

POPERY

Not Founded on

SCRIPTURE:

OR,

The TEXTS which PAPISTS
cite out of the BIBLE, for
the Proof of the Points of

Their Religion,

EXAMIN'D,

And shew'd to be alledg'd without Ground.

VOL. II.

With TABLES to the Whole.

LONDON;

Printed for ~~Richard Chiswell~~, at the *Press and Crown*
in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, MDCLXXIX.



ROY WAIN
1889
1889

The TEXTS examined which *Papists*
cite out of the *Bible* for the
Proof of Their Doctrine

OF

AURICULAR CONFESSION.

By Thomas Lynford

I M P R I M A T U R.

May 29. 1688.

Jo. Battsely.

THE Church of *Rome* taking all courses, whether direct or indirect, to bring Men over to her Communion, or at least to make them out of love with ours, as in other cases, so in this of Confession; pretends sometimes a great Friendship, at other times a great Enmity with the Church of *England*: sometimes we are reported to hold Confession just as that Church does; at other times we want one of the Christian Sacraments, and best means to promote a Religious and Godly Life. By the first of these they endeavour both to keep our dissenting Brethren at as great a distance as they can from us, and to tempt the more unwary amongst our selves to step out of, our Church into another, betwixt whom they are made to believe

believe there is already so close a Correspondence ; by the other they sometimes insnare the more ignorant and more devout, who are too apt to be misled by the specious pretence of better means of Salvation than they at present enjoy.

Now being engaged to examine those Scriptures by which the Doctrine of Auricular Confession is by that Church defended, that all Parties may understand one another aright, and there may be no mistake about our or their holding either too little or too much concerning it, I shall set down how far we agree, and wherein we disagree as to the fore-mentioned Point.

First, We agree that all ought to confess their Sins unto Almighty God. Not because God does not know them before (for he is intimately acquainted with all our most secret Faults) but because without Repentance there can be no hopes of Pardon ; and Repentance never can be rightly performed without Confession : Having acted contrary to God's most righteous Laws, we become thereby obnoxious to Punishment ; but such is God's Kindness to us, that for the sake of a Crucified Saviour he is willing to pardon such our Offences, provided we are heartily sorry for them, and resolve to forsake them ; but how can we be heartily sorry for them, or disposed to forsake them, unless we are willing to own and confess them ? By publishing our Offences before God, we discern the folly thereof, and God's Hatred against them ; and by making such discoveries, we become more ashamed of our selves, and more inclinable to make Resolutions of never being guilty of the like Follies for the future.

And this indeed is the true end of Confession, *viz.* to make Men reform their Lives. Let them confess never so much, it will all signifie nothing to them, unless it help to make them more vertuous, by causing them to reflect upon their past Actions, and by showing them how much they had formerly been mistaken, that so they might be aware how they were any more misled after the same manner.

Now as to this Confession which is made to God, it is either in the publick Offices of the Church, or in private.

In the Publick Offices of the Church, both we and they of the Church of *Rome* have Forms of Confession, but our are certainly much more useful, because our are in a Language which every one understands, but their are not: We, if we be present when the general Forms of Confession are repeated by the Minister, know how to joyn with him in them, and to make particular Reflections upon our most private, and most secret Sins, under those general terms which he useth. But they of the Church of *Rome*, unless they understand Latin, can do nothing of this.

As to Confession to God in private, this is left to the discretion of every particular Person to manage as he shall judg most for his advantage. In which case sometimes it may be sufficient to use such general terms wherein we own our selves to have been grievous Offenders, and therefore do heartily beg God Almighty's Pardon. At other times, the enumeration of such Circumstances as do set forth the heinousness of our Offences, may be of great use to make us more sorrowful for what is past, and more resolute not to be guilty of the like Follies for the future. For this, as I said before, is the true end of Confession, *viz.* to make us

Q q q 2

mend,

mend, and therefore in that consists our greatest Prudence, *viz.* so to manage it as that the end may be obtained. For if this be done, it is no matter whether it be by a general acknowledgment of our past Follies; or by a more particular enumeration of them.

Secondly, We agree that in case of publick Scandal given to the Church by any notorious Crime, a publick Confession thereof ought to be made before the Church.

This is what the Primitive Church was very solicitous about, and what the first Penitents did chearfully submit to.

This the Church of *Rome* does at this day more especially take care of in all cases of Heresy. For altho in most other cases Auricular Confession be allowed of as sufficient; yet in case of Heresy no Reconciliation is to be had without a publick Recantation.

And as for the Church of *England*, she wisheth (as we read in the Commination) *that the Godly Discipline, which was in use in the Primitive Church, were restored;* and in the *Rubrick* to the *Communion-Service*, forbids the Minister to admit any one, who has done any ill thing, whereby the Congregation is offended; to the Communion, before the Congregation be satisfied; which cannot be without an acknowledgment of his fault and the prospect of amendment for the time to come.

Thirdly, We agree that private Confession of Sin may be made to all sorts of People, whether of the Laity or of the Clergy; And that

1. When any Injury has been done another. Every body is bound to make some sort of reparation for
having

having injured his Neighbour. Now it may happen in some cases, either upon the account of the Injury it self, or the Circumstances in which he who has done it is placed, that the only Reparation which can be made is a free acknowledgment thereof; and in other cases where there is a possibility of making some other Reparation, yet still it cannot be done without the like acknowledgment, and begging of Pardon of the injured Party for the Injuries which have been done him.

Besides, such Acknowledgments do discover the sincerity of his Repentance who has done the Injury, in that he is willing to endure the shame of having his fault known by him, from whom, if he were not heartily sorry for what he had done, he had most reason to conceal it.

2. In case of any doubt or scruple. Some People are apt to entertain wrong Apprehensions both of God and themselves, and from thence to be very much perplex'd in their Minds in reference to their spiritual Condition, and the real well-fare of their Souls. Now in such cases what can be more fit and reasonable, than that they freely declare themselves to such whom they believe best able to give them satisfaction. He who cannot resolve all scruples which arise within his mind concerning himself; if he has any wise and discreet Friend; whether of the Laity or Clergy; whom he knows to be able to assist him in such his perplexity; is much to be blamed, if he does not what he is wont to do, when he is at a loss as to the management of his Temporal Concerns, *viz.* open his Difficulties unto him, and make the best advantage he can of his Advice and Directions.

3. In all cases whatsoever, Although in doubtful and difficult cases Confession of Sins to others is most necessary, yet even when the matter is plain before us, and we clearly discern in what our Offences against God do consist, it may then likewise be of great use to discover our Faults to them; and that

1. Because the advice of others, even in the most manifest cases may be helpful towards a right management of our selves, and we shall be better instructed to conquer and subdue our wicked Lusts and Affections, when to our own thoughts concerning them we add the Directions of others.

2. That we may have the Prayers of good Men to God for us; That he would be pleased to send his Spirit into our Hearts to enable us to overcome those Temptations which do daily beset us, and to break off those Sins to which we find our selves so much addicted.

Fourthly, We agree that Confession of Sin ought more especially to be made to the Priest, and that in all cases whatsoever.

1. Because he must needs be supposed to be best provided to give proper Advice and Direction in all cases whatsoever. It is his business and employment to study Cases of Conscience, and to prepare Answers to such Doubts and Scruples as are wont to arise in Mens Minds.

He must be presumed to understand better than others do the Nature of God's Laws, and in what the breach thereof doth consist, and consequently must needs be better able to direct the Sinner what to do, whenever he is tempted to act contrary to any of them. So that as in the case of Law-suits, Men go to
some

some able Lawyer for Advice and Counsel; in the case of Sickness, to some experienced Physician; so likewise in the case of any spiritual Distemper, they ought to advise with some of the Clergy, who must be presumed to be most skilful in such matters.

2. Confession to the Priest is most useful, because God has constituted him his Minister here on Earth, to declare the terms of Reconciliation to Penitents. And therefore for such to make Application to him for Counsel and Advice in all difficult Cases, and to receive the benefit of Absolution, must necessarily afford them great Comfort and Satisfaction.

From the Consideration of God's Goodness, and of our Saviour's undertaking for them, they may be encouraged to hope for Pardon and Forgiveness; but when he, who is appointed in God's stead to speak Peace to their Souls, recommends them unto God in Prayer, and upon impartial Examination of their Condition, pronounceth them to be the proper Objects of God's Love, and assures them that he is willing, for the sake of Christ, to be reconciled unto them, this will certainly afford great Comfort to their Minds, and make them more at ease within themselves than otherwise they would be.

Thus far we and the Church of *Rome* agree: but we disagree in the two following Particulars.

1. That Secret Confession is of Divine Institution.

2. That in Confession it is necessary to enumerate all our Sins, together with their Circumstances, of what kind soever.

These things the Council of *Trent* has positively determined, and denounced an *Anathema* against all such who assert the contrary.

Sess. 14. can. 6, 7.

My design at present is, to examine the Authority which that Council, and the Defenders of it, have produced from Scripture for the defence of the fore-mentioned Articles.

Now the chief place of Scripture insisted on, both by the Council and others, is that of *St. John, ch. 20. 23.* *Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever Sins ye retain, they are retained.*

Unto which *Bellarmino* annexeth these two as parallel, *Mat. 16. 19.* *And I will give unto Thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.*

Mat. 18. 18. *Whosoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.* From which places it is thus argued;

That since here is a Power plainly given by Christ to his Apostles, and consequently to their Successors, of remission of Sins; and that it is impossible that this Power should be exerted unless they come to the knowledge of them, and they cannot come to the knowledge of them, but by the Confession of those who are guilty of them; therefore it is absolutely necessary, that they who are desirous to have their Sins forgiven, should make a particular Confession of them.

In answer to which Argument I observe,

First, That as to that of *St. Matthew 18. 18.* it is by some made to have respect not only to the Priest, but to every particular Christian. For in the foregoing Verses, Directions are given to every one, of what Condition soever, how to behave himself towards his offend-

offending Brother. He must first admonish him *alone*, then in the presence of *two or three Witnesses*, then *tell it to the Church*, and if he continue still incorrigible, account him no better than as a *Heathen Man and a Publican*. And then immediately follows, *Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven*. By which words, upon the account of what went before, they understand a Power to be given to every good Christian of judging concerning any Offence committed against him, together with an assurance of having any such Judgment which he shall here make upon Earth (provided that it be just and impartial) ratified by God in Heaven. Hence St. *Augustine* saith, *Thou hast begun to account thy Brother no better than a Publican, thou bindest him in Earth, but take care that thou bindest him justly, for Divine Justice breaks in sunder the Bonds that are unjust: When thou hast corrected and agreed with thy Brother thou hast loosed him in Earth, when thou hast loosed him in Earth he is loosed in Heaven*. But suppose these words of St. *Matthew* were directed only to the Apostles and their Successors. I then observe,

Ver. 15.
Ver. 16.
Ver. 17.

Ver. 18.

Aug. de verb.
Domini in E-
vang. Mat.
Scr. 16.

Secondly, That both this place and that of St. *Mat.* 16. 19. may be interpreted with respect to that general Power and Authority which was given by our Saviour to the Apostles of determining in all matters concerning the Christian Religion, and of declaring what was right and fit to be done, and what was otherwise.

All are agreed that by the *Kingdom of Heaven*, is to be understood the State and Condition of God's Church under the Gospel, wherein he is worshipped after a spiritual manner as residing in Heaven, as giving his Disciples and Followers the hopes thereof, and as pre-

scribing means for the obtaining it ; whereas under the Law he was worshipped after a terrestrial manner, as dwelling more particularly here on Earth amongst his select People the Jews, requiring external Performances, and promising Earthly Benefits to such Performances.

By the *Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, is likewise generally understood that Power and Authority in his Church which was given by Christ to his Apostles, our Saviour therein alluding either to the Custom among the Jews of inaugurating or creating Doctors by the delivery of a Key, that being the Symbol of that Authority which was then given them, or to that place in *Isa. 22. 22.* where God, to declare his Resolution of putting *Eliakim* into the place of *Shebna* (whom he designed to remove from being Steward of the Royal Family) saith, *And the Key of the House of David will I lay upon his Shoulder.*

But as to those Expressions of *binding and loosing* there is some dispute about the Interpretation of them. For by *to bind* some understand *to prohibit*, and by *to loose* to *permit* ; and consequently that the Authority here given to the Apostles is, as I said, general, of determining in matters of Religion, what was fit to be done and what not, according to which meaning of the words the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* are said, *Mat. 23. 4.* *to bind heavy Burdens*, i. e. to impose some unprofitable Observances upon their Followers, by injoyning as necessary what was not so, and by forbidding as sinful, what might have been lawfully performed by them.

Now if the words be thus interpreted, here will be no countenance given to the Doctrine of Confession, as taught in the Romish Church, because the Power of *binding and loosing* will not then have respect to Persons, but to Things. It will be a general Decla-

ration

ration of what is fit to be practised in the Church of God and what not, which is here spoken of, and not barely a Power and Authority, with respect to those particular Sins which any Person makes Confession of. To countenance which Explication, it may be fit to take notice, that it is not said, *Whomsoever ye shall bind in Earth, &c.* but *Whatsoever ye shall bind, &c.* and that those who are skilful in the Jewish Learning do give us several Instances where the words *to bind and to loose* are taken in this Sense, adding withal, That since our Saviour made use of words that were usual and common, it cannot but be supposed that his Auditors understood him according to the vulgar meaning of them.

Lightfoot Hor.
Heb. in loc.

In the 20th of St. John it is indeed said, *Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted, &c.* and therefore regard is there had to Persons; but here no regard is had to Persons, but only to Things, *Whatsoever shall ye shall bind, &c.* and therefore it is not necessary that these places in St. Matthew should be parallel to that in St. John, since they may be interpreted with respect to that general Commission given by our Saviour to his Apostles of determining, as they were taught by the holy Spirit concerning matters of Religion, he at the same time assuring them that whatever they, according to his Word, and that holy Spirit which directed them, did so determine, should certainly be ratified in Heaven. But let us suppose them to be parallel, and that by *binding and loosing* is meant the same with *remitting Sins and retaining* them, yet is there here nothing which can at all favour the Doctrine of Confession in the Church of Rome, because I observe,

Thirdly, That *Remission of Sins* may be otherwise interpreted than with relation to that formal Absolution

which is given by the Priest to such as come to Confession. For,

1st, By remission of Sins, may be understood the declaration of God's Will concerning remission of Sins. The Apostles and their Successors are God's Ambassadors, and do acquaint us what his Will is concerning Remission of Sins; and that,

1. By preaching the Word of Reconciliation unto us. And in this sense the Apology of the Church of England acknowledgeth the Power of binding and loosing, of opening and shutting to have been given by Christ unto the Ministers; and the Power of loosing to consist herein; when the Minister by the preaching of the Gospel shall tender the Merits of Christ, and Absolution to dejected Minds and truly penitent, and shall denounce unto them an assured Pardon of their Sins, and hopes of eternal Salvation. Which is agreeable to what St. Ambrose asserts, viz. That Sins are remitted by the Word of God; whereof the Levite is an Interpreter and a kind of Executor; To the Author of the imperfect work upon St. Matthew his calling the Priests *Key-bearers*, because to them is committed the word of teaching and expounding the Scriptures; and to St. Hierom's declaring the Apostles to loose Men by the Word of God, and by the Testimony of the Scriptures, and by an Exhortation to Vertue. The Key of knowledg is committed to the Priests and they do understand best the Mysteries of the Gospel, and what are the terms of our being reconciled unto God, and therefore may be then said to remit Sins, when they conscientiously explain to us what God on the one hand has promised us with reference to forgiveness of Sins, and what on the other hand he requires of us in order to our being made partakers of such a Promise.

By Jewel's
Apology.

Amb. de Cain
& Abel lib. 2.
c. 4.

Hierom. l. 6.
Comment. in
Isa. c. 14.

They

They who out of Prejudice or Interest explain the Word of God deceitfully, and give such Interpretations thereof as do tend to promote Sin and Wickedness, these, like those Lawyers whom our Saviour justly blames, do take away the Key of Knowledg, and may be said to retain Sin, because they shut up the Kingdom of Heaven against such as would otherwise enter therein, whereas they who faithfully expound the Will of God to their Hearers, and do thereby help to further their departure from every thing that is sinful, do thereby exert that Power of remission of Sins, which is here by our Saviour bestowed upon them.

2. The Declaration of God's Will concerning remission of Sins, is made manifest by the Priests obtaining Pardon for Sinners by Prayer unto God for them. The Priests and Ministers of the Gospel are by God appointed to offer up Petitions on behalf of the People committed to their charge, and the great subject of such their Petitions must be the forgiveness of Sins. God is willing to be merciful to true Penitents, but he will be applied unto for it, and therefore remission of Sins may upon this account be attributed unto the Priest in that he does daily deprecate God's Anger against Sinners, and through the Merits of a Crucified Saviour, intercedes at the Throne of Grace for them. Hence St. Chrysostom informs us, *That Priests do not only exercise this Power of forgiveness of Sins when they beget us again in Baptism, but after the administration thereof, that Power of remitting Sins continueth in them,* and for proof thereof, makes mention of that Passage in St. James; [*And the Prayer of Faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he have committed Sins they shall be forgiven him*] and from thence deduceth this inference *that Priests forgive Sins,*

Chrysoft. *mel*
episcopus Bishop
 y. tom. 6.
 p. 17.

Ja. 5. 15.

not

not by teaching and admonishing only, but by helping us with their Prayers, which is the reason that all the Absolutions in the several Offices of our Church are in the form of Prayer. And even that most solemn one in the Visitation of the Sick is prefaced with an humble Petition to God for forgiveness of Sins to the Party who then humbles himself, and is truly penitent.

3. The declaration of God's Will concerning Remission of Sins is made manifest by the Priest's Administration of the Sacraments. God has instituted the two Sacraments on purpose to confirm to us the Promises made in the new Covenant unto us, and has therein set his Seal that he will make good whatever he has engaged to perform. Now remission of Sins being the great thing promised in the New Testament, is in the two Sacraments after a more special manner confirmed unto us.

And therefore as to Baptism, St. Peter's Advice to his Hearers was, *Acts 2. 38. Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of Sins.* And it is very observable what a Learned Man hath lately taken notice of, that *whereas St. Matthew speaks of the Power of baptizing granted by our Saviour to the Apostles when he was about to leave them; St. John instead of that mentions this Power of remitting or retaining Sins; and St. Mark and St. Luke speak of Baptism, to which the one joyns Salvation, and the other Remission of Sins; which Observation does very much countenance their Opinion, who determine the Power of the Keys to the Authority given by our Saviour to his Disciples of admitting Profelytes into the Church by Baptism, and that this Power being mentioned to have been given to St. Peter, had peculiar respect to his being constituted the Apostle of the Gentiles*

Mat. 28. 19.

Dr. Stillingfleet
the Council of
Trent exam-
ined, p. 124.

Gentiles, to whom he first opened the Kingdom of Heaven, as we read, *Acts* 10. & 15. And as to the Eucharist, our Saviour himself, when he gave the Cup to his Disciples, *Mat.* 26. 28. said, *This is my Blood of the New Testament which was shed for many for the remission of Sins.*

When therefore the Ministers of the Gospel do rightly and duly administer the Sacraments according to our Saviour's Institution, they may then likewise be said to declare God's Will concerning the Remission of Sins.

2dly, Remission of Sins may not only be interpreted with respect to that Declaration of God's Will concerning Remission of Sins made manifest to us by the Ministers of the Gospel in the preaching of God's Word, in Prayer, in the due administration of the Sacraments, but likewise with respect to those good Effects which are hereby actually produced in Mens Minds. When by a right application of the fore-mentioned means, they beget within Sinners a sober sense of their wicked ways: So that they are become heartily sorry for what they have done amiss and resolve to do so no more, when they have stirred up in them such an Aversion towards what is sinful, and have settled such excellent dispositions of Soul as do render them the proper Object of God's Love; so that he now looks upon them with a pitiful and compassionate Eye, is ready to forgive all their former Transgressions, and to receive them into favour. When, I say, the Ministers of the Gospel have thus disposed Sinners for God's Mercy, and rightly prepared them for the forgiveness of Sins, then may they be rightly said to *remitt Sin.*

But suppose *Remission of Sins*, spoken of by St. *Jahn*, has respect to the formal Absolution pronounced by the Priest

Priest upon the Confession of Sins, yet still the Doctrine of Auricular Confession will hereby be never the more established; because I observe,

Fourthly, That such Remission or Absolution may have respect to the publick Censures of the Church duly inflicted upon notorious Sinners. God has without question given his Ministers a Power of excluding all such out of their Communion as by their scandalous Lives are unworthy of it, and of re-admitting them again upon an assurance given of their Repentance and Amendment.

And this was early practised in the Church when publick Offenders were not permitted to come to the Sacrament, and at other times totally excluded the Congregation of the Faithful, and not again restored until by a publick acknowledgment of their Crimes, and a sufficient intimation given of their being reformed, they gave Satisfaction to God's People, whom, by their wicked Practices, they had so grievously scandalized. Now this is such a godly Discipline, as our Church is so far from finding fault with, as that she does most heartily wish it were restored. But then if our Saviour's words are interpreted (as they are by many) with respect to such publick Censures, then are they still far from countenancing such a private sort of Confession as the Church of *Rome* requires of her Members.

But let it be supposed further, that even the Remission of Sins here spoken of has respect, not only to Sins which have given Scandal and deserve publick Censure, but likewise to such Sins as are secretly confessed to the Priest. Yet then I observe in the fifth place, that our Saviour's words do not determine any such Confession to be absolutely necessary to be performed by

every one who desires forgiveness of Sins. We do not deny but that God has given his Priests a Power of applying his Promises to true Penitents, and of giving them the assurance of Pardon, if they find them fitly qualified for it. But it does not appear that there lies an absolute Obligation upon the Sinner to have recourse to the Priest; so that no Absolution can be had from God without his so doing. In cases of doubt and scruple it is highly expedient to give an account thereof to such as are best provided to resolve them. Nay, in all spiritual Cases whatsoever, it may be of great advantage to make application to the Ministers of the Gospel for their Direction and Prayers. But yet we are not to suppose but that if without doing this any one does truly repent him of his evil ways, and begs God's Mercy, he will be accepted by him.

It is God alone who forgives Sin, neither does he part with such his supreme Authority over his Creatures, altho he has substituted his Priests to declare the assurance thereof to true Penitents; and therefore where-ever he finds a proper Object of Mercy, there he reaches forth Pardon whether any of his Ministers are acquainted with such an ones Condition or no.

It will administer great Comfort to uneasie Minds, to have the Ministers of the Gospel, after a due examination of their spiritual State, to declare in God's Name, that they are Persons to whom the Promises of Forgiveness do belong; but still it is left to their choice, whether they will apply themselves where this Comfort is to be found.

If People will come to those whom our Saviour has appointed to declare Remission of Sins, such as are faithful Ambassadors of Christ will not fail to pub-

SSS

lish

lish it to all such whom they find fitly qualified for it ; but our Saviour has left no Power in his Church to compel them to it.

They of the Church of *Rome* will needs perswade us that God has tied himself to the determination of his own Priests, and that he will give no Pardon until they have declared the Penitent deserving of it. Now God may, it is true, appoint what means he pleaseth of conveying any Mercy to us; and if he had plainly said, that he would forgive none but such whom his Ministers, after a due Examination of their State and Condition, according to the Rules of the Gospel, had declared capable of Forgiveness, there had then lain an Obligation upon every one of us to have recourse to such his Ministers, if ever we expected the forgiveness of our Sins. But what our Saviour saith in this place of *St. John*, implies no such thing. Neither does *Bellarmino* any where prove (what he so confidently asserts) that the Ministers of the Gospel are so far forth constituted Judges by our Saviour, that all those who are at Enmity with God are bound to have recourse to them for Forgiveness. They may be so far forth said to be Judges, in that upon a due examination of their Condition who come unto them, they are authorized to pronounce the Sentence of Absolution upon all such, whom, according to the Tenor of the Gospel, they find deserving of it: But this does no ways infer the absolute necessity of having recourse to them for their Judgment; or that no Reconciliation can be had with God, without making such an Application to them.

And therefore that is a very ridiculous Inference of *Bellarmino's*, that because it is said, *Whatsoever*

you

you loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven; therefore it follows, that whatsoever you do not loose on Earth, shall not be loosed in Heaven.

They who with Sincerity do acquaint his Ministers with their Condition, and upon their acquainting them with it are, according to God's Laws, absolved by them, these have a well-grounded Assurance, that what is pardoned thus on Earth, shall be forgiven in Heaven. But still they are left to their liberty, either of applying themselves thus to God's Ministers for their Judgment, or of confessing their Sins only to God, who, without any such Application, will forgive them if he finds them truly deserving of it.

But to make one step farther, Suppose it should be granted that it were absolutely necessary to make Application to the Priests for the forgiveness of Sins. I observe then in the

Sixth and last place, that notwithstanding this, there would be no Obligation to the particular enumeration of all Sins together, with their Circumstances, which is a thing so rigorously insisted upon by the Church of Rome, as to denounce a Curse against all such as declare against it.

For besides that, this oftentimes is impossible as well as very indecent; the great business of the Ministers of the Gospel, in order to their giving any one assurance of forgiveness of Sins, is to examine whether he be truly penitent, which may be done without a particular enumeration of all Crimes whatsoever.

Had God given his Ministers a Power of punishing Sinners according to their deserts, it would then have been necessary that they should have had a particular account of all those several Sins which they had been

guilty of. But their Authority consists not in punishing, but in giving assurance of Pardon, and in order to their doing this, it is not so much necessary to know what kind of Sins he has been guilty of, as what kind of Man the Sinner at present is. How great soever any ones Crimes may have been, if he appears to be one who is heartily troubled for his having offended a good and gracious God; if he has emptied himself of all vain Conçeits concerning the best of his Actions; if he depends wholly upon the Merits of our Saviour's undertaking, and gives good reason to believe that he will be more careful for the future in the observance of all God's Laws; such an one may very justly be absolved, altho he who gives him the assurance of forgiveness of Sins has not a distinct knowledg of all his wicked Practices.

It is Impenitence only which can exclude from the forgiveness of Sins; and therefore where nothing of this appears but the quite contrary, there the Sinner may have assurance thereof given, although his particular Faults be only known to God and his own Conscience.

Where Doubts and Scruples arise in reference to particular Sins, there must be a particular discovery thereof in order to the obtaining a resolution of them; but in other cases, if the Sinner expresseth himself truly humble and penitent, that will be a sufficient ground for the Priest's giving him hopes of Pardon, although he is no ways informed concerning all those several Sins which he has ever been guilty of.

Having thus shown what little reason there is to ground this Doctrine of Auricular Confession upon this

this place of St. *John*, I shall only add, that several of the Writers of the Church of *Rome* have been of the same Opinion; and although the Council of *Trent* has founded the divine-right of Confession upon these words of our Saviour, yet that it has not been the traditionary sense of those of that Communion.

Gerhard Con-
fess. Cath. Lib.
2. par. 3. Art.
16. cap. 3.
Dr. Scilling-
fleet Council of
Trent examin.
p. 122. \

The next Text I shall examine, is that of *Act. 19. 18.* *And many that believed came, and confessed, and shewed their Deeds.* Where, by *their Deeds*, *Bellarmino* understands all particular Sins of what kind soever, and that the Confession here spoken of was to *St. Paul*.

I answer,

1. That it does not appear but that the Confession here spoken of was made to God alone, and not to *Man*.

2. That if it were made to *Man*, it is not certain whether it was private to *St. Paul*, and not rather publick to the whole Church.

3. That it is most probable that the *Deeds* here spoken of were not a Catalogue of all Offences whatsoever, but only of such as did more particularly respect the use of Charms and Conjurations. *St. Paul* having done many Miracles at *Ephesus*, several Vagabond Jews took upon them to do the like, and so call over them which had evil Spirits, ver. 13. but with very ill success, for the Spirits fell upon them and wounded them, ver. 16. Upon this the Name of the Lord *Jesus* began to be magnified, and those who had been accustomed to use Enchantments, being terrified with this Example, became Converts to Christianity, confessed

essed and shewed their Deeds, *i. e.* acknowledged the grievous Crime of being so-addicted to Magical Arts as they had been. Now there is a great deal of difference betwixt any ones acknowledging some particular Sins which he happens to be guilty of, and of which the present fear of Punishment has extorted a Confession, and the being obliged to make a Confession of all Sins whatsoever.

4. That altho it should be granted, that all Sins whatsoever were here confessed by these new Converts, yet this makes nothing for Auricular Confession. For we do not deny but that any one for Advice and Counsel may unbosom himself, and discover whatever he has been guilty of, but this we contend, that it is no-where absolutely required by our Saviour. If these new Converts, having sat in Darknes and in the shadow of Death, did discover all their Miscarriages, of what nature soever, to *St. Paul*, and intreat his direction thereupon, they did well. But altho they had not been so punctual in giving an account of themselves, if they had truly repented them of all their wicked ways, God would have forgiven them; and so he will every one else who does the like, altho he should not make such a particular discovery of his Miscarriages to those whom God has appointed to hear such Discoveries, and when they are made to apply his Promises of Forgiveness according as they are found disposed who make them.

