„breeding: why did not you teach him better? *Answer.* Did your *Salamanca*
„Doctor of Diuinity come to learne breeding at *S. Omers*, amongst *School boyes*?
„You will find it harder to answer this question, then for me to answer yours:
„we taught no better, beeause he was eapable of no good instructions. What is
„bred in the bone, will not out of the flesh. The first noysome tincture could
„neuer be well purged out of that vessel: & for that reason he was cast out,
„that he myght not annoy others.

„ *Anonimus.* p. 10. thinks J indict *Oates's* father, & vouches *Cornelius*
„*Agrippa* for it, a man who was dead before ether of vs was born: & so could
„speak much to the purpose doubtlesse.

Papists *many Encroachments vpon Princes for these thousand yeares, proue*, say you, *their Inclinations for the future.* What will the *Encroachments* of Presbiterians, sine they appeared, proue? who haue shaked not Kings; but Kingship, not Monarks, but Monarky it selfe? which *Encroachments* were carryed on with that stubborn violence, that they produced wors effects in four years, then those things you mean of *Papists* could in all probability haue don in four thousand. To proue this, we need not examin Records, or read Historys; our own memory furnishes examples enough, which should not haue been so lyghtly past ouer, had not his Majesty by an vnparalelled act of Mercy forbidden all speech of them, nor mentioned, did not your Impudence oblige me to it. *Est coram hominibus dura fit frons tua, erubescit coram Deo mens tua.* Your conseience giues the lye to your words, how confident soeuer they seem. The disorders, which hapned in Catholick times are like an Ague in the spring, painfull not dangerous, & Leaue the body more healthy, then before: Those of Presbiterians, are like Putrid feauers, or the Plague, which leaues scarce hopes of Life.

„ J. P. p. 15. The encroachments of Presbiterians are no excuse of the en-
„croachments of Papists. *Answer.* nether did I alleadge them as such; but only
„to shew whence Monarky is most endangered: and to admonish our Pilots,
„that to auoyd a few floating reedes, they run not their ship vpon a rock.

„ You are offended, I say that *Disorders of Catholicks are like Agues in the*
„*spring, painfull not dangerous, & leaue the body more healthy then before: those*
„*of Presbiterians are like Putrid feauers, or the Plague, which leaues scarce hope of*
„*life.* Yet look on hystorys, & you will find my words tru in both parts. The
„Barons wars left the Authority Royal much better setled then before: so did
„the commotions of *Iack straw, & wat Tyler.* That betwixt the two branches of
„the Royal family seemes to me no rebellion, the titles of the two partyes were
„disputable, & a King was fought for by both sides: yet that ended in Monarky
„too. So *France* after its ciuil wars in the time of *Henry* 3. *Henry* 4. & Lewis 14.
„was



„was composed vnder Monarky much more absolute, then euer. Whereas the
„*Presbiterians* cast down King, Monarky, house of Lords, Bishops, &c. when
„did Catholicks broach such Anti-Monarkicall principles, as appeare of late?
„That the *King is but one of the three estates. That it is not treason to take armes against*
„*him, vnlesse it be against the other two estates. That the house of Commons made the*
„*King. That the succession of the Crown depends on the Parliament.* &c. It is nether
„the *Tiber*, nor the *Seine*; but the *Leman Lake*, & *Holland Bogs*, which send forth
„these Pestilential vapours. They were not heard of in our nation, till some
„Sir *Politicke would be*, began to dance the Geneua gig. What hopes of life, where
„the body politick abounds with such peccant humours?

„ J must take notice of your Presbiterian honesty in citing my words. I sayd,
„Papists Rebellions were like *spring Agues, painfull; not dangerous* you p. 15. l. vlt.
„make me say: *nether painfull, nor dangerous.* As if there were any *Agues* not *pain-*
„*full.* This dishonest shif shew that my vindication pinches hard, & giues you
„no real ground to confute it, seing you are forced to falsify my words, before
„you can answer them.

„ Anonimus p. 11. after saying much & prouing nothing, concludes that
„*Rebellions* of both Papist & Presbiterian are bad enough. *Answer:* we agree in
„that: may I say they are too bad; but the later are still the worser of the two. He
„aduises vs to change *our Principles*, for *his*: but doth not tell vs what those are.
„The passage from a Protestant to a Presbiterian is as natural, as from a Cater-
„piller to a Butterfly: there are in ward principles in nature for this, & in Doc-
„trine, & Religion for that. Which both experience & reason shew, & a Pres-
„biterian is half a commonwealth man, *ipso facto.* He may therefore conclude
„for the embracing our Principles

Lately in the low-countrys one (such a freind to Iesuits, as you are) charged them with the first murther in the world: for *Cain* & *Abel* were their schollers, & the master gaue them a play-day, that *Cain* might wreak his malice on his Innocent Brother. Nay the eating of the forbidden fruit was charged on them too: for another Iesuit Confessor of *Eue* told her she might eat it without scruple. With a like reason you accuse Papists, of what? why, *it is known* K. *Iames escaped not their poison.* To whom is it known? & by what Reuelation? Those of that time are silent. The Parliament held a while after charged the fact vpon a great Peer, no Papist. But K. *Charles I.* who had best means to discouer the Fact & most reason to examin it declared there was no such thing. Vppon what Authour of equal credit, is your knowledg grounded?

„ J. P. is silent here. *Anonimus* attributes the charge *of Abel's murther*, to *a sneaking*
„*monk*; as if there were no other men in the Low-Countryes. Then he cites
whole