where Greek Bishops were the chief that confuted the heresy of Arius.

Now seeing the church hath received this Greek term, he thought it meet to be used, and not to be altered, so long as it were understood and known to have the sense in the scriptures. When the church of all nations had received to sing Amen and Alleluia in the Hebrew tongue, it was not "lawful for the Latin man, or the barbarous man, to translate them into their own language?" he meaneth in the public service, seeing the people understood them, and the custom of the church is not without cause to be broken. But that they might not be translated into other speeches, or pronounced in other languages, if the people understood them not, is far from Augustin's meaning.

Hierom, *Ep. 137*, rendering a reason why these words and such other, were retained in the scriptures, saith, "That the Septuagint or the apostles provided, that seeing the first church was gathered together of the Jews, they would invoke nothing that might offend the believers, but delivered as they had received from children: but afterward when the Gospel enlarged into all nations, things once received, could not be changed. Although Origen say, that because of the propriety of every language, that they could not so well be expressed in other tongues as in their own, it is much better to leave them untranslated, than by translating to diminish the force of them."

But notwithstanding this opinion of Origen, he doth translate both *Amen* as the seventy do, *Fait*, or as Aquila did, Faithfully, and *Alleluia*, *Laudate Dominum*, Praise ye the Lord. But Gregory will bear you witness, that our nation, with their Christianity, received the Hebrew word *Alleluia*. And what of that, so long as they understood it? That the ploughmen in Palestine sang *Alleluia*, Hierom reporteth, which they understood, because it is all one in the Hebrew and Syrian language, which was their vulgar tongue: and therefore they might well understand it in the monastery, which was commonly understood in all the world abroad. "But it is a sacred, Christian, mystical, and angelical song, and yet in the new service it is turned into, Praise ye the Lord."

Is not Praise ye the Lord a sacred, Christian, mystical, and angelical song? doth nothing please you but that which the people understand not? That which the angels sung in the Syrian tongue to the shepherds at the nativity of Christ, was a sacred, Christian, mystical, and angelical song: yet you sing it in your mass, neither in the Syrian tongue in which they pronounced it, nor in the Greek tongue, in which Luke did write it, but in Latin, and yet not in the Latin of your authentic translation, nor indeed truly translated: for you sing in *Excelsis*, and not in *Altissimis*, and yet I think it were but a small matter to pick a quarrel against you.

Therefore *Alleluia* is not quite gone, as you say falsely, when we have the full sense and meaning of it in our language, much better than you have of that angels' song, which you

call *Gloria in Excelsis*. We sing therefore the Lord's songs, his name be praised forever, in our own country, and in our own language, and in the unity of the church of God, out of the filthy sink of Babylonical superstition.

But last of all, you think you may ask us whether it be all one to say, *Matt. 21*, *Hosanna*, and Save us we beseech thee. And we think we may answer you, that it is not all one: for *Hosanna* signifieth, Save we beseech thee, not save us. The people therefore prayed for the prosperity and increase of the kingdom of Christ, as the prophet taught them long before: and the apostle to express their godly zeal, useth the very word which they uttered. That it was a word of exceeding congratulation and joy, is not in the signification of the verb, but in that special use of it, and so in the word *Alleluia*. It is one thing to translate, another thing to give the sense, according to the circumstance of the text translated.

Therefore *Alleluia* is as truly translated, and may as well be expressed in English by Praise ye the Lord, as it is in Latin by *Laudate Dominum*: witness Augustin, Hierom, and your own vulgar Latin interpreter, who profane and diminish the signification thereof, by *Laudate Dominum*, as much as we do, by Praise ye the Lord.

8. For our translation of this word *δικαιοματι*, Luke *cap 1*, the reader may be resolved in that place. We translate a word that hath diverse significations diversely, as the understanding of every place requireth. So here we translate it justifications, righteousness, or just deeds, as the author of the homilies in Augustin translateth them, *Justa facta*, or any thing that hath the same sense. And we fear no inconvenience to translate it justifications in English: for our justification before God by faith only will never be overthrown by that term, though we deny not, but these justifications be the good works of Saints. But where we say they "be so called, because they are the fruits of faith, and of the justice which we have by faith only," you say, "it is most evidently false, and against the very text and the nature of the word." Concerning the text it is this: To her was granted, that she should be clothed with fine linen or silk, clean and shining: for the fine linen or silk is the justification of Saints.

This text compared with Apocallypse, chap. 7. 14, showeth whence the beauty of this garment cometh; verily, not of the justice of men, but of the blood of the Lamb, and the merit of his sacrifice. Therefore the text hath no evidence for you. But the nature of the word affordeth you a strong argument: "for there is no cause," you say, "why any thing should be called a man's justification, but for that it maketh him just." Here you reason childishly of the etymology of the Latin word *justifico*, which signifieth indeed properly to make just; but in scripture is often used to account just, to declare just, to acquit in judgment, as infinite words are used unto other significations, than can be taken out of their precise etymology or derivation.



Therefore you must reason of the nature of the Greek word *δικαιοπραγα*, except you will allow justifications to be taken in as many significations as *δικαιοπραγα* be. If you will do so as reason would enforce you, there is cause why a thing may be called a man's justification, which doth not make him just, but declare him to be just. In the Psalms, oftentimes your vulgar Latin translation useth this word *justificationes tuas*, for God's justifications, and *Luke 1, Justificationibus Domini*, in the justifications of the Lord. Might you not as well say, "there is no cause why any thing should be called the Lord's justification, but for that it maketh him just?"

If there be cause why any thing may be called the Lord's justification, which doth not make him just, there is also cause, why a thing may be called a man's justification, which doth not make him just, but declare him to be just: and so are good works the justifications of Saints, because they declare them to be just, not because they make them just before God, as we have proved more at large, *James 2*. Wisdom is justified of her own children, and yet she is not made just by them. The publicans and sinners justified God, yet they made not God just. Jerusalem hath justified her sister Sodom, yet she hath not made her just. Wicked judges sometimes do justify the ungodly men, yet they make them not just. The Pharisees justified themselves, yet they made not themselves just. The lawyers call that a man's justification, which maketh neither the man nor his cause just, but declareth them to be just.

The word is not justification, but justifications, in the plural number, wherupon you may as well conclude, that every good work is a man's justification by making him just, and so you have not two justifications making a man just, according to your new distinction, but infinite justifications. But in truth all these justifications are the effect of one justification, which is by faith only in the merits of Christ, and are the ornament and outward garment declaring the inward justice of the soul. For garments are all without the thing clothed with them, and are not called inward, in respect of the thing clothed, but in respect of more outward garments. Therefore this pure shining garment is the light of good works, proceeding from inward faith, and shining outwardly, the glory of their heavenly Father.

10. This place is not abused by Protestants, but proved invincibly against Papists, that all religious worship and service belong to God, and may not be yielded to any creature. But you say, "it maketh for no such purpose, but only warneth us, that divine honour and the adoration due to God alone may not be given to any creature?" yet the text is plain, that all religious worship and service are due to God alone, and to no creature. For the angel saith not, worship God only with this kind of service, but worship God: signifying that this service was due only to God. Augustin saith; "We honour the angels with

love, not with service, neither do we build temples to them: for they will not be so honoured of us, because they know that we ourselves, when we are good, are the temples of the highest God. Therefore it is rightly written, that a man was forbidden by the angel, that he should not worship him, but one God only, under whom he was a fellow servant with him. But they which invite us, that we should serve them, and worship them as gods, are like to proud men, which if they might, would likewise be worshipped: but to suffer these men is less perilous, but to worship the angel is more dangerous. Let religion therefore bind us to one God omnipotent, because between our mind by which we understand him to be the Father and the truth, that is, the inward light by which we understand him, there is no creature interposed."

By which sentences it is manifest that he meaneth, that all religious worship and service are due only to God, and that whosoever, angel or man, requirerh or receiveth any religious worship or service, he usurpeth that which is due only to God. Where it is to be noted, that he overthroweth your distinction of *Latria* and *Eulia*, seeing he denieth religious *Dulia* or service, to be due unto angels, who are to be honoured with love, not with service. But where we reply that John, so great an apostle, could not be ignorant, that no angel is to be worshipped as God, and therefore intended not to worship the angel as God: you answer, "by the like reason, if this latter kind of reverence had been unlawful, he could not have been ignorant thereof, nor could have done it." But it is manifest by his own confession, that he was twice deceived in this point, not of ignorance, but of forgetfulness in this ecstasy of mind, while he beheld the glory of the angel that showed him these things. But the other error of worshipping the creature as the Creator was too gross an error, to enter into any so religious and wise a heart as the apostle had. *Athanasius contra. Arr. lib. 2. Euthym. Pancpl. par. 1. tit. 11. Greg. Nyssen. Orat. ad Simpl. de filio. Euthy. Pan. par. 1. tit. 11. Cyril. Thesau. lib. 2. Gregorius Baticus de fide ad Gallan Ploc. Aug.*

We might have learned, you say, of Augustin, how this fact of John was corrected by the angel. Augustin indeed answering the question, how the civil adoration yielded by Abraham to the people of the land, might stand with that saying of Christ: "Thou shalt adore the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve," showeth, that civil adoration is not there forbidden, but religious adoration and service, which is proper to God. "Neither let it move," saith he, "that in another place in a certain scripture, the angel forbiddeth a man to adore him: for the angel seemed or appeared to be such a one as he might be adored instead of God: and therefore the worshipper was to be corrected." Who-reby he meaneth no more, but that the glorious apparition of the angel deceived John to think that he might be adored with religious worship, which pertaineth only to God.

whereas angels are so honoured, as he said before, with love, not with religious service. But you say, "the angel was so full of majesty representing Christ's person, and in his name using divers words proper to God; as, I am the first and the last, and am alive and was dead, that he might well be taken by John, by error of his person, to be Christ himself." But this could not be for divers causes. For this was not the same person that appeared in the first chapter, like to the Son of Man: which was Christ himself, and no Angel that presented his person. As Christ himself appeared in his own person to Paul. *Acts 9.* And at other times, so did he there unto John.

John confesseth, that this angel which showeth him these things, was one of the seven angels that had the seven vials *chap. 16.* I. Therefore he could not be deceived in his person, to think he was Christ. He willed him, immediately before, to write, "Blessed are they that are called to the supper of the Lamb," which John was not ignorant to be Christ, according to the vision which he reporteth, *chap. 5.* Therefore it is manifest, that John knew this angel not to be Christ, and therefore erred not in his person to think he was Christ, and intending to worship him as Christ, but to worship him as a heavenly angel, that had showed him these things, and opened these great mysteries unto him. Therefore in vain you go about to excuse his fault with your shameless distinction, which he doth plainly confess, to the glory of God, and the edifying of the church in the true and sincere worship of God. Where you say, he was not culpable at all in his fact, and sinned not in this adoration, you will belike remove the crime from John to the angel: who forbade him the fact, wherein he sinned not, nor was culpable at all. And it is a very gross error of your Schoolmen to hold, that if a man worship a devil in the shape of an angel, he sinneth not, nor committeth idolatry formally, but only erreth materially. As though sin of ignorance and error were no sin, because it is not so great as sin against knowledge; and as though men were not bound to learn to know God, that they worship none instead of God, nor with the worship that is due only to God. The man of God that believed the old Prophet which lied unto him sinned grievously, as appeareth by his punishment, because he transgressed the word of the Lord, and did not examine his prophecy, by that which he was assured to be the word of God, *1 Reg. 13.* So if John had worshipped the angel as Christ, he was culpable, because he did not first consider whether he were Christ indeed. But in truth he did so appear to be one of the seven angels, that John could not be ignorant that he was not Christ.

But where you defend him by his knowledge of all duties of a Christian man, you labour in vain to excuse him, seeing not only in this place, but also after this admonition, he committed the same offence, as he confesseth, *chap. 22.* of human frailty and forget-

fulness, though not of general ignorance of Christian duty. Upon which place Ambrosius Auserb writeth thus: "It is greatly to be marvelled why John, contrary to the prohibition of the angel, would have worshipped him the second time. For before in like manner he had forbidden him to adore him, and taught that God only is to be adored. What meaneth it therefore, that contrary to his commandment, who verily as a messenger of truth, had told him before, that this honour of reverence was of duty to be offered not to a creature, but to the Creator, he would now honour him again? Unless perhaps, he joined this and the former vision together, and repeated the same things which he did before: or else being stricken with great astonishment of the visions, he confesseth that he had forgotten that which the angel commanded him before, and so would have adored him again."

That you affirm, John to have been in as great honour with God, yea and in more than many angels, you show your boldness, to pronounce so confidently of that which no mortal creature knoweth. The word of God telleth us of the dignity of the children of God after the resurrection, to be equal with angels, but in this frailty of life whereto they are subject, they must needs be inferior to angels, seeing Christ himself in whom was no frailty of sin, was made inferior to the angels, by the suffering of his death, *Heb. 2. 9.* Your second explication is yet more absurd, that the angel and John should strain courtesy, as men do, in yielding and refusing reverence one of another. But the words of the angel do plainly confute this fond gloss. For rendering a reason why he will not be adored by John, he saith, "that he himself is his fellow servant." He saith not that John is in grace and merits before God as good as he. But he is a servant as well as he, bound to worship God their common Lord, as much as he is: not to receive worship of his fellow servants: that he is fellow servant, not only of John, but of the rest of his brethren that have the testimony of Jesus. And *cap. 22.*, and of them also that keep the words of this book, that is of all Christians. Therefore he straineth not courtesy in respect of John's great graces and merits: for he will not receive this worship of any Christian, by the same reason that he refused it of John. The words are manifest, John is precisely admonished of the angel, of error and undutifulness in the fact, yet soon after of forgetfulness falleth into the same error and undutifulness again. "But howsoever that be," you say, "this is evident, that the angel's refusing of adoration, taketh not away the due reverence and respect we ought to have to angels, and other sanctified persons and creatures." We would not by any means take away the due reverence and respect we ought to have to holy persons and things, whatsoever be sanctified by God. But it is evident, that this the angel's refusing of adoration, taketh away all religious adoration or

service of angels, or other creatures whatsoever, which is due only to God. But where you say these words, "See thou do it not, signify rather an earnest refusal, than any signification of crime committed thereby," it is very absurd. For these words be not only of refusal, but of prohibition, as every child knoweth, and Augustin in the places before mentioned doth testify. Seeing therefore they prohibit that which was to be done, as Augustin also confesseth, the doing of that which the angel forbiddeth must needs be a crime, whosoever committeth it, and the greater after so earnest a prohibition.

Concerning the expounding of doubtful places of scripture by conference of other clear places wherem you deride us, Augustin saith, "Nothing almost is fetched out of these obscurities, which is not found elsewhere, to be uttered most plainly. *De doct. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 6.* Now this text is so clear and evident of itself, as it is one of those places, which may serve to expound the obscurity or difficulty of other texts, where any doubt may arise concerning religious adoration and service, which is due only to God. But seeing you will be blind in the clear light of the sun at mid-day, and make doubt of this place where none at all needeth, but to cloak your shameful idolatry, yielding religious worship and service to creatures: let us consider your three doubts or questions. "Whether there ought to be, or may be any religious reverence, or honour done to any creature?" But here, because you have Augustin flat against the grand question, you distinguish of this word religion and religions, by petition of principle or begging the matter in controversy, that there is one kind of religious worship proper to God, and another to creatures, whereas the question is, whether all religion and religious worship and service be due only to God? But because I will not strive with you about a term, if we might agree about the matter: so that you will grant with Augustin in the place by you quoted, "That we may have no religion or religious worship and service of the works of men, that is of images, for the workmen themselves that make such things, are better than their works, whom yet we ought not to worship." That we ought to have no religion or religious worship and service of dead men: "For if they live'd godly, they are not so taken that they seek such: but they will have him to be worshipped of us, by whose illumination they rejoice, that we are fellow servants of their dignity or worthiness. Therefore they are to be honoured for imitation sake, they are not to be adored for religion." That we ought to have no religion of angels, whom we honour with love, not with service. If you will grant all this with Augustin, I will not hold you so hard at the staff's end for this term religions. There is a religious reverence due to such things as are holy by sanctification, and application to the service of God, in respect that they are by God sanctified and applied to his service.

But this due reverence and estimation of such things is no religious adoration, worship, or service of those things, or due to those things. Therefore the temple, the tabernacle, the ark, the propitiatory, the cherubim, the altar, the bread of proposition, the sabbath, and all their holies, were esteemed and revered as holy things, but not adored, worshipped or served, by religious kneeling to them, bowing to them, or praying to them. Likewise the sacraments of Christ, are to be reverently esteemed and honoured, and the seals of God's promises; but not to be adored, worshipped, served, kneeled to, or prayed unto.

To omit the Lord's Supper, because it is in controversy, what true Catholic ever said that baptism, or the water thereof is to be adored, worshipped, served, by bowing or kneeling to it, or by praying to it? The like I say of the gospel, scriptures, or the name of Jesus, to which no religious adoration, worship, or service is due, although they are to be honoured and religiously esteemed for God and Christ's sake, whose word and name they are. And although men may kneel while the scripture is read, or bow while Jesus or Christ is named, yet to the books or the sound of the name, no adoration is to be given, but only to God. God's priests and prophets are to be honoured with civil reverence for religion's sake, with charity, as Augustin saith of angels, not with religious service, with duties of the second table, not with any duty of the first table.