Another Text insisted upon by *Bellarmino* and others, is *2 Cor. 5. 18, 19.* *And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the Ministry of Reconciliation, to wit, that God*

was

was in Christ, reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing their Trespases unto them, and hath committed unto us the Word of Reconciliation. From whence it is inferred, that since the Apostles, and consequently their Successors, were to be the Ministers of Reconciliation, it was impossible for them rightly to perform such their Office, unless they were Inform'd concerning the Nature of that Enmity which is betwixt God and Sinners, and this they could not be, unless they received from those who had offended, a particular account of their Guilt.

To which Inference I reply,

1. That these words are to be interpreted (as they are even by *Cajetan*, and other Popish Writers) of the preaching of the Gospel; the care whereof was committed to the Apostles upon our Saviour's leaving the World. God, by the Sufferings of our Saviour, did reconcile Sinners to himself, and necessary it was that some should be appointed by our Saviour to give notice of this Reconciliation: Upon which account it is here said, *that the Ministry of Reconciliation was given to them*; and *ver. 19.* *that the Word of Reconciliation was committed unto them*, i. e. that they were set apart to publish unto the World, *That God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing their Trespases unto them.* Of their being set apart for which purpose, *St. Paul* gives further evidence, *ver. 20.* *Now then we are Ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead, be reconciled to God.* For here the Apostle exerciseth that *Ministry of Reconciliation* which was committed to him,

him, but this he does without giving the least intimation of the necessity of Auricular Confession.

2. Suppose the Ministry of Reconciliation, here spoken of, should imply the Authority delegated by Christ unto his Apostles, of giving the assurance of forgiveness of Sins to all such who confess their faults, and are truly penitent, yet this does not imply the necessity of rigorously exacting a particular account of every Sin, with the Circumstances that attend it. For in order to the Ministers of the Gospel thus reconciling Men to God by giving them the assurance of the forgiveness of Sins, nothing is more required than to find out whether they are truly penitent, which may be known without such an exact knowledg of all their Sins.

And here it may not be amiss to take notice, that although they of the Church of *Rome* do exact a particular Confession of all their Sins from those who are within the bosom of the Church, yet they do not require it of such who are without, and only about to be admitted into it: Were an Heathen to be received into their Communion, a general Confession should then serve in order to his being absolved. But after he is once received, then whatever Sin he happens to be guilty of, his Confessor must have a particular account of. As if they did not care what they made the terms of Communion for the gaining a Profelyte, but after they had gained him, were resolved to tie him to the hardest terms they could think of. For otherwise since sincere Repentance is that alone which can give any assurance of forgiveness of Sins, there is no reason why, if this at first gave a Man a Title to
 God's

God's Promises upon his entrance into the Church, it might not do the same afterwards without a particular enumeration of all private Sins whatsoever.

Another Text is that of St. James, Jam. 5. 16. *Confess your Faults one to another, and pray for one another, that ye may be healed.* Where Bellarmine will have *Faults*, to denote all Faults whatsoever; and the Confession spoken of, to be made only to such to whom (he saith) it ought to be made, *via.* to the Priests,

I answer;

First, That these Words are by some interpreted with relation to those Injuries Men do to one another; and then the meaning of them is, — That they who have injured one another, should freely acknowledge such their Offences, and beg Pardon for what they had done, heartily praying for one another, that so they might be healed, *i. e.* either that the Sickneses of their Minds might be done away by God's forgiving such their Trespases upon their forgiving one another, or that their Corporal Sickneses, which God had inflicted upon them for such their injurious Behaviour, might be removed, and they restored to their wonted healthful Condition.

Secondly, That if the Apostle's words are considered as closely connected to what went before; then the *Faults* here made mention of, are not only Injuries, but any Crimes whatsoever, which God in the beginning of the Church punished with Sicknes; and the *being healed*, denotes the miraculous Cure of such upon

T t t

their

their Repentance; and the *praying for one another*, signifies the *Prayer of Faith*, i. e. the Prayer of such, who, from some inward Inspiration, were assured that what they had prayed for, should certainly come to pass. For the case in short was this:

God in the beginning of the Church was wont to punish several notorious and scandalous Sinners with bodily Sickness (as is manifest from 1 Cor. 11. 30. *For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.*) And the Apostle St. James here directs those whom God had thus punished, to send for the *Elders of the Church*, ver. 14. who were endued with a Power of working Miracles, (*Luke 9. 1, 2. Mark 6. 13. Acts 2. 43.*) and to acquaint them what they had been guilty of, which might give occasion to God thus to punish them; and if the Elders of the Church, from some inward Inspiration, understood that God, by them, would work a miraculous Cure upon such who were sick, they would then pray over them, anointing them with Oil, and the effect should immediately follow.

Now is there not a great deal of difference betwixt publickly confessing some particular Faults upon such an occasion as this was, and when there was such a Power of healing in the Church, and the being constantly obliged to confess in private to the Priest all Sins whatsoever? But they, who, from *anointing with Oil*, which was nothing else but a Ceremony of the Gift of Healing, could so easily infer the Sacrament of *Extreme Unction*, are to be excused if they have deduced another Sacrament from what is in the same place said concerning Confession.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, That although the Words of *St. James* may be thus interpreted with relation to what went before; yet they may be considered as a general Proposition, deduceable from what the Apostle had discoursed in the *14th* and *15th* Verses, concerning those extraordinary Cures wrought by the Prayers of the Elders upon such as were sick; and that because,

1. Here is nothing said concerning *anointing with Oil*, which was only used when any extraordinary Cure was wrought.

2. Because it is not said, Confess to the Elders, but to *one another*; which is a general term, and takes in those of the Laity as well as those of the Clergy.

3. Because there is annexed a known general Duty of *praying for one another*.

Now if the words contain a general Proposition, and that the Apostle, having shown how prevalent the Prayers of good Men are in some cases on the behalf of Penitents, does from thence take occasion to persuade all Christians to acknowledg their Faults to one another, that so by their mutual Advice and Prayers for one another, they may be recovered of all their spiritual Distempers, of what kind soever: there will still be less foundation in this Passage for the Doctrine of Auricular Confession. For then *Bellarmino's* forced Interpretation [*Confess to one another, i. e. you who want Absolution, to those who have power of giving it*] can never take place. But the Confession, here spoken of, must be mutual, of any good Christian to another: and it may as well be inferred from the latter Exhortation, to *pray for one another*, that none but the Priest

is to put up Prayers unto God for us, as from the former, that we are only to confess to him.

The last Text in the New Testament which *Belarmine* does more particularly insist upon, is that of *St. John*, 1 Joh. 1. 9. *But if we confess our Sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our Sins, and to cleanse us from all Unrighteousness.*

To which it may be replied :

1. That he himself is so modest as to assert Sacramental Confession to be only probably inferred from this place.

2. That he grounds this Probability upon the Supposition, that in the 20th of *St. John*, ver. 23. *Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted, &c.* Confession is determined to be of absolute necessity; and therefore that when it is here said, that *God is faithful and just*, it is with respect to the Promise by him there made, of pardoning all such who confessed their Sins to the Priest, and none else; whereas has been shown, the necessity of Auricular Confession cannot be proved from that Passage.

3. That the Confession, here spoken of, is (according to the Interpretation of some of the best Popish Commentators) to God alone, and does denote not a particular recital of all Sins whatsoever, but an humble acknowledgment (like that of the *Publicans*, Luk. 18. 13.) of having offended God, in opposition to their Presumption, who (like the proud *Pharisee*, Luk. 18. 11, 12.)

11, 12.) rely too much upon their own Merits, and (as it is expressed in the Verse precedent) *say they have* 1 Joh. 1. 8. *no Sin.*

Having thus examined those Texts wherein Auricular Confession is supposed to be directly proved; I might with good reason pass over such wherein it is declared to be only prefigured.

1. Because *Bellarmino* himself confesseth, *that Arguments, which carry any force or efficacy along with them, can be fetched only from the literal Sense of the Scriptures.*

Bell. de verbo Dei lib. 3. cap. 3. Con-venit inter Nos & Adversarios ex solo literali sensu peti debere argumenta efficacia.

2: Because when the thing it self is not to be found in the Scriptures, it is to no purpose to talk of its being prefigured. If neither those Texts which I have examined, nor any other, do clearly show Auricular Confession to be of Divine Institution, of what use can it be to appeal to other Scriptures for the finding out some resemblances of it?

But however, that all pretence of Argument from Scripture may be wholly removed, I shall likewise briefly consider the several Figures of Auricular Confession set down by *Bellarmino*, and from him borrowed by the *Catholick Scripturist*, and other Popish Writers.

The first Figure of Auricular Confession is fetched from *Gen. 3. & 4.* where God is said to require a Confession first of *Adam*, and then of *Cain*; by an Angel, the Representative of the Priest under the Gospel.

Bell. de Pœn. lib. 3. c. 3.

I answer: The Confession, here spoken of, was made only to God, and that the Voice of one walking in the

the

the Garden (*Gen. 3.*) said by *Bellarmino* to be the Voice of an Angel, was the Voice of God: For it was the Voice of him who gave the Commandment about not eating of the Tree of Life (*ver. 11.*) and the Voice of him who gave the Woman to the Man, *ver. 12.*

Corn. & Lap.
in loc.

The second Figure is found in the 13th and 14th Chapters of *Leviticus*, where the Leper coming to the Priest to receive his Judgment, whether he were clean or no, is supposed to prefigure the Sinner's coming to Confession to the Priest under the Gospel.

But there is a great difference betwixt these two.

1. Because the Leper's coming was publick; but the Confession required is private.

2. Because the Leprosie was but one particular Disease; whereas Auricular Confession is an enumeration of all Sins whatsoever.

3. Because the Leprosie was visible in the outward parts of the Body; but Auricular Confession is not only of open and scandalous Sins, but of the most internal and secret Faults.

4. Because the Leper came for Judgment, whether he were clean or no; but the Sinner who comes to Confession, comes to be made clean, *i. e.* to be absolved.

5. Because the Leper came when he himself was not certain whether he was infected with the Leprosie or

or no; whereas in Auricular Confession, the Sinner is supposed to be conscious of the Sins which he is to confess.

6. Because the Priests in the Old Testament are Types not of the Ministers of the Gospel, but of our Saviour, who is the Christians only High-Priest.

The Third Figure is fetched from *Numb. 5. 6. Speak unto the Children of Israel, When a Man or Woman shall commit any Sin that Men commit, to do a Trespass against the Lord, and that Person be guilty.*

Ver. 7. Then they shall confess their Sins, which they have done: and he shall recompence his Trespass with the principal thereof, and add unto it the fifth part thereof, and give it unto him against whom he hath trespassed.

I answer;

1. That it is not necessary that every Ceremony or Passage in the Old Testament should prefigure something in the New; nor that if Confession under the Gospel were prefigured in this Passage, it should be Confession to any other but to Christ alone.

2. That here is no mention made of a particular enumeration of all Sins whatsoever. The *Touch-stone of the Reformed Gospel* asserts, that by *confessing their Sin*, is to be understood *their Sin in particular*; and we could agree with him; if by *their Sin in particular* he understood (as he ought) that particular Sin whereby any one had injured his Neighbour, and not all particular Sins whatsoever.

Pag. 39.

The

Fig. 173. The *Catholic Scripturist* instancing in this Passage for the proof of Auricular Confession, cries out, *Behold Confession! Behold Restitution!* Which last words show that he supposed the *Recompence* here spoken of, to be a *Recompence* for some Injury done; and if so, then has the Confession here spoken of, respect likewise to such an Injury, and not to all manner of Sins of which any one happens to be guilty.

The fourth Figure mentioned by *Bellarmino*, is in Mat. 3. 5, 6. *Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the Region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him, confessing their Sins.* •

I answer;

1. That Confession here spoken of, is of such as were to be baptized; but Auricular Confession is required of such as are already baptized, and therefore it may be as well inferred from hence, that Men are often to be baptized, as that they are often to confess.
2. That this Confession was voluntary; but Auricular Confession is declared to be of absolute necessity.
3. That this Confession was publick; but Auricular Confession is private to the Priest alone.
4. That by confessing their Sins, can be only meant an owning themselves (as *Cajetan* and other Popish Commentators do affirm) to have been great Offenders; it being impossible to suppose that ever *St. John Baptist* could

could have heard the particular Confessions of all such who came to his Baptism.

The fifth and last Figure is fetch'd from St. *John*, ch. 11. 44. *Loose him* (Lazarus) *and let him go*. Where *Bellarmino* makes *Lazarus* his coming out of the Grave, to denote the Sinner's coming out of his Sins by Confession; and the *loosing him*, to express the Power of Absolution in the Priest.

I answer;

1. That *Alphonsus de Castro* having shown that no proper Argument for Confession can be fetched from the History of sending the Lepers to the Priest, adds that *the like may be said of what our Saviour spoke to the Apostles concerning Lazarus*; and that *Maldonat*, another Popish Writer, asserts, that they do not build Sacramental Confession upon this place, *i. e. upon the Sand*, but upon that other Passage, *Whose-soever Sins ye remit, they are remitted, &c.*

Simile est illud quod de Lazaro resuscitato, Christus dixit Apostolis, Solvite eum, & finite abire. Maldonat. in loc.

2. That our Saviour's Words do properly denote nothing else but the untying those Grave-Cloaths wherewith *Lazarus*, having been dead and buried, was bound; and although an ingenious Fancy may apply them to Confession and Absolution of Sins, yet this does not prove either of them (especially as practised in the Church of *Rome*) to be of Divine Institution.

3. That our Saviour spoke not only to his Apostles, but likewise to other Standers-by, who by untying

V v v

Laza-

Lazarus, were to be Witnesses of the Miracle wrought by him: and therefore if Absolution is here prefigured; it is prefigured to be in the People as well as in the Priest, and every private Person may from hence be concluded to have a Power of remitting the Sins of those who confess to him.

Having thus considered all the most material Passages, which the Defenders of the Church of *Rome* insist upon for the proof of Auricular Confession, I shall conclude with these following Observations.

First, That besides such Writers of that Church, who (as we have observed) do deny the several Passages before-mentioned to have any relation to Auricular Confession, there are others of the same Communion, who have positively declared that it cannot be proved from the Word of God; as the *Glossator* *Nicolaus de Orbellis*, *Scotus*, *Gabriel*, &c.

Gerhard.
Confess. Cath.
l. 2. par. 2.
Art. 16. c. 4
Dallzus de
Auric. Confess.
p. 12.

Secondly, That whereas they of the Church of *Rome* do so extravagantly commend those who come to Confession, and make it part of the Character of the most virtuous Persons; there is no instance of such kind of Penitents in Scripture, neither are any there commended upon any such account.

Thirdly, That *St. Paul*, who gives Directions almost concerning every thing relating to the Church, gives no Directions either about making Confessions to the Priest, or his receiving them.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, That there are in the Scriptures many places which do plainly declare Confession to God to be sufficient, as well as Instances of such as have had their Sins forgiven them upon their Repentance, without a particular enumeration of all their Faults, as in the case of the Prodigal Son, *Ista. i. 16, 17, 18.* *Ezek. 18. 21, &c.* *Zachau, Luke 19. 8.* of the Woman that was a Sinner, *Luke 7. 48, &c.*

T H E E N D.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswel at the Rose and Crown
in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1688.

THE HONORABLE
MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF
SOUTH-WEST
SOUTH-WEST

THE HONORABLE
MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF
SOUTH-WEST

The TEXTS examined which *Papists*
cite out of the *Bible* for the
Proof of Their Doctrine

OF

SATISFACTIONS.

(By John Ligonier)

PART I.

IMPRIMATUR.

Aug. 16. 1688.

Guil. Needham.

THE Church of *Rome* having advanced a certain Doctrine of *Satisfactions*, which they maintain to be founded upon several Places of Holy Scriptures, the design of some following Pages is to observe the meaning of those Places, and whether they be a sufficient Foundation of such a Doctrine. But for the better Advantage of this Design, that I may perform it with more Perpicuity, I shall discourse of these *Satisfactions* in some latitude, and explain some things that are previous, and in order to a right stating of those Scriptures which are brought for the proof of them,

X x x

I. I shall give an account of this Doctrine of *Satisfactions*, as it is asserted in the Roman Church.

II. I shall observe the Grounds and Arguments it is founded upon.

III. ~~There being removed, or there being no~~ Satisfactions for such Purposes, as they maintain them, I shall observe the Reason of Afflictions, and voluntary Chastisements or Penances, which are the Matter of Satisfactions, in the Church.

IV. And so come in the fourth place, to explain those Texts of Scripture which they produce for this Doctrine.

V. And, lastly, shew the Original of it, when it began, and was established in the Church.

I. To give an account of this Doctrine of Satisfactions, which is this, That God, upon the exercise of a true Repentance, through the Mercy of his own Nature, and the Satisfaction of Christ's Sufferings, remits the Guilt, and eternal punishment of Sin; but leaves a Debt of some Temporal Pains to be undergone by us, which we are to expiate, and satisfy for; either in the Afflictions of humane Life (as they are the Dispensations of Divine Providence) or in some undue Performances, and voluntary Penances of our own; which if we do not, they still remain upon us as a necessary Suffering in the other State. And by these Afflictions, or in these Penances, they affirm, that we can truly satisfy for the temporal Penalties of our Sins, which are still retained, or required from us after the Remission of their eternal Punishment.

Now all this is to be understood in respect of such Sins as are committed after Baptism; for those that are

antecedent to that are wholly cancelled thereby in that fuller Application of Christ's Sufferings; and those Persons that immediately die, after the Benefit of that Sacrament, as they are capable of no punishment in this Life, so they are secure from the Purgatory of another in the notion of these Authors. As if Remission of Sins, and the Application of Christ's Sufferings did not belong to a true Repentance, without which even Baptism it self of adult Persons would signify nothing; (*Acts* 2. 38. & 3. 19.)

This is the Sum of the Roman Doctrine in this Particular: The Professors of that Church very nicely distinguish the punishment of Sin into Temporal and Eternal, the latter of which they affirm to be remitted to all true Penitents through the Efficacy of Christ's Sacrifice; but the former to be payed and satisfied for in their own Persons.

This Doctrine hath a general Consent to it, although they differ in some certain Notions and Definitions about it, some maintaining that the Guilt of Sin, or the Offence of the Divine Majesty is remitted through Contrition alone, or in the Benefit of Absolution added thereto, and that the eternal Punishment in the Virtue of the Keys is changed into a Temporal, which Works of Satisfaction are necessary to the Discharge and Removal of.

Others think that both the Guilt and Eternal Punishment are remitted through Contrition, but that an Obligation still remains to some Temporal punishment in the order of the Divine Mercy, which the Gospel-Ministers in the Authority of their Priestly Office can remit one part of, and injoin some Penances as a Satisfaction for the other.

The Texts examined which-Papists cite

Now some distinguish in Sin, between the Offence thereof, or Averſion from God; and inordinate Appetite, or Converſion to the Creature: and for the firſt they ſay, being infinite, as it reſpects, or is an Affront of an infinite Majeſty, none can ſatisfy but the Man Chriſt Jeſus; and therefore this is only forgiven thro' the Faith of him, and his Performance on our behalf; but for the other, which is only a finite thing, every Perſon may ſatisfy in his own Action, through the Aſſiſtance of the holy Spirit which enables him thereto.

And as to the Efficacy of theſe Satisfactions, ſome modeſtly affirm that they only apply the infinite Satisfaction of Chriſt to us, and are effectual as they are joined through Faith to his Paſſion. Others maintain that they have no Value from Chriſt's Paſſion, which they would not have in their own Nature, though the Influence they are performed by, were obtained in another Means, or Conveyance to us.

However 'tis their general Doctrine that they are equivalent in themſelves to the Temporal Penalties due to Sin, and obtain in a commutative manner, the Remiſſion of them, as they are acted from the Graces of the Holy Spirit, which being an infinite Principle in our Souls, makes the Performances that derive from them, fully answerable to the Demerit of Sin, and a proper Satisfaction on our part for it.

Now it is obſervable, that the Council of *Trent*, which is now the Canon of the Roman Church, determines nothing among theſe Niceties of School-Authors, but only affirms in a general manner, that a Temporal Punishment is ſtill due to Sin, after its Guilt, and eternal Punishment is cancelled in reſpect to Chriſt's Merits, which muſt be undergone either in the Chaiſtiments of this Life, as they are inflicted by Divine Providence,

dence; or some undue Works, and voluntary Penances upon our selves; or else it remains upon us as a necessary Debt in another World, which we must pay to Divine Justice, before we can enter into the Blessedness of that State; but that by a patient sufferance of outward Afflictions, or Works of Penance upon our selves, we can fully satisfy the Justice of God through the Merits of our Saviour, and redeem that temporal penalty, or obtain a compleat Remission of the whole punishment and Guilt of Sin. And therefore these Satisfaction, as they are defined by Afflictions, or Works of Penance; so they are called Compensations of the Divine Offence, and accounted not only as proper Remedies of ill Habits, or Preservatives against fresh Miscarriages afterwards; but punishments of past Sins in order to the forgiveness and pardon of them. And that by this Means in the Help of Divine Grace we can purchase that Pardon, or fully satisfy, by way of equivalence, for the temporal penalties of our Sins. And not only so, but that we may perform more than is necessary upon that account, or found an Overplus of Satisfaction, which through the Communion, or intimate Relation of Christian People, they all being Members of one Spiritual Head, may be applied to the Advantage of others; upon which account the Saints may be called our Redeemers, as they deliver us from the Debt of temporal Punishment by the payment of it themselves, according to *Bellarmino, lib. 1. cap. 48. de Indulg.*

Concil. Trid. P. 124. Bell. de Indulg. l. 2. c. 6. for p. 660. Exam. p. 2. p. 206. Bell. ibid. cap. 1.

Now this Doctrine does suppose many things :

1. That Sin is not wholly pardoned altogether as to both Guilt and Punishment; but some part of the Penalty due thereto still remains after the Pardon or Remission of it.

2. That

2. That we can add to our Christian Duty, and arrive at a state of Vertue above the Precept, or perform undue Works, and more than is require, upon the account of our former Sins. And,

3. That these Performances, or undue Works, can satisfy the Divine Justice for the Remains of Temporal punishment due to Sin after its Pardon and Forgiveness, through the Efficacy of Christ's Sufferings: Nay that they can satisfy in such an abundant manner as may be communicated to the benefit of other People.

1. Now as to the first of these, that certain Temporal Pains or Punishments are still left as a just penance after the remission of Sin as to its Guilt and eternal Punishment.

This is, first, contrary to the Gospel-Covenant in the Sacrifice of our Saviour; *Heb. 8. 12. I will be merciful to their Unrighteousnesses, and their Sins, and their Iniquities will I remember no more*; that is, upon the term of a true Repentance, and in the special means of applying Christ's Benefits, *the Laver of Baptism*, and Regeneration, their Sins will I remit, as so many cancelled and discharged Debts, and deal with them as if they had persisted perfectly innocent, or never been guilty of Sin at all; according to the Doctrine of St. Peter to the obstinate Jews, *Acts 2. 38. Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of Sins.*

And we may be convinced of the latitude of our pardon from God by those Scriptures, where our Sins are compared to Debts, upon which account we are said to be Debtors, and the remission of them is denoted by the remission of a Debt; as *Matth. 18. 13, 14.* In the Parable of a King that would reckon with his Servants, where, upon the humble entreaty of one of them,

them, 'tis said, *That his Lord was moved with-Compassion, and forgave him the Debt.* And Mat. 6. 9. that Petition in our Lord's Prayer is thus expressed, *Forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors.* Now as we cannot imagine that he answers this Precept, or the qualification of Forgiveness at God's Hands, who remits a part of his Brother's Trespases, and revenges or challenges a Recompence for the rest, but that a plenary Remission is enjoined hereby, that we receive our offending Brethren into all the Beneficence or kind effects of Christian Charity; so neither can we interpret the Divine Mercy concerning a part of our Offences, when God declares in an indefinite manner, that he will *forgive us our Debts*, or that he does forgive them in regard to Christ's Sufferings, according to the Apostle, Col. 3. 32. where he also sets forth our Christian Duty by way of Simile, *Be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you.* Now as Forgiveness denotes the removing of the Punishment, so that cannot support the Roman Doctrine, which they commonly say, that God forgives the greatest part of the punishment of Sin in regard to what he requires of us according to the Relation of eternal and temporal pains to one another; seeing there is no mention of this in the Revelation of God's Word, which is the only measure of our Knowledge concerning the Mercy and free Emanations of the Divine Nature; and seeing this derogates from the performance of our Saviour, and leaves but one part of our Redemption to him, whose purchase it wholly is, and whom it does intirely belong to; (of which more afterwards.)

Nor is this reconcileable to the ordinary Acception, and custom of Speech among Men, to remit any thing,

and

yet demand the solution of one half of it; as it is inconsistent with the use of those Words which the Scriptures express this thing by, which signify freely to pardon without any thing of equivalent, or compensation thereto, (*χαριστάσαι*) and to put away or remove from one, (*ἀφίεναι*) or when it passes into a third Person; *liberare debitorem per acceptilationem & dicere acceptum fero*; to set free a Debtor by an Acquittance, wherein the Creditor does declare that he is satisfied as much as if he had received the full payment. This is the acceptance of the Word among prophane Authors, and may be best explained as to its importance among the Penmen of the holy Scriptures, by St. John, where he joins this with the opposite Word (*νεγιέν*) to hold or retain, chap. 20. 23. *Whose soever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever Sins ye retain, they are retained*; that is, those Persons whom ye the Apostles rightly receive into the Communion of the Church, upon the profession of a true Faith, and Repentance of their past Sins, they shall partake of all the Advantages and Priviledges thereof, Remission of Sins, a more plentiful influence of God's Spirit and eternal Happiness, afterwards; and those Persons whom ye exclude from that Communion, as truly wanting a Christian Habit in their Minds, shall still remain under the consequence of their Sins, both in this and the other World.

And those other Places of holy Scripture, which declare the pardon of Sin to be a gratuitous and free thing, cannot be accommodated to this Doctrine, as Rom. 3. 24. *We are justified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus.* And Eph. 1. 7. *We have Redemption through his Blood, the remission of Sins, according to the Riches of his Grace*; that is, our Sins are freely pardoned in the Benignity of the Divine Nature, through

through the Ransom of our blessed Saviour; but how can that be gratuitous and free, or what Relation has it to the *Benignity* of the Divine Nature, when we suffer half of the Punishment due to Sin, and as it were, purchase it by that Means?

And those Expressions among the Prophets, of *God's blotting out Transgressions as a thick Cloud*, whensoever any truly repents of them, *Isa. 43. 25. & 44. 22. his subduing our Iniquities, and casting our Sins into the depths of the Sea*, *Micah 7. 19. Psal. 103. 12.* his promising Life to the penitent Sinner, whatsoever his Miscarriages have been before: These cannot consist with an Obligation still left to some Penalties for past Sins, but must needs import a full exemption from all Sufferings, by way of Punishment; upon that account, as well temporal as eternal, either of which are not reconcilable to such Expressions, nor would it be a *blotting out Transgressions*, where some of the Punishment is still retained.

And more expressly, as a refutation of this Doctrine, *Rom. 8. 1. There is no Condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit*; that is, those who endeavour in an honest compliance with Divine Grace, to subdue their carnal Affections, and follow the Dictates of their Spirits, and the more certain Suggestions of the Spirit of God, as those are displayed upon that Principle, and intermingled or blended with it; such Persons, although they be guilty of many Miscarriages, as the necessary Results of humane Infirmary, yet in the efficacy of Christ's Sacrifice they shall be fully acquitted and discharged therefrom, so as no Condemnation shall ensue, nor any punishment temporal or eternal. This is the notion of the Words, that thro' the means of Christ's Sufferings, we are rescued from the penalties of our Sins, and this Benefit

ness is only applied to those Persons that pursue a Gospel-Life, and are only chargeable with the lapses of humane Nature, or truly repent of deliberate Sins. And those following Words have the same importance, *ver.* 34. *Who is he that condemneth? 'tis Christ that died, or rather that is risen again; that is, 'tis an unreasonable thing to condemn or adjudg to any punishment the pious Professors of Christ's Name, seeing he has suffered upon their account, and payed the price of their Redemption.*

And 'tis a more plain Affirmation of our Impunity, as also of the Means by which it was purchased, and acquired for us, that of the Apostle in two parallel places, *Gal.* 3. 13. *Christ hath redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, being made a Curse for us: And God hath made him to be Sin for us, who knew no Sin, that we might be made the Righteousness of God in him; that is, the Death and Sufferings of the Man Christ Jesus being so righteous as he was to the utmost rigour of the Law, were upon our account, to redeem us thereby from the just demerits and stipend of our Sins, that he being treated as a sinful Man, we should be considered upon the exercise of a true Repentance, notwithstanding the many Failures we are guilty of, as righteous Persons, and wholly acquitted from the penalties due to them. For if there should be any remainder of so much as a temporal punishment unremoved by this Mediation of our Saviour, it could not be said in an indefinite manner, that he hath redeemed us from the Curse, or that we were made the Righteousness of God in him.*

And pursuant to this purpose is that other place of the Apostle, *Rom.* 5. 1. *Therefore being justified by Faith, we have Peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; that is, being arrived at the due Improvement of a Christi-*

an Faith, such as belongs to the farther Discoveries, or Revelation of the Gospel, which will carry us to a higher advancement of Holiness of Life, as we are possessed of a higher degree and proportion of it; we being arrived at this Christian Faith, the most powerful inducement of a virtuous Conversation, shall be rescued from the penalty of our past Sins, or have Peace with God, through the Atonement of his Son, and be no longer in a state of Displeasure or Enmity with him.