Your second question is, "whether that honour be called adoration in Latin, or by a word equivalent in other languages." In the scripture, that religious reverence and due estimation of holy things is never called adoration, worship or service of those things, nor by any word equivalent. The prophet, *Ps. 98.* saith not, adore his footstool, but adore ye at or before his footstool, because it is holy. That verse 5 is plainly expounded in the last verse of the Psalm, even in your vulgar translation. In the Hebrew text it is plain. Likewise *Heb. 11.* the text is not, that Jacob adored the top of his rod, but that he adored upon the end of his staff, that is, leaning upon his staff, as it is proved in the answer to your notes upon that text. Your last question is, "whether we may, by the scriptures, fall down prostrate before those things, or at the feet of the persons that we so adore." To this question I answer, with religious adoration, we may not adore any thing or person, but God only. But we may fall down prostrate, or kneel in adoring of God. Where you say, "that our arguments make as much against civil duty, as religious," it is utterly false. For we distinguish duties, according as God himself hath distinguished them, by the two tables of his law. In the first table of religion, we find but one duty of adoration, which is prohibited to be given to any creature, and commanded to be given only to God. "But that the scriptures do warrant us to bow down our bodies at the presence, or at the

feet of holy persons, specially angels, you have examples to prove." Examples are no warrant against a law, except they be allowed by the law, or the law maker. Although some ancient writers think that before Christ came in the flesh, angels might be adored, but not since. You say, Abraham adored the angels that appeared to him, *Gen. 18*. Where-to I answer, he adored them with civil adoration, as honourable and reverent personages, because they came in the shape of men, supposing them to be men, as his preparation for them declareth; yet one of them was Christ, whom he might have worshipped with divine honour. You say, "Moses adored the angel that showed himself out of the bush, which was a creature, although he represented God's person, *Ex. 3*, as the angel that spake here to John." Touching Moses, your own vulgar Latin text is plain, that it was the Lord himself, and the Hebrew text calling him the angel of the Lord, meaneth plainly Christ, and no creature. Paul so calleth him expressly, *1 Cor. 10. 9. Exod. 13. 32*, he is called the Lord which led his people out of Egypt, that sometime is called the angel, because he is the angel of the covenant, as Malachi calleth him, *Mala. 3. 1*.

"Balaam adored the angel that stood before him with a sword drawn." *Num. 22*. I might answer peradventure, that Balaam's example is meet for Balaamites to follow. But indeed the Hebrew text saith not, that he adored the angel, but that he inclined his head, and bowed himself upon his face, adoring God, when he saw his angel ready to take vengeance of him. "Joshua adored falling flat down before the feet of the angel, calling him his Lord, knowing by the angel's own testimony, that it was but an angel." He knew by the Lord's testimony that it was Christ himself, the prince of the armies of the Lord, that appeared to him in the similitude of a man. Within three verses after he is called Jehovah, the Lord himself. Wherefore neither this, nor any other examples you can bring, proveth that it is lawful to adore, worship, or serve angels.

You proceed and say, "not only to angels, but also to great prophets, this devotion was done, as to Daniel by Nebuchadnezzar."

No religious adoration was ever lawfully given to any prophet, but civil adoration of love, not of religious service, though in respect of God, whose servants they were, as all civil honour given to earthly kings and other persons in authority is in respect of God, whose ministers they are, yet is no religious adoration, worship, or service. Therefore it was shameful idolatry that Nebuchadnezzar would have offered sacrifice to Daniel, who, without doubt, did withstand him, though it be not expressed. Yet it is easily to be gathered, not only by the piety of Daniel, that would never admit such a sacrilege, but also by the 47th verse of that chapter, where the king's answer to Daniel is rehearsed, acknowledging that the God of the Jews, is the only God, to whom only all religious service

and worship are due. Therefore you do shamefully slander the holy prophet, in saying that he did not refuse that adoration and outward offices of religion, and Hierom that he doth defend the same. Though Porphyry was a wicked blasphemer, yet it is a shame to belie the devil, for neither did Porphyry charge Daniel with intolerable pride, but said it was incredible that such a proud king would adore his captive.

These be the words of Hierom upon Daniel 2. 46. "At this place Porphyry doth cavil, that the most proud king never would have adored a captive. As though the Lycaonians also would not have offered sacrifice to Paul and Barnabas, because of the greatness of their miracles. Therefore the error of the Gentiles, which think all that is above themselves to be gods, ought not to be imputed to the scripture, which doth report all things simply as they were done. But also we may say this, that the king himself did declare the causes of adoring and offering of hosts, incense, and sacrifice, saying unto Daniel, verily your God is the God of Gods, &c. Therefore he doth not so much adore Daniel, as God, which revealed the mysteries in Daniel. As we read that Alexander the Great, king of the Macedonians did, in the high priest Jehoiada. But if this interpretation be misliked, we must say, that Nebuchadnezzar being confounded at the greatness and astonishment of the wonders, knew not what he should do, as he that understood who was the true God, and Lord of kings, and adored his servant and burned incense to him.

You see plainly that Hierom doth not defend this religious service to have been lawfully offered to Daniel, but yieldeth reasons that might move the proud king to worship Daniel, as the Lycaonians would have honoured Paul and Barnabas, or thinking to worship God in him, as Alexander did in giving reverence to Jehoiada the High Priest. The falling down before Elizeus by the children of the prophets, and by the Shunamite, was civil and not religious adoration, so I say of Achior adoring Judith. Therefore by comparing the scriptures, we do not find that religious adoration, worship, or service, may be done to any creature, how holy soever, but only to God and Christ, which John was manifestly forbidden to do to any other. But you say, "the angel for causes, might refuse that which John did lawfully do unto him." But the angel might not forbid that which was lawful to be done, except you will set him to school, and teach him such divinity as he never learned in heaven. For he doth here straightly forbid him, saying, "See thou do it not," and addeth a reason why he neither ought to receive such adoration, nor John to offer it, because he is fellow servant with him and all true Christians, to whom no such adoration is due, but only to God. Which if it had not been his express meaning, he should have induced John into an error, and caused him to think that God only is to be adored, which is an error by your doctrine, if saints,

angels, images, reines, &c., may be adored with religious adoration. If there were causes known to you, why the angel might refuse that which John did lawfully unto him, why doth he not rather express those causes, than these which you hold to be no causes. If you know not those causes, why do you dream of that you know not, and deny those to be causes which the angel doth express? Because he is a servant, not the Lord, a creature, not God to whom only all religious service is to be given.

But you conjecture there were causes why the angel might refuse that which John might lawfully give to him, as Peter did refuse the honour given him by Cornelius, according to Chrysostom's opinion. But you do without shame slander Chrysostom, for there is no word to prove that Cornelius did lawfully offer to adore Peter, nor that Peter might lawfully take such kind of adoration, as I have showed, *Acts 10, sec. 7.* For adoring of the angel of Philadelphia, *cap. 3*; where Christ himself and not this angel foreshoweth that adoration.

Arethas saith, "worship not me, saith the angel, as foreshowing things to come, for this utterance of prophecy is not mine," &c. By which you see that he meaneth, that John worshipped him as an angel, which had foreshowed these things, not as God, nor supposing that he was Christ. Ambrosius Ansbert saith in the person of the angel: "Take heed that thou go not about to yield unto a creature the honour which is proper to God only, but rather consider and give thanks, because he whom thou goest about to adore, is in nothing thy superior, is in nothing now found more excellent than thou, because we are fellow servants of one Lord, and fellow citizens of one city, although according to the dispensation of the mystery he seemeth now to be preferred before thee. And hereof certainly thanks are to be given to the Redeemer of us all, because that nature which before did worship angels, and was not forbidden, now by his coming, is both forbidden to adore them, and also is judged in nothing inferior to them. And lest we should think that this dignity is proper only to John, when the angel said unto him, See thou do it not, I am thy fellow servant, immediately he added and said, and of thy brethren, having the testimony of Jesus."

#### CHAPTER 20.

2. If a thousand years signify no certain number of years, but the whole time of the New Testament, neither do the forty-two months of Antichrist's reign, signify a certain number of three years and a half, but rather the whole time of his reign, which is but short in comparison to the eternal reign of Christ.

4. Augustin speaketh not of Popish sees and consistories, in which the prelates of the Antichristian church take their ease in the one, and serve their covetousness, or exercise their cruelty in the other: but he saith,

"They are to be understood of *Sedes propositorum*, the seats of the overseers or governors of the church, and of the governors themselves," which execute judgment by preaching the word of God, and exercising Christian discipline.

4. The rest of the souls fry not in purgatory, while the martyrs reign in Heaven with Christ. "For although," saith Augustin, "they are not yet with their bodies, yet their souls do even now reign with him, while these thousand years do run, wherefore it is read elsewhere in the same book: Blessed are the dead, which die in the Lord, from henceforth now, even so saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours: for their works follow them. So the church reigneth now, first with Christ in the living and in the dead. For therefore, as the apostle saith, Christ died that he might have dominion over the quick and the dead. But he maketh mention of martyrs' souls only, for that they as chief do reign being dead, which had fought for the truth to the death: but of a part we understand the whole, even the rest that are dead which pertain to the church, which is the kingdom of God.

5. Regeneration in the elect is sealed to them by baptism. But seeing baptism may be given out of the church which shall afterward be effectual in the church, when they that were baptized by heretics come to the Catholic Church, it is manifest that regeneration is not made in baptism *ex opere operato* of the work wrought. For they may have the right seal of regeneration, which yet have not the right faith and spirit of God, whereby they should be regenerated.

5. Because the common people in Augustin's time, did commonly and specially call them in Latin *Sacerdotes*, which were bishops and elders, as the scriptures nameth them: he giveth warning that the word *Sacerdotes* in this place, doth not signify those special officers of the church, but all true Christians, which are all *Sacerdotes*, that is, sacrificers, because they are members of that one high sacrificer, Christ: but you think his words notable, because he saith, that bishops and elders are now properly called *Sacerdotes*, where he meaneth not, that this term is properly appertaining to them, but that they were now, that were in his time, so called peculiarly, whereas the name is general to all Christians. For he meaneth not that bishops and elders be called *Sacerdotes*, that is, sacrificers properly, and all other Christians improperly: but the adverb properly is opposite to general, and signifieth no more than specially or particularly. Therefore this place is rather a reproving than allowing of them that call the ministers of the church properly or peculiarly by the name of *Sacerdotes*, which is common to all Christians, men and women. Neither is it any confusion to them which refuse not the name of priest, when it signifieth no more than the Greek word importeth, which the Holy Ghost useth, and whence it is derived: but only when by perverse

usage of our English speech, it is taken to signify a sacrificer, which indeed it doth not signify. As for the name ministers being used in scripture, no man ought to refuse, but rather the name of *Sacerdotes*, which the scripture of the New Testament never useth for a bishop, elder, or priest of the New Testament.

7. Augustin saith, which you do fraudulently omit, to have a simple colour of his authority against us; "If this be to the devil, to be bound and shut up, not to be able to seduce the church, then shall this be his loosing; that he may be able, God forbid. For the church shall never be seduced by him, being predestinated and elected before the constitution of the world, or which it is said, the Lord knoweth who are his. And yet the church shall be here even in that time in which the devil is to be loosed: as since the time it was instituted, it hath been here and shall be at all times in her children, or members which by birth succeed them that die." By this it is manifest that Augustin speaketh not of the visible estate of the church, in which are many hypocrites, but of the congregation of the elect, that shall never fail, while the world standeth. Now let us see what you gather out of him. First against the old heretics the Chiliasts, in which error certain great clerks were entangled, whereupon you infer, "That the scriptures are hard, and that there is no security, but in that sense which the church holdeth." Concerning the hardness of the scripture, it is a sorry conclusion, because one prophecy of things to come is hard, therefore the whole scriptures generally are hard. But although we grant unto you that many things are hard in the scripture, yet it will not follow that all things are hard therein. Augustin doth plainly teach you, *De doct. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 6.* "That the Holy Ghost hath so magnificently tempered the scriptures, that by plain and easy places he might provide against famine, and by hard places he might wipe away loathsomeness," that commonly ariseth of plenty and abundance easily gotten. Whence the security of understanding those difficulties is to be obtained, he showeth, when he saith, "That nothing almost is with any great study gained out of those obscurities, which is not found elsewhere to be intred in the scriptures most plainly." Meaning that all things necessary to salvation, are most plainly delivered in the holy scriptures, though there be some things pertaining either to the times that are passed, or to the time to come, which are not necessary for us to know, that are difficult or hard to be understood. There is therefore undoubted security, in the plain text of the scripture, though they that boast themselves to be the church, do hold the contrary. Therefore the sense which the church holdeth, must be grounded upon the scriptures, if it be true, if it be not grounded upon the scripture, there is no security in holding it.

Seeing the church is oftentimes as uncertain as the question to be decided by the au-

thority thereof, what security can there be in the sense, which the church holdeth, before it be certain, which is the church? And if there be so easy a rule of security of truth in the sense, which the church holdeth, it is marvel that it was unknown to Papias, Ireneus, and so many ancient fathers of the primitive church, which erred in this point: of the kingdom of Christ to continue on earth for a thousand years, which Augustin judged to comprehend all the time of the church upon earth, since the death of Christ to the end. Although it may well be taken for a thousand years after Christ, during which time the devil had no such power to obscure the grace of Christ's redemption, as he hath obtained since by the Pope's doctrine of merits, satisfaction, and justification by works. In Pope Joan was a lively image of the whore of Babylon, so of the loosing of Satan in Pope Sylvester II. Who being a conjurer and soicerer by the devil's means was made Pope, as is famous, even in the Popish stories; a number also of whose necromantical scholars, as Benno the Cardinal, who lived not long after him, affirmeth, by the devil's means, obtained the seat of Antichrist. But to return to your observations, you say, "The late heretics are by the said words fully refuted, not only affirming that the church may be seduced, but also holding that the very true church may err, and fall from truth to error and idolatry." What licentiousness of lying and slandering is this, that you usurp so commonly? which of us ever said, that any one of God's elect might fall from Christ to idolatry finally? much less the whole church of the elect and predestinate, of which Augustin speaketh. But this we say with Augustin, that "They which being overcome, do follow the devil, pertained not to the predestinated numbers of the sons of God. It is to be confessed that when iniquity aboundeth, the charity of many waxeth cold: and that through the unaccustomed and most grievous persecutions and deceits of the devil, when he is loosed, they which are not written in the book of life are many that should yield." We say not therefore that the whole church or any true member thereof should be seduced unto destruction, but that many of the visible church, whose names are not written in the book of life have been seduced by Antichrist's persecutions and deceits, especially after Satan was let loose. We say also that the Pope, which is the devil's vicar, and not Christ's, is Antichrist, which hath no lawful government of the church, but usurpeth tyranny against the true church of the elect. And that he with his clergy which seduce the world with his blasphemous doctrine are the whore of Babylon and not the church of Christ. We say further, that the kingdom of Antichrist is but for a short time, in comparison of the eternal kingdom of Christ, yet hath it continued many hundred years, though not always in like pride and tyranny. But that he hath persecuted the Saints for a thousand years at the least, we say not. For after he was first revealed in Pope Boniface

the Third, he did fortify the errors of purgatory and invocation of Saints, the use of images, and such like, which were sowed in the church before him, and added many other errors unto them. Seducing, by hypocrisy and counterfeiting of fasting and continency, forbidding meats and marriage. Having a show of Christian simplicity, expressed in the vision of the beast with two horns like the Lamb, yet speaking like the dragon, and procuring the full restoration of the decayed Roman empire, which is the beast with seven heads and ten horns, in the See of Rome. Which once obtained, he wallowed in all filthy pleasures of the flesh, like a barlot, poisoning, and alluring the kings of the earth to commit fornication with him, and having bewitched the earthly princes, to become obedient unto him, then at length Satan was loosed. And the true church, which detesting those abominations, and not able any longer to abide the corruptions in doctrine, and manners of his wicked retinue, departed out of Babylon, was most cruelly persecuted in those whom they called Albigenes, Waldenses, Pauperes de Lugduno, Picardi, &c. and that more cruelly than ever the Heathen emperors persecuted the Christians before Constantine's time. For in those Heathenish persecutions for the most part, the Christians were accused and condemned in some form of law, but in these cruelties, bloody wars were held, and cruel battles fought against them to destroy them utterly, if it had been possible.

After which most cruel wars, when they were often driven into mountains and desert places of the Alps, Appennines, Hercinia silva, and other corners of the world, or else dispersed and kept close in all regions of Europe, the bloody inquisition was set up against them, which also hath consumed many thousands of them. Yet was it never able so to overcome them, but that not only dispersed members, but even whole churches of them continued in the desert corners, until it pleased God in this last time, to have his gospel openly preached, and his word to make war against Antichrist, and to have the victory as in chap. 19, ver. 11, to the end. Which prophecy is now fulfilling, and shall be accomplished, let Antichrist and all that take his part rage never so much against it. We do not therefore assign the whole thousand years or the most part to Antichrist's reign. For we hold that the chief tyranny of Antichrist, though he showed himself in claim and usurpation in part, and deceived many before, began at the end of the thousand years, when Satan was let loose, after which time, the pope's cruelty was greatest, when his heresies by the schoolmen and the new sect of friars were most stoutly defended.

That Antichrist and the devil shall be weaker toward the day of judgment than they were before, and the truth better known, and the faith more common among many, after Antichrist is begun to be consumed with the breath of our Lord's mouth, which is his holy

word, agreeth not only with the prophecy of Paul, but it is most clearly described in chap. 19, ver. 11, to the end. Yea through the whole chapter: which is a prophecy of the joy of the church, after the condemnation of Antichrist and the whore of Babylon is known therein: and of the preparation of the church, which is the bride to the day of her marriage: of the victory of the word of God against Antichrist: of the vain attempts of Antichrist, and the kings of the earth to resist the word of God and the kingdom of Christ. Against which there is nothing contrary in the gospel or in this prophecy of John. For though faith shall be hard to be found at the coming of our Saviour Christ, and in few, in comparison of the multitude of unbelievers, both open enemies and counterfeit Christians, yet faith shall be found in the elect, whom he shall find at his coming, as it is manifest, *1 Thes. 4. 17*, though they be not so many in number, as have been in other ages, that were before Antichrist, nor so few as were during the time of his greatest tyranny and persecution. You see and confess, that the pope and his religion are lessened, and his power of cruelty diminished; I would, if it be possible, that you might also see that the pope is Antichrist, who is now consumed by the breath of the mouth of Christ, which is his holy word: and with the two edged sword that proceedeth out of the mouth of him that sitteth on the white horse, whose name is the word of God, and is rightly called King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Against whom it is folly to strive, for all his enemies must be made his footstool. By him Antichrist is lessened, and his cruelty diminished, so that his force shall not be greater, but daily lesser, until he be utterly destroyed and thrown into hell fire with the devil and his angels, according to this prophecy. For it is not the impudent claim that he maketh to be Christ's chief minister and head of his church, being the king of pride and the enemy of Christ's church, that can any longer hide his wickedness, which is laid so open by the preaching of the gospel, that all the elect of God may easily see it: though such as the God of this world hath blinded, will not open their eyes, but obstinately refuse the light that is offered to their own destruction.

8. That which you falsely say to be persecution in the Church of England, Scotland, Flanders, &c., is in truth the lessening and diminishing of Antichrist and his religion, which daily proceedeth even in Italy, Spain, France, and wheresoever he maketh most cruel wars against the word of God, and that which you say shall be, that the church of all nations is to be assaulted most grievously, hath already been performed by Antichrist the Pope. Although the battle here spoken of is a more general consent of all the enemies of the church, inward and outward, secret and open, to make assault against it, though not in one place nor time, nor after one manner. But the universal hatred of all the reprobate, is figured under the names of Gog

and Magog, in which the Papists and Mahometists are the chief, though enemies one to the other. Yet agreeing as the Pharisees and Sadducees in the hatred of Christ, so these do in persecuting the church. By this vision therefore, the church is comforted; that as she is instructed in the former visions, that neither the heathen persecutors without the church, nor Antichrist sitting in the midst of the temple of God, should prevail to destroy her, no more should all the enemies of the church, consisting of hypocrites and infidels, which should be the greater number toward the end of the world, though they joined in one against her, be able to overthrow her, but in fighting against her, they should gain their own undoubted destruction.

11. Men shall be judged according to their works, which are the fruits of faith or infidelity. But in the book of life is not contained the record of every man's works, but the name of the elect only; for which record there are other books opened before. Where you say infidels are otherwise condemned than for lack of faith only, it is true; and yet if they had that faith only, by which God justifieth the ungodly, they should not be infidels, but faithful and fruitful in good works, and so not condemned, but glorified with the rest of the elect.

#### CHAPTER 21.

22. There is no external sacrifice of propitiation any more required, nor any material temple, but the spiritual sacrifice of mortification, praise, thanksgiving, prayers. For teaching and the public exercises, whereof the church hath now need of houses of assemblies, which then shall be needless, yet praise and thanksgiving shall never cease.

27. All that are cleansed by the blood of Christ are perfectly cleansed, and need no purgatory pains to make them cleaner.

#### CHAPTER 22.

2. Christ is our tree of life, not only by the sacrament of his supper, for then they only should be partakers of life in him, which are partakers of the sacrament, but by faith, and participation of his Spirit, which last is common to all his elect, even infants, which through infirmity of their age, have not faith actually.

8. We see both are taught, when they are beside the word of God, as to adore an idol, and to adore before an idol, yet are they not all one. For some outwardly bow before an idol, that in the heart detest it. But to adore before the ark, propitiatory, altar, &c., which God by his word alloweth is not to

adore the ark, propitiatory, altar, &c., but God in those places, or in presence of those things.

11. Man doing good works by God's grace, doth increase that justice which is a fruit of justification by faith. But that justice by which he is just in the sight of God, he increaseth not by good works, for it is perfect in Christ, in whom we are just through faith. *Fulg. de rem. pec. cap. 17. Remig. Ps. 10.*

12. Heaven is the reward freely given to our good works by the grace of God, not of the merits of works, nor as a hire to him that worketh, *Rom. 4. 4.* But as an inheritance to the children of God, *Matt. 25. 34. Rom. 8. 17.* It is said to be due, and rendered or repaid, not because it is merited or deserved by us, but by Christ, and promised to us. This is the doctrine of all the scriptures, howsoever the enemies of God's grace labour to obscure it.

18. You shall never be able to prove that we have added any thing that is false, or taken away any thing which is true in the whole Bible. What you have done even in this translation, and in your annotations, I leave to the judgment of the readers that will peruse this answer, and also the defence of our translations against the slanderous book of Gregory Martin.

20. The words of your prayer be good and godly, but that they proceed not from a faithful heart, not only your wilful and obstinate maintaining of errors against the most clear light of the truth, with your intolerable licentiousness of lying and slandering the saints of God, do sufficiently declare, but also your horrible practices of treason and murder of our Queen, by your emissaries, Campion, Parsons, and other like trumpets of sedition, and other ministers of your wickedness, Throckmorton, Somerville, Parry, Savage, Babington, &c. and the Spanish invasion by you procured and intended against your country, do openly cry out against you, that you are men void of all fear of God, faith, good conscience, and religion, so that every true Christian man may say of you with the prophet, *Ps. 36.* "The wickedness of the ungodly hath said in my heart, there is no fear of God before his eyes," &c. Therefore though you can speak good words in hypocrisy, yet your heart knoweth, and your cauterized conscience cannot but bear witness, that you dare not abide the trial of God's judgment; howsoever, as all wicked offenders do commonly, you do presumptuously appeal unto it. I will say no more, but with the whole church of God conclude, Come Lord Jesus!

Amen.

FINIS.



## INDEX.

### A.

- Abbot's face, Matt. 14. 13.
- Abraham's bosom, Luke 16. 22. Apoc. 5. 3.
- Abrenuncio in baptism, 1 Peter 3. 21.
- Absolution of a priest. The excellency of this power above the power of angels and princes; what it is to loose and bind, Matt. 16. 19. John 20. 21, 22, 23.
- Abstinence. See fasting.
- Adoration of God, called Latria; and adoration of creatures, called Dulia, Matt. 4. 12. Heb. 11. 21. Acts 10. 25. and 14. 12.
- Adoration of the ark, crucifix, images, relics, and the like, Heb. 11. 21.
- Adoration of angels and holy persons, Apoc. 3. 9. and 19. 10. and 22. 8.
- Adoration in spirit and truth, John 4. 23.
- Adoration or reverence to holy persons, even to the kissing of their feet, Acts 4. 37.
- Alleluia, whether it may or ought to be translated, Apoc. 19. 4; often used in the church, Apoc. 19. 4; whether it be all one to say, praise ye the Lord; and whether in translating six psalms, the protestants have left it out nine times, or the papists, in their Portuis, more than nineteentimes, Apoc. 19. 4.
- Alms, whether they redeem sins, Luke 3. 11. Luke 11. 41; whether alms procure us patrons in heaven, Luke 16. 9; whether they procure release of pains after death, Acts 9. 39; whether they increase grace, 2 Cor. 9. 9.
- Alms-men, whether they be happy for the merit of their alms, 2 Cor. 9. 9. Acts 9. 39.
- Alms, whether an act of God's worship, 2 Cor. 9. 12.
- Alms and hospitality to priests and other holy men, whether they make the giver partaker of their merits, Matt. 10. 12. Luke 16. 9. 2 Cor. 8. 14. 2 Cor. 9. 1. Gal. 6. 6. 2 Tim. 1. 18. See works.
- Altars, Heb. 13. 10. Altars, whether sanctified by the oblation of Christ's body, Matt. 23. 19. The name of altars and tables, whether a material altar to sacrifice Christ's body be necessary, Heb. 13. 10. Dedication or consecration of altars, with saints' relics, Apoc. 6. 10.
- Amen, whether it may be translated, John 8. 34. Apoc. 19. 4.
- Anathema, Rom. 9. 3.
- Angels, whether to every Christian one is appointed protector, Matt. 18. 10; how they be protectors of countries and churches, 1 John 2. 1. Apoc. 1. 20; what is the religion of angels in Paul, Col. 2. 18; praying to angels, Col. 2. 18; peace from God and the holy angels, Apoc. 1. 7; whether there be nine orders of angels, Eph. 1. 21; whether Michael be patron of the church, Apoc. 12. 7; why painted fighting with a dragon, Apoc. 12. 7.
- Anointing. See extreme unction.
- Antichrist, who is, 2 Thes. 2. 3, 4, 5, 6. Apoc. 11. 2, 8. Apoc. 13th chapter.
- Antichrist, whether he shall be one singular man, 2 Thes. 2. 3. Apoc. 13. 18; whether he shall come near the world's end, 2 Thes. 2. 3, 4; whether Antichrist's reign shall be only three common years and a half, Matt. 24. 22. Mark 13. 20. Apocalypse 11. 2. Apocalypse 12. 6. Apocalypse 20. 7; whether Antichrist shall abolish the mass, 2 Thes. 2. 4; whether Antichrist shall suffer no false worship of God, but of himself only, 2 Thes. 2. 4; whether all framing of letters to express his name be uncertain, Apoc. 13. 18; whether the protestants be forerunners of Antichrist, 2 Thes. 2. 3, 4. Apoc. 13. 6, 11, 17. Apoc. 20. 8; whether the pope be Antichrist, 2 Thes. 2. 3; two special reasons why Antichrist is so called, 2 Thes. 2. 4. The apostacy of Antichrist and his from the Catholic church, whether it be from the see of Rome, 2 Thes. 2. 3; whether the persecution of Antichrist shall cause the church to be invisible, Apoc. 12. 3; whether Elias and Enoch shall be persecuted by Antichrist, Apoc. 13. 7; what is Antichrist's triple honour against the honour of Christ, Apoc. 13. 17; his attempts to draw from the true faith, Apoc. 13. 17; how there be many Antichrists, 2 Thes. 2. 3; whether the pope cannot be Antichrist, 2 Thes. 2. 3. John 5. 43. Apoc. 12. 11. Apoc. 13. 18. Apoc. 20. 7; whether the protestants make Leo and Gregory furtherers of Antichrist, 2 Thes. 2. 3; whether they place Antichrist in the see of Rome in Paul's time, 2 Thes. 2. 3; whether not to be with the see of Rome is to be with Antichrist, Act. 11. 26. 2 Thes. 2. 3.
- Apostles, their name, dignity, and authority, Luke 6. 13. Matt. 18. 18, 19; how some apostles were greater than other, 2 Cor. 12. 11; whether the apostles forsook their wives, Matt. 8. 11. Matt. 19. 9. Luke 18. 29. Luke 4. 38; whether Philip the deacon left his wife, Acts 21. 9. See priests. Whether the apostles vowed poverty, Matt. 19. 27. 2 Cor. 6. 10; whether the apostles made the creed. See the argument of the Epistles in general. What honour and reverence is given to the apostles, Acts 4. 37 and Acts 5. 11; whether any precepts of the apostles not comprehended in the scriptures are to be obeyed, Acts 15. 11. 1 Cor. 7. 12.
- Apostolical tradition. See tradition. Whether it be lawful to use the apostolical salu-

- tation, Rom. 1. 7; whether to be saluted only of the apostles giveth grace, Rom. 16. 3; whether the pope's office be rightly called an apostleship, Ephes. 4. 11; whether every convertor of a several country may be properly called an apostle, Luke 6. 13; whether the apostles or converters of countries do merit heavenly glory, 2 Cor. 1. 14; whether Augustin the monk be the apostle of England, 1 Cor. 4. 15.
- Ave Maria. See lady.
- B.
- Babylon, whether in the Apocalypse it signify Rome the see of Antichrist, Apoc. 14. 8. Apoc. 16. 19. Apoc. 17th chapter.
- Baptism maketh not members of the church. See argument of the Acts.
- Baptism, how it taketh away sins, Acts 22. 17; whether it justify, Rom. 6. 3, 4. Rom. 7. 6; whether necessary to salvation, Mark 1. 9. John 3. 5. Matt. 3. 11. Baptism of infants how necessary, Rom. 5. 10. 1 Cor. 7. 14; whether the Popish sacrament of confirmation do diminish the force of baptism, Acts 8. 17. Exorcisms and other ceremonies of Popery, whether necessary or convenient, Mark 7. 14. Acts 8. 33. 1 Pet. 3. 21. Ephatha, Mark 7. 14. Abrenuncio, 1 Pet. 3. 21. The indelible character of baptism, 2 Cor. 1. 22. The baptism of heretics and schismatics, whether always damnable, 1 Pet. 3. 21. Whether John's baptism were inferior to Christ's, Matt. 3. 11. Mark 1. 4, 9. John 3. 31. Luke 3. 16. John 1. 26. Acts 1. 5. Acts 19. 3. Names in baptism, Luke 1. 63; whether Christ himself baptized, John 4. 2.
- Beza, whether he maketh God author of sin, Matt. 6. 13. Acts 2. 23; whether he controlleth the Evangelists, Luke 1. 7, 8. Luke 3. 36. Luke 22. 20. Acts 8. 27; whether he imagine corruptions of the Greek text according to his fancy, Matt. 10. 2. Preface, sec. 39; whether he translate for Christ's soul in hell, his carcass in the grave, Acts 2. 27.
- Bishops, what spiritual power they have, Matt. 18. 18. 2 Cor. 10. 4; their power to punish heretics confessed by Calvin, 2 Cor. 10. 6; their consistories, Apoc. 20. 4; how far they must be obeyed, Matt. 15. 9. Acts 11. 18. See church. How they are to be honoured and feared, Acts 5. 11.
- Bishop's blessing, Matt. 10. 12. Matt. 19. 13. Heb. 7. 7; what secular affairs agree not with spiritual men's function, 2 Tim. 2. 4; how superior to priests and distinct in office, Acts 8. 17. Acts 1. 3. Phil. 1. 2. Titus 1. 5; their power of consecrating bishops, Titus 1. 5. Acts 13. 2, 3.
- Bishopping, Acts 8. 17.
- Bishop's visitations, Acts 15. 36; whether Paul allow them for worthy bishops that cannot preach, 1 Tim. 5. 17.
- Blessings of creatures, how effectual and operative, Matt. 26. 26. Mark 8. 6. 1 Tim. 4. 4; blessing the table, 1 Tim. 4. 4; blessing a pre-eminence of the better person, 1 Tim. 4. 4. Heb. 7. 7; blessing of bishops and priests, fathers and mothers, Heb. 7. 7.
- Blessing with the sign of the cross, Luke 24. 50. 1 Tim. 4. 5.
- Bread supersubstantial, Matt. 6. 11.
- C.
- Cainan, Luke 3. 36.
- Calvin, whether he blasphemed against the divinity of Christ, John 1. 1. John 10. 29; whether Calvin blasphemed against Christ's own merits, Philip 2. 9. Apoc. 5. 9. Heb. 2. 9; or against the saints in heaven, Luke 16. 28; whether he hold that God is the author of sin, Matt. 13. 15; whether he blaspheme concerning Christ's suffering the pains of the damned, and that he was abandoned of his father, Matt. 27. 46. Mark 15. 34; whether he blasphemeth against remission of sins, Heb. 6. 4, 9.
- Calvin's doctrine, whether it tend to the abomination of desolation, Mark 13. 11.
- Canonical hours how proved, Acts 10. 9. Acts 3. 1. Gal. 4. 10; how they answer to the time of Christ's passion and agonies, Luke 18. 1. Gal. 4. 10. See prayer.
- Catholics, whether this name discerneth true believers from heretics, and whether Protestants speaking properly do understand Papists by this name, Acts 11. 26; how Augustin esteemed this name, Acts 11. 26; whether the Protestants mock at this name, as the Donatists did; whether they leave it out of the creed; whether they leave it out in the titles of the Catholic Epistles. The title of them before the Epistle of James, Acts 11. 26.
- Catholic Epistles, why so called, Acts 11. 26. Argument of the Epistles in general.
- Catholic terms and speeches, 1 Tim. 6. 20. 2 Tim. 1. 13.
- Catholic parents, who be, 2 Tim. 1. 5.
- Catholic church. See church.
- Catholic faith. See faith.
- Catholic faith, whether it be taken out of England, Apoc. 2. 5; whether ignorance is allowable in true Catholics, Luke 10. 21. Luke 12. 8. 1 John 2. 20.
- Catholic men's obedience to their pastors, how far it ought to extend, Acts 11. 4; to councils, Acts 15. 28.
- Catholic assemblies in time of persecution. See persecution.
- Censurers of the church. See Ecclesiastical.
- Ceremonies used in the Popish church, whether by example of Christ, John 9. 6. External elements how used in the sacraments, Gal. 4. 10. Augustin's estimation of ceremonies, and whether he be falsely alleged against them, Gal. 4. 10; whether Popish ceremonies be not burdensome, but sweet and to edification, Gal. 4. 10; whether they be neither heathenish nor Judaical, Gal. 4. 10.
- Charity, whether it be more principal in justification than faith, 1 Cor. 13. 13. See justification.