All these places plainly manifest that when we have arrived at the qualifications of Forgiveness, according to the tenour of the Gospel-Covenant, we are fully exempt from all Sufferings upon the score of former Sins, and have no remains of any sort of Punishment to be undergone by us, the whole guilt and the whole punishment being both remitted and relaxed together.

And, moreover, as it would argue Insincerity and Unfaithfulness in God to deal with us so expressly contrary to his own Declarations in his holy Word, so it would likewise be a plain repugnancy to his Justice. He has been graciously pleased to confirm and ratify a New Covenant with Mankind in his Son, in which he has promised upon certain terms of Faith and Repentance, to constitute him a Sacrifice for us, and transfer the punishment of our past Sins to him, or indemnify us through his Sufferings: Of which we find an express account in many places of holy Scripture; thus in that particular Prophecy to this purpose, *Isa. 53. 4, 5, 6. Surely he hath born our Grievs; and carried our Sorrows; he was wounded for our Transgressions, he was bruised for our Iniquities; the chastisement of our Peace was upon him, and with his Stripes we are healed, &c. the Lord has laid on him the Iniquity of us all: and ver. 12. He was numbred with the Transgressors, and he bare the Sin of many, &c.* part of which

*

Y y y 2

which is cited by St. Peter, 1 Epist. 2. 24. *His own self bare our Sins in his own Body on the Tree, that we being dead to Sin, might live unto Righteousness, by whose Stripes we are healed.* And so the Apostle to the Hebrews, chap. 9. 28. *Christ was once offered to bear the Sins of many. And Christ hath once suffered for Sins, the just for the Unjust,* 1 Pet. 3. 18. And he is described by the Baptist, *the Lamb that taketh away the Sins of the World;* Joh. 1. 29. And in those places mentioned before, *He was made a Curse for us, and he was made Sin for us;* that is, according to the Idiotism of the Hebrew Language, he was a Sacrifice for our Sins. Now then our Ransom being paid in Christ, or he having suffered the full demerit of our Sins in our room, as having no foundation of Sufferings in his own Person, we are fully acquitted from that Debt, if we only perform those terms, which in the dispensation of the Divine Wisdom apply those Sufferings to our account, or transfer the benefit thereof to us; and it would be an Instance of Injustice to require a Satisfaction of penitent Sinners for their past Misdemeanours, as it would be for a Creditor to demand that Debt from any Person, which his Surety had discharged before either in kind or in something else of a higher value.

And then this depreciates the infinite payment and satisfaction of Christ, if there be still some temporal pains left to us upon the score of former Sins, which we must sustain in our own Persons after a true Repentance of them, then Christ did redeem us but in part, and did not wholly satisfy for us, which must either be chargeable on the Divine purpose, and so would be a plain Collusion in the God of Truth, or on the Inefficacy of Christ's Sufferings, as if they were insufficient to compensate the Divine Justice, or to purchase our Impunity

punity, and some Satisfaction of our own were to be joined with them to render them adequate upon that account.

But then they say that Christ immediately satisfied for the eternal punishment and guilt of Sin, and immediately for temporal pains likewise, in as much as he obtained such an influence of Divine Grace, by which we may satisfy our own selves.

Which Doctrine, as a fuller evidence of the Absurdity of it, ascribes this Satisfaction to the Person of the Father as his Act, who was the Object thereof, or whom it was offered as an Atonement to, in as much as he being the Root of the Divine Nature did communicate, by an eternal Emanation; those Powers to Christ, which enabled him to satisfy for us. But if it must be ascribed to Christ who performed that bitter Instance, or as himself speaks in the Prophet, *who trode the Wine-press alone of the Wrath of God, Isa. 63. 3.* then it is a dangerous thing thus to diminish the inestimable Value of his Sufferings, and deprive him of the Merit of one half of them by a sacrilegious reference to our selves; which would induce one to believe no Satisfaction at all, and so detain one under the horror of his Sins, or prevent the happy confidence of remission of them, and the Saving Graces of God's Spirit to enable him against them for the time to come.

And it is also bold and venturesom to assert such a Doctrine as has no support in holy Scripture, there being no-where any mention there of this half-Satisfaction, or that Christ satisfied for the whole Guilt of our Sins, but not the whole punishment of them; but that he universally suffered for Sin, and entirely dissolved the Obligation thereof. The Apostle says, *Col. 2. 14. That he blotted out the Hand-writing of Ordinances against us,*
which

which was contrary to us, and took it away, nailing it to the Cross. But if a company of temporal punishments still remain to be satisfied for in our own Persons, which were not expiated in Christ's Sufferings, then the Hand-writing is still unremoved, and in force against us.

But moreover there are several Absurdities in this Doctrine upon their own Principles; first, that venial Sins, as they stile some, only having a temporal Punishment belonging to them, which must always be suffered and satisfied for in our own Persons, are not included in Christ's Sacrifice, and such Persons as are only guilty of those, have no benefit there-from as to the Pardon obtained by it: which is a direct repugnancy to the Apostle, 1 John 1. 7. *If we walk in the Light as he is in the Light, the Blood of Christ Jesus cleanseth us from all Sin;* that is, every Sin is acquitted and pardoned to us thro' him upon a due disposal, and qualification in our selves.

And they maintain, that Sin is wholly remitted and pardoned in Baptism, both as to the Guilt and Punishment of it: which is a flat Contradiction to their other Assertion, that we must satisfy our selves for some part of the punishment of Sin, notwithstanding the infinite Payment and Satisfaction of Christ; for the efficacy of Baptism does wholly derive from Christ's Satisfaction, and we partake of nothing in that Sacrament, but what is the Purchase and Influence thereof, and therefore seeing the temporal pains of those Sins, that were acted before, are remitted in Baptism; it plainly follows, even upon their Principles, that Christ's Satisfaction is applicable to the whole penalty of Sin, and no portion thereof is left undischarged by it. But 'tis the fate of an erroneous Doctrine, that one always falls into contradiction in the Defence thereof, which Truth alone, from the Uniformity it carries to all the Parts and Branches of it, can secure us from.

And

And whereas they affirm that Christ satisfied for the eternal punishment of Sin, and that mortal Sins have only such belonging to them. This would make the circumstance of such Persons, who have been guilty of these, after Repentance, and the Application of Christ's Sufferings in the Sacrament, much better, than what is the Portion of less Offenders, which is Confutation enough only to mention.

But then sometimes they say, to save this (with what consistency let themselves consider) that although God requires a certain punishment, either here, or in Purgatory, from the truest Converts, yet he exchanges an immense Debt for a little Sum, and only inflicts some temporary Sufferings for eternal Misery. This indeed, if he should do of his own Benignity, as it was to accept of a Surety and Mediator for us at the first, without any Payment or Solution made, would have been an Instance of great Grace; but seeing he has accepted of a Surety, and the whole account is cancelled in him, he cannot rightfully challenge any share or portion of it over again; and the smallness of the Challenge does not at all help the matter, seeing 'tis the same Injustice although less Injury, to demand a parcel only where all was discharged and paid before, as to insist on the whole Sum.

And if this be so contrary to the Justice of God, it is much more so to the benignity and immense Goodness of his Nature. For seeing the Scriptures every-where teach us (as they also confess themselves) that God, through the performance of our blessed Saviour, is no more an angry Judge, but a compassionate and loving Father, and that *his Love* does far exceed the strongest Affection in human Nature of Parents to their Children, *this* being abundantly with more concern in him, although devoid of Fondness & Passion, it cannot be imagined how that

that unusual Severity should consist with that strength of Affection; that he who has remitted eternal Death to us most deserving of it, should yet require those Penalties from us which are inconsistent with the notion of remission of Sins, or which, if the Offence be forgiven through the Merit of Christ's Sacrifice, we are no ways under the Obligation of.

Thus the Doctrine of some remains of temporal Punishments, after the pardon of Sin, as to its Guilt and eternal Consequence, is expressly contrary to abundance of Places of holy Scripture, which being a matter of God's free Bounty, is only to be known & observed therefrom.

It is also repugnant to the Divine Justice to demand a Debt twice over that in our own Act and Performance, which was already satisfied for by the great Oblation of Christ Jesus for the Sins of the whole World.

It also depreciates the infinite Value of this Oblation, when it is not allowed to extend to the *whole demerit* of our Sins, but we must atone for one part of it in our own Persons.

'Tis likewise inconsistent with the Fatherly Affections, and Kindness of God through Christ Jesus, to punish those whom he has admitted to Reconciliation and Friendship in regard to his Sufferings. From all which it plainly follows, that there is no reserve of temporal Punishment left to Sin after the pardon and forgiveness of it, through the Efficacy of Christ's Sufferings, and the qualification of a true Repentance on our part, which was the first ground of the Doctrine of Satisfaction.

The second is that we can supererogate with God; that is, that we can arrive at a state of Vertue above the Precept and Obligation of our Christian Duty, or perform undue Works, and suffer more than the Demerit of our former Sins. Which we shall find

find quite impossible both in respect of *Action, and Sufferings.*

As to the *former*, the entire use of all our Faculties belongs to him, from whom we received them, or who made and framed us in these admirable Advantages of reasonable Creatures; there is nothing that we can perform or do, that can exceed such great Obligations on our Side, the utmost effort of our reasonable Powers in his Service, and to his Glory is no more than a just Gratitude, or equitable discharge of our selves to him, nor is this above our Christian Rule, or the express definition of our Christian Duty; *Mar. 12. 30. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, and with all thy Soul, and with all thy Mind, and with all thy Strength.* Which Love of God as it contains all Christian Vertues as to its latitude (*John 14. 15. & 21. 23. 1 John 2. 5. & 5. 3.*) so being expressed in such a manner, does declare the highest degree and advancement thereof. And *1 Pet. 1. 15. Be ye holy in all manner of Conversation, as he who hath called you is holy.* From which two Places we may infer that those who are commanded to exert themselves upon God in such a manner, in the utmost stress of all their Faculties, Understanding, Will, and rational Affection, and are also enjoined to approach the great Exemplar of all Holiness, as near as they can in a careful imitation and conformity thereto, they are obliged by way of Precept to the highest perfection and degree of Virtue, according to the capacity of humane Nature. Indeed the advancement of our Vertues is not just the same height to all People, but must be supposed of a great latitude in regard to the several Tempers of Mankind, which being in such a difference as they are, make it impossible that all should attain to the same Perfection, as to the matter of their Vertues, or conquest of themselves.

*

Z z z

selves. Though they may advance as far upon their Temper, having a greater strength of animal Affection to combate withal, yet they do not all stand in the same elevation or degree of holy Habit with one another.

And this difference in our selves of the force of the animal Affections in different Persons will explain those Texts of Scripture which the Romanists bring for the proof of undue Works, and refute such a Doctrine, as *Mat. 19. 10, 11, 12.* the plain Interpretation of which is, that those Persons in whom the incitements of Flesh and Blood are less prevalent; so that they may the more easily obtain a Conquest of them in a due guard of themselves, and the proper means of reducing their Bodies into a managable Habit, constant Temperance, frequent Fasting, and the use of intense Prayer to supply the defects of our own Strength, by a more liberal Influence of Divine Grace; those that can attain this in the better Advantages of Temper or Grace that they may have to this purpose, upon which account they'll be more delivered from the entanglements of this World, and in a better freedom for the exercises of Religion; as *St. Paul* acquaints us, *1 Cor. 7.* they seem to have a Precept to this freer state of holy Celibacy, *ver. 12. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it,* and not only counsel or advise thereto.

And that other Place, which they explain of a voluntary Poverty, concerning the young Man, *Mat. 19. 21. Go, sell all thou hast, and give to the Poor,* has this Lesson and meaning in it, that we should be constantly affected to relinquish our whole Estates, whensoever they hinder us in any instance of a Christian Vertue, that we cannot express because of them, a due Obedience to any Doctrine of our Saviour: When we observe too great an adherence to these things; that our Affecti-

ons are too deeply engaged in them, and our dependance settled upon them, so that they exclude a due Faith and Trust in God, or our necessary compliance with some discoveries of his Will to us. This is the same importance with that other place, to take up our Cross, and follow Christ, and is a Precept still to all Christians in the Sufferings of the Church, or *in times of Persecution for the Truth's sake*, that we renounce our temporal Enjoyments when they stand in competition with *that*, and we cannot jointly preserve both.

Indeed as to the instance of Christian Charity we ought to give liberally in a constant reliance on God's Providence, and the Reward of eternal Glory at the last, according to our Saviour, *Luke 6. 38. Give, and it shall be given you, &c.* But we ought to observe a certain proportion according to the Store we are blessed withal, so as to reserve a due Competency for our selves, such as may answer the Conveniences of Life, without any provision for the Luxuries of it; as the Apostle advises, that others be not eased, and we burdened, *2 Cor. 8. 13.*

This is the Doctrine of the Place, that we ought to relinquish all, either in case of an express Command to this thing, or by way of consequence, when there is such an Incompetency between the holding of our Estates, and the Profession of any Gospel-Truth, that we cannot retain or enjoy both of them. So that it is a Precept still in its true Relation, as it denotes a transcendent Love and Affection to Christ above all things else, and not a state of voluntary Poverty, which may often prevent us of an Act of Beneficence, when we thus divest our selves of the capacity of it. And altho the Romanists frequently boast of their many Examples of a voluntary Poverty, yet they always in so much wisdom part with their Possessions, as to procure a cer-

* By entering
some Monastery,
or the like.

tain Subsistence in some way or other *, and not be cast upon the unseen Supplies of Divine Providence by that means; and they also ascribe such a Merit to them, and make such Challenges thereupon from Divine Justice, that they are rather instances of spiritual Pride than true Humility, and so cannot be thought to have such a Perfection or Reward in them. And then if we consider the definition of our Duty in a farther latitude, the Precepts of God are in such a degree, & prescribe such an absolute Perfection of our Behaviour, that in this present compo-
 sure of Flesh and Blood we can never attain or reach to it. To love our Enemies, so as to have no intention of Revenge to them, or be hindred in any Instances of Beneficence towards them, when it happens in our way: And to love our Neighbours as our selves; to be indifferently affected to the Possessions of this World, so that we can be contented with our own Portion and measure of them whatever it be; or part with them all in the defence of a righteous Cause, not to entertain a motion of Concupiscence in our Hearts, or the fancy of any other thing, which being performed and brought into Action, would be a Sin. These are such heights and advancements of Vertue as we can never ascend to; much less exceed and lay a Merit of Supererogations, or undue Performances thereupon.

And as to the second thing, that we can suffer more either in the chastisements of Divine Providence which we patiently submit to; or in voluntary Infiictions upon our selves, than the demerit of our Sins; so as to be a Satisfaction for them, or a Treasure for those of other People, will appear very absurd, when we consider the abominable Nature and Desert of Sin, the infinite Majesty, and the infinite Goodness, and the infinite Assistance of divine Grace, which in the highest Instance

of Ingratitude, it is committed and acted against. And that there is no Equivalency in the Sufferings of this Life, to the Reward of Heaven, so as to purchase it, either for our selves, or other People, the Apostle gives us his Opinion, *Rom. 8. 18. I reckon that the Sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the Glory which shall be revealed in us.*

Thus having proved that we are not capable of undue Performances, or Instances of Vertue above the Rules of our Christian Duty, nor that we can suffer in an aggravated manner above the Debt of our Sins, which quite removes the Ground of Satisfaction, both for our selves, and other People: I might stop here as to any further Pursuit of this Matter; Yet because they expressly affirm that justified Persons can satisfy for the temporal Pains left to Sin after the Remission of eternal Punishment, I shall a little further consider this Doctrine. In Confutation of which we may observe that such is the Nature and Offence of Sin, and its bold Effront to the Divine Majesty, that God in the Effect of his infinite Mercy would not remit it without an Instance of his just Displeasure and Indignation upon it, the more to imprint by this Means a due Notion of his own Purity upon the Mind's of Men, and the Repugnancy of Sin to him, which would have been more lost in them by an Act of pure Impunity. And then an Offence of the Divine Majesty being to be compensated and satisfied for, there could no Equivalent be found but his Sufferings, or the free Oblation of himself, who was God and Man in one Person, or in whom the Godhead dwelt bodily; and so having both the Subject of humane Nature to suffer in, and the Divinity joyned thereto in a wonderful manner to enhance the Value of those Sufferings, he was only a proper Atonement upon that Account, and

Bell. de Penit.
lib. 4. c. 7.

and did fully expiate the whole Offence and Punishment of Sin. In the Sacrifice of himself which had so much Obedience and Resignation in it, to answer the Rebellion of our Sins, and such an high Estimation from the Dignity of his Person, he purchased the Priviledg of Repentance to us, and whensoever we truly perform that, a full Remission of our past Sins, according to his own express Declaration, *Luke 24. 47.* Which is also the Dictate of the holy Spirit, *Ephes. 1. 7.* *In him we have Redemption, the Forgiveness of Sins. And he is the Propitiation for our Sins, 1 John 2. 2.* And he has given himself a Ransom for all, *1 Tim. 2. 6.* And he has redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, *Gal. 1. 13.* And by the Obedience of one many are made righteous, *Rom. 5. 19.* The true Importance of all which places is plainly this, that we are wholly rescued from all the Guilt and Penalties of Sin in the Sufferings of our Saviour, those are our Ransom, and the Price of our Redemption, and there is no Remains of any Punishment to past Sins, after a sincere Repentance of them, and the Application of Christ's Sufferings thereto through Faith.

And that this great Atonement was absolutely necessary in Respect to the whole Punishment of Sin, both temporal and eternal, which has no such nice Distribution of it in Scripture, and that we cannot satisfy the Divine Justice upon either Account by any Behaviour, or Action of ours, is very demonstrable from the Inabilities of lapsed Nature, that we can perform no good thing in our own Strength, or the abstracted Principle of our own Natures, without an *Influence of Divine Grace*, (*which Bellarmine sometimes affirms to be necessary in Satisfaction, Ibid. p. 1104.*) neither if we could entirely comply with the infinite Principle of Divine Grace, as it inspires good Thoughts into us, and as it

assists

brought down by some temporal Hardship. We shall then be more recovered, to all the benefits of consideration, which a prosperous Circumstance often hinders, and so be more left in the free exercise of our reasonable Faculties, to determine our selves in the result of them, as Creatures of our quality ought to do. And there being this Pressure upon the animal Nature, it will be less apt to fall forth into its usual habits of Pride, Intemperance, or the like; and so we shall have more moderate Temptations to engage withal. Afflictions, when they happen to good Persons, are signal Advantages to their Vertues, and they always grow into a more Christian Habit and Temper by them: Nay, in respect of wicked Men, they have this tendency likewise, and will obtain the like Advantage, unless it be prevented by an incorrigible Obstinacy, or a confirmed Habit and Disposition that cannot change. This was the Apostle's Method concerning the *Corinthian* that was guilty of Incest, to excommunicate him (which was always attended with bodily Pain) and is therefore expressed *to deliver him to Satan for the destruction of the Flesh, that the Spirit might be saved in the Day of the Lord*, 1 Cor. 5. 5. And 'tis not to be questioned but this is often the Process of Divine Providence to cast Men into a state of Adversity, as the most proper and effectual Remedy of their Vices.

And then secondly, Afflictions as they reduce the extravagant temper of Flesh and Blood, by which our Vertues become more easy, so they will excite a greater Vigilancy for the future, that we offend not afterwards, when we consider *the severe Chastisements* we either presently are, or formerly have been engaged in, as our own Conscience will inform us of the true cause and occasion of *them*. These will bring us to a just apprehension and notion of Sin, that we rightly conceive of

it, as it is in its own Nature, when we observe these Chastisements upon it, and so carry us in our utmost diligence to a hearty Repentance, and Endeavour against it.

Afflictions likewise are a proper means, and have a direct Influence to many particular Instances of Vertue, they conquer the Insolency of our Natures by a kind of weight, and pressure upon them, and so enstate us in a habit of Humility, and lowly mindedness, that we be not possessed with any vain Conceptions of our selves; they take off the fretfulness of our Temper, and work a disposition of Patience in us, and a quiet resignation to the Will of God, whatsoever Events we shall at any time be concerned in. And these disappointments of our outward Circumstances, will excite a due Faith in us, and make us look up to our Heavenly Father in a firm reliance upon him, either for the Influences of his blessed Spirit to support us under them, or the Effects of his gracious Providence to deliver us from them; as God himself speaks in an equal reflection upon the *Jews*, and other People, *Hos. 5. 15. In their Affliction they will seek me early.* And this holy Discipline continued upon us will procure our Constancy in these Vertues, or promote our farther advance in them; And if it be removed from us through this effect of it, 'twill leave such a sense and remembrance behind it, that we shall scarce venture upon such Courses as may incur it over again.

And Afflictions furthermore are a demonstration to other People of the desert and offence of Sin, which is always the occasion of them, and so may be the same means of Recovery therefrom, and of the Vertues of a holy Life to them likewise. They are not distinguishable, as to the matter of them, from Punishment, al-

though they are not formally so, the same Instances having this difference upon the Righteous, and upon the Wicked, that they are only a Discipline to the one for Reformation, but pure Judgment to the other for Destruction. And therefore whatsoever design they are sent upon, they are plain Convictions of the contrariety of Sin to the Nature of God, and the severe Judgment that he will at last inflict upon it, and so may be a proper Inducement to all People to repent and depart from it.

These may be the Reasons why God inflicts his temporal punishments, or the Calamities of this Life upon good People; altho he does not equally inflict them upon all. Some he allows in a perpetual Prosperity without any portion of them, or any chastisement of their past Sins: and some he exercises continually under them, notwithstanding their signal Attainments and Proficiency in a good Life: and some he rescues from them when they have more proceeded in their Vertues, and arrived at the further habits of them; and all this according to the Counsel of his own Will, or the unsearchable Depths of infinite Wisdom.

And as to those Penances that were usually inflicted upon notorious Sinners in the Discipline of the Church, they were for other purposes, and not to satisfy the Divine Justice for such a share of Punishment due to Sin as was exempt from the expiation of Christ's Sufferings.

And first, they were inflicted; that such Offenders in a long process of holy Discipline might afford a more certain Evidence of the Sincerity of their Repentance; and that other People who cannot look into the Heart, or see the disposition of that deceitful Principle, might be fully satisfied thereof, that the Church by this means,

†

as

as much as is competible with human Frailty, might consist of pure Members, and mutually excite to Holiness of Life, and be a mutual check in respect of the contrary Courses.

Another reason of these Penances was to give Satisfaction to the Church, or answer the Offence that is offered to it by a dissolute Action, and take off all Scandal and Reflection from it, that it allows no such Misdemeanours, by thus proceeding in the severest Censure and Penalties upon them, which if otherwise, would both encourage its own Members to an Unchristian Behaviour, and also afford an infinite disparagement of that holy Society, and the Gospel-Profession to those without.

Another Reason of such a severe Discipline according to the proportion of their Sins (some excluding longer from Christian Assemblies, and the Prayers of the Church, and the Advantage of the blessed Sacrament, some less) was this, that such Offenders might duly reflect upon the Nature of Sin, in that opportunity of suffering for it; and from thence be carried to a hearty Contrition and Sorrow for it, a humble Supplication for Mercy, and pardon through the Atonement of Christ Jesus, and a sincere Endeavour and firm Resolution of Amendment afterwards, which will be more intense according to the degree of these Penances, and more preserve them from the like Offences lest they incur the same Punishment over again.

Another Design was the Benefit of others, that being admonished by these Examples upon Sin they might be more deterr'd from the practise of it, & not account it such a slight thing as corrupt Nature, and the Suggestions of Flesh and Blood would pronounce, or represent it to be; which Reason is assigned by the Apostle, 1 Tim. 5. 20. And these publick Censures on the Actors of more grie-

vous Sins will produce a greater Aversion in the Minds of Men, and a greater caution and endeavour against them, than the most reasonable Institution or Precepts can do, that have no such Penalty annexed to them, as might be demonstrated from a Prospect of humane Nature, if a sad Experience did not witness to it, where these Censures are wanting. This is the notion of Ecclesiastical Discipline, or publick Penances in the Church, according to the Doctrine of the antient Fathers, not to satisfy the Divine Justice for a certain share of the punishment of our Sins, as the Romanists now maintain, but as a better Advantage of our Christian Vertues, either to recover us from habits of Sin, or in the Efficacy of a publick example, preserve and secure us from falling into them.

Thus having laid down the true account of Satisfaction, which is only proper to Christ Jesus from the Dignity of his Person, and which he fully rendered to the Divine Justice upon the Cross in regard to the whole Offence and Consequence of Sin, leaving no part of the punishment thereof to our own Persons, after the exercise of a true Repentance; and also having shown that the Afflictions of this Life are graciously lent in the effect of the Divine Goodness to restore us to a state of Vertue, or that we may arrive at a farther improvement and degree of it; and likewise that Church-Censures had the same notion and design in them, according to the sense of the first Antiquity, where they were most carefully practised with that true Success of a more eminent Piety that belongs to them; I shall now upon this Advantage proceed to explain those Texts of Scripture which the Romanists bring for the demonstration of their Doctrine, that some temporal Penalties still remain to be undergone by us after the remission of the Guilt of Sin, and

and its whole relation to eternal Misery; and that these Penalties can be removed and satisfied for either in the Sufferings of this Life, or some certain Penances upon our selves.

Now as to the first, that some Penalties still remain after the Sin is pardoned, they insist upon these Places. First, *Gen. 2. 17.* concerning *Adam*, that he was left subject to Death, and his whole Posterity in like manner after his Trespas was remitted in the Promise of a Redeemer: Which common Fate of all Man-kind, with the first Parent and Author of it, the Apostle describes, *Rom. 5. 17.* *As by one Man Sin entered into the World, and Death by Sin, and so Death passed upon all Men, for that all have sinned.* Now the Answer to this is easy, That Death now is no Punishment to good People, nor comes upon them in that respect; for since the Sting thereof is taken away by our Saviour, the whole Defect of our Sins fully expiated and atoned for in his Sufferings upon the Term of our Repentance, there is a double Advantage in Death, both a Deliverance from the Temptations of this Life, and a Translation of us into the Blessedness of another. Such is the Contrivance of infinite Wisdom, and the Efficacy of the Divine Goodness, that that which was our greatest Punishment, in the Means of Christ's Sufferings is become our greatest Benefit; that which terminated this animal Life, and also contained in it eternal Death, or delivered us over to the Miseries of another World, is made the Passage to the Glories of the Heavenly State. And whereas *Belarmine* says in a supposed Triumph over *Calvin*, that *Death can have no Relation to our Vertues or Proficiency, in them for the Time to come, seeing it would be a ridiculous Assertion to maintain that Men were punished with Death, that they might live more cautiously afterwards.*

This

This does not hinder but that *Death* is truly considerable as a Benefit to good People, and not a Punishment, which transfers them then to the Haven of Heavenly Bliss. But however the Manner of Death may give an Occasion to several Vertues, and be an Exercise of our Piety in many Respects; as suppose it be the Instance of Martyrdom, then it affords a due Matter of a holy Resignation to the Will of God, a resolved Patient and Fortitude of Mind to support under those Agonies, as it is a proper Incitement of our Christian Faith to exert it self with more Vigour upon God for a more liberal Assistance of Divine Grace; and also of great Influence to other People; to confirm them in those Truths for which it is undertaken and submitted to. And Death may be a Benefit to many, as it may come immaturally upon them in the Vigour of their Constitution, and not in a State of Weakness and Infirmity, or the natural Causes thereof; in that it prevents some certain Opportunities and Temptations to sin, which in the Continuance of Life and Health would have been undoubtedly complied withal, as the Author of the Book of Wisdom speaks of some *that were speedily taken away lest that Wickedness should alter their Understanding, or Deceit beguile their Soul*, chap. 4. 10. Now although it be a ridiculous thing to affirm that Men are punished with Death, that they may live more cautiously afterwards, seeing there is no Repentance or Amendment after that, yet it is no ridiculous thing at all, but a Method of Divine Providence to remove those by an Anticipation to their natural Temper, into the Happiness of the other World, while they are in a better Disposition and Habit for it, whom a longer Stay or Continuance would certainly carry into some Vices: And therefore *Death* in the Manner thereof, as it respects the last Instance

stance of our Lives, or the time antecedent to it, may be very beneficial to us, this may bring us into more thorough Inquiries of our selves, a more full Apprehension of our former Sins, a stronger Aversion to them, and more hearty Purposes, and a sincere Beginning of the contrary Vertues; and these Examples of the Divine Providence in this respect, are like to produce the same Effects and good Fruits upon other People.

But then according to their own Argument, (so full of Contradiction is a false Doctrine) Death cannot be supposed in the Nature of a Punishment as to several People, who yet are subject to it, for those that immediately die after Baptism are quite free both from the Penalty and Guilt of Sin in their Notion, that being perfectly done away in that holy Sacrament, and special Application of Christ's Sacrifice; and therefore there is no manner of Sufferings left or remaining to such Persons; but Death is a pure Benefit to them, as indeed it is to all that die in the Exercise of a true Repentance, and the Habit of their Christian Vertues.

Bell. lib. 4.
Penit. c. 1.