- Clarity, whether it be the form of faith, Gal. 5. 6.
- Chaste or single life in Popish clergy, whether it be angelical, Matt. 22. 30; whether more for the service of God in them that have not the gift of sole life, 1 Cor. 7. 6, 28. See priests, holy orders, monastical life. Whether it be impossible for every man, Matt. 19. 11. 1 Cor. 7. 17; whether some Protestants may not justly affirm that they have not the gift of continency, 1 Cor. 7. 7. 1 Tim. 3. 4. Titus 1. 6; whether all may have the gift that will, Matt. 19. 11. 1 Cor. 7. 17; whether the chastity of virgins, widows, and married folks differ in merit, Matt. 13. 8.
- Chrim, Acts 8. 17.
- Christ, whether he be a priest as he is God and man. See priest. His descending into hell. See hell. Whether he be the only mediator. See saints. How he maketh now intercession for us, Heb. 7. 25; whether the Popish votaries forsake all and follow Christ, Luke 5. 28.
- Christians, the name of, derided by Italian Papists, Acts 11. 26.
- Christian, true, liberty. See Gospel.
- Church Catholic or universal, Matt. 21. 23. Luke 24. 47. Acts 11. 20. Col. 1. 6. 1 Tim. 3. 15. 1 John 2. 2; What this article signifieth, I believe the Catholic church, John 1. 39. 1 Tim. 3. 15; whether they are blinder than the Jews that see not the Popish church to be the true Catholic church of Christ, 2 Cor. 3. 14; whether the unity of the church consist in communicating with the Pope, Gal. 2. 9. Eph. 4. 5; how the unity of the church is by the blessed sacrament, 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17; whether the Protestants at the first avoided the name of church, and thrust it out of the bible, Eph. 5. 23; whether the church can never err, Luke 18. 8. John 14. 16. John 16. 13, 23. John 17. 17. Eph. 5. 23, 24. 1 Tim. 3. 15. Apoc. 20. 6; whether the Protestants blaspheme concerning the church's apostacy or revolt from God, Matt. 28. 20. John 14. 17. Col. 1. 6. Thes. 2. 3. Apoc. 12. 7; whether Christ be not perfect without his church, as a head without a body, Eph. 1. 21, 23; whether the church be always visible, Matt. 5. 15. Acts 2. 47. Acts 11. 24. 2 Thes. 2. 3. 1 Tim. 3. 15. Acts 5. 39. Col. 1. 6. Apoc. 1. 20; whether Elias' words make anything to the contrary, Rom. 11. 3; what shall be the state of the church in Antichrist's time, Apoc. 12. 6; how the church is small in the beginning, and growing great afterward, Mark 4. 3. Luke 5. 6, 10. Luke 24. 47. Col. 1. 6; her laws, customs, and governors, how they are to be obeyed, Matt. 15. 9. Acts 15. 13, 41. 1 Cor. 11. 8. 2 Cor. 1. 2, 16. 1 Thes. 4. 8. 2 Thes. 3. 14. Heb. 13. 24. 2 Cor. 5. 18; how she only hath the true sense of the scriptures, 2 Cor. 3. 3; how she judgeth all, and is judged of none, 1 Cor. 2. 11, 17; how she judgeth between canonical scriptures and not canonical, Gal. 2. 2; how she judgeth which are sacraments, which not, John 13. 14; whether the Catholic church, which is the body of Christ, consist of good and bad, Matt. 3. 12. Matt. 13. 30. Matt. 22. 11. John 15. 2; whether the true church is proved always by succession, John 4. 20. Acts 5. 39. Ephes. 4. 13; whether Christ left many things to be taught in the church, which are not taught in the holy scriptures, John 10. 22. Apoc. 10. 1. See tradition. How the custom of the church is a good answer against all wranglers, 1 Cor. 11. 16; whether there may not be salvation out of the church of Rome, 1 John 1. 3. 1 Tim. 3. 15; whether such as be out of the church, though they hear and read never so much, can understand nothing, Mark 4. 12; whether any man can be head of the whole church but Christ, Ephesians 1. 22; whether the Pope may be ministerial head of the universal church, Ephes. 1. 22; whether no temporal prince may be head or chief governor of the particular church within his dominion, Matt. 16. 19. Matt. 22. 21. Heb. 13. 17. 1 Peter 2. 13; John 21. 17; whether no woman being a prince can be head or chief governor of the particular church within her dominion, 1 Cor. 11. 34; whether the Popish service imitate the church triumphant in heaven, Apoc. 4. 8. Apoc. 19. 4; building of material churches, monasteries, &c. whether meritorious, Luke 7. 5; dedication of churches, and the feasts of them, John 10. 22; what cost in adorning them pleased God, Matt. 26. 8, 11. Mark 7. 11. Mark 14. 4. John 12. 7; whether God will be honoured in churches, rather than elsewhere, Acts 7. 48. 2 Cor. 1. 11. John 12. 20; how God dwelleth not in material temples. Acts 7. 48; wherewithal churches be profaned, Mark 11. 16, 17. John 2. 15; whether our parents and other necessities of poor men are not always to be preferred before the adorning of churches, Mark 7. 11.
- Clergy, the name to whom in scripture it is given, 1 Peter 5. 3; the difference of the clergy and the Laity, 1 Peter 5. 3.
- Clergy exempt from tribute, Rom. 14. 6; what degrees of superiority are among themselves, and over others, Luke 22. 24. 2 Cor. 1. 24. 2 Cor. 12. 11; whether the privileges and exemption of the clergy be grounded upon the scripture, Matt. 17. 26. Rom. 13. 4.
- Commandments of God, whether possible to be kept, Matt. 11. 14; Luke 1. 6. Luke 10. 28; John 14. 15; 1 John 3. 4. 1 John 5. 3. Rom. 8. 1. Rom. 13. 8; keeping of the commandments, how profitable and necessary to salvation, Matthew 5. 20. James 2. 10. Matt. 19. 1. Mark 19. 17. Luke 18. 20. Apoc. 14. 12; whether they differ from counsels, Mark 10. 21. Luke 18. 2; whether a man is justified by keeping of them, Luke 1. 3, 6. Romans 8. 16; whether Popish traditions be the commandments of men. See traditions. Whether rail laws, doctrines, and service of the church of England, be the commandments of men, Matt. 15. 8. Mark 7. 7.
- Communion, whether rightly ministered by

- Protestants, 1 Cor. 11. 20. to end; whether they imitate Christ's institution, and the apostles' tradition, 1 Cor. 11. 23, 31; whether their communion be idolatry, 1 Cor. 8. 10; whether they call it improperly the communion, 1 Cor. 11. 24; whether they call it improperly the Supper of the Lord, 1 Cor. 11. 20; whether their communion bread be profane, 1 Cor. 11. 29; whether it be Calvin's supper and not Christ's, John 4. 20; whether it is the very table and cup of devils, and accordingly to be abhorred, 1 Cor. 10. 21.
- Community of life and goods in the first Christians, whether it be used now of the Popish cloisterers only, Acts 2. 44; whether it was a commandment or a counsel only, Acts 2. 44.
- Concupiscence after baptism, whether it be sin of itself without consent, Rom. 6. 10. Rom. 7. 15, 19, 25. James 1. 13. 1 John 3. 6; how the apostle calleth it sin, Rom. 6. 12; whether it defileth, or maketh imperfect all the actions of a just man, Rom. 7. 25.
- Confession in particular, whether necessary, Matt. 3. 6. Mark 1. 5. John 20. 23. Acts 19. 18; whether secret or auricular confession be necessary, John 20. 23; to a priest, Luke 17. 10. John 20. 23. James 5. 15; of all mortal sins, James 5. 15; before the receiving of the sacrament, 1 Cor. 11. 28; whether the English ministers hear confessions, and absolve contrary to their own doctrine, John 20. 23. See penance.
- Confessing of Christ and his religion. See faith.
- Confirmation, otherwise called bishopping, whether it be a sacrament, Acts 8. 17; what grace and effect it hath, John 7. 39. Acts 8. 17. Ephes. 1. 13; what heresies against it, Acts 8. 17.
- Chrism or holy oil, whether necessary in confirmation, Acts 8. 17.
- Conscience, how to be discharged in punishing of papists, Mark 15. 15.
- Consecration by imposition of hands, 1 Tim. 4. 14. See orders.
- Continency. See chastity; whether all notable bishops and priests of God's church have been single, or continent from their wives, Titus 1. 6.
- Continency of married folk for prayers' sake, how commendable, 1 Cor. 7. 5; whether necessary for the more worthy receiving of the sacrament, 1 Cor. 7. 32.
- Contrition, whether it be against justification by faith only, 2 Cor. 7. 9. See penance.
- Corporals for the blessed sacrament, upon what scripture grounded, Matt. 27. 59.
- Corporals and chalice hallowed, 1 Cor. 11. 29.
- Councils, of what persons they consist, Acts 15. 6; how they represent the whole church, Acts 15. 6; whether Peter and his successors were, or ought to be always presidents in councils, Acts 15. 6, 7; whether councils be of no force without their confirmation, Acts 15. 6, 7; whether they have such assistance of the Holy Ghost, that they cannot err, Acts 15. 20. Luke 1. 3. John 15. 27. John 16. 12, 23. Rom. 3. 4; whether examination of matters, or disputation be necessary, when the council cannot err, Luke 1. 3. Acts 15. 27; whether all good Christians ought to rest upon their determination always, Acts 15, 31; how the ancient fathers esteemed of general councils, Acts 15. 28; whether all decrees of councils are to be put in execution, Acts 15. 41; how later councils alter the former, Acts 15. 7, 13; whether heretics only refuse councils, Acts 15. 1, 20, 28; heretical and schismatical synods what be, Acts 15. 28.
- Counsels, evangelical, whether differing from precepts, Matt. 19. 13, 26. Acts 2. 44. 1 Cor. 7. 13; whether they tend to perfection, and be followed by popish cloisterers, called of them religious, Matt. 19. 21. Mark 10. 21. See works of supererogation and religious.
- Cross whereon Christ died, whether holy and to be honoured, John 19. 17. Heb. 9. 4; whether the cross be called the sign of the Son of Man, Matt. 24. 30; the sign of the cross in blessing, whether used by Christ, Luke 24. 51; how effectual to sanctify, Luke 24. 51; 1 Tim. 4. 4. In sacraments and other hallowed creatures, 1 Tim. 4. 5; whether it is necessary to be borne in our foreheads, Luke 24. 51. Apoc. 7. 3. Gal. 6. 14; the crucifix or rood with Mary and John, upon what ground of scripture, John 19. 26; whether there be any virtue in the sign of the cross, Mark 9. 38. 1 Tim. 4. 4; whether it shall appear at the latter day no less to confound the Protestants than the Jews, Matt. 24. 30.

## D.

- Days, what distinction of them ought to be, Rom. 14. 5; whether one day is more sanctified than another. See feasts and festivities; the church useth not the heathenish name of days, Apoc. 1. 10; whether the Papists call not the week days *Feriae*, by a profane name, Luke 24. 1. Apoc. 1. 10.
- Deacons, their office, Acts 6. 3. See orders.
- Depositum, 1 Tim. 6. 20.
- Devotion uttered by external sign, how it is allowable, Matt. 9. 6. Mark 3. 10. Luke 19. 4. John 1. 14. Philip 2. 16. James 5. 14. Mark 11. 9. See pilgrimage. How God is served in spirit, notwithstanding external devotion, John 4. 23. Rom. 1. 9; whether true devotion be called of the Protestants superstition, Acts 17. 22, 23; whether Popish devotion towards relics and holy things be a token of great faith, Matt. 9. 8. Rom. 1. 8; the holy women's devotion, whether it excuse Popish superstition, Mark 16. 1. Luke 8. 3.
- Devotion of Zachæus, whether it approveth Popish devotion to see and to be near to the sacrament, Luke 19. 4; kneeling at *Verbum caro factum est*, and *et homo factum est*, what devotion, John 1. 1.
- Dissensions and divisions of heretics among themselves, Philip. 3. 15.
- Doctors of the church, which be necessary,

John 4. 23; what regard we must have to their doctrine, Heb. 13. 7, 9: how Augustin esteemed of them, Heb. 13. 7, 9; whether their crown in heaven be of the merit of their labours, Philip. 4. 1. 1 Pet. 5. 4; whether the ancient doctors be contemned in England, 2 Cor. 11. 6.

Dulia See adoration.

## E.

Ecclesiastical censures, whether rightly executed in the Popish church, Matt. 16. 19. 1 Cor. 5. 4. See excommunication.

Ecclesiastical power or jurisdiction, how far it extendeth, Matt. 16. 19. John 2. 15. 2 Cor. 10. 4. See bishop, clergy.

Elias, whether he be yet alive, and shall be the precursor of Christ's second coming, Matt. 11. 14. Matt. 17. 11. Mark 9. 4. Apoc. 11. 3.

Enoch, whether he be yet living, Heb. 11. 5; whether he shall preach in Antichrist's time with Elias, Apoc. 11. 3.

Ephphata. See baptism.

Eremites, wherefore they have their name, profession and life, commended by the example of Elias, of John Baptist, and Christ himself, Matt. 3. 1. Matt. 9. 8. Matt. 4. 1. Matt. 14. 12. Mark 1. 9. Luke 1. 80. Luke 21. 37; whether in the primitive church there were innumerable eremites and monks, such as the Papists have, Matt. 14. 12. See monks and monastical life.

Excommunication, what punishment, 1 Cor. 4. 5. 2 Cor. 2. 6; whether excommunication in the primitive church, was joined always with corporal torment, Acts 5. 3. 1 Cor. 5. 5. 1 Tim. 1. 20; whether the Protestants deny that heretics are to be excommunicated, 2 Cor. 10. 4.

Exorcism. See baptism.

Extreme unction, whether it be a sacrament, Gal. 4. 3. James 5. 14; whether the apostles anointing with oil made a preparative to the sacrament of extreme unction, Gal. 4. 3. James 5. 14.

## F.

Faith. See justification, works; whether faith only doth not justify, Matt. 7. 16. Matt. 9. 28. Matt. 13. 17. Matt. 22. 40. Matt. 23. 15. Matt. 25. 3, 41. Mark 1. 15. Mark 11. 22. Mark 12. 33. Mark 16. 16. Luke 1. 6. Rom. 6. 3. Gal. 3. 27. Heb. 5. 8. Heb. 11. 33. Luke 7. 50. Luke 13. 6. John 5. 29. John 8. 31. 1 Pet. 4. 8. 1 John 2. 29. 1 John 3. 4. Apoc. 2. 22. Apoc. 14. 12. Acts 10. 2. Acts 24. 25. Luke 10. 28. John 15. 10. Rom. 1. 18. Rom. 2. 13. 1 Cor. 13. 2, 13. 2 Cor. 7. 9. Ephes. 3. 17. Ephes. 6. 23. 1 Thes. 5. 8. 1 Tim. 1. 5. Whether Augustin's book *de fide et operibus*, be against justification before God by faith only, James 2. 21; whether justification by faith only be an old heresy. Argument of the Epistles in General, James 2. 21. Argument of both the Epistles of Peter; whether James calleth them that

teach justification before God by faith only, vain men, and compareth them to devils, James 2. 14, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26. What is Paul's doctrine concerning faith and good works, Argument of the Epistles in General; whether Paul ever join faith and charity in the act of justification before God, Philemon 5; whether his words of faith be misconstrued by the Protestants, Argument of the Epistles in General. Rom. 3. 5, 10, 20, 22, 28; whether other scriptures be falsely alleged by the Protestants to maintain justification by faith only, Mark 5. 36; whether the faith of the Protestants be a vain security of salvation, Rom. 8. 38. 1 Cor. 9. 27. 1 Cor. 10. 12. Heb. 11. 1. Rom. 5. 2. Rom. 4. 24. Luke 12. 5. 1 Pet. 4. 18. 1 John 4. 17. Rom. 11. 20. Philip. 3. 11. See salvation. Whether the seven catholic Epistles were written against justification in the sight of God by faith only, Argument of the Epistles in General. Argument of the Epistle of James. James 2. 21. Argument of John's Third Epistle; why faith is so often named in the case of justification, Gal. 3. 7. See justification; in what sense most of the ancient fathers say, that only faith doth justify, James 2. 24; How it is said by our Saviour Christ, believe only, Mark 5. 36; what manner of faith doth justify, Rom. 1. 17. Rom. 4. 24. Gal. 5. 6. Heb. 11. 1, 6. James 2. 24. Rom. 3. 22, 24. Gal. 3. 7; whether faith may be had and lost again, Luke 8. 13. Rom. 11. 20. 1 Tim. 1. 19; whether grace and charity may be lost, Apoc. 2. 2; what is the Apostle's analogy or prescript rule of faith, Rom. 12. 16. Heb. 6. 1; what it is to hold the first faith of our apostles and fathers, Rom. 6. 7. Rom. 16. 17. 2 Cor. 12. 12. Gal. 1. 8. 1 Tim. 6. 20. 2 Tim. 1. 5. 2 Tim. 3. 15. 1 John 2. 24. 2 John 5. 10. 1 Cor. 15. 15. Gal. 3. 7. Heb. 13. 9; how one man's faith obtaineth for another, Luke 5. 20.

Fast or fasting, what act of religion, Luke 2. 37; whether meritorious, Matt. 15. 9. 1 Cor. 15. 32; prescript days of fasting, whether allowable, Matt. 15. 9. Acts 13. 3. Gal. 4. 10; Ember days, Matt. 9. 38. Luke 6. 12. Acts 13. 3; what was the heresy of Aerius concerning fasting, Acts 13. 3; prohibition of certain meats, whether it be Christian fasting, Matt. 15. 9. Mark 7. 7. Acts 13. 3. Rom. 14. 2. 1 Tim. 4. 3. 1 Tim. 5. 23; whether the scripture be grossly abused by the Protestants against the Popish fasts, Matt. 15. 9. Mark 7. 7. Rom. 14. 2. 1 Cor. 8. 1. Col. 2. 16, 21. 1 Tim. 4. 3, 8. Titus 1. 15; what fasting is heretical, Luke 2. 37. Col. 2. 21. 1 Tim. 4. 8; the Lent fast, and the origin thereof, Matt. 4. 2. Mark 1. 12; whether it be sin not to fast in Lent, Matt. 4. 2; whether Lent be an apostolical tradition, Matt. 4. 2. Luke 4. 2; whether it be the true imitation of our Saviour's fasting, Matt. 4. 2; whether by keeping of it true Christians are known from infidels, Matt. 4. 2; what the doctors' sermons were of Lent fast, Matt. 4. 2; whether the Popish fasts were foresignified by Christ himself, Matt. 9. 15

**Fear**, what fear is not in charity, 1 John 4. 18  
 See Faith of the Protestants, and salvation;  
 servile fear, whether not ill, 1 John 4. 18.  
 Acts 24. 25; fear of hell, how profitable,  
 Luke 12. 5.

**Feasts or festival days**, how necessary for the  
 church, Matt. 2. 1. John 10. 22. Acts 2. 4.  
 Gal. 4. 10. Heb. 13. 7. 2 Pet. 1. 15. Apoc. 1.  
 10; whether the scriptures be grossly  
 abused by the Protestants against Popish  
 festivities and holidays, Rom. 14. 5. Gal. 4.  
 10. Col. 2. 16; the feasts of Easter and  
 Whitsuntide, Acts 2. 1. Acts 20. 16. Gal. 4.  
 10. Apoc. 1. 10; whether greater grace be  
 given upon such solemn days, Acts 2. 1.  
 Acts 20. 16. Gal. 4. 10. Apoc. 1. 10.

**Free will**, whether man hath, Matt. 12. 33.  
 Matt. 16. 27. Matt. 19. 11. Matt. 20. 23.  
 Matt. 25. 8, 41. Luke 2. 14. Luke 10. 28.  
 John 1. 12. John 6. 44. Acts 27. 31. Rom. 7.  
 19. Rom. 9. 11, 14, 17. Rom. 10. 20. 1 Cor.  
 15. 10. 2 Cor. 3. 5. 2 Cor. 6. 1. Philip 2. 13.  
 1 Tim. 2. 4. 2 Tim. 2. 21, 25. James 4. 8.  
 Luke 13. 34. Apoc. 2. 21. Apoc. 3. 20. Gal.  
 5. 17; whether man's free will worketh  
 with God's grace, 2 Cor. 3. 5. 1 Cor. 15. 10.  
 1 John 3. 3. Acts 13. 46. Ephes. 4. 23.  
 James 4. 8; whether man have any free-  
 dom of will from the servitude of sin, with-  
 out the grace of God, John 8. 36. Apoc. 3.  
 20; whether predestination, reprobation,  
 concupiscence, take away free will, Acts  
 27. 31. Rom. 7. 15. Rom. 9. 14, 22. Acts 13.  
 46. Gal. 5. 17; whether the Jews' blind-  
 ness and reprobation were through their  
 own free will, Luke 13. 34. John 12. 39.  
 Acts 13. 46. Acts 28. 27; whether their be-  
 traying and crucifying of Christ, and Judas'  
 treason was only of their free will, Acts 2.  
 23; likewise the refusing of the gospel  
 when it is preached, Rom. 10. 16.