Another Argument they insist on for these remains of temporal Punishment after the Pardon of Sin, is the Example of *David*, who was punished for his Adultery with *Bathsheba* by the Death of the young Child, after the Guilt of that abominable Instance was remitted to him, 2 Sam. 12. 13. But that this had a future Regard in it to restrain *David* and other People by his Example from such lawless Indulgences afterwards, and so was the Chastisement of a Father, and not an Act of pure Judgment, may be plainly evinced in opposition to the Cardinal's two Reasons to the contrary. The first of which is that those Words of the Prophet, after he had declared the Pardon of his Sin, ver. 14. *Howbeit because by this Deed thou hast given great occasion to the Enemies*

of the Lord to blaspheme, the Child also that is born unto us: she shall surely die; Respect only what was past, and so express a Punishment in them: And indeed that it was a Punishment as to the Master of it, cannot be denied; but that 'twas not formally so, as not being inflicted without a gracious Purpose of a moral good or better Conversation for the time to come, which pure Punishment quite excludes, and so had a future Reference in it, needs no further Argument, than only a Consideration of the Words themselves, which may be thus explained, and paraphrased upon, because by this enormous Act thou hast offered a Pretence to prophane People to think unworthily of the Divine Nature, or deny the essential Purity thereof, and so allow themselves in such brutish Practices; therefore to vindicate that, and prevent the Consequence of such an ill Notion, or the loose Behaviour that would more prevail upon it, the Child that is born to thee shall surely die: for if it had lived it might plausibly have been said, that God receives into his special Favour Adulterers; and Murderers, and no way discriminates between the Profligate and the Vertuous, which would have been a main Encouragement to such wicked Courses. His second Reason that it was an Act of pure Justice or Punishment upon David, is drawn from David's Opinion in the matter, that it was so, which his Mourning, Fasting, and Prostration upon the Ground for the Recovery of the Child does plainly evidence; for says he, he would never have deprecated such a thing as was beneficial to him upon the Account of his stricter Caution, and more constant Piety afterwards, and which was inflicted for that very Purpose. But how does this appear to be David's Opinion? his Behaviour in the Case seems only to be influenced from his Compassion for the Child, and his

great Faith, or his strong Perswasion of the exorable Nature of God; for when the Child was dead he returned to his wonted Comforts and Enjoyments of Life.

And as to his better Behaviour for the time to come, Were not his Fasting, &c. proper Expressions of a true Repentance? and the more these Exercises were intended, or the longer he kept in the Occasion of them, the more they were like to imprint upon him, and produce the stronger Purposes against such Enormities afterwards.

And what he urges that he would never have deprecated such a Penalty as he saw to have a direct Tendency both to his own and other's Vertues, is as inconsistent, as if one should conclude that because a sick Person is very averse to the bitter Potions that are prescribed him, and would willingly decline them if he could with any regard to his own Safety; therefore they are only Penalties upon him, and not Remedies of his Distemper, being to be denominated from his Aversion to them, and not from the Effects which they produce in him. The Apostle says, *that he besought the Lord thrice, when he was buffeted of the Messenger of Satan, that it might depart from him.* Shall one therefore affirm that that Calamity was inflicted upon him, as a Punishment of his past Sins, and not for his caution afterwards? The Apostle himself refutes this, and expressly declares that that Circumstance, whether it were some bodily Sickness, or whatsoever else, was therefore dispensed to him, to secure him from spiritual Pride, and preserve him in a Habit of Christian Modesty; *lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of Revelations, there was given to me a Thorn in the Flesh,* 2 Cor. 12. 7. The Saints may deprecate from a certain Common Sense of Nature that abhors Suffering, those things

B b b b

that

that they discern to be profitable for them, if be they painful or grievous to them. And that *David* did so much pray against the Death of his Son, does only signify that it was a most sensible Loss to him; and not that it would be no advantage to his Repentance, and better Life for the time to come.

And as to that other Instance of *David* his numbring the People, 2 *Sam.* 24. which he heartily repented of, *ver.* 10. and therefore according to the Divine Promise was remitted and pardoned to him, yet after that had his choice of three Evils, one of which he must suffer and submit to. This also is to be explained in a Parallel-meaning with the former Place, that 'twas only a fatherly Chastisement upon *David*, in order to recover him to his proper Vertue of Humility of Spirit, and Dependance on God, and remove him from a vain Confidence in an Arm of Flesh, or the Multitude of his People which his Mind was possessed with at that time.

And as to the People it was most certainly a righteous Dispensation and Judgment upon them, and perhaps may be thus accounted for, that those that were slain by this Pestilence, were such as were Parties in *Sheba's* Rebellion, *chap.* 20. that of *Abfalom's* being punished before with the Slaughter of twenty thousand Men, *chap.* 18. 7. Which was less in respect of the People, he being of the Lineage of *David*, and having the right of Primogeniture in it, but the other a *Benjamite* and Foreigner thereto. And that this was the probable Reason of this Mortality, may hence appear, that *Jerusalem* which maintained her Allegiance, and adhered to *David* in that Conspiracy, was spared, *ver.* 16. *chap.* 24.

Another Passage they produce to this Effect, is concerning *Miriam*, *Numb.* 12, who for her Controversy with *Moses* (in which she had engaged *Aaron* likewise) upon

upon the Account of his foreign Wife from the Lineage of *Israel*, being smitten with a Leprosy, the usual Punishment of Pride, as *Grotius* observes, and being healed thereof at the Supplication of *Moses*, which was a Sign of the Pardon of her Sin, was yet excluded from the Assembly seven Days, to demonstrate a remaining Punishment to it after that. But this Separation likewise being such a slight thing as it was, cannot be esteemed a judicial Act, but was the Discipline of a Father, only for her moral good; that by a kind of Penance for her Misbehaviour, she might be brought to a greater Shame and Sense of it, and a more hearty Contrition upon that Account, and also repair the great Offence she had offered thereby, and afford an Instruction to all People, what a grievous Wickedness that is in the Sight of God to envy his Ministers the Advancement of their high Function, or contemn them in the Discharge of it. And upon this Instance were founded the Jewish Censures or Separations from the Synagogue in case of any publick Sin; as also Exclusions from holy things in the Christian Church, till the offending Persons had given some Evidence of the Truth of their Repentance. But neither this removal of *Miriam* for seven Days, nor the Censures of the Church were proper Punishments, or inflicted as Satisfaction to Divine Justice, as I proved before.

Another Instance which they bring, is from the History of the Golden Calf, when the People fell into Idolatry to it, *Exod. 32*. *Bellarmin's* Words hereupon are these, *Many thousand Men were slain without any difference for the Adoration of the Calf; neither is it credible that all those did die in the merit of that Sin, when the Lord did testify that at the Prayers of Moses he had remitted it.*—

But here is no mention of the remission of the Sin, all

that is signified in the Text being only this, that God through the Entreaty and Intercession of *Moses* was prevailed upon to repress the vehemency of his Anger towards them, and not consume them by an utter Destruction as he was first inclin'd to do, ver. 19. for 'tis immediately subjoyned to his Supplication, *and the Lord repented of the Evil which he thought to do his People*; that is, upon this occasion he as it were reversed his purpose of their final Ruin and Desolation, which is the whole importance of the Place; not that he pardoned that abominable Fact, for he stored it up for future Vengeance, as he himself acquaints us, ver. 31. *Nevertheless in the Day when I visit, I will visit this their Sin upon them*: and ver. 35. *The Lord plagued the People because they made the Calf that Aaron made*, which was after the Slaughter or Atonement that *Moses* commanded, ver. 27. And whereas he says, that there were many thousand slain, it is expressly contrary to the Hebrew Text, in a general Agreement of all Copies, which only mention three; but perhaps a Latin Version where the sum is twenty thousand, may be more authentick than the Original with some People. And what he affirms not to be credible, that all those should die in their Sin, is without any proof or reason at all. Why should one reckon it so incredible, that among such a number of guilty Persons (the whole amounting to six hundred thousand) there should be three thousand so wholly resolv'd to their Idol-worship, that they should die in that obstinate purpose, without any motion of Repentance in them? For if we reflect upon the Person of *Moses*, we cannot imagine, if we could suppose such a thing of the *Levites*, and that they had not been more averse to that Wickedness, which inspired them with so much Zeal to be the Instruments of Vengeance upon it; I say, we cannot imagine it of

Moses.

Moses, if we could of the Performance of the Levites, that he should command an undistinguishing Slaughter without any difference of Guilt, or Innocency, or Repentance; but that they were a Company of more furious Idolaters, and the chief promoters of that foul Immorality, whom he enjoined to be slain, and they performed his Injunctions upon. And this most probable account of the Action makes it nothing relating to the purpose it is brought for. For what respect has a just Punishment upon some hardened and impenitent Idolaters to those Penalties which, according to the Roman Hypothesis, God requires from good Men after the pardon of their former Sins. But however, suppose, which is less probable, that in that Slaughter of three thousand some fell in the advantage of a true Repentance, and the remission that is consequent thereto, how is that a Punishment, or how imports it a Satisfaction to Divine Justice to be translated into the Happiness of another World, which Death, thro' the Efficacy of Christ's Sufferings, is the Passage to? Or is it not rather a signal Instance of infinite Goodness to be removed from the Temptations of this Life, while one remains in the habit of a true Repentance, and firm Resolution of their Vertues?

Another Proof they bring is *Numb. 14.* Bellarmine's Argument from this Place is in these Words, *The whole People repined and murmured, yet in the means of Moses's Intercession God was appeased and reconciled to them: but nevertheless, as the punishment of that Crime, all the Jews that were then numbered, died in the Wilderness, except Caleb and Joshua who murmured not, and now besides (as we have said before) that the punishment of Death cannot be for future amendment, God himself testifies in that place, that he exacted that Punishment in revenge of their Sin,*
and:

and ye shall know, says he, my revenge, *Et scietis ultionem meam*— Now let us consider this Author's Reasons, why the temporal Death of this People within the compass of forty years for their dissatisfaction with an extraordinary Bounty of Providence towards them after the pardon or remission thereof, *ver. 20.* must be concluded to have been a punishment.— And his first is, That Death cannot be inflicted upon any account of Reformation. This had been true in regard to the Persons themselves upon whom it was inflicted, if it had been a present Death, because it is allowed on both sides that there is no Repentance after that. But did all this People die at once? was not this Judgment expressly declared and denounced to them? And were they not leisurely summoned by it, so as one to be an Example to another, and all to have sufficient notice of it? And was not Death then denounced and inflicted in such a manner a proper means of their Reformation, when they beheld it marching up and down the Hebrew Camp, and knew certainly it would come to themselves in such a time? So that it is not to be questioned but that this Death had the effect of a certain Discipline upon good People, and was very beneficial to their stricter Behaviour, and their farther Attainments in a virtuous Life; and as to impenitent persons, who most probably were the first instances thereof, as not being reclaimable by any farther opportunities, or examples before them, (and I hope he will not say their Sins were pardoned) it was indeed a punishment to them, which must needs be their portion some-time or other; but it afforded a proper Instruction to those that survived them, and was likewise designed as a moral Advantage and special Document to succeeding Ages, according to the Apostle, *1 Cor. 10, 11.* where he reckons up this, among other

Punishments of the Jewish Nation, Now these things happened unto them for Ensamples, and they are written for our Admonition, upon whom the ends of the World are come.

And as to what he, secondly, insists on that this is called a Revenge, *ver. 34.* (although it was properly a Punishment, and a commencement of everlasting Misery in respect of those that were not qualified for the remission of Sins) is only their Latin Version, and not agreeable to the * Hebrew Text, which signifies a Breach or Rupture, and imports thus much, That whereas by a strange Instance of Discontentment and distrust of my Power you have violated my Covenant on your part, I will also break it in my respect, or reced from the Promises annexed to it, as to your own Persons (you shall all die in this Wilderness) although I will perform it upon your Posterity, *Caleb* the Son of *Jephunneh*, and *Josua* the Son of *Nun*, and your little ones which you said should be a Prey, them will I bring in, and they shall know the Land which ye have despised, *ver. 31.* So that the whole Scope of the place is this, Upon the Entreaty and Supplication of *Moses* God was pleased to pardon their Sin that he would not smite them with the Pestilence, or disinherit them, as he first declared he would do, *ver. 12.* but he would graciously exercise them under the sense and apprehension of Death within a certain compass of forty Years, as a means of their stricter Vertues and more careful Behaviour afterwards.

And the Death of *Moses* and *Aaron* in the Wilderness, they being not permitted; because of their Unbelief at the Waters of *Meribah*, to enter the promised Land, is produced as another Instance to this purpose, (*Numb. 20. Deut. 32.*) for says *Bellarmino*, *None can deny but that*

* וירעתם
את תגו-
אתי

that they were both received into the Divine Favour after the commission of that Sin, and therefore a certain Punishment remained after the Guilt thereof was pardoned. That they were received into the Divine Favour is not to be questioned, and therefore 'twas only a Fatherly Discipline for their own and the Peoples Good. Their Death denounced to them, would always preserve and keep in their Minds a sense of their Sin which was the occasion of it, and be an incitement of their Repentance; and being inflicted, would be an Instance to other People of the great Offence of Infidelity, or distrust in God, the more effectually to secure them from that Sin, and to engage their dependance upon him for a due Provision in all their Circumstances that he should at any time bring them into. And 'tis a famous Example of humane Infirmity, and also of the Purity of the Divine Essence, that will not suffer the least Miscarriage in his dearest Servants without some instance of Displeasure upon it, though that always be in such a matter as has a relation to their spiritual Good: and 'tis no question but these holy Men made these Advantages from it. Although there was something of Mystery in it, that *Moses* should not enter the promised Land, that Felicity being reserved to *Joshua* to represent or signify to us, that true *Israelites* did not arrive at the Kingdom of Bliss through the efficacy of the Old Law which *Moses* was the Minister of, but by the Conduct of our Saviour Christ, whose Figure *Joshua* was, and whose Name he bore. And if we consider the thing it self, it cannot be accounted really a Punishment to be translated into an Heavenly *Canaan* against such a strange fancy to continue some longer time in an earthly one, which was exactly their case in both their respects.

Ano-

Another Instance is the Prophet of Judah, who came to prophesy against the Altar at Bethel, and was slain by a Lion for his Disobedience to the Command of God, in eating and drinking in that Place, 1 Kings 13. Now Bellarmine's Argument upon the Place runs thus; *Seeing this Calamity was foretold this Prophet, by the other Prophet in Bethel, it cannot be doubted but that he repented, and so obtained Forgiveness from God: For 'tis an evidence of his Sanctity, in which he finished this mortal Life, that the hungry Lion offered no Violence to his Carcase, nor to the Ass that stood by it.* And this of his Repentance must easily be granted, for he that pay'd such a regard to the Message of God, that he was seduced by a Pretence of it, may well be supposed to have been perswaded by a true Oracle and Embassy to him, which being in such a matter concerning his hasty or untimely Death, must needs be the strongest Inducement to the Consideration of his Sin, and the most hearty Address for Pardon of it. But in that it was so, that it had this Efficacy to his Repentance, it must be concluded to have been a fatherly Chastisement, and not a Satisfaction to Divine Justice, or a meer Punishment and Vengeance upon him. And this fatherly Severity could not but have this Influence with it as to other People to be a perpetual Admonition to them, not to be carried against the Authority of a Divine Revelation, or even the Dictates of unprejudic'd Reason by the contrary Doctrines of any Man, though he should bear the Name of a Prophet, and even pretend a particular Mission or Inspiration for it; and therefore there is no need to determine this Calamity of this holy Man to have been properly a Divine Punishment, when there are so many other evident Reasons and Advantages of that thing,

C c c

his

his own Proficiency, or the further attainment of his own Vertues, and the exemplary Instruction of good People, that they should firmly adhere to the Word of God against all the Doctrines, and Traditions of Men that are contrary thereto. But perhaps *Bellarmino* had no mind to take notice of such a plain Deduction and Inference as this.

The last Place this Author produces for these remains of temporal Punishments after the Pardon of Sin, is from the 11th chapter of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, ver. 29. &c. Upon which he thus forms his Argument: *The Apostle writes that many of those who unworthily communicated of the Sacrament of Christ's Body, had Death inflicted on them as the Punishment of their Sin: for, says he, therefore many are weak among you, and many sleep: but that these very People were reconciled to God before their Death he acquaints us after, whom he adds, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the World.* But the Apostle does not say that Death was inflicted as a Punishment, this is a Commentary besides the Text in Defence of a Doctrine that has no Text for it, but he says, *that we are therefore chastened of the Lord, lest we should be condemned with the World.* Then which he could not have informed us more expressly of the Nature of this Correction, that it was not to punish the Offence, but to recover the Offender, and therefore 'twas no Punishment properly speaking, but a Medicine or Remedy; whose whole Designment is to that Effect. Nor upon this mention of Death can he object his old Sentence, that 'tis ridiculous to affirm that Men are punished with Death, that they may live more cautiously afterwards, seeing it was not inflicted in one moment, as is observable from the Words of the Texts,

Texts, but they were first sick, by which they perceived their mortal Condition, or the several Advances of their Dissolution, the more forcibly to induce them to prepare for it, and then they died in some space of that Sickness. They were thus chastised with these Infirmities, and the Fear of Death thereupon; that, by this means they might more examine their former Neglects, and more seriously purpose and resolve against them, and either live with more Caution afterwards, if their Health was restored to them, or depart in a better Preparation, and more Confidence into the Mansions of another World. And so their Death in such a manner was an Advantage to their own Salvation, as well as exemplary to other People, to instruct them from these Afflictions of their Brethren, that they approach with more Reverence to the holy Sacrament of Christ's Body, and not as to an ordinary Meal or Table.

And thus we see how little these Texts prove that Assertion they are brought for, that they do not denote a judicial Punishment, or a Satisfaction to Divine Justice, which has no Regard to the moral Good, or Reformation of the Offender, as appears from those Malefactors that are either condemned by the civil Magistrate, or delivered over to the Pains of Hell, by the juster Judgment and Tribunal of God; but that they only signify a fatherly Discipline, and a gracious Method of the Divine Love in order to their Amendment, who are exercised under them.

I should now consider those Texts of Scripture which the *Romanists* bring for these Satisfactions in another World, or those temporal Pains that are to be endured in a State of Purgatory, which is a middle Region between Heaven and Hell; for that Place is founded for

Men to discharge some Remains of Punishment that are left on the Score to Divine Justice above their Sufferings in this Life, and not to improve them any-whit thereby, or gain the Disposition of one Vertue in them. Such a more improbable Notion is it than the Purgatory of *Plato*, or *Pythagoras* was, who made it a place of Purification for those that were but indifferently either good or evil, in order to qualify them for a higher Sphere of Heavenly Happiness: I say, I should consider those Texts of Scripture which the *Romanists* bring for their Satisfactions in Purgatory, but they will be examined by a better Hand.

The Second Part will quickly follow.

E R R A T A

- Pag. 501. lin. 5. for *immediately*, read *mediately*.
 502. lin. 30. for *heights to all People*, read *level to all*, &c.
 520. lin. 4. for *Master*, read *Master*.
 528. lin. 31. for *strange*, read *strang*.
 ibid. lin. 33. in both *their* Respects, dele *their*.
-

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswel at the Rose and Crown
 in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1688.

The TEXTS examined which *Papists*
cite out of the *Bible* for the
Proof of their Doctrine

OF

SATISFACTIONS.

PART II

IMPRIMATUR.

Aug. 23. 1688.

Chas. Needham.

I Therefore come to their second Assertion, That those
temporal Penalties that still remain as a Debt to
Sin after the Pardon or Forgiveness of it, may be
removed, and satisfied for either in the Chastise-
ments of this Life (as they are inflicted in a Course of
Providence,) which we patiently suffer and submit to;
or by some voluntary Penances upon our selves. And
having proved before that there are no such remaining
Penalties, and that the Scriptures brought for that Pur-
pose have no such Scope or Design in them, as also that
Penances had another Reason in the first Institution and
Practice of them, I have quite obviated this Labour,
D d d d .

but

but however seeing they produce *Texts* of Scripture for this also, I shall examine them, and endeavour to put their right Sense and Comment upon them.

And the first is the Example of the *Ninevites*, who had an utter Desolation proclaimed against them, *Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown*, Jonah 3. 4. *Nevertheless* (says our Author) *by their Works of Penance, Fasting, Prayers, and Sackloth and Asbes, God was appeas'd towards them, and preserv'd their City, or deliver'd them from that Ruine.* But he here takes the outward Signs, and Concomitants of Repentance for the thing it self, and applies that to them, which belongs to the inward Principle or Cause of them. 'Twas an unfeigned Change of Mind from their evil Courses, and their particular Sin of Violence, and Oppression in their great Men, which is almost inseparable from absolute Governments, to which this Deliverance is asserted, *ver. 10. And God saw their Works that they turned from their evil Way, and God repented of the Evil that he said he would do unto them, and he did it not.* A sincere Repentance, which only consists in a true Reformation of Temper and Spirit, must needs produce a hearty Sorrow for past Misdemeanours, which will demonstrate it self in most earnest Supplications, severe Fasting, coarse Apparel, and the like, as the necessary Effects thereof; but then the Reconciliation that is in it is not to be attributed to these outward Performances, as if the Offence of the Divine Majesty were satisfied for by these, but to that change of Spirit, which they result from, this being the Object of the whole Art and Management of Providence, as that which God only delights in an inward Principle or Habit of Righteousness in our Natures.

Another Place is in 2 *Chron. 7. 14.* where God declares that in case of any publick Calamity upon his Peo-

ple, whether immoderate Rain, or Locust, or Pestilence, if they shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my Face, and turn from their wicked Ways; then will I hear in Heaven, and will forgive their Sin, and will heal their Land. Now the Strefs of the Words our Author lays upon humbling themselves: and their reading of the Word turn, *se penitentiam egerit*, as if the Effects of God's Forgiveness were only to be ascribed to some outward Acts of Humiliation, and not a true and hearty Conversion from their evil Ways, which is the same Misapplication I observed before. The plain Paraphrase of the Text is this, That if some Nation through a long course and habit of Sin, either have some grievous Punishment impending upon them, or be actually engaged and exercised under it, yet if they repent of their great Miscarriages, and in the effect of a true Repentance, detest and forsake them for the time to come, and be very humble in the sense of them, and address to God for his infinite Clemency and Mercy to them, according to the Exuberancy of that Attribute, he will then pardon their Offences, or remove those Judgments, that necessarily attend them and belong to them.

Another Place insisted on are the Words of the Prophet *Jeremiab, chap. 18. 7, 8.* *At what Instant I shall speak concerning a Nation, and concerning a Kingdom to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that Nation on against whom I have pronounced, turn from their Evil, I will repent of the Evil that I thought to do unto them.*

The Strefs of their Argument still lies upon the reading of the Words, *if they turn from their Evil*, which in the vulgar Latin is *Penitentiam egerit*, and which is to be done by Acts of Penance. But this has no further than their Version only, which does not

express the Hebrew Text, for the Words of those better Interpreters of holy Scripture, though not infallible, neither the Seventy two, both which are exactly rendered in our English Bible, *if they turn from their Evil*: and how that can be the Authentick Language, and Canon of Scripture, or the Foundation of any Doctrine, which is not accommodable to the Original, in which the Dictates of the holy Spirit were first delivered, I cannot see. If they say there is a continual Influence of this holy Spirit with the Pastors of Christ's Church, which we cannot deny in several Cases; suppose them possessed of an honest Design and Love of Truth, and that they have no secular Aims in them of Advantage, or profit when they apply to their great Office; yet it is not imaginable how these should so much better express their Notions, than the Prophets and Apostles did, or that there should be any Repugnances to one another in those things, which all proceeded from the same Principle. And altho we should not be Grammatical Expositors of the holy Scriptures in the strict Propriety of the Words, which *Bellarmino* charges *Erasmus* and *Valla* withal; yet we must not interpret any Place against the Harmony of the whole Bible, or establish any Doctrine that is inconsistent with that. Indeed to *turn from their Evil*, might fitly enough be rendered by *Penitentiam agere*, but when it establishes an unscriptural Doctrine, nor is agreeable to the Analogy of the Place in its literal Acception, or Interpretation of the Words, it is not to be accounted a true Version. The Importance then, or Paraphrase of the Place is this, That altho a Nation should be just ripe for the utmost measures of Divine Vengeance, which God in the full extent of his long Suffering is then resolved to inflict upon them, yet upon the term of a true Repen-

tance

tance or Conversion from Sin to the Duties of a holy Life, he will recede from his first Purpose upon this change of Disposition in them, and exempt them from that Ruine. Now *Bellarmino* allows this Effect to *Repentance*, as he cannot do otherwise, but then he affirms that Satisfaction always is contained in it, and is a Part or Branch thereof, which is both contrary to the best Authority and the Reason of the thing, for there can be no more than two Ingredients of Repentance, a true Sorrow for past Offences, and an unfeigned Purpose of Amendment afterwards, and those several Severities, whether in Diet or Apparel, are only the Results of that Sorrow, and some visible Marks or Testimonies thereof. And that Repentance should include Satisfaction in it, is inconsistent with the use of the Scripture-Words for that thing, which only refer to the Acts of the Mind, and imply the whole Work to be performed there (*μετανοεῖν, μεταμελεῖσαι*) which are well rendred by *Erasmus* *resipiscere animum mutare*, notwithstanding *Bellarmino's* Satyr and Invective against him, as might be exemplified from many Places, particularly *2 Cor. 12. 21.* which must be interpreted concerning a Conversion or Change of the Mind, and has no Relation to any voluntary Sufferings or Infliction upon themselves for past Sins, that they might recompense the Divine Justice thereby. But the use of this Expression will more appear when it is attributed to God, as it often is in this place, *Jonah 3. 10. & 4. 2. Amos 7. 3, 6.* where it would be Blasphemy to suppose any Suffering or any Displeasure or Revenge upon himself for any past Action: as indeed he never repents or changes his Purpose, immutably acting in different Dispensations of Mercy or Judgment, as free Creatures are disposed in themselves; but according to the apprehension of Men, when the effect of any Threatning

is suspended, the Repentance is applied to him, which indeed is in their own Spirits.

Another Place brought for this Doctrine, that these temporal Punishments may be satisfied for by voluntary Sufferings or Penances, is *Prov. 16. 6.* which according to the Authority of the Latin Version runs thus; *By Mercy and Truth Iniquity is redeemed.* Now upon this our Author argues, *that the word Redemption being at least equivalent to Satisfaction, if it may be affirmed, as we find it more than once in holy-Scripture, that Sins may be redeemed; then it is an easier Assertion that they may be satisfied for.* To which it may be first answered, that Redeemed is not the Importance or proper rendering of the Word, but purged, or expiated, or propitiated for, which agrees in meaning with remitted; and to this sense the *Septuagint* expound it in several Places, *Isa. 22. 14. & 27. 9, &c.*— But to allow our Adversaries a Word, suppose it should be Redeemed, it would not found the Roman Doctrine in this Particular: for if we should grant that Iniquity here implies the effect thereof, that is, Punishment, as it often does, tho' probably not in this place; yet Beneficence and Truth being the most joyous Employments that we are capable of, which have the greatest Pleasure belonging to them, cannot be called penal Actions, such as those are defined to be, that are Satisfactions to Divine Justice for the temporal punishment of our Sins, as we say that through the Graces of Faith and Repentance our Sins are remitted, yet it cannot be affirmed that Faith and Repentance are proper Penalties or Satisfactions, by which the Consequence of Sin is taken away as to the temporal punishment of it. But supposing that *redeem* be the proper rendering, and this refer to the punishment of Sin, not to the Guilt or Matter of it, yet we must observe that

re-redem does not always signify in the usage of holy Scripture, to deliver one from an Inconvenience by the solution of a certain Price, or something equivalent and adequate thereto, as in the Ransom of our Saviour; but it often denotes barely to deliver without any Satisfaction or Payment at all; as when it is so often said, *God redeemed his People from the Bondage of Egypt*: And such a frequent Expression in the Book of *Psalms* concerning the exemption of holy *David* from his personal Dangers, *The Lord redeemed my Life from Destruction*, Psal. 119. 134, &c. And 'tis very remarkable that of the Prophet, *Isa. 42. 3. He shall be redeemed without Money*. So that whether we take this Place in its natural rendering, or after their own Interpretation of it, it cannot be the proof of such a Doctrine; the plain meaning of which is this, that those particular Vices of Fraud or Injustice are purged away, and a righteous Temper advanced in us, by the exercise of a true *Benevolence* to one another, (the latter Substantive supplying the place of an Adjective, as it often does in the Hebrew Language;) or if Iniquity be here to be explained of the punishment thereof, then the sense is, that through the habit of this Vertue that is remitted and done away. But the first Explanation concerning a Spring and Principle of Righteousness in our selves is more probable from the latter Member of this Verse, *And by the Fear of the Lord. Men depart from Evil*; it being the manner of this proverbial Writer for the most part to repeat the sense of the former Clause of every Verse in the second, or express it over again in other Words.

Another Place that is commonly urged for these Satisfactions to Divine Justice for the temporal punishment of Sin, is that of *Daniel* to *Nebuchadnezzar*, Dan. 4. 27. *Wherefore, O King, let my Counsel be acceptable un-*

to thee, break off thy Sins by Righteousneſs, and thine Iniquities by ſhewing Mercy to the Poor, if it may be a lengthning of thy Tranquillity. Now the word where the whole ſtreſs of the Argument lies which we render break off, does alſo ſignify to redeem or free, and therefore may well be ſnatched at by ſome Men for the ground of ſuch a Doctrine, as being againſt the harmonious ſenſe of the whole Bible, can only be maintained by ſome forced Interpretations of ſome places of it. But then allowing the word *redeem*, which often denotes, as I obſerved before, only to reſcue or free, without the interpoſal of any Satisfaction, it cannot be applied to this purpoſe, according to the tenour of their own Principles, if they'll proceed conſiſtently upon them. For as they account for this thing; Men only ſatisfy for the temporal pains of their Sins, after they are received into the Divine Favour, and have their Guilt and eternal Punishment remitted to them, and therefore Believers or juſtified Perſons are only within this Priviledg. But *Nebucadnezzar* being a Tyrant, and an Idolater, and a Stranger from the Jewish Religion, the Prophet *Daniel* could not apply to him in this Senſe, as if he were in Friendſhip with God, and had the Demerit and Guilt of Sin with the eternal Conſequence thereof pardoned and cancelled; nor does he intimate ſuch a Diſtinction in the Punishment of Sin, but only ſpeaks in a general manner, Redeem thy Sins by Righteousneſs, &c. What *Bellarmino* ſays upon the account of this Heathen, that the Works of unregenerate Men in a ſpecial Influence of Divine Grace, can redeem by a kind of Congruity from the Guilt of Sin; and therefore thoſe of juſt Men being exerted by more plentiful Meaſures of the holy Spirit dwelling in them, are ſo available, that they may be ſaid condignly to redeem by a juſt Deſert

in themselves, from the Penalty of Sin, is unreasonable as well as against the tenour of the Scripture, seeing none can attain such a Disposition in themselves, which is to found that Congruity, or arrive at such a Perfection of good Works, even with all the Advantage of Gospel-Grace as may entitle them to the Divine Favour in the Merit of the thing, and not in the effect of infinite Mercy, or according to the gracious Allowances thereof, (but this belongs to another Argument.) Wherefore the plain Interpretation and Sense of the Place is this, Change the Habit of thy former Courses, thy Pride, thy Avarice and Oppression, with which thou hast treated all People, as if they were not in the same Prerogative of reasonable Creatures, and the mutual Offices, and the common regard that belongs to such not due to them, and possess thy Mind with a just sense of the common Nature of Mankind, and the civil Duties thou owest to those whom God has appointed, or set thee over, and then behave thy self with a due humanity to thy Fellow-Creatures, an impartial Justice to every Subject of thy great Empire, and a special Beneficence to afflicted People, such as are in a distressed Circumstance, particularly the poor Captive *Israelites*, who are the Examples of thy Pride and Tyranny; and if thou arrive at such a Conversion in thy self, thou mayst happily divert the Divine Vengeance that hangs over thee, there being then no subject for it, but that removed which God both denounces and executes it upon. So that here is no Compensation to the Justice of God, but only the change of a true Repentance that leaves no Vices in the Minds of Men to be the matter of his Indignation.

Another Place is *Luke 11. 41. Give Alms of such as ye have; and behold, all things are clean unto you.* Upon

E e e

which

which some affirm *that the same is necessary for Sin.* But, first, whatsoever we are purified by, cannot be said to be a Satisfaction, for so we are by Faith and Baptism, and the Word of God. And then Purity refers to the Mind it self, and the Removal of the vicious Inclinations and Habits thereof, that that be possessed with an inward Frame and Disposition of Vertue, which Satisfaction has no Regard to, being only to compensate the Divine Justice; and not to make one the better by it. The place indeed is very remote to their Purpose, and one would wonder how it should have been produced for it, the Importance of which is plainly this in Refutation of the out-side Purities of the *Pharisees*, who were so superstitious upon that account, that Alms-giving, or Beneficence to the Poor, is the best means to purify our selves, and to render our Possessions pure likewise. Which is very evident, as this Beneficence or Charity is an Instance of Justice to our Heavenly Father to return him a certain Tribute of his Bounty to us, and as it contains Repentance in it of our Frauds or Oppressions that we may have possibly been guilty of, and makes amends for them to bestow that upon indigent People, which perhaps through some Impediment we cannot restore to the Owners themselves; and as it also demonstrates a Christian Disposition of Love in us to our Brethren: So that those who are due Proficients in this, both their Consciences are pure, and all their Estates or Enjoyments likewise, as the Apostle acquaints us in like manner, *Tit. 1. 15. Unto the Pure all things are pure, &c.* And an * Author of their own thus explains this Place in reference to the *Pharisees*, says he, *The sense of it is, that their Minds being polluted with Injustice and Rapine might be purified, they were commanded to give Alms of such as they had, that those who had unjustly taken*

* Janfenius.

taken what did not belong to them, should bestow their just Possessions in the relief of other People, that so it might come to pass that to those who were of a pure Spirit, all outward things might be pure to them before God. And now from this obvious Account and Interpretation of the Place, let any one observe what a Support it is to the Doctrine of Satisfaction.

Another Place is produced from the Words of *John* Baptist to the Pharisees, *Matth. 3. 8. Bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance.* Now these Fruits of Repentance must needs be these famous Satisfactions by which Men compensate the Divine Justice for one part of the Penalty of their Sins, but how they can be asserted from this Place is not so obvious; the Scope and Meaning of which is that *John* observing what great resorts of *Pharisees* and *Sadduces* came to his Baptism, whom he knew to be rank Hypocrites, and only concerned for a Shew of Religion among Men, without any regard to an inward Sanctity or Habit of Vertue in their Spirits, as being secure of their Acceptance with God in their Relation to *Abraham*, that they were his Offspring according to the Flesh, to whom the Promises were made; I say, *John* observing such Confluxes of such Men, he plainly told them of their Hypocrisy, and that if they repented according to the Purpose of his Baptism they should exemplify a true Reformation in all the Instances of a holy Life, as the proper Fruits and Evidence thereof, by which they should be the true Children and Heirs of *Abram*, and divert the Judgments impending upon them. And what has all this to do with Satisfaction, as some of their own || Authors explain it? *Meet* || *Janfenius and Maldonat upon the Place.*
Fruits of Repentance does not require any bodily Labour, but only an inward Temper of Piety, which is necessary to all Men. And another says, *By these Fruits we intend A-*

meendment of Manners, and the Works that proceed from a truly penitent and reformed mind. But let us observe how *Bellarmino* argues upon the Words; says he; Our Adversaries do not rightly expound this place in respect to Newness of Life, and the Observation of the Divine Law. For to bring forth worthy Fruits of Repentance, is to act in such a manner, as becomes a true Penitent; but he that is a true Penitent, if he have injured any not only ceases from the Injury, and is more cautious in his Behaviour to that Person afterwards, but repairs the Damage or Inconvenience he has done him. *The Argument proceeds thus, that because we are to repair our Injuries of Men in the Exercise of our Repentance, we are therefore to do so in respect of God likewise.* But this is not a general Truth even in its reference to Men, an Injury may be in such a matter, as exceeds our Ability either to restore or compensate for, and we cannot imagine that the *Repentance* should be unacceptable for not performing an impossible Term, supposing the Instance of *David*, for his Murder of *Uriah*, which we are certain was true; and he against whom the Injury was acted, may remit it, not insisting on a Satisfaction upon that account, and then there is no Obligation thereto. But what have we that we can offer as a Compensation to an infinite Majesty to repair the Offence thereof? or where does he require a Satisfaction of us as the means of Pardon or Remission from him? But then if the Parallel should hold, that because Men must compensate one another for the Injuries done them, therefore they must do so to God likewise, seeing Compensation does consist of an equal return of Honour or Profit to the Detriment of the former Action, and thereby satisfying for the whole Penalty that belonged to it, it would follow that we could compensate

NOT

not only for the temporal part of the Punishment of Sin, but for the whole Guilt and Punishment of it; which is a Conclusion they will not allow in Honour to Christ; though they have no such true regard thereto. From whence it appears, that this part of the Baptist's Sermon of Repentance has no more reference to the Romish Satisfaction than the former Places of Scripture have.

Another Place is 2 Cor. 7. 11. *Where the Apostle among other good Fruits of a holy Sorrow, that worketh Repentance, puts Revenge in the Words of Bellarmine.* Now this Revenge he makes to respect the past time, and to be the same with Satisfaction, or a Severity upon our selves, whereby we compensate the Divine Justice for the Injury of our past Sins. But if we take Revenge here (*την ἐκδίκησιν*) in a great consent of the Roman Authors for the Excommunication of the Incestuous Person, which the Apostle denounced himself in the former Epistle, chap. 5. 3, 4, 5, &c. And which always had this Designment in it, (besides the Vindication of the holy Doctrines of Christ's Church by such an Instance upon the Transgressors of them) to reclaim the guilty Persons by a moderate Infliction or Chastisement upon them, as our Apostle expressly acquaints us in the same place, ver. 5. *That this is for the Destruction of the Flesh; that the Spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus:* I say, if we take this Revenge in this sense, as we are justified in so doing by very many of the Roman Communion, then it had a future Prospect to Amendment or Reformation, and was not inflicted as a Satisfaction to Divine Justice for any part of the Punishment of such a Miscarriage, which indeed, that it should be upon that account, is against their own Doctrine, for according thereto Satisfaction lies open to

†

none

malities of our Sins, and prevent them in the Effect of Divine Justice. But this is a plain misapplying of the place which does not relate to judicial Acts or pure Punishment, but to fatherly Corruptions, or Chastisements, only having this Purpose in them, to render Men better, and reform them thereby; as evidently appears from the following Verse, *But when we are judged we are chastised of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the World.* The natural Exposition of the Text is this, if upon a due Inquiry into our selves to know the Propensities of our Natures, and the actual Miscarriages we have been guilty of in our easy Compliance therewith, and so oppose them with more Caution, and preclude all Advantages they may have against us by a stricter Guard over them, and frequent Abstinences to abate the Principle of them; if we do thus, and obtain a Christian Temper in our Spirits in the Efficacy thereof, we shall quite prevent the Chastisements of God, as being already Partakers of the Design of them, and having no need of such an Admonition and Discipline upon us.

Another Argument that *Bellarmino* urges for his Satisfaction is from the Parallel of the Jewish Sacrifices in the 4th, 5th, 6th Chapters of *Leviticus*, where they are described of a different Value and Estimation, according to the Measure of the Fault. And *these he proves to have been a Compensation for temporal Punishment, because else they would have been frustaneously instituted, seeing they did not expiate the eternal Punishment and Guilt of Sin.* And now allowing this Notion of Legal Sacrifices, yet that Penances should have the same efficacy to compensate for temporal Punishment, because these Sacrifices in a special Appointment, and Regard to Christ, or by an Influence derived from him had such a Vertue annexed to them, is no Consequence. Different Penances,

nances or Degrees of them according to the Exigence of the Distemper, so as to be the best Remedies, and the most effectual Cures thereof, we do not deny; but these have no Relation to the old Sacrifices, nor is there any reason to conclude a common Effect or Operation between them, the one being the Institution of God for what Purposes he pleased, and the other only the Contrivance of Men, though not without their proper Advantage in the due Use and Exercise of them. But to speak the truth of the matter, these were only typical things both Sacrifices and Satisfactions, and did only take away legal Defilements, that such as had been polluted therewith, in this means might again be admitted into the Tabernacle, and the publick Service of God there, which otherwise they were to be deprived of; as the Apostle testifies, *that they only sanctified to the purifying of the Flesh, and that they did not purge the Conscience of the Offerers from dead Works*, which is only attributed to Christ's Sacrifice, *Heb. 9. 13, 14*. But it may be demanded, If this was the only Effect of them, and there was no remission of Immoralities by them, or Sins against the Law of Nature, but only Transgressions of positive Precepts, that a positive Punishment, or temporal Inconvenience should not be inflicted on them, how were the Worthies of the old Testament exempt and purified from their Sins? Just as we are in the Efficacy of Christ's Sacrifice which was to be offered for the Sins of the World, and which was then offered both in the Intention of the Son, and the Acceptation of the Father; they were exempt from all the Consequences of Sin, in the means on their side of *a true Repentance and Faith in this Sacrifice*: And the whole Pardon did belong to *these Dispositions* in their Minds, as we may observe from the People of the Jews, who although they

they sacrificed in the greatest Abundance, yet had their Sins still charged upon them, enjoying no other Advantage therefrom, but only the Esteem of a legal Purity, and the Liberty of their Temple-Service, and free Commerce with one another, which else they would have been debarred of. And whensoever God promised Remission of Sins, it was to these Qualifications of Faith and Repentance, and not to the material thing of offering a Sacrifice, which nevertheless might relieve them from some temporal Judgment in the Divine Designation, as it related to the Oblation of Christ. Neither were these Sacrifices vainly instituted, according to *Bellarmino*, though Remission of Sins was not purchased by them, because they were express Representations of the Sacrifice of Christ, and did excellently instruct the pious People of those Times in the Notion and Faith of him. So that the Sacrifices under the Law, as they were only typical things both of the Sacrifice of Christ, and the Compensation thereof to the Divine Justice for the Offence of our Sins, and were neither Compensations themselves, nor had any Remission belonging to them, except only in a civil Regard of Legal Impurities, they cannot be Proofs of this Doctrine of Satisfaction if there were any reference between them.

The Argument founded upon Merits, that because we can deserve eternal Life, we can therefore satisfy for some part of the Punishment of our Sins, which is less than the other, being only one-false Doctrine for the ground-work of another, I shall not need to enlarge upon, only observe how harmoniously to the Roman Assertion let them consider, that eternal Life is stiled in Scripture the Gift of God, *Rom. 6. 23*; and ascribed to the Mercy of the Lord in the day of Judgment: *2 Tim. 1. 18*. And when it is called a Reward, as

Matth. 20. call the Labourers, and give them their Reward. And when it is expressed a Crown of Justice, *2 Tim. 4.* that Reward must be explained of the Divine Goodness, which proposes such an ample Return to our imperfect Labours, so much above the Equivalency of them in a commutative way; and that Justice must be referred to the Promise of God, by which he is obliged to perform his Word, that had no other Reason but his own Bounty, and infinite Goodness.

Thus I have endeavoured to lay down the true sense of those Texts of Scripture which the Romanists bring for their Satisfaction; which all results into this general Doctrine, That the Favour of God is always obtained, and his Judgments diverted in the exercise of a true Repentance: this is that which stops the Vials of God's Wrath towards any People, not a Compensation to Divine Justice, which is impossible for any Creature, and is only the purchase of Christ's Blood, but a true Change and Conversion in themselves. A most compassionate and merciful Father, after the more gentle Methods of Precepts and Doctrines, and secret workings in our Spirits, often inflicts sore Chastisements upon us to excite us by a kind of Violence to a Reformation by that means; and when he has disciplined us into this Habit, and advanced a Christian Disposition in us, he then removes those Scourges from us, which have now accomplished their Design; and purged away that vicious Matter that was the cause and occasion of them. So that these temporal Punishments or Afflictions are taken off, not after the manner of Satisfaction, but by way of Disposition or change of Temper in our selves.

And as to Works of Penance, which are either means of Repentance, or Effects and Signs of it, seeing they may be such great Advantages to the repressing of our sensual

sensual Appetites, and affording us a more easy conquest of our selves, there can be no Objection to them, whether they be voluntarily undertaken, or by the Authority of a Gospel-Minister who has the care of Souls committed to him, if they be not such as are repugnant to the true Service and Worship of God, or having no foundation in his holy Word, but only being the Commandments of Men, would make a Will-worship in the observers of them; and if they be not magisterially enjoined without a due Prudence or relation to the Exigency they are designed for. Those three Instances must needs be admitted if they be discreetly applied, Prayer, Fasting, and Alms, as being of great efficacy to the promoting of a Christian Temper in our Spirits. Fasting will bring us into the government of our Bodies, that our Vertues will be more attainable by us; and giving of Alms in the more repeated Exercise thereof, when we more converse with the Joys and Thanks of relieved People, will advance us to a Disposition of Charity and Christian Affections in our Souls: And Prayer not only procures a more liberal Assistance of Grace with us, but in the more frequent practice of that Duty, raises our Spirits above Sensuality, and the World, and begets an Heavenly-mindedness in us. But then some of these cannot be Works of Satisfaction which are defined laborious Works, being the most joyous Employments we are capable of; what can be a more pleasurable Action than conversing with God in Prayers, and Praises, and Thanksgivings to him, or in frequent Study and Contemplations on his Word? And what can afford us a more comfortable Reflection than to redress the Miseries of our indigent Brethren, and help them to some share of the Enjoyments of this Life? That Person to whom these Performances are irksom and grievous, is not only

not to be reckoned as ... but to have lost the proper Instinct of a Man through some ill Courses or Behaviour. And even Fasting it self, and those other Austerities in our Apparel, being clothed with Sackcloth and the like, so often mentioned in Scripture, have a spiritual Comfort and Joy in them, as being either the means of a sincere Repentance, or the Effects of it, tho they be so ungrateful to the Body. But however they are no Satisfaction for any part of the penalty of Sin, but only Advantages to repent of it, and remove the Judgments that belong to it, as we attain in the use of them to a more vertuous habit and Disposition in our Natures.

And now having shown against the Doctrine of Satisfaction, that there is no Proof of it in Scripture, *viz.* That Men can compensate by any Afflictions, or voluntary Penances for any part of the punishment of their Sins, which is an unreasonable Assertion in respect of mere Men, as well as derogatory to the Redemption of our blessed Saviour; it manifestly follows, that none can satisfy for the Penalties of other People, or acquit and release them, which must be done by an overplus of Satisfaction, or a performance of more than is requisite upon their account. Yet seeing the Romanists do maintain this unreasonable thing, that Men may exceed in their Satisfaction, and so found a Treasure of the Church, as they call it, which the Governours thereof, especially our holy Father the Pope (to speak in their phrase) have the power to apply as they please. I shall also consider those Texts of Scripture which they produce for these Redundances with as much Brevity as may be.

And the first is *Col. 1. 24.* where the Apostle says, *I now rejoice in my Sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the Afflictions of Christ in my Fleish, for*

his Bodies sake, which is the Church. Bellarmine complains upon this Place of Chemnitius, and other Protestants for affirming of the Catholick Writers (as the Roman Party stile themselves) as if it were a Doctrine of theirs that there was something wanting to the absolute Fulness of Christ's Satisfaction, which he calls an impudent Lie, and declares that none of their Writers can be alledged for it, they all maintaining in a great Agreement, the Satisfaction of Christ to have been of infinite Value, and a full Atonement not only for the Sins of one World, but of Millions more, if there had been so many, and that all manner of Sin, and all kinds of Punishment are expiated by it, that which they assert being only this, that the Sufferings of the Saints may be an Accession to the Treasure of Satisfaction in the Church, but are not requisite to supply any Defect in Christ's Passion. And they were to be thanked for this Justice to our Saviour, if their Practice did not contradict it, for if they believe this ample Sufficiency, nay this Redundancy of Christ's Satisfaction, why do they then join others to it, and why do they perswade their unhappy Penitents to fly to these, and dispense their Pardons and Indulgences from them. But however seeing he speaks of a general Agreement, let us hear how some of them express themselves in this matter, which can only be a reasonable Foundation of their Practice. Thus a certain * Author comments upon the place, *The Apostle openly declares that his Sufferings in the Flesh did profit the Church, and supplied the Deficiency of Christ's Passion, or that which that had left in it, not that the Sufferings of Paul were more efficacious than those of Christ, but that Christ removed the Guilt of Sin by his Passion, and Paul with other just Persons in their Sufferings for his Body, or the Church have accomplished the Remainder.* I suppose

* Polygran. in assercione quor. Eccles. dogmatum.

poſe he means that which was to be a Stock for Indulgences, and the Diſcharge of temporal Punishment. Now what can be more plainly ſpoken as to the Defect of Chriſt's Sufferings, and that a Sufficiency in all Reſpects is made up from the Saints, which is the ſenſe of their other Authors, only expreſſed with more Decency, that indeed through an Influence of Divine Grace in the Purchase of Chriſt, we can ſatisfy for the temporal pains of our Sins, and that we may do more than is requiſite for our ſelves upon that account. Now this being ſuch a Repugnancy to the Apoſtle in abundance of other Places, cannot be his meaning in this, that he ſhould join any thing elſe, as a Completion to the Atonement and Satisfaction of Chriſt's Sufferings, or ſuppoſe a want in them. His Doctrine is this, there being two ſorts of the Sufferings of Chriſt expreſſed in Scripture, one perſonal which he ſubmitted to on the Croſs for the Redemption of his Church, and which was there compleated; others, which he ſtill ſuſtains in his faithful Members, whom he has a Sympathy and fellow-feeling with, and which he ſhall always be concerned in, to the end of the World: I ſay, there being theſe two ſorts of Chriſt's Sufferings, the Doctrine of the Apoſtle in this Place is in relation to the latter of them, that he moſt willingly did engage in his ſhare of the Afflictions of faithful People for the Benefit of the Church, to confirm them in their Chriſtian Habits of Faith, and Patience, and Reſignation to God by his Example. And that theſe Afflictions being ſuſtained by the Members of Chriſt, and for his Name are reckoned to him, is very evident, not only from the Sentence of the laſt day upon uncharitable People, *I was an hungry, and I was thirſty, and I was in Priſon, and ye miniſtered not unto me*; but from many other places. Thus our Saviour ſpoke from Heaven, when

our Apostle was a Persecutor of the Christians, *Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?* Acts 9. 4. And so it is said concerning Moses, *that he esteemed the Reproach of Christ greater Riches than the Treasures of Egypt.* And the Apostle likewise after his account of the kinds of their Afflictions, 2 Cor. 4. 10. *We bear in our Body the Mortification or Sufferings of the Lord Jesus.* And again, 2 Cor. 1. 5. *As the Sufferings of Christ abound in us.* And that his Afflictions were a singular Advantage and Edification to the Church, he himself tells us more than once, *Phil. 1. 12, 13, 14. I would ye should understand, Brethren, that the things which happened unto me, have served rather to the Furtherance of the Gospel; so that my Bonds in Christ are manifest in all the Palace, and all other Places; and many of the Brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my Bonds, are much more bold to speak the Word without Fear.* And so again, 2 Cor. 1. 6. *Whether we be afflicted it is for your Consolation and Salvation, which is effectual in the enduring of the same Sufferings which we also suffer; or whether we be comforted, it is for your Consolation and Salvation.* Where the Apostle plainly informs us of the Effect of his Afflictions, that it was not to exempt his pious Brethren from such like Chastisements in their own Persons; (which is the account of Satisfaction) but to encourage them thereto, and inspire them with more Resolution under all the Hardships of a Christian Life, by the Example of his Constancy, which well explains the End of his Afflictions in this place to the *Colossians*; that they were for the Edification of the Church in some of the Vertues of their Heavenly Profession, whether Faith or Perseverance, or any other proper Product of such a Circumstance; and both the Expressions will admit of this sense. And very many of the Roman Writers are content with it, which *Bellarmino* himself does allow

to be natural enough for one Acceptation of the place : and if so, if it may be expounded another way, then these Satisfactions for other People are no necessary Inference or Deduction from it. And 'tis very observable that where he asserts his own sense, he only does it upon a Supposal of the thing in Controversy; that because the Apostle was willing to promote their Advantage in all the Respects that he was able, as one must conceive of the Author of that Sentence, *I would gladly be spent for you*, therefore he communicated his Sufferings to the Expiation of the temporal Guilt or Penalty of their Sins. But might not one as well conclude concerning Merit, that because he was desirous to be beneficial to them in every thing that he could, therefore he merited eternal Happiness and Glory for them? Ought it not to have been proved first of all, that he could do either of these, or that he could profit them in other Instances, than only by confirming and building them up in their holy Faith, which we allow, and no more? By this kind of Argument one might maintain the most extravagant things, and assure ones self of all those Advantages that the Charity, or Christian Affection of any Person would be willing to procure for him, whether they be possible and expedient, or no. This therefore cannot be understood as a Proof of Satisfactions for other People, but only imports thus much, that the Apostle was very joyful to endure the hardest things, and accomplish his Proportion of those Afflictions that successively are to be undergone by the Company of faithful People, or Members of Christ to the end of the World; he was glad to endure these, for the spiritual Advantage and Edification that might redound therefrom to the Church. To which is parallel, and to be explained in the same manner, that other place of our

Apostle, 2 Tim: 2:10. Therefore I endure all things for the Bless'd's Sake, that they may obtain the Salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal Glory: and also 2 Cor. 12: 15. I will very gladly spend, and be spent for you, viz. That he would cheerfully part with all that he had for the Procurement of their Salvation.

Another Place is Ephes. 5. 1, 2. *Be ye followers of God as dear Children, and walk in Love, as Christ also hath loved us, and given himself for us an Offering and Sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling Savour.* Thus one of them comments upon this place, That as Christ being the Head of his mystical Body, in the effect of his ardent Charity, offered up himself for his Members; so ought every Member upon any needful or important occasion, even sacrifice it self for its Fellow-Member. And what if we should yield all this to be contained in our Christian Charity, that after the Example of our Saviour, we should be disposed even to die for the procurement of some greater advantage to our Brethren, which is no more than the Doctrine of the Apostle, 1 John 3. 16. *Hereby perceive we the Love of God, because he laid down his Life for us; and we ought to lay down our Lives for the Brethren:* Does it therefore follow that it can only be by way of Satisfaction for the penalties of their Sins, and upon no account of their moral Good or proficiency in a Christian Life? But then if the parallel should be exactly insisted on according to their Interpretation, seeing Christ satisfied by his Death for the whole guilt and demerit of Sin, it must then be allowed that in our Death for our Brethren we also satisfy in the same latitude, not only for the temporal punishment of Sin, but the eternal Guilt and penalty of it, which is a repugnancy to their own Doctrine. For the Instance of our Saviour cannot universally be proposed

G g g g

to

to our imitation, who was God as well as Man, and in the exercise of his Divinity did perform abundance of things; but only he is proposed to us in the Actions of his humane Nature, the admirable Sanctity, and moral Perfections which he exemplified in his whole Behaviour. But however, altho we are obliged to lay down our Lives for the Brethren in some signal Instance of their Advantage, yet this is not the Scope or Doctrine of the Place, but only the Sincerity of our Christian Affections to one another, that as Christ by his voluntary Oblation and Sacrifice of himself for our Sins, did afford the highest Example of an intense Charity; so we should be hearty and unfeigned in our Respects to our Fellow-Christians, *Love as Brethren, be pitiful and courteous*: And thus the Writers of the Church of Rome do generally explain it.

Another place for these vicarious Satisfactions, that the effect of any ones Sufferings can redound to others, is *Gal. 6. 2. Bear ye one anothers Burdens*: Which that it relates to that particular sort of Charity, that consists in a candid Interpretation of one anothers Actions, and not censuring them in the hardest sense or construction of them, is very manifest from the Context both before and after: That we set up a Tribunal of Equity for one another, and make all the Condescensions that we fairly can as to any Misbehaviour any Person has been guilty of, his Circumstance might have rendered him more liable to it, or the natural habit of his own Body, and we are not secure from the like Instance our selves. The Paraphrase of the place then may be this, that we ought with a great deal of Patience to bear the Faults of other People, to be candid and favourable in our censures of them, and not to use Severity upon them; which expression of a due Charity, (not to mention how apt it is to in-

duce one to Repentance, which the contrary Method would exasperate and harden) is the accomplishing of the Law, and will obtain the most lenity to our selves, if we should happen according to the liableness of humane Nature to be overcome by any Temptation. This is the true Exposition of the Place, as it lies with the Context, and how much it relates to Satisfaction one for another, let any one judg.

Another Argument is drawn from the Communion of the Saints. We are taught (says *Bellarmino*) *in this Article, that all faithful People are mutually Members, and one living Body: and as living Members do assist one another; so the Faithful in like manner do communicate their good things among themselves, especially those which being superfluous to one, may be necessary or profitable to others.* Indulg. lib. 1. cap. 3. But the Communion of Saints does only require a mutual Sympathy and resentment among them; or a kind of Partnership both in Grief and Joy, and all the Accommodations of this Life, when the afflicted Circumstance of any of our Brethren stands in need thereof, that they should all be affected just as any of them are, and make their Possessions a common Treasure or Store for them; and that they should likewise communicate as much as they are able, their spiritual good things, their Knowledge, and Counsels, and Christian Admonitions to a holy Life; but that they should transmit their proper Actions to one another, is unconceivable, and against the Logick of all Men, as that the Effects of an undoubted Faith, the Constancy and Fortitude of the blessed Apostles should be reckoned to any other Person as their own Vertues. And this they confess in respect of Merit, that that is a thing which cannot be communicated; and how an instance of suffering should be more, being both alike personal Performances, I cannot perceive.

G g g g 2

In-

Indeed the fruits of our good Works have a common Influence and Nature, as they are Ornaments of the same Body, and excite every Member to the like Behaviour, and Christian Morals; but the Actions themselves are appropriate to the Subject, and incommunicable; and *Bellarmino's* Argument, when he asserts, and maintains the contrary, is only begging of the Question. *The Saints*, says he, *do communicate their good things to one another*: So say we too, all the good things that they have, but Satisfaction is denied by us Protestants to belong to them, as being only the Prerogative of Christ's Sufferings, who was God and Man in the same Person, and therefore these should first have been proved in respect of the highest Saints, that an Overplus of Sufferings above the Merit of their own Sins is possible to them, and not supposed it as a certain Principle. But it may be thought he had done this before in some other place of his many Volumes, which is as hard a task as any novel or upstart Doctrine of the whole Popery.