## G.

**God**, whether the Protestants teach that he is  
 the author of sin, Matt. 6. 13. Matt. 13. 15.  
 Acts 2. 23. Rom. 1. 26. Rom. 3. 5. Rom. 9.  
 16, 17, 20, 21. Rom. 11. 8. James 1. 13;  
 what is the meaning of those places that  
 sound as though God were the author of sin,  
 Matt. 13. 15. Mark 4. 11, 12. John 12. 39.  
 Acts 2. 23. Rom. 3. 5. 2 Thes. 2. 11; how  
 the death of Christ was by God's determi-  
 nation, Acts 2. 23. Acts 4. 28.

**Gospel**, whether it be only the written word,  
 or else tradition unwritten also, Mark 8. 35.  
 Rom. 1. 15. See tradition. What is the  
 pre-eminence of the Gospel or New Testam-  
 ent above the Old, 2 Cor. 3. 9. Heb. 7. 18.  
 Heb. 8. 10. Heb. 9. 12; whether the Pro-  
 testants teach that under pretence of the  
 liberty of the Gospel, every man may  
 choose whether he will be under laws spiri-  
 tual or temporal, James 1. 25. Gal. 5. 13.  
 1 Pet. 2. 16; whether he suffereth for the  
 Gospel that suffereth for any article of Po-  
 pery, that is not taught in the word of God  
 written, Mark 8. 35.

**Grace**. See free will; whether grace and

charity may be lost, Apoc. 2. 4; whether to  
 consent to God offering grace, be only of  
 grace, Apoc. 3. 20. Rom. 10. 16. Eph. 4. 23.  
 2 Tim. 2. 10; whether God's grace causeth  
 men's works to be meritorious. See me-  
 rits; whether all God's graces and gifts be  
 not freely given, 1 Cor. 12. 8, but some de-  
 served; whether the Greek text of the  
 New Testament be corrupted, 1 John 4. 3.  
 Preface 27, 28, 29.

**Gospels and epistles in the mass-houses**,  
 Matt. 1. 1

## H.

**Hallowing or sanctifying of creatures after  
 the Popish manner**, whether grounded upon  
 the scriptures 1 Tim. 4. 4; the force of such  
 hallowing, 1 Tim. 4. 5.

**Holy places**, Matt. 17. 9. Acts 7. 33. 1 Tim. 4.  
 5. 2 Pet. 1. 18.

**Holy bread**, whether grounded on the scrip-  
 ture, 1 Tim. 4. 5; water, 1 Tim. 4. 5; days.  
 See feasts, and saints; things not to be pro-  
 faned. See sacrilege.

**Hell fire**, Matt. 5. 23.

**Hell**, whether in scripture it be taken for  
 Limbus Patrum, Acts 2. 27; whether Christ  
 descending into hell, delivered the fathers  
 and just men of the Old Testament, Luke  
 16. 22. Acts 2. 24, 27. 1 Pet. 3. 19, 20;  
 whether Calvin deny the article of Christ's  
 descending into hell, Matt. 27. 46. 1 Pet. 19.  
 20; whether Augustin call them infidels  
 that deny the descending of Christ into  
 Limbus Patrum, 1 Pet. 3. 19. Acts 2. 27;  
 whether the Protestants translate hereti-  
 cally for that purpose, Acts 2. 27; whether  
 profitable to fear. See tear.

**Henoch**. See Enoch.

**Heretic**, Titus 3. 10; marks are to know he-  
 retics, Matt. 7. 15, 16. Acts 20. 26. 1 Tim.  
 1. 3, 4, 7. 1 John 4. 1, 2; whether it be a  
 mark of a heretic to go out of the Romish  
 church, Eph. 3. 4, 5. Titus 3. 10. 1 John 2.  
 19; name of the Protestants and such like,  
 whether it be a mark of heretics, Acts 11.  
 26. James 3. 1. Apoc. 2. 6; whether they  
 run, not sent, as heretics do, Matt. 21. 23.  
 Luke 6. 13. John 10. 1. Acts 13. 2. Rom. 10.  
 15. Gal. 1. 1. Heb. 5. 4; whether they dis-  
 sent as heretics, Matt. 23. 8. Acts 15. 39.  
 Philip 3. 15; whether they preach otherwise,  
 and contrary to the faith received from  
 Christ and his apostles, as heretics do, Gal.  
 1. 8. 1 Tim. 1. 3. 1 Tim. 5. 17; whether  
 they deceive by hypocrisy and sweet words,  
 Luke 6. 26. Rom. 1. 7. 2 Cor. 11. 6. 2 Tim.  
 4. 5. 2 Pet. 2. 3; whether they use vanity in  
 preaching and vain glory, Luke 6. 26; whe-  
 ther they preach licentiousness and carnal  
 liberty, 2 Pet. 2. 2, 19. Apoc. 2. 14; whe-  
 ther they use meretricious and painted elo-  
 quence, 1 Tim. 5. 17; whether they teach  
 new doctrine, 1 Tim. 1. 3; 2 John 1. 10;  
 Heb. 13. 7; whether they invent new terms  
 and speech, as heretics use to do, 1 Tim. 6.  
 20; whether they vaunt great knowledge,  
 especially of the scriptures, in such manner

- as the heretics do, Luke 6. 3. John 5. 39. 1 Tim. 1. 7. 1 Tim. 6. 20; whether they be ignorant of the scriptures, Mark 12. 24. Jude 10; whether they boast of the spirit without the word, 1 John 4. 1; whether they condemn councils and fathers, Acts 15. 23, 31. Gal. 2. 2. 1 Tim. 6. 20. Heb. 6. 4; whether they corrupt the scriptures, 2 Cor. 2. 17. 2 Cor. 4. 2; whether they deny the books of the canonical scripture, or of the doctors that be not comericit, James 2. 11. Acts 17. 34; whether they control the very text of the scripture and the sacred writers thereof, Luke 1. 78. Luke 22. 20; Acts 8. 26. Luke 3. 19; whether they use foul shifts and wrangling to avoid the evidence of the scriptures, John 1. 1. John 20. 23. 2 Pet. 3. 16. 1 Tim. 5. 9, 12. Heb. 6. 4. 1 John 5. 16. Acts 8. 17; whether they slander the church of God, John 6. 53; whether hatred of the see of Rome, as it is now the see of Antichrist be a mark of heretics, Rom. 16. 16; whether the Protestants acknowledge no judge of controversies, 2 Cor. 1. 24; Gal. 2. 2; whether they despise rulers, especially ecclesiastical, Jude 8, 11; whether they be void of faith, John 14. 12. 2 Cor. 12. 1. Acts 10. 30; whether they be mutable in faith, and inconstant, 2 Cor. 1. 18; whether they be given to voluptuousness as heretics, Rom. 16. 18; whether they hold several and secret conventicles as heretics, Matt. 24. 15. Luke 24. 47. Luke 17. 23. Jude 19; whether their synods have not the promise of Christ, Acts 15. 28; whether their persons consist of worse persons than the Popish clergy, 1 Tim. 3. 6; how heresy profiteth the church, 1 Cor. 11. 19; whether the Protestants have many faiths, Eph. 4. 5; whether they have many analogies, and rules of faith, Rom. 12. 6; whether their doctrines be tables, 1 Tim. 1. 4; whether they shall come to naught, though supported awhile by never so mighty princes, Acts 5. 39; whether the marks of heretics agree to the Protestants, Titus 3. 10; whether ecclesiastical persons may punish heretics by death, Luke 9. 55. Apoc. 17. 6; how the books, service, and sermons of heretics are to be avoided, Mark 3. 12. Titus 3. 10; whether it be lawful to communicate with heretics in any case, 2 John 10. Apoc. 2. 22; whether all books of heretics are to be burnt, Acts 19. 19; whether they that have not the sign of the cross on their body, be easily seduced by heretics, Apoc. 9. 4; whether women have been most commonly promoters of heresy, 1 Tim. 2. 12; zeal against heretics, whether a colour to maintain treason, Apoc. 2. 6; what arch-heretic is signified by the fall of the star, Apoc. 9. 1.
- Heretics, Simon Magus, the father of, whether more religious than the Protestants, Acts 8. 24; whether the Protestants or Papists may more rightly be compared to Cain, Balaam, Core, Jude 11. Apoc. 2. 14; whether Calvin was a heretic, the forerunner of Antichrist, Mark 13. 14. 2 Thes. 2. 3, 4. Apoc 20. 7; whether they be all heretics**
- that call the Pope Antichrist, John 7. 20; whether the Protestants be ravening wolves, as heretics be, Matt. 7. 15, 16. Acts 20. 29; whether they be thieves, not entering by the door, John 10. 1; whether the Protestants or the Papists were prophesied of, and described by the apostles to be heretics, 2 Pet. 2. 13. 2 Pet. 3. 16. Jude 19. 1 Tim. 4. 1, 4, 5.
- Heaven, whether shut until the passion of Christ, Matt. 3. 16. Heb. 9. 3. Heb. 11. 40. See Lambus Patrum; whether difference of rewards in heaven, be according to merits in this life, Matt. 13. 8. Matt. 20. 9. 1 Cor. 13. 20. 1 Cor. 15. 4. Phil. 4. 2. See merits, works, rewards.**
- Hospitality towards the afflicted for religion, whether it cause participation of merits, Matt. 10. 11. See alms.**
- I, J.
- Jesus, how the name of, is to be adored and revered, Philip 2. 10; how it worketh miracles, Mark 9. 38; what force it hath against devils, Mark 9. 38. Phil. 2. 10. 1 Tim. 4. 5; whether the Protestants by reverence to the name of Jesus, prepare the way to Antichrist, Apoc. 13. 17.**
- Idols, whether in all the Bible they signify the false Gods of the Pagans, and not the images of heretics also, 1 John 5. 21. Rom. 1. 23; whether the word idol may not be applied to the other images of the Papists, and heretics, notwithstanding the second council of Nice, 1 John 5. 21. See images; whether the Protestants be ashamed of their translating image for idol, 1 John 5. 21; whether heretics be the only idols of the New Testament, 1 Cor. 10. 21.**
- Images, whether they be set in the church for the peoples instruction, Acts 17. 29. Heb. 9. 4. 1 John 5. 21; whether Popish images have God's own warrant, Heb. 9. 4. 1 John 5. 21; whether they differ from idols, Heb. 9. 4. 1 John 5. 21; whether they are to be adored, Philip 2. 10. Heb. 11. 21; of what antiquity they are, Matt. 9. 21. 1 John 5. 21; whether there be any fruit or commodity in them, Acts 17. 29. 1 John 5. 21; images of the blessed Trinity, and of angels, whether they may be made, Acts 17. 29. Rom. 1. 23.**
- Image breakers, whether justly condemned and accursed by the second Council of Nice, 1 John 5. 21; whether miracles were wrought by the image of Christ, Matt. 9. 21; whether the abolishing of the image of Christ be a preparation to set up the image of Antichrist, Apoc. 13. 17; whether the honour of Christ's image be the honour of Christ himself, Apoc. 13. 17.**
- Imber days, Acts 13. 3.**
- Indulgence. See pardons.**
- Imposition of hands, Acts 13. 3.**
- Interrogatories of infants at baptizing, 1 Pet. 3. 21.**
- Justification, or to be justified, Rom. 2. 6; whether there be any more justifications before God than one, Rom. 2. 13; whether there be any justification before God but of**

- mere grace without works, which the Papists call the first justification, Rom. 4. 4. Rom. 10. 8. Rom. 11. 6. Eph. 2. 8. Rom. 3. 21; whether any man is justified before God by works, Matt. 6. 1. Luke 1. 6. Rom. 2. 6. James 2. 6, 13, 15, 27. 1 John 3. 7. Apoc. 19. 3. See faith; whether any works do justify a man before God, Rom. 3. 20, 22, 23. Rom. 1. 2, 4. Rom. 11. 6. Heb. 11. 1, 33. Gal. 2. 6.
- Justification, how attributed to hope, charity, &c., Rom. 8. 24. Heb. 11. 33; whether charity be the principal virtue in justification before God, Gal. 5. 6. 1 Tim. 1. 5; whether Protestants admit charity and good works in justification before God, Gal. 5. 6; why justification is often attributed to faith, Rom. 5. 2. Gal. 3. 27. Heb. 11. 6; what Paul's meaning is when he commendeth the faith, Heb. 11. 33; whether true justice, whereby a man is justified in God's sight, be inherent, and not imputed, Matt. 5. 21. Luke 1. 6, 75. Rom. 2. 13. Rom. 3. 22. Rom. 5. 1, 2, 19. 1 Cor. 1. 30. Gal. 6. 15. Eph. 1. 4. Eph. 3. 17. Eph. 4. 23. Eph. 6. 14. Coloss. 3. 10. 1 John 3. 7. Rom. 7. 6; how is it said, none just, Rom. 3. 10; how is it said imputed for justice, Rom. 4. 9; what justice may be increased, Apoc. 22. 11. Rom. 5. 1. 1 Thes. 4. 10; how it is called God's justice, Rom. 1. 17. Rom. 3. 22. 2 Cor. 5. 21. Phil. 1. 9; how Christ is our justice; 1 Cor. 1. 30; how the Protestants avoid the word justification, Luke 1. 6. Apoc. 19. 8; what is the justice of Moses' law, Rom. 10. 5.
- K.
- Kings, the right and authority of, is no whit less because he is a heathen, 1 Pet. 2. 11; They are not to withdraw their obedience from under the spiritual judgment of the church, 1 Pet. 2. 11.
- Keys. See Peter
- L.
- Lady, our, the Virgin Mary, so called by the Papists; whether she were without sin, Mark 3. 33. Rom. 5. 14. 1 John 1. 8; her perpetual virginity, Matt. 1. 23. John 9. 52; whether she vowed virginity, Luke 1. 34; whether she was assumed, Acts 1. 14; whether the church is bound to hold her festivities, Acts 1. 14. Luke 1. 48; what is her excellency, titles, and prerogatives, Luke 1. 28. Luke 11. 27. John 2. 3. Acts 1. 14; what honour is due to her, Luke 1. 42, 43; whether she is an advocate, Acts 1. 14. 1 John 2. 1; whether she be our hope, Acts 1. 14. 1 Thess. 2. 18; what is the meaning of such terms given to her, Acts 1. 14; God and our Lady save us, whether it be a Christian prayer, Acts 15. 28; the often saying of the Ave Maria, how commendable, Luke 1. 28; whether the ancient fathers used the same, Acts 1. 14; whether she were always partaker with our Saviour in sorrows, Luke 2. 35; what is the meaning of Christ's speeches to her that may seem hard, John 2. 4, 5; whether the Protestants keep no holyday of her, no not of her death as they do of all other chief saints in the Episcopal Church of England, Acts 1. 14; whether she knew all the mysteries of Christ, Luke 2. 19; whether the Protestants be generations that shall call her blessed, Luke 1. 48; whether they derogate from her honour that is due to her, Luke 1. 28. Acts 1. 14.
- Laymen, whether in any case or manner they may judge of their pastors, of the true sense of the scriptures, or of questions of religion, Acts 17. 11. See priest, clergy.
- Lent. See Tradition.
- Limbus patrum, whether it be Abraham's bosom, Luke 16. 22, 26. Acts 2. 24, 27. Heb. 11. 40. Heb. 9. 8. Apoc. 5. 13; whether there be such a third place, Luke 8. 55. Apoc. 5. 3; whether the just of the Old Testament were not in heaven before the ascension of Christ, Luke 16. 22, 26. Matt. 3. 16; whether Christ's descent into hell was to deliver them, Luke 16. 22. See hell, heaven.
- M.
- Maccabees, whether canonical scripture, Luke 1. 3. John 10. 22
- Mary. See Lady.
- Marriage, whether it is a sacrament of the New Testament, Matt. 1. 20. Matt. 19. 6. Luke 16. 8. John 2. 2. Eph. 5. 32; whether it may not be dissolved for adultery, Matt. 5. 33. Matt. 19. 6, 9. Mark 10. 9, 10. Luke 16. 18. John 2. 2. Rom. 7. 2. 1 Cor. 7. 11; whether it be lawful after divorce, Matt. 5. 33; 99. 6. 9. Mark 10. 9. 10. Luke 16. 18. John 2. 2. Rom. 7. 2. 1 Cor. 7. 11. See chastity, continency; how it is honourable in all, Heb. 13. 4; how it is inferior to virginity and widowhood, Matt. 1. 23. 1 Cor. 7. 5, 6, 28, 29.
- Marriage of priests and votaries, whether unlawful. See priest's vow; whether the Papists be falsely charged which hold heresies against marriage, 1 Tim. 4. 3; whether they truly esteem of marriage more than the Protestants, Eph. 5. 32; marrying of the brother's wife, whether to be dispensed with, Mark 12. 19.
- Martyrs, whether only in the Popish Church, 1 Cor. 13. 2.
- Martyrdom of saints, whether a sacrifice meritorious; see merit; whether martyrs are surest of all men to escape the second death, Apoc. 2. 11.
- Mass. See sacrifice; the word mass, how long since used by the fathers, 1 Cor. 10. 21. Matt. 8. 8; whether the Apostles said mass, Acts 13. 2; whether the liturgy of the Greek fathers was the Popish mass, Acts 13. 2; whether the mass be agreeable to Christ's institution, 1 Cor. 11. 23, 24, and to the end; whether it be agreeable to the Apostle's tradition, 1 Cor. 11. 24; whether it be agreeable to Paul concerning the