Now upon this head of the Communion of Saints, they bring two Places more; the first is *2 Cor. 8. 14.* *But by an Equality that now at this time your Abundance may be a Supply for their Want, that their Abundance also may be a Supply for your Want, that there may be an Equality.* Now the Romanists so interpret this Place, as if the *Corinthians* in return of their Liberality to the indigent *Jews*, were to receive such a Supply of Prayers, and Satisfaction from those *Jews*, as was wanting in themselves; that is, spiritual things for carnal, according to the Apostle, *Rom. 15. 27.* *If the Gentiles have been Partakers of their spiritual things, their Duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things.* From hence they conclude such a Communion in the Church, that one

may transfer his Acquirements to another, and not only temporal things, but spiritual. *From this, says Belarmine, it plainly follows that one may satisfy for another, and that the Sufferings of some may be applied to other People.* But this is a violent and forc'd Usage of the place; here is nothing to carry ones thoughts to this Commutation of a different Kind or Recompence of spiritual for temporal, but they are plainly temporal on both sides. The meaning of the Apostle is apparently this, (there being no certainty of these worldly Possessions, which make themselves Wings and fly away, but he that is now furnish'd with abundance of them, and so enabled to relieve others, may shortly be reduced to so much Indigence, as to stand in need of Charity himself, and so on the contrary) that the *Corinthians* abounding ἐν τῷ ὑὺν κερῶν, in this present time should administer to the Jews, who were then wanting, that in case there should happen a change of Circumstance; and they both placed in opposite Fortunes, the Jews might again assist the *Corinthians*, not only from the Obligation of Christian Charity, but common Justice. Commentators refer this to a Famine in *Judea*, which might quickly be over, and so they in a Condition of giving Alms, and not receiving. And now if there be this interchangeable Charity, or mutual Beneficence among Christians, what does that concern Satisfaction? or how does it follow that some pious People should compensate in the Measure of their Sufferings for the Penalty of others Sins? which is their Inference from the place. And that place to the *Romans*. 15. 27. is no Advantage to this Argument, *If the Gentiles have been made Partakers of their spiritual things, their Duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things.* The Recompence here is expressly in carnal things; and to be applied

not

not to the Benefit of Satisfaction, but to the Doctrines of Salvation, and the inestimable Treasure of the Word of Life, which the *Gentiles* first received from the preaching of the *Jews*, and which well deserved such a return as this. But then suppose that the Place should be meant of a Retribution of spiritual things, which they wanted for those temporal things wherein they abounded, yet why should these be Satisfaction? are there no other spiritual Bounties which a pious and grateful Soul can remunerate a secular Kindness, or Beneficence withal? Have Prayers no Value or Effect in them? Are holy Instructions, or Improvements in the sacred Science of the Scriptures of Truth, and Examples of Vertue copied therefrom, of no Benefit to any Person, so that they may recompense a small Contribution of the good things of this World? Those that understand this place with *Bellarmino*, of spiritual returns for temporal things, do define these returns by Prayers and Suffrages for their Alms-Givers, or Benefactors, of whom a certain Author sets down a long Catalogue.

Another place which they bring from this Article of the Communion of Saints for the Establishment of Satisfaction one for another, is *Psal. 119. 63.* The Argument whereof only depends upon the Latin Version, *Particeps ego sum omnium timentium te*; I am a Partaker with all those that fear thee; but the Hebrew Word is *אח*, which we better render in our English Bible a Companion; *I am a Companion of all that fear thee.* Which only argues the Prophet's converse to have been with pious Men, and proves him also to have been such at the same time. But what if we should allow their Latin Version, are not there many Effects and Offices of Charity, which all good People participate in, a mutual Resentment of one anothers Circumstances, and most

most hearty Applications, and Instances under them, and Prayers to God to accomplish that in their behalf, which lies beyond their proper Powers, to perform for them? And will not these Instances sufficiently explain the Communion of faithful People, which are all set forth in the Revelations of God's Word? But must we needs run to the unscriptural thing of Satisfaction for the full Importance, and definition of it? This is adding to the Oracles of God, and the stating of things we find there: what the Consequence thereof is, let them consider who do so.

Another Place is 2 Cor. 2. which they form into this Argument, *The Apostle mitigated the due Penalty to the incestuous Person, whom he had excommunicated for that grievous Crime, upon the Earnest and Intercession of the Corinthians. Ver. 10. To whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive also; for I forgive any thing to whom I forgive it; for your sakes forgive I it in the Person of Christ.* Now from hence they conclude, that he may be delivered from the Penalties that belong to our Sins by the Sufferings of other good People, as these are applicable to our account. But first of all, supposing Prayer to be a laborious Work, as they define Satisfaction; which being the transport of our Souls to Heaven, cannot come under that notion; here is no mention of the *Corinthians* Prayers in this matter: indeed he remitted this publick Censure, or shortened the time of it, *for their sakes*, or for their advantage, that perhaps they might not grow proud of themselves, or contract a hardened and uncompassionate Temper towards any Brother by that means; but it no ways appears that he did this at their request. And besides, if they had addrest him in this behalf, it could not have been reckoned as a Satisfaction, which was thus offered to the Apostle, and not to God, against whom the In-

†

jury

jury of Sin especially *Precedent* to that to whom a Compensation is chiefly to be rendered. But however that this was a Discipline of the Church, to lead this Person, and all the Members of that Communion to a true Reformation and Holiness of Life, and not a *Satisfaction* upon him, or to be performed by any other Person upon his Account, *which* has no respect to a future Amendment, is very evident, that as soon as it had this effect upon him, it was then relaxed, and he exempt and delivered from it; *ver. 6, 7, 8. Sufficient to such a Man is this Punishment, &c.*

And that last Argument of theirs, that God vouchsafed many Advantages to some for the good Works and Merits of others, as for the Piety of *Abraham* he spared *Lot*; and for the Uprightness of holy *David* almost all the Kings of *Judah* after him, who were abundance of them very ill Men; and several times at the Instance of *Moses* he relieved the whole People from sudden ruine. And therefore this regard to virtuous Men being allowed in the Dispensation of his Benefits, which is evident from the Scriptures, why should it not be admitted in the pardon of temporal Punishment? And 'tis certain that God has signified this regard to pious Men by more Examples than these, and not only in the collation of Advantages or Benefits, but in the remission of punishment too; but then this was not done in the purchase of their *Merits*, which none can possibly arrive at, nor by way of Commutation; or one satisfying for another, which none could ever do upon his own account, but it wholly proceeded from the immense Goodness and infinite Affection of the Divine Nature to Mankind, which takes hold of any occasion of their Benefit, or free exertion of it self towards them.

Thus

Thus I have done with those Texts of Scripture, that either *Bellarmino* or any other of his Communion, that I know of, produce for *Satisfactions*, whether they be such as are performed by any Person for himself, or being a redundancy on that account are applied to other People; and I hope sufficiently made it manifest that they bear another sense than what these Authors have put upon them.

I shall now in the last place with as much brevity as may be, shew the Original of these *Satisfactions*, how they began, and were established in the Church. In order to which we must, first, observe the antient Discipline of the Church, that those who were guilty of any notorious or greater Offences were always removed from the Communion of it, and were to undergo a long Exclusion and state of Penance, before they were admitted into it again, which might be a proper means of a true Repentance in themselves, and both a testification thereof, and a determent to other People from the like Miscarriages (as I observed before.) The time of this Exclusion was often long, according to the nature of the Offences. The great *St. Basil* in his Canons of Ecclesiastical Censures, prescribes a Penance of fifteen years to those that had been guilty of the Sin of Adultery, before they were to be admitted into the Communion of faithful People, as to all the advantages thereof, both of Prayer, and the holy Eucharist: and those who had committed the less instance of that Sin with an unmarried Person, which is stiled Fornication, were not ordinarily to partake of these Advantages till after a Penance ~~ing~~ ^{ing} ~~ven~~ ^{ven} years: And so other Sins, as they were esteemed of an higher Nature, or were more influential upon other people from the quality of the Persons acting them, had a proportionable Penance assigned to them, which was always longer and more severe, when

H h h h

it

it was subjected in any of the Orders of the Priestly Function, than when it related to Lay-people, as we might produce many Canons to this purpose concerning Drunkenness and the like; nay, those things that were always reckoned inoffensive, and no matter of Censure at all in Lay-people, when admitted by a Clergyman, were adjudged to great Penalties, as to play at Dice, or enter the Theater, and publick Spectacle, with the like; the pious Fathers of the primitive Times being of opinion, that these were Indecencies to the holy Character, and not consistent with the Sacredness of it; or which being allowed in such Persons would be too much an occasion to those Vices that are commonly the Effects of such Liberties.

Can. ad Am-
phy. 75.

Now these Penances, as they were allowed to none, or none were capable of the Benefit of them, but those who were disposed for the Grace of Repentance to relinquish their evil Courses, and no longer persist in them; so they were accomplished by several steps or gradual advances above one another.

The first was called the Station of weeping (*ἡ πρόκυλισσις*) without the Port of the holy Oratory, where the Sinners were obliged to stand, not being permitted to enter therein, and entreat the Prayers of the happy partakers of that Priviledg, which they often did with floods of Tears in a just resentment of their Offences.

The second step was the place of *Abstinence* within the Port, and which extended to the *Servants* of the *Catechumens*, whether they were those, who being willing to become Christians from a Pagan State, did only apply for a due Information in the Faith and Morals of that Heavenly Profession; or those other that being arrived at a competent notion and knowledge thereof,

thereof, did desire, and had a right to the Sacrament of Baptism: and here the Penitents were used to stand only partaking of the Word preached, and then departing with the *Catechumens*, not being allowed to join with the Faithful in the Church-Liturgy or Common-Prayer.

The third was the place of Subjection or Substration, (*substratio*) to which were appropriated the penitentiary Acts, as it is rendred by Translators who were very skilful in this Discipline, *Penitentia*, and the Verb *substratus*, *penitens*. The Areopagite explains this of a kneeling down, by which the Penitents submitted themselves to the Presbyter, who was appointed to have the charge over them, without all question for a relaxation of their Penance, that they might sooner come into all the benefits of Church-Communion. But it is more probable that these Acts of Homage were performed to God, and were the effects of a true Contrition. Now these Penitents of this Station were further promoted in the Temple, but only participating of the Exposition or preaching of the Word, departed also with the *Catechumens*, when the Church began their solemn Devotions.

Eccles. Hierarchy. cap. 5.

The fourth Station was as it were still a farther Advancement in the Oratory, where these Penitents were conjoined with the Assembly of the Faithful, and employed in Prayer with them, though they were not admitted to the holy Table, or the Communion of Christ's Body, and most effectual means of applying the saving Benefits of his Passion to us, which was to be at the Discretion of the Minister, when he considered that in the Degree of their Repentance they were qualified for it. And this is the Sense of that frequent Expression that the Penitents of this Order were received

H h h h : 2

ceived

ceived into Church-Communion, *χωρίς προσφορῆς* (χωρὶς προσφορῆς) that they had the Priviledg of Common-Prayer with those faithful People who were not under any Church-Censure, but were not admitted to a Participation of the Sacrament with them. For whether this *Oblation* relate to the blessed Sacrament itself according to the Opinion of *Zonaras* and *Balsamon* in many Places; or to those Gifts that were usually offered upon the holy Table by every Communicant at the time of receiving, it still carries the same Sense, seeing those that were refrained from the Concomitants of the holy Eucharist cannot be supposed to have enjoyed the free Use and Benefit thereof.

For the further Illustration of these several Degrees, or Stations of Penance, I shall translate two Canons of Saint *Basil*, which will both confirm the former account I have given of them, and also render that more obvious. The first is the 75th of the first Epistle to *Amphilochium*. “ If any have defiled himself with
 “ his half-Sister either by the Father or Mother’s side,
 “ permit him not entrance into the House of Prayer,
 “ till he refrain from that abominable Practice, and
 “ after he’s come to a due Apprehension of his fearful Sin, let him lament three whole years at the
 “ door of the Sanctuary, entreating the Devotions of
 “ them that enter, that in an earnest, and Christian
 “ Compassion, they would every one supplicate
 “ the Lord for him. After this let him be received to
 “ the Station of Hearing for three other years; and
 “ in the Solemnities of the Church, when he has heard
 “ the Heavenly Instructions, and Doctrines of the Gospel, then dismiss him, as being unworthy to be a
 “ Partner in their Devotions. And afterwards, if he
 “ request these with Tears, and Weeping, and Address

“ to.

“ to God in a due Contrition and Humbleness of Spi-
 “ rit, afford him *the Station of Subjection* for other
 “ three years. And when he has shown the proper
 “ Fruits of a hearty Repentance, let him be admitted
 “ to *the Prayers of the Faithful*, without the Priviledg
 “ of an Oblation; and then conforing two years with
 “ them in their holy Devotions, let him approach to
 “ *the Lord's Table*, and a free Participation of the Be-
 “ nefits thereof.

The other Canon is the 81st. “ Seeing many upon
 “ the Incurfion of barbarous People, have shamefully
 “ violated their Christian Faith, either by adhering
 “ to magical Rites, or partaking in the Heathen Sa-
 “ crifice, or swearing by their Gods, whether Idols,
 “ Sun, or Stars, or the like, let their Discipline be ac-
 “ cording to the Canons of the antient Fathers. Those
 “ that offer themselves to the Gentile Cruelty, and be-
 “ ing overcome by the unmerciful Usage and Tor-
 “ ments thereof, such as almost make a Necessity in
 “ humane Nature, to yield under them, and so are
 “ drawn to an Abnegation, let them be excluded
 “ three years *in the place of Weeping*, and then only
 “ admitted to the *hearing* of the Scriptures for two
 “ more, and let them be three years in *the Station of*
 “ *Subjection*, or in the special Acts and Exercise of
 “ Repentance, such as may most demonstrate the Sin-
 “ cerity thereof, and then received to the *Communion*
 “ *of the Faithful*, as to their Devotions and publick
 “ Prayers. But those that have betrayed their Chri-
 “ stian Faith, without this Violence or Impression up-
 “ on them, in more Freedom of their depraved Will,
 “ let them be removed from any common Act with
 “ faithful People three years, and be in the *State of*
 “ *hearing* for two, or only have the Benefit of the
 “ Word.

“ Word preached, and in the *Place of Subjection* for three
 “ more; and then being conjoynd with the Assem-
 “ bly of the Faithful, as to the exercise of their common
 “ Devotions for three years, let them then come to the
 “ Communion of the blessed Sacrament of *Christ's Body*.
 Where we may observe to reconcile this Canon with
 the seventy third, that this holy Father was of Opinion,
 that a Sacrificing to *Demons* in the Heathen Notion of
 them, as supposing them to be middle Deities, and to
 have some share in the Government of the World,
 which perhaps in those less removes from a state of
 Paganism, might consist with some imperfect Acknow-
 ledgment and Faith of Christ, that he was a Superi-
 our Mediator to them; I say, this Father was of this
 Opinion, it may be upon these Reasons, that a sacri-
 ficing to Demons, was less in the Balance of Sins, than
 an *absolute Denial or Renouncing of Christ*, and there-
 fore to *this* he prescribes a perpetual Weeping and Ex-
 clusion, from the higher Benefits of Christian Assem-
 blies, their common Devotions, and *holy Eucharist*, which
 he does not allow but at the hour of Death to such Per-
 sons when he thinks upon Belief of the Mercy of God,
 it may be admittred and afforded to them, whereas
 the Penance to the other was only for a certain time.

And these Penances were not so necessary either as
 to the Measure or Continuance of them, but either
 the Bishop, or some Presbyter authorized by him,
 could relax them, and contract the time of them,
 which they often did upon the Evidence of a *true Re-
 pentance*, when these had obtained their just Efficacy
 upon any Person; for in regard to *this* they had a dis-
 cretionary Power assigned to them in several Coun-
 cils, which is also contained in the Authority of a
 Bishop, either to remit some part of the Penance, or
 even

even dispense with *one Station* of it, as the Repentance was more demonstrable by the Consequent Fruits of Holiness and Vertue redounding therefrom. And it was likewise very usual in the Approaches of Perfection, as well as in case of extream Sicknes, to receive the Penitents into the Peace of the Church, though they had not accomplished their course of Discipline, and afford them the blessed Eucharist, and confirm them against their Sufferings, by the extraordinary Graces of that Sacrament. And these Remissions only related to Canonical Censures, and not a judicial Punishment of Sin to which Purpose they are now applied by a sort of Christians, who stile themselves Catholicks, though directly contrary both in this and many things else, to the sense of the first Fathers.

Concil. Anchy.
can. 5, &c.

Now these Penances or Church-Discipline, as they are proper to subdue the sensual Affections, both by rebating the cause of them in our Natures, and advancing a more cautious habit in our Spirits against new Lapses, or compliance with them, when we must suffer such Severities upon that account; and are also effectual to preserve other People from such Enormities upon the same reflection that these must be expiated in a long scene of Shame and Sufferings; which circumstance of Shame, in respect of many Tempers, is the strongest Inducement to renounce or forsake any thing: I say, as these Penances are expedient to these purposes, as I observed before; so likewise they are absolutely necessary in regard of abundance of People, who would perfectly resign themselves up to their own sensual Appetites, and wholly live according to that stronger Principle of humane Nature, unless they were restrained by this means, which Restraint or Violence

olence upon them at the first may afterwards grow through Custom, into a voluntary Behaviour and free Exercise of their Christian Vertues. Although all People sufficiently know the moral Law, as to the principal Duties of it, that being written upon their Minds, as well as revealed in ten Precepts; and there is no Difficulty concerning this, but only as it falls in more intricate Circumstances some times, which are called Cases of Conscience, and which by the Art of some Men are made more and more intricate too, than ever can happen in humane Life, yet neither the Reasonableness of their known Duty according to the temper and Faculties of Man, nor the Threats of eternal Misery to the Neglect of it in the other World, being at such a Distance, can preserve them in the Practice thereof. And therefore there were always Censures in the Church upon this Advantage, or Necessity of them, which were first established by our Lord himself, *Mat. 18. 17.* And often practised by the Apostles in an extraordinary manner, so as to be attended with bodily Torments, that Men by this means might be forcibly kept from Sin, through a present Shame and Punishment upon it, who would be less wrought withal in a long Prospect of eternal Ruine, and that they might be thus accustomed to the material Exercise or Action of Vertue, which at last would become a Habit in them, and the result of their own choice. And I doubt not but these Censures so carefully practised in the Primitive Church, recovered thousands to a strict observance of their Christian Duty, and a temper of Vertue in their Spirits, who would otherwise have continued loose Persons through their whole Life time. Such an Advantage would the

re-

restoring of primitive Discipline be in our Church, as it would reduce us to a more Christian State, and remove that Libertinism, and dissolute Living that is among us.

Now these Penances being so beneficial as they were, and such an Advantage to a Gospel-Holiness, began to have too high Expressions bestowed upon them by several of the Fathers, that they could atone, or satisfy for Sin; appease the Lord, and appease the Judge; and that both the Offence and Penalty thereof could be redeemed and expiated by them * : though they meant no more than that they were an occasion to free Creatures to forsake Sin, and arrive at such a disposition of Vertue and Religion as must needs be acceptable to God, and had no foundation of Punishment in it, and therefore to derive these Benefits to such People as were under the power of their evil Habits, they often recommended this pious Discipline above the proper Efficacy of it, which does not consist in the bare Action as though that had any merit belonging to it, but in its Influence upon the Mind, as it tends to the Reformation of that Principle, and the acquiring of a better Frame and Disposition in it. But however such Expressions as these are the only ground that the Romanists have from primitive times for their Satisfaction, which they so contradict in their Doctrins about them. The Fathers well understood these Penances only to be Medicines of a vitious Nature, and an external Satisfaction, if any one please, to the Church to repair the scandal of some wicked Action, which was their whole Notion in the matter, as is evident from their Indulgences which were only Remissions of some part of these Penances when they

Chem. Exam.
p. 2. p. 205.

concluded, that they had wrought a true Repentance, and performed the Cure they were sent upon; but they never applied these to the Punishment of Sin, as if they could discharge a certain Proportion or Share thereof, that is the temporal Penalty that belongs to it. This is a novel Doctrine of the Catholick Church now a-days, that is only denominated from one City or Archbishoprick; but was not known in the truly antient and Apostolick Church, which was dispersed over all the World, and maintained a perfect Harmony in every part. And as these Satisfactions did but start up in some late Centuries; So tis likely they were never so explicitly treated of, till the thirteenth, in which the subtile Doctor lived who expressly makes them Expiations for past Sins, and, if possible, is more subtile about them than other things.

*Supplen. 3 part.
Quest. 14. art.
1.*

Thus we see how this only true and infallible Church is changed from the Primitive Faith, and the Doctrines of the first Fathers. I wish we may preserve our selves from it in such particulars as these, and in the Spirit of Meekness, communicate with one, who acknowledging her self liable to be mistaken, yet is well assured, that she is established as to all her Doctrines, and Usage or Discipline, upon the Scriptures, and the concurrent Sense of the *first Fathers*, who as they were nearer the blessed Apostles, or contemporary with them, by which they could better understand their Institutions; so being such self-denying Persons as they were, are better Authors of any Doctrine, and more to be trusted or relied upon, than a Company of Merchants in Religion, or those that betray designs of Profit in all their Sanctions, which they having been so

suc-

successful in, and having laid such a platform of Secular Greatness, and such a power of Indulgences or Pardon of Sins, without the trouble of Contrition for them, makes the only Inducement (that I know) to become Profelytes to that Church, which is so little Apostolick for those reasons.

T H E E N D.

E R R A T A.

- Pag. 536. lin. 19. for *Principle*, read *Spirit*.
550. lin. 22. for *fore*, read *some*.
574. lin. 12. dele *likely*.
-

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswel at the Rose and Crown
in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1688.

The **T**EXTS examined which *Papists*
cite out of the *Bible* for the
Proof of their Doctrine

CONCERNING
PURGATORY.

PART I

IMPRIMATUR.

Sept. 19. 1688.

Gual. Neesham.

THE Council of *Trent* shews her *Avarice* and
Subtilty in no one Point defin'd by her, more,
than in her definition concerning *Purgatory*,
which, tho she proposes for an Article of
Faith, (and that a most important one,) yet her *Wis-*
dom has thought fit to give no definition of it, but
leaves it to her *Prelates* and *Priests* to tell what it is,
and in what Extent to be believ'd.

Again, Tho she Prefaces her Canon with a pretence
of a *Purgatory* establish'd in the *Catholick Church* ac-
cording to the *Doctrines* of *Scripture*, and the *Tradi-*
tions of *Primitive Fathers*,

The **T**EXTS examined which *Papists*
cite out of the *Bible* for the
Proof of their Doctrine

CONCERNING
P U R G A T O R Y.

By John Bramston

P A R T I.

I M P R I M A T U R.

Sept. 19. 1688.

Guil. Needham.

THE Council of *Trent* shews her Artifice and Subtilty in no one Point defin'd by her, more, than in her definition concerning *Purgatory*, which, tho she propounds for an Article of Faith, (and that a most important one) yet her Wisdom has thought fit to give no description of it, but leaves it to her Prelates and Priests to tell what it is, and in what Extent to be believ'd.

Again, Tho she Prefaces her Canon with a pretence of a *Purgatory* establish'd in the Catholick Church according to the Doctrines of Scripture, and the Traditions of Primitive Fathers, yet when she comes to give

K k k k

her

Secret. de
Purgat. in ini-
io.

her own Injunctions about it, she is pleas'd to pass by the Scriptures, and oblige her Bishops to be careful to have it preach'd too, and believ'd by all the Faithful, not as founded in Scripture, but as it has been deliver'd by holy Fathers and Councils. It seems (whatever the later Defenders of it may have found out) that Holy Ghost which directed her, assur'd her of a much better security from Tradition, than foundation in the Scriptures. But was not this Infallible Council all this while much more cautious of her own Honour and Ease, than careful of the Souls of her Profelytes, whose Faith she thus exposes to the uncertainty of Man's Representations? What if any Priest should trump up *Origen's* old *Purgatory*, he may produce a much fairer pretence for it from Antiquity, than can be produc'd in vindication of the present *Roman Purgatory*? and let him but make it appear to be as beneficial to the Churchmen, and there can be no doubt but it shall be allow'd to be as necessary to be believ'd by the Church.

Amongst the Ancient Writers, we meet many strange and unaccountable Fancies this way, and there seems to have been a general Notion amongst them of a *Purging Fire*: But then this was as different from the present *Papistical Purgatory*, as the present Time is, from the Time to come, or as that, which is to purge some only, from that which is to purge and purify all Men: For theirs was a Fire which was suppos'd to burn out at the Day of Judgment, and through which not only Venial Sinners, and such as are defective in some part of satisfaction, but also the purest Saints, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, nay, the holy Virgin her self, was imagin'd to endure and pass through: And this *Purgatory* is abundantly prov'd out of the Fathers by *Bellarmino* himself. So that if the Opinion of holy Fathers must guide their
Faith;

Secret. de
Purgat.

Faith; or if they are to believe now as the Fathers believ'd in this particular, they must have not only a very implicate, but according to *Bellarmino* himself, a very groundless and erroneous Faith; since he explodes these Imaginations of the Fathers for such. But to come more close to the Business in Hand, tho' the *Trent Doctors* were so nice and tender in their Canons, yet we find them more courageous in their Catechism, where amongst the Articles of their Creed they not only number *Purgatory*, but also define or describe to us what it is, viz. A *Purgatory Fire*, by which the Souls of the Faithful, after some determinate Torments, are purg'd; or, as the word *Expiare* more properly imports, in which they make satisfaction and amends to God's Justice for the failures which they had not time to repair in this Life; and so become qualify'd to enter those everlasting Mansions, into which nothing that is desir'd shall enter. And no doubt it must be upon this Authority that *Bellarmino* so confidently maintains the punishment of *Purgatory* to be the punishment of Fire, since the Council of *Trent* no ways defines it to be a Fire in her Decree about it. As to the place of this *Purgatory*, whether it be in the Heavens above, or in the Earth beneath, we as yet hear not one word; now for this they are to rely upon their Confessors, and how they will be able to resolve what the Church Representative presum'd not to meddle with, I leave them to judge that can take a view of those irreconcilable Imaginations some of the later of the Fathers and Schoolmen had concerning this Particular. For my part I cannot but wonderfully mistrust the Inspiration, which is pretended to have directed these holy Fathers to believe, and propose to be believed, on pain of Damnation, a Place, of which they dared not to give

Bell. ibid.

Catech. ad
Para. de quin-
to Sumb. Arz.
pag. 52.Bell. de purg.
lib. 2. cap. 10.
Parag. certum
est quarto.

any manner of account at all : Since there is scarce any one Text either in the Old or New Testament, where we meet the word Fire, but what with some fetch or other their Arguers apply to, and interpret of their *Purgatory*; must it not follow that this Council really mistrust'd the Explications of their own Expositors, that it was satisfy'd *Purgatory* was not intended in, or asserted by those places, since notwithstanding all of them, she hath avoided defining it to be a Fire? Perhaps indeed such a particular assignment of Place as we meet defended by the Cardinal and others, was not so fit for an Infallible Synod to assert ; yet since she pretends that her Faith hereof is grounded on the Scriptures, methinks it might well become her Infallibility to have asserted as much as is, according to their own Principles, to be deriv'd from Scripture ; and if that be any thing at all, it must be both that it is a Fire, as *Bellarmino* infers from 1 Cor. 3. 15. — *shall be sav'd so as by Fire*; and also that it is a place under the Earth ; since almost all of them reason for it, from these words, — *to whom every Knee shall bow, of things in Heaven, in Earth, and under the Earth* : Concluding those *under the Earth* can be none but the Souls in *Purgatory*; for at last, if it be no Subterraneous Prison, what Impudence must it be thus to abuse and misapply this Scripture? So that without misrepresentation, I hope, we may aver, that the Popish Article in this Point, is this, That there is a Subterraneous Place, where after this Life the Souls of the Faithful do abide for some time, till chastis'd with the Torments of its Fire, they have paid Satisfaction for such Sins as they had not satisfy'd for in this World, and which Satisfaction may be hastned, by the Prayers of the Living ; since the one is the plain Doctrine of their Catechism, and the other a necessary Inference from

Bell. quo supra.

Phil. 2. ver. 10.

from those Arguments from Scripture, wherewith they themselves defend their *Purgatory*. And therefore we may observe, that the bare Doctrine of a third Place (tho that is as inconsistent with the Scriptures) with which the Author of *Popery Represented and Misrepresented*, would shuffle off this Article of *Purgatory*, will not suit with the Doctrine and Article of the Church of *Rome*; unless it be a place of Fiery Torments, where he that has obtained full pardon for all his Sins, may further satisfy and atone; and out of which he may be pray'd by the Intercessions of the Living. Now then we of the Reformed Church of *England*, not only particularly disown such a *Purgatory*, but also absolutely deny that there is any such state at all for Satisfaction by Torments after this Life. We acknowledg but two States, the one of the Faithful in Heaven, the other for the Unrighteous and Impenitent in Hell; and this we maintain; First, Because the Scriptures speak of no more but these two; besides, since the Church of Christ has never been represented under other Titles than these two, *Militant*, and *Triumphant*: They do necessarily exclude this third *Subterraneous* Church; which is neither *Militant*, because ascertain'd of Salvation, and freed from the Conflicts and Oppositions of this World; nor *Triumphant*, because Scorched and Afflicted with the most exquisite Pains and Torments. Secondly, We reject their *Purgatory*, because it is no other than a Dream and Delusion of Man's Fancy and Contrivance, without the least colour or countenance of the Holy Scriptures to support it; much more, without plain and clear Scripture to recommend and enforce it for an Article of Faith; and this is that we undertake to make good at present. Nor can we more happily discharge this Performance, than by a close Encoun-

†

ter.

ter with our Adversaries, and by laying open the dark Obscurities they depend on, and discovering with what weak and impertinent Misapplications they abuse the Scriptures, fondly ensnaring their own Souls, and other Mens.