- prayers and petitions therein, 1 Tim. 2. 1. for *Kirieleison*, 1 Cor. 14. 1 Tim. 2. 5; for *sursus cordis*, and *Helina*, 1 Tim. 2. 1, 5; *Sauctus* thrice repeated, Apoc. 1. 8; *Hosanna*, Matt. 21. 9; the canon of the mass, John 17. 20; the *Pater noster* in the mass, 1 Tim. 2. 1; *Agnus Dei* in the mass, 1 Cor. 11. 29; kissing the Pax, Rom. 16. 16; *Domine non sum dignus* in the mass, Matt. 8. 8; communion which is a part of the mass, 1 Cor. 11. 24; whether Antichrist and his ministers shall abolish the mass, Matt. 24. 15. Mark 13. 14. 2 Thess. 2. 4.
- Maundy Thursday, Heb. 7. 18.
- Mediator. See saints. Whether Christ be our only mediator, 1 Tim. 2. 5.
- Merits, or works meritorious, whether any be, Matt. 25. 1, 34; whether it hath correspondency to mercies, hire, and rewards, Matt. 5. 12. Matt. 6. 4. Mark 9. 41. 1 Cor. 13. 1. Col. 3. 24. Apoc. 11. 8. Apoc. 22. 12; whether the meaning and word of merit and meritorious are in the scripture, Luke 20. 35. 1 Cor. 3. 8. Heb. 13. 16. Col. 1. 12. 2 Thes. 1. 5. Apoc. 3. 5; whether the grace of God make men's works meritorious, Matt. 25. 8, 34. Rom. 8. 18, 24. Rom. 11. 36. 1 Cor. 3. 8. 2 Cor. 1. 5, 2. Tim. 1. 8; whether difference of reward prove difference of merit, Matt. 20. 23. Matt. 13. 8. 2 Cor. 9. 6. 1 Cor. 3. 8. Luke 19. 17; whether men merit their justification, see justification; whether to be worthy and to merit be all one, Luke 20. 35. Col. 1. 12. 2 Thes. 1. 5. Apoc. 3. 4; whether there be any time of meriting in this life, John 9. 4, see works; why the Protestants avoid the word merit, Heb. 13. 16; whether Calvin deny Christ's own merits, Phil. 2. 9. Apoc. 5. 9; Michael why painted fighting with a dragon, Apoc. 12. 7; whether miracles are necessary to confirm the doctrine of Luther or Calvin being agreeable to the scriptures, John 15. 24. 2 Cor. 12. 11; whether saints do work miracles properly, or God by the saints, Acts 3. 6. 13; whether true miracles be done only in the Catholic Church, Matt. 17. 19, 30. Mark 13. 22; when heretics may work true miracles, Mark 9. 48; forged miracles where to be found, 2 Thess. 2. 9. Apoc. 13. 3; how miracles are wrought by application of creatures, by the name of Jesus, of the Apostles, and other holy men, by saints and their relics, Paul's shadow, Paul's napkins, Mark 9. 38. Mark 6. 13. John 5. 2. John 14. 12. Acts. 3. 6. Acts. 5. 13. Acts 8. 2. Acts 12. 6. Acts 19. 12. Acts 28. 5, 10; by touching Christ and whosoever belongeth unto him, Mark 3. 10. Mark 7. 33. Mark 8. 22; why miracles are at one place one time more than another, Luke 4. 23. John 5. 2. 1 Cor. 12. 29; whether miracles be peculiar to certain countries, Acts 28. 1, 5; whether the Protestants be as faithless to believe true miracles as the old Pagans, John 14. 12; whether they attribute true miracles to the devil as the heathen did, Matt. 9. 5. 34; whether they derogate from the unfeigned miracles of saints, under pharisaical pretence of God's honour, John 2. 24; whether the Popish church hath the gift of miracles, Mark 16. 17.
- Monks, whether they should work with their hands, 2 Thes. 3. 10; whether there was any religion in shaving of their heads, and nuns clipping of their hair, in the ancient church, 2 Thes. 3. 1. See hermits, religious.
- N.
- Names must be significative, not profane, Luke 1. 63. Heb. 7. 1.
- Name of Christians derided in Italy, Acts 11. 26; of the authors of sects, Acts 11. 26; of the first institutors of several religions of Popery, Acts 11. 26; name of Jesus. See Jesus.
- Nicolaites, Apoc. 2. 6.
- Nuns clipping their hair, 2 Thes. 3. 10.
- Novelties of words, whether used by the Papists or Protestants, 1 Tim. 6. 20; whether they be not profane novelties, which neither in word nor sense are found in the scriptures, 1 Tim. 6. 20; how they are to be tried, novelties of words, 1 Tim. 6. 20.
- Numbers, mystical, whether over curiously to be observed, Apoc. 1. 4; whether the Protestants be rash in condemning the numbers of prayers, fasts, masses, &c., Apoc. 1. 4; the number of twelve mystical, Mark 3. 11.
- O.
- Original sin. See sin.
- Orders, whether the three holy orders are bound to continency, 1 Tim. 3. 2, 8; whether men that have been twice lawfully married, be excluded from holy orders, 1 Tim. 3. 2. 1 Tim. 5. 9. Tit. 1. 6; whether all the seven Popish orders have been since the Apostles' time, 1 Tim. 3. 8. whether the order of Popish Deacons was instituted by the Apostles, Acts 6. 3; whether holy orders is a sacrament, 1 Tim. 4. 14, instituted by Christ at his last supper, Luke 2. 22, 19. 1 Cor. 11. 24; how given by imposition of hands, Acts 13. 3. Acts 11. 22. 1 Tim. 4. 14. 2 Tim. 1. 1; whether the Protestants hold election by the people's voices, to exclude imposition of the Bishop's hands, Acts 11. 22; whether imposition of hands give grace, 2 Tim. 1. 1; what prayers and fasting the Papists use at giving of their orders, Luke 6. 12. See Ember days.
- Oaths, which are unlawful, Acts 23. 12.
- P.
- Palms, Apoc. 7. 9.
- Papist, the name, Acts 11. 26; what they are 2 Cor. 2. 10.
- Pardons, Popish, or indulgences, whether they be granted upon Christ's own words, 2 Cor. 2. 10; or upon his example, 2 Cor. 2. 10. Luke 23. 15; or upon his merits and mutual satisfaction of one for another, Col. 1.

- 24; whether practised by Paul, 2 Cor. 2. 6, 10; or by the hol<sup>y</sup> bishops of the primitive church, 2 Cor. 2. 10
- Pardon, whether a Popish, be only a remission of temporal punishment due for sins, and not for sin itself, 2 Cor. 2. 6, 10.
- Pardons, why more common now than of old time, 2 Cor. 2. 11.
- Pardoning, to whom authority of pertaineth, Matt. 16. 19. 2 Cor. 2. 6, 10. Col. 1. 14.
- Pardons, whether Popish, are given in the virtue and name of Christ, 2 Cor. 2. 10.
- Parents, whether they are to be relieved, rather than churches or altars garnished, Mark 7. 11; Patriarchs blessing their children no pattern of parents now, Heb. 7. 7.
- Pax, kissing the. See Mass.
- Penance, which is perfect repentance, whether it imply confession and painful satisfaction, Matt. 3. 2. Matt. 11. 21. Luke 10. 13; whether the Greek word *μετανοια* and *μετανειν* do signify such penance, Matt. 3. 2. Matt. 11. 21. Luke 11. 32. 2 Cor. 12. 21. Apoc. 9. 20; whether John Baptist first, then Christ and his Apostles, preached Popish penance, Matt. 3. 2. Mark 1. 4, 5, 15. Luke 3. 3, 11. Acts 2. 38. Acts 20. 21. Acts 26. 20; what was John Baptist's penance, Matt. 3. 2, 6. Luke 7. 38; what was Mary Magdalen's penance, Luke 7. 38; what great penance was used in the primitive church, 2 Cor. 2. 11. 2 Cor. 12. 21; the old canonical discipline, 2 Cor. 12. 21; whether Paul chastened his body by Popish penance, 1 Cor. 9. 27; whether temporal pains remain due, when sin is remitted, Heb. 12. 6; whether any satisfaction can be made to God's justice by any works of man, Matt. 3. 8. Luke 3. 11. Luke 19. 8. Acts 8. 22. 1 Cor. 11. 31. 2 Cor. 2. 10. 2 Cor. 6. 5. Heb. 10. 31. James 2. 13. Apoc. 10. 9; whether satisfactory works derogate anything from Christ's satisfaction, but are requisite because of the same, Rom. 8. 17. 2 Cor. 2. 6. Col. 1. 24. Heb. 5. 9. The Popish sacrament of penance, John 20. 23; whether it be as necessary as baptism, John 20. 23; whether it be *secunda tabula post naufragium*, John 20. 23; whether the contempt thereof be a sin against the Holy Ghost, Matt. 12. 31; whether the parts of true repentance be contrition, confession, and satisfaction, John 20. 23; what is contrition, 2 Cor. 7. 9, 10; whether Luther held any heresy of contrition, 2 Cor. 7. 9, 10; how it worketh salvation, 2 Cor. 7. 9, 10; whether men are bound to confess, John 20. 23. See confession. Whether all sins may be remitted by this pretended sacrament, Heb. 6. 1. Heb. 10. 26; whether it be the heresy of the Novatians to deny that confession to a priest is necessary, and his absolution, John 20. 23. See absolution, priest. Whether Popish penance be required before baptism in such a be of age, Acts 2. 18.
- Pentecost, Acts 20. 16.
- Perfection, whether any attain to it in this life, Phil. 3. 12; the state of perfection. See monastical life, religions; whether any thing may be permitted, that is not allowed, as stewes by the popish church, Mark 10. 4.
- Persecution of Catholic men, whether it be meritorious, Luke 6. 23; whether the secret assemblies of the papists be in persecution for the faith of Christ, Acts 12. 2. Matt. 24. 15. Acts 17. 5.
- Peter, in what sense Cephas, a rock or stone. John 1. 42. Matt. 16. 18; whether Christ by giving him this name, designed him before hand to be the singular or only rock or foundation of his church. Matt. 16. 18. Matt. 26. 75; whether he promised to build his church upon him, that is his person. Matt. 16. 18, 19; whether the pope and church of Rome cannot err, because Christ prayed that Peter's faith in temptation might not fail, Luke 2. 22, 31.
- Peter's primacy absurdly grounded upon his fall by the Papists, Luke 22. 31; whether the church was builded upon him, otherwise than upon the rest of the Apostles, and what primacy he received, John 21. 37. Eph. 2. 20. Arguments of both the Epistles of Peter; whether the church was built upon Peter's person, and not upon his faith or confession only, Matt. 16; what dignity or pre-eminence Peter had above the rest of the Apostles, Matt. 10. 2. Matt. 14. 23. Matt. 17. 27. Matt. 18. 1. Mark. 3. 16. Mark. 14. 71. Mark. 16. 7. Luke 5. 3, 6, 7. Luke. 6. 13, 14. Luke 8. 45. Luke 22. 31. Gal. 1. 18. Gal. 2. 7. John 21. 17. Acts 12. 5, 6, 17. 1 Cor. 9. 5; whether Paul submitted his doctrine to Peter's approbation, Gal. 2. 2; whether the keys were given to him more than to the rest of the Apostles, and what authority he hath by them, Matt. 16. 18; whether he had greater authority to bind and loose, than any one of the Apostles, Matt. 16. 19; whether he ever practised any primacy of authority, Acts 1. 15. Acts 2. 14. Acts 5. 3. Acts. 15. 6, 7. Gal. 2. 2, 9, 11. Argument of both the Epistles of Peter; whether the Pope is Peter's successor and hath the same primacy and authority which he had, Matt. 16. Luke 22. 31. John 21. 17. Acts 15. 7. Gal. 2. 2, 9; whether by the rock be signified not only Peter's person, but also his chair and See, the church of Rome, Matt. 16. 18; whether he breaketh the church's unity that forsaketh the See of Rome, Gal. 2. 9. Eph. 4. 11, 13; what way Peter is the rock, foundation of the church, as the Papists say, Matt. 16. 18. Eph. 1. 22. Eph. 2. 20; whether Peter's ship signified the church, Luke 5. 3; whether Peter governeth and protecteth the church continually, Acts 5. 15. 2 Pet. 1. 15; whether the Protestants do not avouch the pre-eminence and primacy of Peter against the Puritans to uphold their Archbishops, John 21. 17; whether they denied it before, and now confess it, John 21. 17; whether they derogate from Peter anything that the Scripture giveth unto him, Gal. 2. 11; whether Beza thinketh the text of the Scripture to be fulfilled in favour of Peter's primacy, Matt. 10. 2; whether the argument against Peter's

- primacy be foolish, Acts 8. 14. Rom. 15. 16. Gal. 29; whether it be an impudent assertion to hold that Peter was never at Rome, Rom. 16. 16. Gal. 2. 7. 1 Pet. 5. 13; whether for that only purpose they deny that Babylon signifieth Rome, 1 Pet. 5. 13; whether their greatest reason against his being there be foolish. Rom. 16. 16; whether they wrangle about the time of his being there, 1 Pet. 5. 13. whether as reasonable to ascribe the primacy to John as Peter, John 21. 7; whether it be certain that Peter and Paul planted the church of Rome, argument of the Acts of the Apostles, Acts 27. 23. Gal. 2. 7; whether it be certain that he wrote from Rome; 1 Pet. 5. 13. and was crucified there, argument of the Acts of the Apostles, John 21. 18.
- Pilgrimage, popish, whether warranted by Scripture, Matt. 2. 2. Acts 8. 27; what pilgrimage was used in the primitive church to the holy land, Matt. 17. 9, to the holy sepulchre, Matt. 23. 1. to the memories of Saints, John 5. 2; what kind of devotion, and in what manner was used by pilgrims in those holy places, Luke 7. 5. Matt. 23. 1. see Relics.
- Pope, how the succession of the bishop of Rome is used as an argument against heretics by the Fathers, Eph. 4. 13.
- Pope, whether of the same religion with the ancient Bishops, that were martyrs, Ep. 4. 13. 2 Thes. 2. 3; whether the Pope's room or dignity were ever rightly called an Apostleship, Eph. 4. 11; the Pope's supremacy how proved, John 21. 17. Eph. 1. 22. 1 Tim. 3. 15; whether it was practised by Leo and Gregory, as by the late Popes, John 21. 17; how they refused the name of universal bishop, John 21. 17; whether the Council of Chalcedon called the Pope universal bishop. How impudently they write themselves, *servos servorum Dei*, John 21. 17; whether the pope be ministerial head of the church under Christ, Eph. 1. 22; whether the pope be Peter's successor, John 21. 17. Eph. 4. 11; whether not to communicate with the pope is to be against Christ, or with Antichrist, Matt. 12. 30. See Antichrist. Whether the pope cannot be Antichrist, Matt. 24. 22. 29. John 5. 43. 2 Thes. 2. 4. See Antichrist. Whether he may err personally, but not judicially, or definitively, Luke 22. 31. John 11. 51. John 16. 23. Rom. 3. 4. Gal. 2. 11; whether the pope hath any privilege of office to be respected, whatsoever his person be, Matt. 23. 2. Luke 22. 31. See Roman church, and Peter. The pope pretended Christ's vicar, Matt. 23. 8.
- Prayer. See canonical hours. Whether the Papists use much babbling in their superstitious prayers, Matt. 6. 7; how we should pray always, Luke 18. 1; whether the church's collects, as they be brief, so they be all godly, Matt. 6. 7; how foolishly they break off their prayers, in their short collects Matt. 6. 7; whether they drive not out preaching, Matt. 6. 7; whether service and prayer in the Latin tongue, be much better than in the vulgar, 1 Cor. 14; whether it was always in Latin in the west church, 1 Cor. 14. in the declaration; whether our people at their conversion, sung Alleluia, and not praise ye the Lord: *Sorsum corda et Kyrie-elson*, 1 Cor. 14. See mass. Whether Augustin the monk brought service in the Latin tongue from Rome, 1 Cor. 14; whether the people's private prayers in Latin, be agreeable to the Apostle's doctrine, 1 Cor. 14; whether the people understand not the prayers in the English tongue, and whether more edified by them, 1 Cor. 14; whether it is necessary that the people should understand their prayers, either public or private, 1 Cor. 14; whether their intention and devotion be as great and acceptable in a tongue unknown, as a known tongue, 1 Cor. 14. Matt. 15. 8. Matt. 21. 16; whether the people are edified, and take profit by the priest's functions, though they neither hear nor see what he doth, Luke 1. 10; whether they are taught the meaning of ceremonies and service, and do know them perfectly in all Popish countries, 1 Cor. 14; whether the Popish church hath always allowed Latin prayers to be translated, 1 Cor. 14; whether Paul's place be falsely alleged against the Latin service or prayer, 1 Cor. 14; whether he speak of no such thing, much less against it, 1 Cor. 14; what it is to pray with the lips only, Matt. 15. 8; what faith is required in prayer, James 1. 6; whether the Ave Mary be a prayer, Luke 1. 28.
- Prayer for the dead, whether allowed in the scriptures, Acts 23. 8. 2 Cor. 5. 10. 1 John 5. 16; whether it be a good argument for prayer for the dead, that the Sadducees, or any other heretics denied it, Acts 23. 8; how other men's prayers and intercession avail us, Luke 5. 20. Rom. 15. 25; whether the Popish processions, matins, pilgrimage, be Christian public prayers, 2 Cor. 1. 11; how prayers of Papists are more available than of other men, Heb. 5. 7.
- Predestination and reprobation, how they consist with free will, Acts 27. 31. Rom. 8. 30. Rom. 9. 11, 17; how good works must concur with God's predestination, and whether as a cause or an effect, 2 Pet. 1. 10; what and how far we may and should learn therein, Rom. 8. 30. Rom. 11. 33; whether the Protestants have set forth heretical and presumptuous books of predestination, Rom. 9. 20. Rom. 11. 33.
- Priest, whether in common use it hath the same meaning that the Greek whereof it is derived, Acts 14. 22; whether it be heretically changed into elders, Acts 14. 22; whether it be the office and vocation of a priest in the New Testament, called *πρεσβυτερος* in Greek, in Latin presbyter, to offer sacrifice propitiatory, Heb. 5. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7; whether the sacrificing office of Christ be the same in dignity that the ministry, priesthood, or eldership of the Gospel is, Heb. 5. 5; why they are called angels, Apoc. 1. 20; how they are coadjutors with and under Christ, and work in his name, Mark 2. 10. Luke 17. 14. 1 Cor. 9. 1. 2 Cor. 2. 10. 2 Cor. 5. 8;

wherem consisteth their authority to remit sins, Matt. 8. 4. Matt. 9. 8. Mark 2. 10. Luke 5. 24. Luke 17. 14. John 20. 21. 2 Cor. 5. 8. John 11. 44; whether the Protestants carp at this authority, as the Jews did at Christ for the same, Luke 7. 49; whether we may not be instructed by laymen in default of priests, Acts 10. 40; whether none may have government of the church but priests, 1 Cor. 11. 34; whether Popish priests may not be despised, Luke 10. 16; whether double livelihood be due to good priests, 1 Tim. 5. 17; what pre-eminence they ought to have above others, 1 Tim. 4. 9. Heb. 7. 7. 1 Tim. 1. 20. 2 Cor. 8. 5; whether the Protestants make the name an odious and reproachful name, Matt. 23. 23. Mark 15. 11; why they avoid the word in their English translation of the New Testament, Acts 15. 6; whether perpetual continency is required in elders, or priests of the New Testament, Luke 1. 23. 1 Tim. 5. 22. 2 Tim. 2. 4. Titus 1. 6. 1 Cor. 7. 2. 1 Tim. 5. 14; whether the marriage of priests be unlawful, Matt. 8. 11. 1 Tim. 3. 4. 1 Tim. 4. 3; whether it be contrary to the ancient canons, 1 Tim. 3. 4; whether it be contrary to the Council of Nice, 1 Tim. 3. 4. Matt. 8. 14; what was the sentence of Paphnutius and the Nicene council concerning this matter, Matt. 8. 14; whether ever any were lawfully married after holy orders, Matt. 8. 14; whether married men being made priests must no more company with their wives, and that according to the example of the apostles, Matt. 8. 14. Acts 1. 14. 1 Cor. 9. 5; and according to the custom of the primitive church, 1 Tim. 3. 4; whether the church may annex perpetual continency to holy orders, 1 Tim. 5. 9; whether the forbidding of such persons to marry is no condemnation of marriage, 1 Tim. 4. 2; whether Jovinian's heresy of marriage be called of the Protestants God's word, 1 Tim. 5. 15; what harm is it to be like Vigilantius in allowing the marriage of priests, 1 Tim. 3. 4. See vow. Whether priests must have shaven crowns, 1 Pet. 5. 3; what was the priestly petalon of John, Apoc. 1. 13; who be called priests properly, and who improperly, Apoc. 20. 6; whether all Christians be not spiritual priests and kings, 1 Pet. 2. 9. Apoc. 1. 6. Apoc. 5. 10; what be their spiritual sacrifices, 1 Pet. 2. 5; wherein the excellency of Christ's priesthood consisteth, Heb. 5. 1, 6. Heb. 7. 7, 17, 23. Mark 15. 11; whether Christ be not a priest as he is both God and man, Heb. 5. 6; whether the Protestants be either Arians, or ignorant in avouching that he is a priest as he is God and man, Heb. 5. 6; whether Christ's priesthood be eternal by the succession of the Popish priesthood, Mark 15. 11; Heb. 7. 7, 17, 23. Heb. 8. 2, 3; and concurrerth still in all their priestly actions, Heb. 7. 23; whether he be not the only sacrificing high priest of the New Testament, Heb. 5. 1; whether there be many priests of the New Testament properly and peculiarly so call-

ed, whose priesthood is external, and not only spiritual, Heb. 5. 1. Heb. 7. from the 7th to the end.

Princes, whether they are to be obeyed in matters of religion, Matt. 22. 21. Mark 12. 17. Rom. 13. 1, 2, 4. 1 Pet. 2. 13; whether princes may not make and execute laws concerning religion, Matt. 22. 21. Heb. 5. 1. Heb. 13. 17; whether heathen princes commanding rightly in matters of religion, are not to be obeyed, 1 Pet. 2. 13; whether Popish priests may deny to obey the godly laws of Christian princes under pretence that Peter and John refused to obey the wicked commandments of the Jewish high priests and rulers, Acts 4. 19; whether obedience to princes be not due as well in causes ecclesiastical as civil, Rom. 13. 1, 2; whether the Protestants or the Papists be authors of rebellions and tumults, Matt. 10. 34. 2 Cor. 10. 3; whether Wicliff held any heresy against civil rule and superiority, Rom. 13. 4. 1 Pet. 2. 13; whether Papists be obedient in all temporal causes, Rom. 13. 4; how far princes must obey and be subject in matters of faith and religion, Heb. 13. 17; whether all princes are under Peter and his successors, John 21. 17. Acts 25. 19; how far inferior their election and creation is to God's institution of the spiritual magistrate, 1 Pet. 2. 13; why the temporal magistrate is called a humane creature, 1 Pet. 2. 13; how the Papists pray for kings and princes in their mass, 1 Tim. 2. 2.

Procession on Palm Sunday, whether grounded on the scripture, Matt. 21. 8.

Protestants. See heretics.

Purgatory, whether grounded on the scripture, Matt. 5. 26. Matt. 12. 32. Mark 3. 29. Mark 12. 24. Luke 16. 26. 1 Cor. 3. 12, 13, 15. James 2. 13. 1 Pet. 3. 19; whether men cannot be perfectly cleansed by the blood of Christ, but they must go to purgatory, Apoc. 21. 2.

Purgatory fire, whether it pass all the pains in this life, 1 Cor. 3. 15; whether it be released by the prayers of the living, Acts 9. 36, 39; whether there be such a third place, Luke 8. 55. Apoc. 5. 3; whether the scriptures be abused by the protestants against purgatory, Apoc. 14. 13. See prayer, sacrifice for the dead.

## R.

Reconciliation to the see of Rome whether it be to the Catholic church of Christ. See schism.

Religious life so called by the papists, whether like the solitary life of the ancient church, Rom. 15. 25; whether the confession of such sects of religion is according to Christ's counsel, and the apostle's example, Matt. 19. 21, 27. Luke 18. 22. Acts 2. 44; whether Vigilantius held any heresy against such as forsook all for Christ, Rom. 15. 25; whether divers religions of Dominicans, Franciscans, &c., be not divers sects, Acts 11. 26; whether their divers rules, and imitation of

- divers men, as the imitation of Christ himself, Phil. 3. 17. 1 Thess. 1. 6; whether their living in common be apostolical, Acts 2. 44; their rising in the night to pray, whether according to the scripture, Matt. 26. 41; their blessing how beneficial, Matt. 19. 13. whether their life be the contemplative life, preferred before the active, by our Saviour himself in the persons of Mary and Martha, Luke 10. 42; whether both those lives have been always in the church of Christ, Luke 10. 42: See monks and monastical life, Hermits.
- Relics, what virtue, or miracles, are done by touching of them, Matt. 9. 8. Mark 5. 28; Argument of Luke's Gospel, Acts 7. 58. Acts 8. 2. Acts 12. 6. Acts 19. 12, 15. Acts 28. 5, 20. 1 Tim. 4. 5. Heb. 9. 4; what virtue in the touching of Christ's person or any thing that belonged unto him, Mark 3. 10; the hem of his garment, Matt. 9. 21, 22. Matt. 14. 12. Mark 5. 28; his sepulchre, Matt. 28. 1; Mount Tabor and all the holy land, Matt. 17. 9. 1 Tim. 4. 5; his cross, see cross; Peter's shadow, John 14. 12. Acts 5. 15; his chains, Acts 12. 6; Paul's napkins, or that had touched his body, Acts 19. 12, 15; his chains, Acts 28. 5, 20; his blessing of the isle of Malta, Acts 28. 5, 20; his prison and other memories there, Acts 28. 1; the relics of John Baptist, Elias and Abdias, Matt. 14. 12; Stephen's relics, Acts 7. 58. Acts 8. 2; what Augustin held of relics, Acts 7. 16. Acts 8. 2; what Chrysostom held of them, John 14. 12. Acts 19. 12, 15; what Jerome held of them, Matt. 28. 1; Argument of Luke's Gospel, Heb. 9. 4; what Gregory held of them, Acts 28. 20; whether the greater virtue be ascribed to relics, the more is the honour of Christ, John 14. 12. John 9. 24. Acts 19. 12, 15; whether saints' relics be of greater force after their death, Acts 19. 12, 15; whether relics be miraculously preserved from putrefaction, Heb. 9. 4; what relics were preserved in the Old Testament, Heb. 9. 4; whether Vigilantius held any heresy against relics, Argument of Luke's Gospel, Acts 19. 1, 2; what devotion the old Christians had towards relics, Matt. 14. 12. Acts 28. 20. Heb. 9. 4. John 20. 11; whether the devotion towards Christ's body when he was dead, favour the Popish superstition of relics, Matt. 27. 59. Mark 16. 1; whether the Protestants abuse holy relics as Pagans did, Matt. 14. 12; translation of relics whether warranted by the scripture, Argument of Luke's Gospel, Heb. 11. 22. Acts 7. 16.
- Reprobation, whether it be for sin foreseen, Rom. 9. 1. 22; how it taketh not away free will, Rom. 9. 1, 22; how God raised Pharaoh, Rom. 9. 17; how he is said to indurate, Rom. 9. 17; how to give unto a reprobate sense, Rom. 1. 24, 26. See God, Free will, Predestination.
- Restitution of goods ill gotten, whether to be made according to the advice of the Pope and his clergy, Luke 19. 8.
- Reward, difference of reward in heaven, whether it be according to merit, Matt. 13. 8. Luke 19. 8. See heaven. Respect of reward, whether it should be the chief cause to move us to work well, Matt. 6. 4. Matt. 19. 27. Heb. 11. 26. Luke 14. 14. Apoc. 3. 5; reward in the scripture, whether it signifieth a hire, rather than a free gift, 1 Cor. 3. 8; reward for the relieving of the persecuted Christians, whether it be participation of their merits, Matt. 10. 41. 2 Tim. 1. 16, 18; life everlasting, how is the reward of the forsaking, or losing any thing for God's sake, Luke 18. 30.
- Rome, why called Babylon, Argument of both the Epistles of Peter, 1 Pet. 5. 13. Apoc. 17. 5, 6, 9, 18; whether the Popish church be not there called Babylon; why the Protestants think that Babylon doth not signify Rome, 1 Pet. 5. 13. Apoc. 17. 5; whether the ancient commendation of the church and faith of Rome, pertain to the Popish church, Argument in Epist. ad Rom., Rom. 1. 8; whether the Gospel was transported from Jerusalem to Rome, argument in Acts, Acts 19. 25; whether the Roman faith, and the Catholic faith be all one, Rom. 1. 8; whether the See of Rome have a privilege not to err, Matt. 23. 23. Luke 22. 31. Luke 5. 3. Eph. 5. 29; whether God's providence is towards the same more than all other states, Acts 27. 23. 2 Thess. 2. 3; whether the see of Rome be the rock of the church, and Peter's chair, and See apostolic, Matt. 16. 17, 18, 19; whether it hath stood and ever shall stand immovable, 2 Thess. 2. 3; whether Princes and Emperors ought to stand in awe thereof, Acts 25. 19; whether the ancient fathers of all countries sought unto it for resolution of doubts, and why many did, Luke 22. 31; whether all true preachers ought so to do, Gal. 2. 2; whether Heretics refuse only so to do, Gal. 2. 2; whether they be Heretics that hate this See, Rom. 16. 16; whether Heretics bark about the See of Rome in vain, Matt. 16. 8; whether the Protestants place Antichrist there in Paul's time, 2 Thess. 2. 3; whether the great Apostate that Paul speaketh of, 2 Thess. 2, shall be from this See of Rome, or of the See of Rome from the Catholic church, 2 Thess. 2. 3; whether the devotion of the Popish Romans in visiting the churches of martyrs' relics in their stations and pilgrimages, is a sign of greater faith, Rom. 1. 8.
- S.
- Sacraments, whether there be seven, John 13. 14. Gal. 4. 3. See confirmation, penance, orders, marriage, extreme unction. Whether Popish sacraments and ceremonies be few and easy in respect of Jews' sacraments, Gal. 4. 3; whether the sacraments of the New Testament be more effectual and beneficial than the Jews' sacraments, Gal. 4. 3. John 1. 23. 1 Cor. 10. 3. Heb. 9. 12, 15. Heb. 8. 2, 3, 7. Heb. 10. 1, 2; whether the Popish sacraments and ceremonies

in external elements and observations be not burdensome, Judaical, and heathenish, Gal. 4. 3. John 4. 23; whether the church, not commanded, may use external elements and ceremonies in winning of souls, by example of Christ, John 9. 6; whether Augustin be falsely alleged for two sacraments only, Gal. 4. 3; whether grace is given in and by the sacraments, *ex opere operato* of the works wrought, John 3. 5. John 4. 23. John 20. 22, 23. Acts 8. 17, 18. Acts 22. 17. Rom. 4. 4, 11. Gal. 3. 27. Eph. 5. 32. John 15. 3. 1 Tim. 4. 14. 2 Tim. 1. 6. Titus 3. 5. Heb. 10. 2. James 5. 14, 15; how the sacraments flowed out of Christ's side, and have their virtues thence, John 19. 34; how the contempt or omission of the sacraments is damnable, Luke 7. 30. Acts 10. 47; whether the sacraments are first to be called for in sickness, Mark 2. 5; the Popish sacrament of the altar, why called bread, John 6. 32; what is the mystery and institution thereof by our Saviour Christ, who were present at it, Matt. 20. 23. Mark 14. 23. Luke 22. 15, 19. 1 Cor. 11. 23; whether the Papists do imitate Christ's institution thereof, and the apostles' tradition, the Protestants not, 1 Cor. 11. 23, unto the end of the chapter; whether the Protestants have taken away the blessed sacrament altogether, John 6. 58. 1 Cor. 11. 24; whether the real presence, which the Papists affirm, be true, Matt. 26. 11, 23. Mark 14. 22, 23. Luke 22. 19, 20. John 6. 53, 55, 62, 63. Acts 1. 11. 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. 1 Cor. 11. 27. 1 Cor. 15. 41. Heb. 9. 20. Heb. 10. 5; whether the Gospel be so plain for the real presence, that Beza controlleth it, Luke 22. 20; transubstantiation, how proved, Matt. 26. 26. John 2. 9. John 4. 23. John 6. 63, 64, 66, 68; whether Christ did ever deal so miraculously and supernaturally with his body, that he took away the essential properties of a body, Matt. 14. 26. Matt. 26. 11. Matt. 19. 26. Mark 12. 24. Mark 16. 12. Luke 4. 30. John 6. 52, 62, 64. John 20. 19. Acts 9. 4. Col. 2. 8. Heb. 11. 1; what faith is necessary in this sacrament, Mark 14. 23, 24; whether the Protestants judge thereof only by sense and reason, John 6. 64, 66; whether they be like the gross Capharnaïtes, John 6. 65; whether to ask *how* it may be is a Jewish word, John 6. 52; whether they mock at the blessed sacrament, or at the heresy of the Papists, Matt. 12. 55. Matt. 27. 40. Mark 6. 3. Mark 15. 30; whether Christ be present by consecration, though the sacrament be not received, Mark 11. 22. Matt. 26. 26, 28, 29. 1 Cor. 10. 16. 1 Cor. 11. 24; how the arguments of the Protestants be answered, Matt. 11. 13. John 12. 8. whether the blessed sacrament is to be adored, Matt. 2. 11. Matt. 8. 1, 8. 1 Cor. 11. 29. Heb. 1. 6; whether it is to be honoured by carrying it in solemn processions, Matt. 21. 8; by costly altars, chaises, ornaments, Matt. 26. 8. Mark 11. 4; by clean corporals, Matt. 27. 59; by many other means, Mark 11. 8. 1 Cor. 11. 29; whether the angels are pre-

sent at the Popish mass, Apoc. 4. 8; whether the sacrament sanctifieth the altar, Matt. 23. 19. Acts 7. 33; whether it be the supersubstantial bread desired in the Lord's prayer, Matt. 6. 11; what pre-eminence it hath above manna, to them that receive it worthily, John 6. 49. 1 Cor. 10. 3; what wonderful effects it hath in the receivers, John 6. 54. 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17; in what sense it is called by the ancient fathers a figure, Matt. 26. 26; whether it can be both a figure and the thing signified, Luke 22. 19. Heb. 1. 3; how it is called bread after consecration, Matt. 26. 29. John 6. 32; whether Paul call the sacrament the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. 11. 20; whether the sacrament may be received in one kind only, Mark 14. 23. Luke 24. 30. John 6. 53, 58; whether the authority of the scriptures, and of the primitive church be for the same, Acts 2. 42. Acts 20. 7; whether it be a thing indifferent to receive in one or both kinds, according to the church's ordinance, John 6. 58. John 13. 14; whether for any cause the church can appoint one kind, John 6. 58; whether the whole grace be in one kind, and therefore the people are not defrauded, John 6. 58; whether the arguments of the Protestants be answered, John 6. 58. Mark 14. 22, 23; whether the priests only saying mass, must receive in both kinds, John 6. 58; what purity and preparation is required to the worthy receiving of the sacrament, John 2. 15. John 13. 5. 1 Cor. 11. 27, 28, 29; whether confession of every mortal sin be necessary before the receiving, 1 Cor. 11. 28; whether wicked men receive the true body and blood of Christ, 1 Cor. 11. 27; the punishment of unworthy receiving, whether it prove the corporal presence, 1 Cor. 11. 27, 30, 32; whether it be both a sacrament and sacrifice, Matt. 26. 26; the sacrifice of the mass, how proved, Luke 22. 19. John 4. 23. Acts 14. 12. 1 Cor. 10. 21. Heb. 7. 14, 18. Heb. 9. 12, 15. Heb. 10. 1 to 18. Heb. 13. 10, 15; whether the sacrifice of the mass is the self same that was upon the cross, Heb. 9. 25. Heb. 10. 5; whether Christ sacrificed his body and blood at his last supper, Matt. 26. 28. Luke 22. 19. whether Christ be often offered and in many places, Heb. 10. 11; whether the sacrifice of the mass be a commemorative sacrifice, and yet a true sacrifice, Luke 22. 19; whether it succeeded in place of all the sacrifices of the old law, 1 Cor. 10. 23. Heb. 7. 12. Heb. 10. 8; whether Christ by his death did not take away all sacrifices, but change them into a better, Heb. 7. 12. Heb. 9. 12. Heb. 10. 8, 11, 18; whether the external religion of the New Testament is principally in the sacrifice of the mass, Luke 22. 20; whether Christ's eternal priesthood consist in the sacrifice of the mass, Heb. 7. 12; whether the fathers call it the unbloody sacrifice, Heb. 9. 25; whether the most ancient fathers call it the mass, 1 Cor. 10. 12; whether it be called the Eucharist, and why, Heb. 13. 15; whether the general redemption upon the cross