The Author I shall the more purposely examine shall be the *Catholick Scripturist*; who as he is the latest, so we may expect to find him the most profound and prepar'd; amongst forty Popish Points boast'd to be made apparent in Scripture, we may certainly expect to have this of *Purgatory*, which is of such incomparable Use and Accomplishment for the Churches Grandeur, most irrefutably display'd and laid open. Now then the Method he observes in proving it from Scripture, is this, first, From Principles of Scripture, necessarily inferring such a *Purgatory*. Secondly, From several express Texts which prove a *Purgatory*.

We shall therefore follow him in the same Method;

First, Discover the Impertinence of his pretended Principles.

Secondly, Shew the Insufficiency of the Texts alledg'd, and that, with this advantage given him, that where we find his judgment and knowledg in the Scriptures failing, (which I assure you labours under many great Infirmities) we will help him with the Texts urg'd and insisted on by those of better Judgments and Knowledg, of his own Party.

Cat. Script. 25.
Point of Purgatory.

The first Principle he pretends from Scripture, is this, That there are Scriptures which teach, that after the Sin it self is forgiven, there do remain some Pains still due, even to that Sin, and therefore consequently infer a *Purgatory*, because that Man to whom the Sin is forgiven, may Die before he has paid those pains in this Life.

But

But may not that Man who has read those Passages of the Prophet, *He has born our Grievs, he has carried our Sorrows; he was bruised for our Iniquities, and wounded for our Transgressions.* And again, *The chastisement of our Sins was upon him:* Wonder what Scripture there can possibly be, which teaches us that there are Pains and Sorrows due for Sin, not comprehended with-in Christ's Sufferings, but such, which even after his full Pardon and Remission granted to us, must actually be born and satisfy'd for in our own Persons. Why this he attempts to make out by these two Instances.

First, That Original Sin, tho it is effectually wash'd away in Baptism, yet the Infant Baptiz'd is still obnoxious to Death, after such Remission, which is the Punishment due to that Sin. Cath. Scrip.
25. Points of
Purgat.

Secondly, From what we meet with in the 14th Chapter of *Numbers*, where God tells his People, *That tho he had forgiven them their Sins according to his Word, yet that they should not see the Promised Land, ver. 32. But their Carcases should fall in the Wilderness. Ver. 33. Their Children should wander in the Wilderness forty Years, and should bear their Fornication, until the Carcases of their Fathers should be consumed in the Desert.*

Now the answer to both these Instances, is clear and obvious: For, first, They speak only of such Punishments, as God for their Transgressions inflicted on the Living in this World, and therefore to infer hence a Punishment necessarily to be inflicted on the Dead, must be Irrational. For, secondly, God may no doubt inflict a Temporal Punishment, as he did on *David*; either as a condition of his Remission, or as an outward Admonition and Mark of our Iniquities for all Generations, whereby to deter and affright them from the like misdoings, and yet this no ways argue a Satisfac-

†

tion:

tion inherent in such a Temporal Punishment; or, that when he pardons us without any such Temporal Afflictions annexed, some Punishment must still necessarily be due by way of a Satisfaction for our Sins, which must unavoidably be paid, either here, or hereafter: What? Because God hath entail'd Death upon all for a Testimony, and outward Remembrancer of our Parents disobedience in this Life, therefore there must be a *Purgatory* for satisfactions hereafter. Is Death a Satisfaction for our Original Sin? Then how comes it wash'd away by Baptism before Death? Or again, Because according to the degeneracy of Man's Nature, such an innocent Baptiz'd Infant may die, Is it more rational to say with this Scripturist, it died for a Satisfaction due to our Original Guilt, which remains after our Remission by Baptism, or to say it died according to the Disposition and Appointment of God, who has made Death a continual Memorandum of that Original Guilt? The Scriptures indeed tell us, that *Death came through Sin, and hath so pass'd upon all*; but they tell us withal, that for a good Christian, such as we may believe a Baptiz'd Infant to be, *to die is Gain*: to be sure they say no such thing as this Scripturist would teach us, to wit, that for some Sins forgiven, and remitted to us through Christ's Blood; there remain some after-pains, for a Personal Satisfaction payable by us in another State. Death no doubt is the consequence of that Corruption which our Parents have deriv'd on us through their Disobediencé; but by no means a satisfactory punishment for their Transgressions. And therefore, secondly, Tho God in the same Breath tells his People, *They shall bear their Fornication in the Wilderness forty Years*, in which he told them he had forgiven them their Sins, yet this proves not that it was upon the

the account of any remaining Satisfaction that God afflicted them forty Years, as the *Catholick Scripturist* infers, (for let him answer me, how a Punishment of forty Years, could be a just Satisfaction to the offended Justice of God, against whom they had then sinned most mortally) but that in this Life God would have them subdued, humbled, and kept in forty Years Straits and Severities for a Curb and Bridle to their Posterities; tho in the mean time those who died in the Wildetness with this Promise of Forgiveness, no doubt slept with their Fathers even in the Bosom of *Abraham*; and thus their own Expositors will teach them that these Tribulations and Punishments, wherewith God sometimes afflicts us in this World, are to keep us humble, and dependent upon his Goodness, to remember us continually of our Miscarriages and Iniquities, and so increase our Repentance and Submission, but no Satisfaction or Recompences to compleat the ultimate discharge of our Debts to his Justice. And therefore certainly it must be the greatest wonder in the World, to hear a Man that pretends to be a Father of the Children of Christ, and one of the Priests of the Lamb, conclude with this *Catholick Scripturist*, that because God threatned the Fathers to punish their Posterity so severely in this Life, because these were the Terms and Particulars upon which he had remitted their Iniquity, therefore it must be reasonable to infer the Fathers themselves, who obtain'd a Promise of Remission before Death; should for a time, nay, *forty Years*, says our *Scripturist*, be tormented in Purgatory, or that they could not be forgiven without undergoing the Pains of a middle State. For all that I see, he may as well conclude *Transubstantiation*, or the *Worship of Images*, from this place and instance, as any the least pretence of a *Purgatory*. And there-

Cath. Script
pag. 233.

fore it will not be worth the while to follow him through the rest of his Instances, since they all tend to the same end, and shew only that there was a present Punishment accompanying an eternal Remission, which was purely in the Justice of God to inflict or abate according to his free Mercy, it relating only to this Life; but tell us nothing, that such Punishments were so due to the Divine Justice in another World if not undergone in this, that it could not be satisfied without them; this certainly must reflect on the All-sufficient Sacrifice of our Redeemer, whose Blood is the Propitiation for our Sins, and therefore as his Principle is without Gospel or Divinity, so must the Purgatory founded thereon be without Scripture or Divine Revelation.

Cath. Script.
pag. 337.

His second Principle from Scripture is this, "The Scriptures teach that there are venial Sins, &c. such Sins as are light and trivial, which, tho they deserve some temporal Mulct, yet no eternal Torments, and therefore he that dies impenitent in them can't go to Heaven, because nothing that is in the least defiled can enter therein; nor to Hell, because he deserves not those everlasting Burnings; therefore a third State there must be, even Purgatory, where he may in some sense be purged, and through his own Satisfaction in enduring its Torments, prepare and qualify himself for Heaven. What incomparable reasoning is here! which sets a Man above the Satisfaction of Christ's Merits, his Sins being too small to need his Expiation, which finds Remission for a Man dying in Impenitence, that contradicts the whole Current of the Gospel, which teaches us without Repentance there can be no Remission; and again, to fix a Purgatory, calls in question the Justice and Equity of God himself, who hath pronounced by his Holy Spirit, that he that shall offend

†

in

in the least of his Commands, shall in no wise be his Disciple, and then certainly by no means enter into his Glory.

As to the Instances alleg'd by him of the Midwives preserving the Hebrew Children, and Rahab's denying, and hiding away the Messengers, what grounds they went upon in their Answers appear not to us, whether God, who is the Disposer of all things, by his Holy Spirit immediately inspired and directed them or no, is not mention'd, but for their incurring such venial Sins as he speaks of, there is not the least Pretence nor Circumstance to infer it; the Text says, they feared God in that Action, *Exod. 1. 15.* and that because they did so, he provided for them, and built them Houses. And of Rahab it is recorded, that she was justified by Works, receiving the Messengers, and putting them forth another way, after she had first hid them, *James 2. 25.* By which we may conclude they sinned not at all in so doing; but how it proves them guilty of a venial Transgression, when God himself applauded their Performance, I profess I cannot apprehend. I shall make bold to aver; that had there been any unjust Equivocation, or sinful Falsification, God would never have approved, much less by his Holy Spirit commended and rewarded them. These indeed are two of those Transactions which we are to believe well done, because God himself has vouch'd them to be such, but we can take no measures from such dark Proceedings which remain so unaccountable; and now how even Venial Sins could be thus meritorious, as to obtain God's express Favour, particular Approbation, nay Rewards, will take up our *Scripturist* another labour to make out. In the mean time let us go on and see with what profound Stupidity he toys and trifles with the most terrible

Denunciations of Christ himself: *Mat. 5. 22. Whosoever is angry, says our Saviour, with his Brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the Judgment; and whosoever shall say unto his Brother, Racha, shall be in danger of the Council; but whosoever shall say, Thou Fool, shall be in danger of Hell Fire*: here our *Scripturist* is very pompous and triumphant, and from the pretence of three kinds of Punishments, very confidently proclaims three kinds of Sins, amongst which venial are one, which he will have to merit only a Temporal Punishment, whereas now our Saviour is most serious here in representing the Terrors and Punishments, threatning all the Works and Fruits of our unlawful Anger even in the other World: But what wonder to see so blundering a Jesuit thus, ridiculouly insulting with such Straws, when the great Cardinal himself lays hold on such inconsistent Conclusions to establish his *Purgatory*? One would think nothing could possibly be more plain than our Saviour's Intention in this place, which was to shew, that tho' the Law of Man only censur'd and condemn'd the Murderer, yet the Divine Justice revealed in Christ, will pursue every disorderly Passion, every undue Motion and Operation of Anger; even in a capital manner in the World to come; to which purpose, as Murder was accountable to the Judgment, which had the cognizance of Capital Matters; so says our Saviour, *Whosoever is angry with his Brother without a Cause, that is, is guilty but in the least degree, shall be in danger of the Judgment; whosoever shall say, Racha, shall be in danger of the Council, which inflicts a yet severer Punishment, viz. that of stoning; but whosoever shall say, Thou Fool, shall be in danger of Hell Fire; that is, the highest and most afflicting of all Punishments. Now what can be*

: plain, than that, as Murder is the highest and

cl. de Purg.
b. 1. cap. 8.

most grievous of all the Effects of Passion, and unjust Wrath, and that which gave occasion to this Discourse of our Saviour; so these three are represented by him as several degrees and approaches towards that dreadful Sin, not different kinds of Sins, as the Cardinal, without the least occasion infers, but different degrees of the same Sin, and so consequently the Penalties annex'd to them not different kinds, but several degrees of the same Punishment, *viz.* all equally eternal, tho' not all equally afflicting and tormenting. *Bellarmin* acknowledges that the Punishments insinuated here, are such as shall be inflicted in the next World, but by an inexplicable fetch, would have part temporal, *viz.* those threaten'd to the first two degrees punishable by the Judgment and Council, and part eternal: but he produces no Reason for his Conjecture, nor indeed does any appear, unless it be these words *Hell Fire*, which tho' I confess, they may be taken literally, yet our Saviour seems to use them here in a metaphorical way, with respect to the Terrors of *Hinnom*, which the Jews even then had in Memory, and by which 'tis probable he took occasion to express the exquisiteness of the Punishment due to the highest degree, since they had no such Punishment among them as burning in a light Fire: but since our Saviour here declares every degree to be Capital, why must not every degree be liable to an eternal Punishment? Did ever any Man reckon Venial Offences amongst Capital Punishments? I will here refer our *Scripturist* to one of his own Fraternity, *Maldonat* in his Comment upon this Chapter: As for the Council, says he, that also comprehends Capital Punishments, nay such, by which eternal Death is signified. I would fain know what Temporal Punishments are to be expected at the Judgment-Seat of God,

but

See Grotius upon the place.

Mald. in loc. deinde per Concilium capital. penam intelligit per quam eternam mortem significat.

Theophilact.
in locum 1^o
2^o 3^o 4^o
5^o 6^o 7^o
8^o 9^o 10^o
11^o 12^o
13^o 14^o
15^o 16^o
17^o 18^o
19^o 20^o
21^o 22^o
23^o 24^o
25^o 26^o
27^o 28^o
29^o 30^o
31^o 32^o
33^o 34^o
35^o 36^o
37^o 38^o
39^o 40^o
41^o 42^o
43^o 44^o
45^o 46^o
47^o 48^o
49^o 50^o
51^o 52^o
53^o 54^o
55^o 56^o
57^o 58^o
59^o 60^o
61^o 62^o
63^o 64^o
65^o 66^o
67^o 68^o
69^o 70^o
71^o 72^o
73^o 74^o
75^o 76^o
77^o 78^o
79^o 80^o
81^o 82^o
83^o 84^o
85^o 86^o
87^o 88^o
89^o 90^o
91^o 92^o
93^o 94^o
95^o 96^o
97^o 98^o
99^o 100^o

but that it is there where this Sentence will be given, *Theophilact* apparently informs us, explaining the case of the Sinner in the second degree, who is in danger of the Council: in danger of the Council (says he) of the holy Apostles when they set judging the twelve Tribes of Israel. I doubt that Punishment will be of an eternal duration which they inflict. And therefore because I would refer them to the Authorities most allowable in their own Opinions, which may undeceive them in so weighty a Concern as the wrong meaning of the Scriptures, I must again send them to the same *Maldonate*,

Suarez Tom. 4. in Thom. Disput. 45. §. 1. num. 12. pag. 557. Hic locus non spectat ad hanc Controversiam de Purgatorio, quia valde probabile est omnia illa membra (Judicii, Concilii, Gehennæ) significare æternam damnationem, & poenam majorem, vel minorem, pro qualitate delictorum.

Mald. in Mat. 5. Certum est hoc in loco poenarum & peccatorum gradus, non genera distinguuntur, quæ tria peccata Christus eadem inferni poena, licet non eadem gravitate, digna esse docuit.

with another most applauded Champion of their own Fraternity, and that is *Suarez*, who plainly denies this Text to relate to *Purgatory*, and that for this reason, because 'tis mighty probable those three Particulars (*Judgment, Council, and Hell Fire*) intimate an eternal Damnation, which is greater or lesser according to the quality of the Offence. And then for the Cardinal's three kinds of Sins and Punishments, hear the resolution of *Maldonate* in the place before-cited, 'tis certain, says he, that not the kinds but the degrees of Sins are distinguished in this place, which three degrees Christ has here pronounc'd deserving the same infernal Punishment, tho not the same Weight and Severity of it.

I shall only admonish such Scripturists as these of these two things, and so leave them to a more impartial Reflection on their own Cause, 1. That it is very requisite they should agree amongst themselves about this Text of Scripture, before they lay such stress and weight upon it in so important a Point as an Article of their

their Faith. 2. That they would remember that they are not only *Protestants*, but those of their *own Order* which thus testify against them, how shamefully these have abus'd and distorted this plain Scripture.

And thus we come to his Convincing Words, his few and many Stripes, his Motes and Beams, his Gnats and Camels, which are the remaining support of his Venial Reasonings; to all which, I shall first, give this general Answer, and let our Scripturist make the best of it: That if those Offences express'd in these Terms, and which, for the manner of the expressing them, he concludes to be but Venial, are Sins indeed, then they must be a Transgression of the Law of God, for without Law there can be no Sin. Secondly, If they are committed against any part of the Law of God, then they must be equally Obnoxious to the infinite Wrath and Judgment of God, with other Sins, which are express'd in the most heinous manner. For, since the holy Apostle tells us, *Whosoever shall offend in any one, (tho the most minute particular of the Law) is guilty of all*: Must it not necessarily follow, that such a Minute Transgressor, must also be equally liable to the Punishments due to the whole Law? And then those can never be made appear by Scripture to be other than Eternal; for tho God indeed, does not threaten an equal degree of Sufferings, to unequal Offenders, yet the wages of all Sin, is reveal'd to be *Death*, and that too *Death Eternal*; and we hear of no other Punishment for Sinners of what kind soever in the New Testament, but a *fearful looking for of Judgment, and Fiery Indignation*; but without timely Repentance, a final Exclusion from the Kingdom of Heaven. Our Scripturist indeed insinuates that God and Christ must be Tyrants, and cruel in his Opinion, should they re-

Mat. 12. 36.

ward our lighter Miscarriages with Eternal Pains; but God's Justice has left no comfortable expectation for any Impenitent Sinner whatsoever, dying unrepentant, tho but in the least of Sins; nor indeed do we find any thing offer'd by the Catholick Scripturist himself, to evince the contrary. To pass by his Motes and Beams, which our Saviour calls so, only in comparison with the more heinous Enormities of the *Pharisees*; can any thing be more Venial, than a few Idle Words? and yet if the Scripture the *Catholick* produces, may be relied upon, I dare aver, all pretence of *Purgatory*, for Venial Satisfaction, is altogether Ridiculous: For I say unto you, says our Saviour, that every Idle Word that Men shall speak, they shall give an account thereof in the Day of Judgment: What can be the meaning of this Text, if not this, That every idle word not here repented of, shall be accounted for, at the Day of Judgment? And then where's your *Purgatory-Satisfaction*?

He flutters next with his *many* and *few* Stripes, making the *many* signify eternal Punishment, but the *few* no more than two or three strokes of a Discipline, or such a short Risk in *Purgatory* as may easily be bought off with a small Present to his Confessor at the last Gasps: But can any one be more fit for *many* Stripes than this Jesuit, that blushes not to fool and trifle thus with the Word of God? Do not *Theophylact*, and all Divines (but those that understand no Divinity) understand these Stripes, as the same in kind, but different in their number and portion? Does not our Saviour plainly shew how he will require from us, all according to those Gifts and Capacities he has endowed us with, that whosoever offends or neglects Obedience to his Will, must expect the very same Revenges of his Justice, tho not in the same Degree? Is here any thing

†

to

to incite us to Sin against God, or neglect the opportunities of amendment in this Life, upon the confidence of Salvation through our enduring a few momentary Strokes in another State? Cannot the Stripes be few and many, but they must needs be Temporal and Eternal? Did ever any Divine before this *Scripturist* suggest, Cath. Script.
p28. 242. if all were eternal, then they must all be equally many

and numerous? What says *Theophylact* upon the place, "Let us be afraid, my Brethren, "for if he who knoweth nothing, is worthy "of Stripes, what shall become of us, "who knowingly offend? This was his Address to the Doctors of the Church, and may admonish our *Scripturist*, that even an ignorant Transgression of the Law exposes us to the Stripes due to the Law, yea even to the same in quality, tho not in number, as is payable to the most knowing Offender! and therefore, tho this Catholic *Scripturist*'s Understanding in the Scriptures can't much endanger him, tho he be in the rank of Doctors, yet he has great reason to beware lest his affected Ignorance don't expose both himself and Followers to the greatest Stripes; for my part, I see no other way for him to escape, but by his honest recanting such wretched Distortions and Violations of the Scriptures, and so confessing, that, as the Scriptures enforce no such Principle as Sins Venial, so neither do they establish any such Place as a *Purgatory* for their Expiation.

• Theoph. in locum φειξίμων
ἀδελφοί εἰ ἄν ὁ μὴ οὐδὲν
γινώσκων, ἀξίος πληγῶν, ποῖος
ἀπαιτῶν ἄλλως τοῦ ἵνα γινώσκων
πλημμελήσῃ, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ καὶ
διδασκαλοὶ εἴεν.

And thus I come to his third Principle from Scripture which is this, The Scriptures teach us to pray for the Dead, therefore they teach us there is a *Purgatory*. Now this is as unconcluding in the Consequence, as it is false in the Premises. We say not, but that Prayer

M m m m for

for the Dead is of great Date and Antiquity, but we are sure *Purgatory* is never the less a Novelty for that; the Grounds the Ancients went upon in their Prayers for those deceas'd being altogether inconsistent with the present Circumstances of the Popish *Purgatory*. Every body knows what different Conceptions they had of the State of the Dead, some fancying, that tho they slept in Peace, yet they were detain'd in various Receptacles, out of which at the last day they should be removed, some sooner, some later, according to the Guilt and number of their Sins. Others conceiv'd, that tho they enjoy'd a present ease, yet there would a purging Fire flame out at the last day, which should try and purify, and through which both bad and good were all to pass. Now those who were led with such Imaginations as these; I hope, might offer up their Prayers for the happy Resurrection; speedy acquittal at the day of Judgment, and perfect Confirmation of the Blessedness of them who were fallen asleep in the sleep of Death, without the least apprehension of a *Purgatory*, where even those which die in the Lord, are in continual Broilings and Torments: It is one thing surely to beseech God to be merciful in his last Judgment, and another thing to entreat him to grant a Relaxation, and deliverance out of present Torments; nay, nothing is more apparent than that the Ancients when they pray'd for those departed out of this Life, thought of nothing less than a *Purgatory*; for if we look into their *Liturgies*, do we not find their Publick Offices for the Dead fram'd in this manner, nay in these very words, "*Offerimus tibi Rationalem hunc cultum, pro in fide quiescentibus, majoribus; Apostolis, praecipue vero pro sanctissima Maria Deipara, &c.* We offer unto thee

Matil. & Chry-
sost. in Liturg.

"*Offerimus tibi Rationalem hunc cultum, pro in fide quiescentibus, majoribus; Apostolis, praecipue vero pro sanctissima Maria Deipara, &c.* We offer unto

"thee

“ thee, O Lord, this our reasonable Sacrifice for them
 “ that rest in Faith, our Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets,
 “ and Apostles, but more especially the most holy Vir-
 “ gin. And therefore certainly here’s no appearance
 of the Notion of a *Purgatory*, which not only de-
 priveth of present Rest; but abounds with such Tor-
 ments as neither Prophets nor Apostles, much less the
 Holy Virgin, could, according to their own acknow-
 ledgments, be expos’d to. And indeed whoever takes
 a view of that short Chapter in *Epiphanius*, where Epiph. Heret.
 he justifies the Church in this particular against *Aerius*, 75. cap. 9.
 must conclude that Prayers for the Dead, and *Purgatory*,
 are no such reciprocal Principles; but that
 the one may be made without the least
 supposition of the other. His first and main
 reason for them is this, That they which
 are present at the Prayers, may hereby be-
 come assur’d that the Dead are not reduc’d
 to a Non-Existance, but still alive and in being with
 God himself: which is inconsistent with their Notion
 of *Purgatory*, which is this, That the Souls of the de-
 parted are therein detain’d from God’s blessed Presence.
 2. He not only shews it done to distinguish the faith-
 ful Servants of Christ from other Men, but also Christ
 himself, who is not to be pray’d for, from the best of
 Saints. And when he reckons up the differences between
 Christ and those they pray’d for then, he describes
 them thus; He is God, the other Men; He is in Hea-
 ven, the other in the Earth, by reason of their bodily
 Remains detain’d there; he says not, by reason of their
 Souls detain’d in a subterraneous Prison, as no doubt he
 would have suggested, had that Church pray’d for their
 Dead with those Religious Apprehensions of a *Purgatory*,

Epiph. quo supra πὶ τῶν
 κλειωμένων, οὐκ ἔστιν ἢ τοῖς
 παθόντων, ὅτι ἐῖς ἀπαθόντων
 (ὡς καὶ ἐν ἀνταρξίᾳ ἐν εἰσὶν,
 ἀλλὰ οἷον, καὶ ὡς ἐν τῷ
 δεικνύται.

Epiph. ibid.
 καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν οὐ-
 ράνῳ, ὁ δὲ ἄλλοι
 ὄντες ἐν τῇ
 γῆ καὶ ἐπιγῆς
 καὶ σαρκῶν.

M m m m 2

which

which the present Defenders of it now do. 3. He tells us that Prayers offer'd for the Dead are indeed profitable for them, tho' they take not away all their Sins. Which shews that in his time they hop'd by them in some measure to remit, and take away the Sins of those for whom they pray'd, and so consequently that the Prayers then made in the Church, had no resemblance at all to such as now suppose a *Purgatory*, because these neither respect nor entreat for the Remission of Sins or Guilt, which is all obtain'd and perfected in this Life, before their coming thither; and therefore tho' *Epiphanius* tells us they pray'd for the Wicked that God would extend his Mercy to them, yet it was the Mercy of remitting their Sins, not delivering them out of some Punishments they endur'd for a time for want of a full Satisfaction. And since the Just, such as Patriarchs, and Apostles, were alike mention'd with the Wicked, nothing can be more plain, than that they pray'd for the

Dead without the least Apprehension of a *Purgatory*, and so consequently that Prayer for the Dead does not necessarily infer a *Purgatory*. As for his reasoning, why should they pray either for the Souls in Heaven, or those in Hell? 'tis nothing to the purpose, since some of them pray'd for the hastening and perfecting their Bliss, at the day of Judgment; others with an Opinion that even the Souls in Hell might perceive some relief and mitigation by their Prayers, which Opinion St. *Augustin* professes he will not strive against, so long as the Wrath of God is acknowledged to remain eternally upon them. And therefore I shall say

Epiph. Ibid. ὡραῖοι ὅτι καὶ
 ὡς αὐτοὶ γινώσκοντες ἐν τῷ
 πνεύματι ἀγαπᾶν τοὺς
 ἀποστόλους.

Ibid. ὡς καὶ οἱ ἀμαρτανῶν
 δόξαντες ὡς δὲ δικαίων καὶ
 ἀποστόλων, κεραιῶν, &c.

Enchirid. ad
 Laurent. cap.
 112.

no more, but proceed, to examine what Scriptures they are which teach, and recommend to us Prayer for the Dead.

Now for this purpose he has pitch'd upon two places; the first of which is this: *What shall they do which are baptiz'd for the Dead, if the Dead rise not at all? why are they then baptiz'd for the Dead?* 1 Cor. 15. 29. A very dark Text, to clear a very obscure Doctrine. *Why are they baptiz'd for the Dead?* As if he had said, says our Scripturist, To what end do Men do Penance for the Dead, if the Dead rise not? Why to a very good end, may the Jesuit reply, *viz.* To restore them from the pains of Purgatory; and so the Apostle be never the nearer proving the Resurrection at the last Day, from this Baptism. Again, May we not here demand, why must, *be baptiz'd for the Dead*, be interpreted, doing Penance, offering Prayers, Sacrifices, and Afflicting a Man's self for the Dead; since the *Catholick Scripturist* brings not one Authority for it, and *Bellarmino* renounces the Expositions of the most Celebrated amongst the Fathers, *viz.* *Tertullian, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Theophylact*, besides their own Angelical *Thomas*, to assert it? Indeed, our Saviour expresses his own Passion in such words as these, *I have a Baptism to be baptized with*, Luke 12. 50. And so Martyrdom by the Ancient Church, was call'd *the Baptism of Blood*; but what's all this to Prayers and Sacrifices, or indeed to a Man's personal Afflicting himself? Let *Baptizari pro mortuis* signify *affligi*, to be afflicted in the Passive, yet still how shall it imply *affligere*, or to afflict ones self in the Active? Is it the same thing to suffer Afflictions from others, and to afflict our selves for others? Let them shew where ever Baptism, or to be Baptiz'd, is used in this sence through the whole Scriptures: Why, that

*Bell. de Purg.
lib. 1. cap. 6.*

that *Bellarmino* can do, because the Punishment of *Purgatory* in the Scriptures is called Baptism, as *Matth. 3.* *He will baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire.* But then this is only said, and not prov'd, and therefore why may not we reply, That that Speech of the holy Baptist, *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire,* denotes no more but such a Baptism which Christ fulfilled on Earth; and the word *Fire,* is only expressive of the Efficacy, and great Powerfulness of its Operation. *Chrysostom* explains it thus; and *Theophylact* after him, tells us expressly, when it was that our Lord baptized with this Baptism: What is the meaning of this, says he, *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire?* Why, the meaning is very clear; for he sent his Holy Spirit unto his Apostles, and the Fiery cloven Tongues appeared and rested upon them. And indeed nothing can be more clear, than that *St. John* here foretold our Saviour to be the Giver of the Holy Ghost: And that he would manifest his extraordinary Divine Vertue in a visible Miracle when he thus poured forth his Spirit in the shape of Fiery Tongues upon his Apostles. Here is no forc'd or Metaphorical strain; nothing but what many of the Cardinal's own Fraternity accord to.