- be particularly applied in the sacrifice, Heb. 10. 11; whether Calvin's argument against the sacrifice of the mass, make no less against the sacrifices of Moses, Luke 22. 19. Heb. 9. 15; whether the protestant's argument against Christ's body often offered, and in many places, was answered by the fathers long ago, Heb. 10. 11; whether it is offered to God only, yet in the memory and honour of saints, Acts 14. 12. 1 Cor. 11. 31. Apoc. 14. 13. whether it be a sacrifice for the living and for the dead, 1 Cor. 11. 31. 1 Cor. 10. 12. Apoc. 14. 13. See mass.
- Sacrilege, whether the Protestants do allow, Acts 5. 2; whether profaners of holy things may be punished in body by the spiritual power, Acts 5. 3; in what cases all vessels and ornaments of the church may be broken, and otherwise employed, without sacrilege, Matt. 26. 8, 10.
- Saints in heaven, whether they know our doings and our hearts, and hear our prayers, Matt. 22. 30. Luke 15. 7. 10. Luke 16. 23, 28. 1 Cor. 2. 11. 1 Cor. 13. 10; in what respect they be as angels, Luke 20. 36; whether they may be present with the living, Matt. 17. 3. Mark 9. 4; whether they may be present at their own tombs and monuments, Apoc. 6. 9; whether they are to be prayed unto, and whether they pray for us, Luke 16. 9. Acts 5. 15. 2 Cor. 1. 11. 2 Pet. 1. 15. 1 John 2. 1. Apoc. 5. 8. Apoc. 6. 10. Apoc. 7. 9; whether they be our mediators and advocates without any derogation to Christ, 2 Cor. 1. 11. 1 Tim. 2. 5. 1 John 2. 1. Apoc. 19. 10; how Christ is our only Mediator and only Advocate, 1 Tim. 2. 5. 1 John 2. 1; whether the conclusion of all Popish prayers is *per Christum Dominum nostrum*, John 16. 23; whether the Protestants' arguments against invocation of saints be answered, Rom. 10. 14. Heb. 4. 16. Heb. 5. 9. 1 Tim. 2. 5. 1 John 2. 1; whether Vigilantius was the first that denied praying to saints, and how he was rebuked by Jerome, Apoc. 6. 9; how Jerome saith that Christ and his saints are everywhere, Apoc. 6. 9.
- Saints' holydays, whether necessary and how to be kept, Matt. 2. 16. Matt. 26. 13. Gal. 4. 10. 2 Pet. 1. 15; whether their memories or commemorations are rightly kept in the sacrifice of the mass, Acts 14. 12. 1 Cor. 11. 34. Apoc. 14. 13; canonizing of saints, how ancient, and of what credit, Matt. 2. 16; whether it be blasphemy against the Holy Ghost to attribute false miracles unto the devil, Matt. 12. 24. See miracles, relics. Whether the great honour given to saints by the Papists, is no derogation to Christ's honour, Matt. 19. 28. Acts 19. 12. 2 Thess. 1. 10. 1 Tim. 1. 16. Philemon 5. James 5. 20. Apoc. 2. 26. Apoc. 8. 4; whether saints departed are patrons of men and countries, Apoc. 2. 26; whether they are called by the Papists, Saviours, and Redeemers, &c. without derogation to Christ, 1 Tim. 2. 1. 1 Tim. 4. 16. James 5. 24. Acts 7. 35; whether they may be called our hope, 1 Thess. 2. 18; whether we may believe in saints, Rom. 10. 11; God and our Lady save us, and the like speeches, whether they be godly, Acts 15. 24. Apoc. 1. 4.
- Salvation, whether any man can be sure of, but in an uncertain hope, John 15. 4. Rom. 5. 1, 2. Rom. 8. 16, 38. 1 Cor. 2. 12. 1 Cor. 4. 1. 1 Cor. 9. 27. 2 Cor. 13. 5. Phil. 2. 12.
- Salutations ought to be holy, and not profane, Rom. 1. 7.
- Satisfaction. See Penance. Whether one man's works be satisfactory for another, 2 Cor. 2. 10. 2 Cor. 8. 11. Col. 1. 24; whether John Baptist enjoined works for satisfaction of sin, Luke 3. 11.
- Schism, whether the departure of the Protestants from the See of Rome, is like the schisms of the Jews, John 1. 20. 1 Cor. 10. 26; to Jeroboam's calves and altars, &c. Jude 19; whether it be schism not to communicate with the Pope and his church, Gal. 2. 9. Eph. 4. 5. Luke 13. 26. John 15. 4. See church. Whether the sermons, service, prayer, sacraments, and especially the communion of the Protestants be schismatical, Mark 3. 12. 2 Tim. 2. 6, 9. 1 Cor. 8. 10. 1 Cor. 10. 20, 21. See heretics, and heresy.
- Scripture canonical and not canonical, whether the church have authority to determine, Gal. 2. 2. Introduction 1. Whether the word of God contained in the scriptures is elder than the church, and of more authority, Gal. 2. 2; whether the Protestants deny any books of the canonical scripture, and whether they corrupt the scripture many ways. See Heretics. Whether they make private fantastical interpretations of the scriptures, 2 Pet. 1. 20. 2 Pet. 3. 16; whether the Protestants allege scripture falsely, as the devil and all heretics, Luke 4. 8. John 14. 28. Rom. 8. 27. Heb. 6. 2. James 2. 21. 1 John 3. 6. Apoc. 6. 10. Apoc. 20. 5; women, how they may talk of scriptures, 1 Tim. 2. 2; whether the scriptures be hard to understand, John 5. 39. Gal. 1. 24. Luke 6. 3. Acts 8. 31. 2 Thess. 2. 6. Heb. 6. 4. 2 Pet. 3. 16. 1 Pet. 3. 9. Apoc. 20. 7. Apoc. 1. 1; whether Paul's Epistles be hard about justification by faith, and therefore misconstrued by the Protestants, as by the old heretics, Rom. 3. 15. James 2. 21. 2 Pet. 3. 16; whether the Protestants count all scriptures easy for every man to understand by his private spirit, and therefore reject the old doctors' expositions, and admit nothing but scripture, 2 Pet. 3. 16; whether their distinction be foolish that Paul's Epistles be not hard, but the matter be wretched of, 2 Pet. 3. 16; whether the self same scriptures are alleged by the old heretics, and by the Protestants, and answered by the fathers long ago, 1 Cor. 9. 1. 1 Tim. 4. 2. James 2. 21. Apoc. 5. 1, 3; whether the true sense of the scripture be only in the Popish church, 2 Cor. 3. 6, 11. 2 Pet. 1. 20; how the letter killeth, 2 Cor. 3. 6; whether the Protestants search not the scriptures deeply, but superficially, John 5. 39; who be the little ones that best understand the scriptures, Matt. 11. 25. Luke

10. 21; whether the Protestants follow not the humility of the ancient fathers in reading and expounding the scriptures, 2 Pet. 3. 16. 2 Thess. 2. 5. 1 Pet. 3. 19. Apoc. 1. 1; whether Popish Doctors only are right handlers of the scriptures, 2 Tim. 2. 4; whether the curse for adding and diminishing of the scriptures pertaineth not to Popish expositors, Apoc. 22. 18; of the translating, and reading the holy scriptures in the vulgar tongue of the difficulty of them, and with what humility they ought to be read, and of many other points concerning the sacred scriptures. Preface. Whether the Greek text is corrupted by old Heretics, and therefore not authentical, 1 John 4. 3. 1 John 5. 3, 7; whether the scriptures have not only a literary sense, but also an allegorical sense, Gal. 4. 24. Heb. 4. 4. Heb. 7. 2; whether the Protestants deride the mystical interpretation of the ancient doctors, Heb. 7. 2; whether the people may not judge of the sense of the scriptures, or of their pastors' expositions, Acts 17. 11; whether Papists find any comfort and profit in reading, and hearing the scriptures, 2 Tim. 3. 8; whether they find confirmation of Popery in searching the scriptures, John 5. 2; whether not only scripture is sufficient, but tradition also is necessary, Heb. 9. 9. 2 Thess. 2. 15. 2 Tim. 3. 15. John 21. 25. 1 John 2. 24. Apoc. 10. 5; and the apostles' and church's precepts, Acts 15. 41. See tradition. How the name of sect agreeth to Heretics, Acts 28. 22.
- Sin**, whether the Virgin Mary was conceived in original sin, Rom. 5. 14. 1 John 1. 8; whether she lived without sin, 1 John 1. 8; whether some sins be venial of their own nature, not deserving death eternal, Matt. 5. 23. Matt. 6. 12. Rom. 1. 32. James 1. 13. 1 John 1. 8; whether concupiscence be sin, James 1. 15. 1 John 3. 4; whether every mortal sin exclude a man from the grace of God, and justice, 1 John 3. 6; whether small sin, called of the Papists venial sins, may consist with true justice inherent, 1 John 1. 8; what be venial sins, 1 John 1. 8; how the Papists hold they may be taken away without any sacrament, John 13. 10; whether they may be forgiven after death, Mark 3. 29; whether all remission of sins is by the passion of Christ, as the only satisfaction, and sacrifice for sin, 1 John 1. 7; whether there be many secondary means and instruments of remission, by which the passion of Christ is applied and what they are, 1 John 1. 7; what is meant by sin covered and not imputed, Rom. 4. 7; whether sin against the Holy Ghost may be remitted in this life, Matt. 12. 31. 1 John 5. 16. Heb. 6. 4. See penance.
- Sin against the Holy Ghost**, whether there be any but final impenitence, Matt. 12. 31; whether the Protestants be worse than the Novatians in this point, that they hold the sin against the Holy Ghost is irremissible, Heb. 6. 4.
- Spirit**, what it is to adore, and serve God in spirit, John 4. 23; whether the church, and every private man hath gifts to prove, and discern spirits, 1 John 4. 1; how to try the spirits, 1 John 4. 1; what is the testimony of the spirit in us, Rom. 8. 16.
- Superstition**, whether it be allowed in the Popish church, Acts 17. 22. Col. 2. 8, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23; whether the Protestants call true devotion, superstition. Acts 17. 22, 34.
- Supererogation**, Luke 10. 35. 2 Cor. 8. 14. 1 Cor. 9. 16.
- Supremacy**, of temporal princes in matters ecclesiastical. See princes.

## T.

- Tabor, Mount**. See relics.
- Temples**, whether holy now, as the temple of Jerusalem, Mark 11. 16, 17.
- Tithes**, how due to the ministers of the New Testament, Heb. 7. 4.
- Tongue**, prayers in an unknown, whether lawful. See prayer. 1 Cor. 14. 1.
- Tradition** not written, whether necessary to be received, 2 Thes. 2. 15. Rom. 12. 6. 2 Cor. 3. 3. Heb. 6. 1. James 5. 17. 1 John 2. 24. Acts 20. 16, 37. 1 Cor. 11. 23, 34. Matt. 15. 9. Mark 7. 7. 1 Cor. 15. 3, 10. 1 Tim. 3. 8. Jude 9; whether the church have any such apostolic tradition, Rom. 12. 6. 2 Cor. 3. 3. Heb. 6. 1. 1 Cor. 15. 3, 15. 2 Thes. 2. 15; whether Lent be an apostolic tradition, Matt. 4. 2. Luke 4. 2; whether the mass be according to the apostolic tradition, 1 Cor. 11. 34, with a commemoration and invocation of saints, and prayer for the dead in the same, 2 Thes. 2. 5; mingling water with the wine, 1 Cor. 11. 34; whether baptizing of infants be only of apostolical tradition, 2 Thes. 2. 15; whether the Apostle's creed be only of Apostolical unwritten tradition, 2 Thes. 2. 15, other particular traditions, 2 Thes. 2. 15. 1 Cor. 11. 34; Pater noster in the mass, 1 Tim. 2. 1; keeping of Sunday, Easter, Whitsuntide, Matt. 15. 9. 1 Cor. 16. 8; how to know apostolical tradition, 2 Thes. 2. 15; whether Ignatius wrote a book of apostolical traditions, 2 Thes. 2. 15; what estimation the fathers had of traditions, 2 Thes. 2. 15; whether the Protestants hate the name of tradition, so that they suppress it in the text of the holy scripture, 2 Thes. 2. 15. 2 Thes. 3. 6; whether they are called by Paul depositum, Rom. 12. 6. 1 Tim. 6. 20; whether there be such a depositum descending from the apostles by bishop and bishop unto the end, which the Protestants cannot show, Rom. 12. 6. 1 Tim. 6. 20; whether heretics may be convicted by unwritten tradition, Matt. 1. 25. 2 Thes. 2. 16. whether Popish traditions be not like Jewish and heretical traditions, Matt. 15. 9. Mark 7. 7; whether the translation of the Bible into Greek, is cited of the evangelists always, and is authentical in the Greek church, Heb. 11. 21; whether the vulgar Latin be authentical, Heb. 11. 21; whether



Beza preferreth it before all other. Preface 30; how exact and sincere translators of holy scriptures ought to be, John 2. 4. Preface 37, 38, 39, 40.

Transubstantiation. See sacrament.

## U, V.

Vestments or apparel, Popish, 1 Cor. 11. 29.

Virginity, whether more meritorious than marriage, Matt. 1. 23. Matt. 19. 12. 1 Cor. 7. 9, 25. Acts 21. 9. Apoc. 14. 4; what was Jovinian's heresy hereof, 1 Tim. 5. 15; whether virginity be counselled to all, and commanded to none, Matt. 19. 12. See marriage. Whether virgins professed may marry. See vow. How the estate of virgins passeth the rest, Apoc. 14. 4.

Visions, what credit they have with Protestants, Acts 10. 30. 2 Cor. 12. 2, 21; whether we are bound to believe reports of visions not expressed in the scriptures, Acts 10. 30.

Uction, extreme. See extreme.

Vow, whether it be an act of sovereign worship, Luke 10. 42; whether true religion was never without vows and votaries, Luke 10. 42; whether the Protestants have abandoned both, Luke 10. 42; vow of monastical life, whether godly, Acts 5. 4; vow of virginity or continency, whether lawful, possible, &c., Matt. 19. 11. 1 Tim. 5. 9, 15; whether all young women may vow continency, or monastical life, and may be admitted to profess the same, 1 Tim. 5. 14, 15; whether the blessed virgin vowed virginity, Luke 1. 34; whether the daughters of Philip the deacon were vowed virgins, Acts 21. 9; whether the apostles vowed poverty and professed the religious state of perfection, Matt. 19. 21, 27; whether to marry after the vow of continency be damnable, Acts 5. 4. 1 Cor. 7. 7, 9; whether to marry after the vow of continency in them that are not able to keep it, is to break their first faith, 1 Tim. 5. 12, and to go after Satan, 1 Tim. 5. 15; whether it be the highest kind of sacrilege, Acts 5. 2, 4; whether it be worse than adultery, 1 Tim. 5. 15. 1 Cor. 7. 9; what virgins and widows the apostles alloweth to marry, 1 Cor. 7. 6, 9. 1 Tim. 5. 3; why Jovinian was called by Augustin a monster, and by Jerome a Christian epieure, 1 Tim. 5. 15; whether the Protestants called Jovinian's heresy God's word, 1 Tim. 5. 15; what vows are unlawful, and not to be kept, Acts 23. 12.

Votaries. See Christ.

## W.

Widowhood, how commended in the scripture, 1 Tim. 5. 3; whether necessary for them that must pray continually, 1 Tim. 5. 5; what were the church's widows called Deaconissa and their office, 1 Tim. 5. 9; whether they ought not to have been married more than once, 1 Tim. 5. 9; whether Calvin doth make a most absurd exposition of these words, the husband of one wife, 1 Tim. 5. 9; whether the apostle forbiddeth not all young widows to vow continency, 1 Tim. 5. 14. See continency.

Word of God, whether it is not that only which is written in the scripture, or that may be concluded out of the scripture, 1 Thes. 2. 12. See Gospel, tradition.

Works, whether any meritorious of life everlasting, Matt. 6. 21. Luke 12. 21. Rom. 2. 6. 1 Cor. 3. 8. 2 Tim. 4. 8. Heb. 6. 10. Apoc. 2. 22; whether any works with faith, and the grace of God are meritorious, Argument of the Epistles in general. 2 Tim. 4. 8. whether Paul exclude no works from justification, but such as are without faith, and the grace of God. Argument of the Epistles in General. Rom. 2. 6, 13, 26. Rom. 3. 20, 28. Rom. 11. 16. Gal. 2. 16; whether the Papists presume not of their own works or merits, as of themselves, but as of God's grace, Eph. 2. 8, 9. 2 Tim. 4. 8; whether the Protestants make no difference between Christian men's work done in grace, and the works of Jews and Pagans, Rom. 11. 6; whether they are injurious to God's grace which deny works to be meritorious, 2 Tim. 4. 8; how the scripture which they allege be answered, Luke 17. 23. Rom. 8. 18; whether a man is justified before God by works, and not by faith only, Matt. 6. 1. James 1. 27. James 2. 14, to the end of the chapter. Luke 16. 8, 9. 1 John 2. 7. Gal. 3. 10. Col. 1. 24. 1 Tim. 6. 19. See faith. Whether there be any good works before faith, preparatives to justification, Acts 10. 2. Rom. 3. 24; whether this saying of scripture, Every man shall be rewarded according to his works, is all one with according to the merit of his works, Matt. 16. 27. Rom. 2. 13, 16. 1 Cor. 3. 8.

## Z.

Zeal of Protestants, whether the, in punishing of Papists, be like the mad zeal of the Jews, Acts 17. 5