Chrysostom in locum.
Theoph. in *Lucæ* tertium Caput verſum 16. Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἁγίου. Τὸ δὲ βαπτισμὸς οὗτος ἐν πνεύματι καὶ πυρὶ, καὶ ὁ ἁγίος πνεύματος. καὶ ὁ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐπιπέσει τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ πνεύμα γλωσσῶν ἀφῆσθαι μετ' ἑαυτῶν.

Mald. in *Mat. 3.* Sunt qui per ignem, hoc loco Purgatorium interpretentur sed dubium non est, quin per ignem, Spiritus Sanctus significetur; Conjunction etenim (&) non est copulativa, sed explicativa. Quæ explicatio est addita, qualicumque Spiritus communicatio, sed illa

Thus *Maldonate* upon the place tells us, "Some indeed interpret this place of *Purgatory*; but there can be no doubt, but by Fire in this place is meant the Holy Ghost, for the Conjunction (&) is not here to be taken as Copulative, but Ex-

illustrissima; dic Pentecostes specie ignis quæ facta est, signi-

ficatio

“ plicative ; and this Explication is added to shew that
 “ every ordinary Communication of God’s Spirit is not
 “ signify’d herein ; but that most illustrious descent of it,
 “ in a Fiery appearance in the Day of *Pentecost*. And
 “ that the word, *Fire*, is only demonstrative of the
 “ manner and fulness, of that Communication of God’s
 “ Blessed Spirit, may appear from Saint *Mark*, and Saint
 “ *John*, both which express it only by *Spiritu Sancto*,
 “ Holy Ghost. Nor is *Maldenare* alone in his
 Interpretation, for another of them also,
Ribera in his Comment upon *Joel*, ap-
 plies this of the Second of the *Acts*, and
 thus explains it ; *Te shall be baptized with*
the Holy Ghost. “ they were so far baptized
 “ with the Holy Ghost (says he) that the
 “ whole House was fill’d therewith ; and hence (says
 “ he.) we understand that of St. *Matthew*, *He shall hap-*
 “ *pen with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire*. I confess in-
 deed, the Fathers sometimes apply the word *Fire* to
 another meaning ; but then, not with respect to *Pur-*
gatory, but the Fire of *Gebenna* ; and notwithstanding
 the Cardinal quotes *Basil* for the other, yet besides
 a Man’s own reading, *Tales* tells us, that *Basil*, *Hibery*,
 and *Damascone*, all interpret it of Hell Fire.

And as we have thus refuted the Cardinal’s Proof,
 so shall we easily disappoint him in the Text it self ; for
 why such Strains here, Metaphors, and Fitches ? *Bap-*
tisari pro mortua, i. e. to-do Penance, Sacrifice, Pray
 and Groan for Dead Man. *Salmeron* tells us, the rea-
 son why some make use of this Metaphorical Interpre-
 tation, is, because if the words should be taken pro-
 perly here, there could be no solid Argument, whence
 for the Apostle to conclude a Resurrection, and we
 know the only reason for such Interpretations, is, the
 absurdity

Ribera Com. in *Joel* 2. Numb.
 54, & 55. In tantum Spiritu
 Sancto baptizati sunt, ut re-
 pleretur tota domus in qua
 erant sedentes. Hinc intelli-
 gimus ibid, *Matth.* 3. Ipse
 baptiz. &c.

Tol. in *Luc.*
 cap. 3. Sic
 ignem inter-
 pretatur *Basil*,
Hilarius, & *Da-*
mascent.

Salmeron Com.
 in *I Cor.* cap.
 15. disput. 24.
 Quoniam pro-
 prie.

absurdity and impossibility of the Literal Sense. But is here really any thing of all this in the Case? Suppose some Men out of concern for those who died without Baptism, in a mistaken Zeal would be baptized for them, it hopes the Dead might perceive the benefit of their Vicariate Baptism at the Resurrection; would not such a Custom as this be a good Argument against such Men, that there is a Resurrection? Again, suppose there was such a Custom in the Church (and we can bring great Authorities to confirm there was) that the Catechumens, in all desperate Diseases, or upon a certain prospect of Death, when they were as to this Life (as we say) lost Men, to be look'd upon rather as Dead, than Living, used to receive the Baptismal Laver; and so *Baptisari pro mortuis*, be interpreted to mean no more, than to be Baptized for such as were accounted for dead Men: How would this weaken the Apostle's Reasoning? Must not an Argument pressed from such a Custom, rather convince such Men, that according to their own usage there must be a Resurrection; than destroy the strength of such an Inference? I shall determine nothing of certainty of so uncertain a Text (unless it be that it signifies nothing to a *Purgatory*); but thus

Epiph. Cerinthian. Hæres 28.
 Καὶ τῶν ἕνεκα ἢ παροδοῦσι
 ἢ ἐλθεῖν εἰς ἡμᾶς, φησι, ἃ ἀν-
 τὸν ἀγίον Ἀποστόλου εἰρηκῶναι.
 εἰ ὁλως περὶ, &c. p. 114.

much *Epiphanius* tells us, That it was in the sense of the first Supposition that Tradition had interpreted those words of the Apostle, *If the Dead rise not, why are they then baptized for the Dead?* And as to the Catechumens, that they by this their usage, declared for the Resurrection of the Dead: That the Apostle alluded to a particular manner of some Men, 'tis plain, by the way in which he expresses it, *Why are they baptiz'd for the Dead? And why stand we in Jeopardy every Hour?* By the one, referring to the manner

of some particular Men; in the other respecting the general Afflictions of all Christians, suffering, in hopes of the Resurrection: And therefore how a Universal Obligation of praying for the Dead, can be inferred from such a particular Instance; as does not so much as glance at Prayer, I conceive not. All that *Bellarmino* replies to this, is this, That *Baptizantur* refers to all the *Jews*, and that our Saviour did chuse here rather to Reason them into the belief of a Resurrection from the old Custom of the *Jews*, who used to pray for the Dead, than the latter usage and manner of Christians: But is not this to answer one Difficulty with another? How prepared the Cardinal was to make out such a Custom amongst the *Jews*, as founded upon the Commands of God's Law in the Scriptures, we may easily conjecture, by his sticking so close to his Apocryphal Canon for it: and if such a Custom was not grounded upon the Law of God, the Cardinal's reply is to no purpose, unless it be, to remember us of this Answer, that, Why are they baptized for the Dead? may be only mentioned here, as an Argument *ad Hominem*, made use of by the Apostle only to illustrate the truth of the Resurrection, no ways delivered as a Truth, and Doctrine, approv'd here, and establish'd, by the Apostolical Authority. 'Tis more than probable that some of them, who had that Custom amongst them, yet still denied the Resurrection, because the Apostle does so pressingly, and with such a vehement Iteration of their own Custom, endeavour to convince them of the certainty of it; but then it must follow, that, let those words signify what they will, they can be no Argument for the Recommendation of what they signify to our use and performance, and so the *Papists* as far as ever from making out this Doctrine of Praying for the Dead, from this Scripture. Nor is this of its being used

*Bell. de Purga.
cap. 6. at contra hanc, &c.*

only as an Argument *ad Hominem* our own Conjecture, but such a one, as has the judgment of no less a Cardinal than *Baronius* to support it. And now is not this an admirable way of founding Articles of Faith upon such Scriptures, which they dare not trust the Fathers to Interpret, nor yet can accord in their own Explications about them.

But now it will be time to enquire, how much stronger the *Catholick Scripturist* is, in his other Text, which is this: 1 John 5. 16. *If any Man see his Brother sin a Sin which is not unto Death, he shall ask, and he shall give him Life for them that sin not unto Death. As, when they find the word Fire, they presently discover the terrible Flames of Purgatory; so where ever they light upon the word Death, or Dead, they can immediately perceive that advantageous relief of Praying for the Dead. Was ever Text so manag'd, as our Scripturist has handled this? If he makes any-thing of it, I think 'tis only this, that it treats not of Sins Mortal, and Sins Venial. There is a Sin unto Death, says the Apostle, I do not say, ye shall Pray for it; and so we, says the Scripturist, never Pray for those whom we know to die Unrepentant; and this is the true meaning of the place. Is this the true meaning? Then let me ask this Catholick Expofitor, Do you Pray for those whom ye know to live Unrepentant? That is, Do you Pray for those very Sins, which ye know the Sinner has not Repented him of? Yes, that they do, if the Scripturist is in the right of it; For they hold Prayer lawfully and fruitfully made, for all Sins whatever, during the Lifetime of the Sinner. But how this can agree with the true sense of the place, or be reconcileable with the Apostles meaning, whom he acknowledges to have taught us here, that there is a Sin unto Death, for which, he dares not say we shall Pray, let the Scripturist explain.*

Baron. Annul.
Tom. 1. Ann.
57. S. 165,
& 166.

Cath. Scrip.
pag. 247.

Cath. Scrip.
ibid.

is the true meaning of this place? when the Apostle insinuates, there is a *Sin unto death*, i. e. of that deadly provocation as shall never be forgiven, and therefore such as we can have no grounds to Pray for. He does plainly teach us we must not Pray for the Dead: when he speaks of a Sin not unto death, he does then as plainly justify us in our Prayers for the Dead. I know not the way of Breeding amongst the Catholick Fathers, but should a *Protestant* Sophister have inferr'd such a Conclusion from such Premisses, he would certainly have been soon hiss'd out of our Schools. Suppose the Apostle had spoke in the words of this Scripturist, (with which he thinks to salve up all) there is a Sin until death, and a Sin not until death; this would have inform'd us, that there remains no help by our Prayers in this World, for Final Impenitence; and so again, that we are to Pray here for the Penitent in this Life; but it must still remain a Mystery, how the Apostle should hereby suggest, or recommend to us Prayers for the Dead. What is the Apostle doing in this Chapter? Is he not endeavouring to excite and stir us up to Prayer, with the assurance that God will hearken to, and grant us our Petition if we ask any thing according to his Will? *Ver. 14.* Again, does he not here give an Instance what it is God is willing we should ask of him, and tell us, that if we see our Brother sin a Sin, yet if we experience withal, that he relents, and continues not obstinate and unrepentant in his Sin (which certainly brings Death, and shall be pardon'd upon no Prayers or Intercessions) we may pray for such a Sinner, and he shall be rais'd from the death of his Sin, and restor'd unto the Life of Salvation upon our Prayers: What's all this to Praying for the Dead? Does he not strangely manifest his extraordinary Knowledg in the Scriptures when we hear him repeating this, that we may pray for all Sins before the death of the Sinner, as a Reason why St. *John* must necessarily

in this place intend Praying for the Dead, since every Novice can inform him that we are no more to pray for all the sins of the living, than we are to Pray for all the sins of the dead, if there be any force in these words of the Apostle: We may no doubt Pray for the Conversion of all Sinners upon Earth, and that God would give them a timely Repentance in this Life, but we must not pray for their Impenitence, or that God would forgive them their Sins Unrepented of; and this must be the Import of the Apostle's Expression, who tells us not, that we are to pray for such Sinners while living; or that we may not Pray for them, when dead; but only that he affirms not, that we may Pray for them at all. But is it not still more admirable, to hear the *Scripturist* proving Prayer for the Dead from this Text? Because the Apostle speaks of their Prayers who knew their Brother to sin not unto Death, that is, as he himself explains it, to have given Signs of true Repentance; which I warrant a Man can't give Signs of true Repentance till he is dead: the words are, *Who sees his Brother sin*, which must suppose, that he that prays, and the Sinner who is pray'd for, are both in the same state as to place, *viz.* in this Land of the Living: and I believe, no Man could have apprehended any thing of the condition of the Dead from this Text, but he that has no Life at all in his Understanding. Good God! may not a Man read his Bible all the days of his Life, without the least apprehensions of a *Purgatory* from such Scriptures as these be? Has not the *Catholick Scripturist* plainly destroy'd his own Undertaking, by appealing to such Scriptures, which as they prove no Prayer for the Dead, so do they, according to his own Measures, lead us to conclude, that there is no *Purgatory*. And thus much for his pretended Principles from Scripture inferring a *Purgatory*.

Cath. Scri.
in the same
Page.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswel at the Rose and Crown
in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1688.

The **T**EXTS examined which *Papists*
cite out of the *Bible* for the
Proof of their **D**octrine

CONCERNING
PURGATORY.

c By John Bacon

PART II.

IMPRIMATUR.

Sept. 19. 1688.

Guil. Needham.

BUT we have not done yet, there remain still
some ranks of more exprest Texts, usher'd in
with all the Wit and Artifice of the most ac-
complish'd *Bellarmino*, which may require some
stay; tho' give no great stop to this Conclusion, no *Pur-*
gatory in the Scriptures. These are marshall'd into two
Heads, some out of the Old, some out of the New
Testament; out of both which, with great Pomp, he
proclaims there is a *Purgatory*. For the greater Honour
of the Old, he makes his first, and most vigorous at-
tempt out of the *Apocrypha*, as if that Book, which
he himself grants the *Jews* received not, was the best

*Bell. de verbo
Dei lib. 1. c. x.
at the beginning,
Hic libri simul
omnes recipi-
untur ab He-
brais.*

O o o o

Witness

Witness of their Faith and Devotion. I shall not spend time now in examining such Proofs as those, which come not out of the Scriptures, but proceed to his more Canonical Quotations, whose Authority is allow'd by all sides. And first; Is it not very strange to find a *Purgatory* pleaded for out of the Old Law, which tho' most express and particular in all things relating to Prayers and Sacrifices, yet insinuates not the least Offices, for a deliverance out of that subterraneous Captivity? Have not many of their own Party doubted, and as many openly deny'd there was any *Purgatory* before Christ, and indeed does not the nature of the thing it self abundantly proclaim as much? for to what end should God enjoyn them thus to pray and afflict themselves, for those tormented in such a State, out of which there was no possibility of Relief or Redemption for them then, there having been, according to their own Principles, no entrance for any into Heaven before Christ? Again, after all their Sins were forgiven, which is the case of those in *Purgatory*, what hinder'd, but they were as fit for *Limbus Patrum*, wherein the deceas'd are supposed to have been then detain'd from the glorious Vision of God, which must have been Torment enough to every righteous Soul, as any other whatever. But to speak to the Texts themselves alledg'd for proof hereof, *Zech. 9. 11. As for thee also, by the Blood of thy Covenant, I have sent forth thy Prisoners out of the Pit, wherein is no Water;* is one of the strongest and most appeal'd to, and which *Bellarmin* concludes absolutely to refer to a *Purgatory*. But would it not be very expedient these Arguers should determine amongst themselves what is the true meaning of these words before they found an Article of Faith upon them? Was *Limbus Patrum*, where all

De Purg. lib. 1.
cap. 3. §. 101.
mus locus.

the purest Saints are fancy'd to have resided with Peace and sweet Contentment, so very like or agreeable to *Purgatory*, with all its fiery Pangs and Scorplings, as that God may have represented both in the same Words and Characters? That this use is, and has been made of this Text, to infer the one as well as the other, not only the *Cardinal* acknowledges, but *Becanus* also tells us that *Catholicks* commonly understand it either of *Limbus Patrum*, or our *Purgatory*: and one of their present Champions applies it directly to a *Limbus*; and then may not we with better reason conclude it alludes to neither of those two States which are so irreconcilably different from each other? *Bellarmin's* reason why it must be understood of a *Purgatory*, and not *Limbus Patrum*, is this, because the Lake mention'd here is describ'd to have been without Water, whereas in *Limbo Patrum*, there are the sweet Waters of Consolation and Refreshment: But how consistent is this with his own Descriptions of *Purgatory* in the fourth Chapter of his second Book, where he treats of the state of the Souls held therein? What? Is *Purgatory* without Water, without the least Refrigeration or Comfort? Can they who have obtain'd the certainty of their Salvation, even that certainty which excludeth all Fear, remain without the least Capacity of Ease and Refreshment? Does not the *Cardinal* himself tell us that the Church in the Canon of her Mass prays for those in *Purgatory* under the Denomination of such as sleep in the Lord? And again, that those who sleep in the Lord by reason of their certainty of Salvation, perceive an incredible mixture of Consolation with their Torments: and then, if this reason of the *Cardinal* be no reason at all, why may not the others of them who interpret it of a *Limbus* be esteem'd the

Bell. de Purg.
lib. 1. cap. 3.

Becan. de
Purg. Calvin.
pag. 538.

Touchstone of
Reformed Gospel
pag. 80.

Bell. ibid.

Bell. de Purg.
lib. 3. cap. 4.
§. tertio quia
ad finem ca-
pit.

more substantial Expositors, and so the Papists without a *Purgatory* in Scripture, for all such Passages as this? The meaning of this Text is plain and easy to any one who reads the Chapter, wherein he will perceive, that, tho it may have had some respect to the Redemption of *Israel* out of that horrible Captivity. of *Babylon*, where they had been destitute of the sweet Refreshments, the refreshing Streams springing from the true Worship and Sacrifices of God, which were not to be offer'd but at *Jerusalem*; yet it had a more particular Eye to the Redemption of Man out of the bottomless Lake of everlasting Damnation by the strength of that Covenant established in the Blood of Christ: for does not the 9th Verse in these words, *Behold, thy King cometh unto thee: He is just, and having Salvation, lowly, and riding upon an Ass, and upon a Colt the Foal of an Ass*; plainly describe to us our Blessed Redeemer hastning to the joyful Triumph and Accomplishment of our Eternal Blessedness upon the Cross? Has not the Holy Ghost, *Mat. 21.8.* applied to, and interpreted this very Prophecy of Christ? In a word, here is nothing in the Circumstances of this place, which, according to their own Principles, is applicable to a *Purgatory*: for first, the Souls therein detain'd can no ways be said to be the Prisoners of Christ, because they are suppos'd to have obtain'd his full Remission before their coming thither, neither can any Soul be said to be deliver'd from *Purgatory* by the Blood of his Covenant since they profess that this Releasement is either to be purchased by the Prayers of the Living, or work'd out by our own Personal Pains and Torments.

Another place alledg'd by the *Cardinal* for proof here-of, are those words of the Psalmist, *Psal. 66. 12. We went through Fire and Water, and thou broughtest us out*

into a wealthy place. The former Text asserted a *Purgatory* by marking out to us a Lake wherein is no Water; behold here both Fire and Water conspiring to make up a *Purgatory*. We may observe here, that tho' *Bellarmino* is most positively confident in his Vindication of the Texts cited out of the Apocryphal Books, yet as for those brought out of the Canonical Scripture of the Old Testament, he neither justifies them with one Argument, nor yet avouches any one of them upon his own word; as to this before us he says nothing for it, but that among divers Explications *Origen* understands it of a *Purgatory*: but whoever examines *Origen's Purgatory*, will find his Notion can give but little advantage to the Chimera *Bellarmino* undertakes to maintain, neither will the Cardinal abide by the Explication of *Origen*: and therefore we will answer him here in the words of an applauded Bishop of their own, utter'd by him upon the occasion of their misusing this very Text to this purpose. "I approve not such trifling as this (says he) which explains these words of *Purgatory*. Indeed if we read the Psalm, it is unaccountable to imagine how any Men could possibly produce such a Text for such a Doctrine, wherein there appears not the least relation to, or countenance for a *Purgatory*, unless it be in the word *Fire*; and they may as well derive it from Hell Fire, as that Fire and Water herein represented: For does not the Psalmist in the fore-going part of this very Verse repeat before the Almighty, *thou suffered'st Men to ride over our Heads?* and does that look like a State of *Purgatory*? Again, does he not in the 9th and 10th Verses shew how God had proved and tried them as the Silver is tried; and Verse 13, 14. manifest before the Lord that he would now go into his House with Burnt-Offerings, and pay him those

Noticia in
Luth. Artic. 37.
Quod alii sic
magister non
probo.

Vows which he had spoke with his Mouth, and promised with his Lips when he was in these Troubles. Do not all these Circumstances abundantly evince that the Fire and Water through which God had now brought them into the present ease and enjoyment of this World, was that Fire of Afflictions, Miseries, and Necessities wherewith he had chastis'd and visited them in this Life? And therefore consequently that the only Inference deducible from these words must be, that of the Holy Ghost, through much Tribulation we may enter into the Kingdom of God. . And thus have we this Text explained by *Ribera* a Jesuit in his Comment upon the last Verse of the 13th of *Zachary*, where he interprets those words, *I will bring the third part through the Fire, and will refine them as Silver is refined, and try them as Gold is tried, &c.* thus, This shews, says he, that Christians shall be exercised, tried and approv'd by Temptations and Miseries, as we read *Psal. 66.* so that we may pass through the Heat and Terrors of this Fire and Water, and yet be never the more in danger of the Parchings of their *Purgatory*: What Jesuitical Theology is this, to interpret such Discourses as relate to Afflictions and Trials in this Life, so as to establish thereby the fictitious Pains and Torments of the Dead?

There are several other Texts and Places alledg'd by the Cardinal to the same purpose, as *1 Sam. 3.* *The Inhabitants of Jabish Gilead when they heard what the Philistines had done to Saul, fasted seven days;* and *2 Kings 1.* where it is said, *David wept until Even for Saul and for Jonathan, and the Men that were with him.* "For tho indeed, says *Bellarmino*, all this might "have been the Effects of Grief, and Sorrow, occasion'd "by that dismal Slaughter, yet it is credible it was to

†

Rib. Com. in
Zech. 13. Num.
17. significat
Populum
Christianum
variis tentati-
onibus exer-
cendum atq;
probandum, ut
fiat quasi au-
rum purissi-
mum, ut *Psal.*
66. Transva-
mas, &c.

“ help and ease the Souls of the Dead, it seeming irrational for them to weep and fast seven days together upon any other account. But first, is it credible that it was to help out of *Purgatory*? then it is not certain and demonstrable, as those Inferences which are to confirm and make out Articles of Faith ought to be: for tho it be credible to any one who inspects his reasoning, that the Cardinal was here conscious of his own trifling, yet I suppose they won't infer it to be Demonstration. 2. Why is it credible that upon this News they were struck more with the thoughts of the Torments of *Purgatory*, than with the Apprehensions of the Disgrace and Ignominy redounding hereby to the People of *Israel*, whose Prince thus became a Prey and Sacrifice to their Enemies, which they knew was an evident Manifestation of God's Wrath against them? The Text plainly lays before us the grounds and reason of this Fasting, that it was for the House of *Israel*, and because they were fallen by the Sword, ver. 12. i. e. because the Name of *Israel* would hereby be reproached among the Heathen; not because their deceased Friends were to be tormented with the Pains of the Dead in *Purgatory*. And therefore put the case it might have been irrational only for a Testimony of Sorrow, as the Cardinal suggests, to have fasted seven days, yet I hope twice seven days could not have been too many to have manifested the sense of their Sins, which had thus provok'd the Almighty to deliver them and their King with Infamy and Slaughter unto the Will of their Enemies. But *Bellarmin* attempts farther to clear his Argument, that it was for the good of the Dead in *Purgatory* that they fasted seven days, from the use and custom of *David*, who us'd to fast and pray for the obtaining some Gift or Blessing from

God, as in the case of the Child, for whom he ceas'd praying when dead, and all hopes of enjoying him in this World were perished. But not to oppose the Cardinal in his Conjecture, how can this possibly make out a *Purgatory*? *David* and the People no doubt propos'd the obtaining of something by their Prayers and seven days fasting; but why must that necessarily be the ease and deliverance of the Souls in *Purgatory*? Was there nothing else to be obtained here? What may we think of God's acceptance of their Humiliation? What of their Endeavour herewith of appeasing the Wrath of God, and an obtainment of the Reconciliation of his Mercy and Compassion for the future? Was any thing of this kind also irrational? When *David* ceas'd his fasting upon the Death of the Child, did he not teach us that the advantage and benefit of our Prayers extend not to the Dead? Is it not a very strange thing that a Man can't mourn or lament for the loss of a Father, Brother, or a deceas'd Friend, but such Sorrow must immediately point out and direct us to a *Purgatory*? The holy Apostle *St. Paul* indeed comforts and sollaces such as sorrow for the Dead, and endeavours to restrain and moderate their Grief, but it is by assuring us the Dead are but asleep; notwithstanding the suitability of the opportunity, he gives not the least hint of any racking Pains they endure in the way to rest; neither does he bid us comfort our selves with the hopes or assurance that our Prayers and Intercessions shall obtain, or hasten their Release out of them: so that we may conclude the Apostle's Thoughts were far different from those of the Cardinal, applying the sense of our Sorrows for the Departed to the apprehensions of a *Purgatory*.

Another Text produced by the Cardinal is out of Micha 7. 8, 9. *Rejoyce not against me, O mine Enemy: when I fall, I shall arise: when I sit in darkness, the Lord shall be a Light unto me. I will bear the Indignation of the Lord, because I have sinned against him, until he plead my Cause, and execute Judgment for me.* If we mind the whole Chapter, the sense and proper meaning of it will appear to be this; the holy Prophet in the first part of it represents the great Sins and Iniquities of *Jerusalem*, that such was the degeneracy of *Israel* that *the best of them was become a Briar, and the most upright sharper than a Thorn-hedge*, ver. 4. that therefore God's Vengeance and Destructions were upon them to pursue their Transgressions with his Justice. And then again, as is usual in all the denunciations of God's Wrath against his People, in the Person of *Jerusalem* the Holy Prophet manifests some Remains of the Divine Love and Mercy still reaching towards them, admonishes *Babylon* not to insult over her; for tho' she was now laid waste and destroy'd by her, yet should she be rais'd again and become rebuilt in Glory; tho' she should thus bear the Indignation of the Lord, for this reason, because she had sinn'd, yet afterwards upon her Repentance and Amendment should God plead her Cause against her Enemy, (*viz. Babylon*) and execute Judgment for *Jerusalem*, repair those Wounds and Breaches now made in her, in the ease and glory of her Posterity. This is the plain and proper import of the Chapter, and therefore this place can respect only the present Miseries and Afflictions befalling us in this Life. As to *Purgatory*, here is not so much as any one Circumstance which resembles it: For first, the Wrath of God which *Jerusalem* now bore, was that utter'd against the heaviest Sins, and most intolerable Apostacy from his Law,

even those mortal Sins which condemn not to *Purgatory*; which were not to be purg'd or done away by its tiercest Satisfactions. 2. 'Tis no ways agreeable to the Souls in *Purgatory*, to have the reason of their Fall and Condemnation thither, represented with such Aggravations of the greatest Sins and Transgressions, because they are released from the Guilt of Sin in this Life; and sent thither only to recover some unwary slips and venial Deflections. As for the Cardinal he only mentions this Text to make up his number, says nothing for it himself, throws his own delusion upon St. *Jerom*, whom yet *Ribera* in his Comment upon the place cites in favour of the quite contrary Explication, *viz.* the very same Exposition which we have given before.

Ribn. in locum: Ita Hieronymus & alii. Ne lateris, O Babylon, de ruina mea, quæ mihi nunc à Prophetâ prædicta est, eadem à te expugnata, sed iterum ædificabor.

Another of his places cited is the 9th Chapter of *Isa.* the 18 Verse, *Wickedness burns as a Fire, it shall devour the Briars and the Thorns.* The clear sense and meaning of the Prophet in this place, is apparent enough from *vers.* 9: where he begins the description of the Pride and Haughtiness of *Israel*; and admonishes them of the Vengeance of God pouring forth all her Enemies upon her; and therefore when he tells us in this Verse that Wickedness burneth like a Fire, it is the Wickedness of these Enemies of *Israel* whom the Prophet meaneth, and whom God would now permit to devour not all the People, *viz.* not those who yet worshipped and obeyed aright, but *the Thorns and Briars*, the most lewd and sinful Persons amongst them. But now how the devouring the Thorns and Briars, which denote the most grievous and mortal Sinners, can intimate those Venial Transgressions which the Fire of *Purgatory* may consume, wear away, and satisfy for, I shall leave to these Framers of a *Purgatory* to explain.

Another Text still is out of the 3d Chapter of *Malachi*, and the 3d Verse, *And he shall sit as a Refiner and Purifier of Silver, and he shall Purify the Sons of Levi, and purge them as Gold and Silver.* Who this Refiner and Purifier is whom the Prophet speaks of in this Chapter, it is plain in the first Verse, *viz.* The Lord, even the Messenger of the Covenant renew'd by the Father in his Son Christ, whom our Fathers before, and all Christians now delight in. 2dly. The end and purpose of this Purification and Refining by Fire, is also clear in the latter end of the 3d Verse, *viz.* *That they may offer unto the Lord an Offering of Righteousness.* And therefore, thirdly, the Persons to be thus refined and purified, by the efficacious operation of this Fire of God's holy Spirit, could be none but the Sons of *Levi*, the Priests and Congregations of *Israel* conversant in this Life at the time of Christ's coming and Appearance, the end of this Refiner being to prepare and qualify such, to pay those sacrifices and Oblations as may become pleasant unto the Lord, *ver.* 4. In a word, the Prophet in this place foretels the Expiation, and cleansing of our Hearts by the Holy Ghost given by Christ, and therefore he is said by the Fire of his holy Spirit to warm our Souls, to purge and cleanse them, as the Fire purgeth and cleanseth Metals, by separating and throwing off their Dross; and in this sense the Spirit of Christ, *i. e.* by which he is said to renew and purify us from our Corruptions and Filthiness, is frequently by the Prophets entituled the Spirit of Fire, and the Spirit of Burning, particularly *Isa.* 4.4. which place also is alledged for the Confirmation of *Purgatory*, but with what ground, let the Cardinal determine, who in his Argument from this place, acknowledges the Refining and Purging mentioned in this place, to relate merely to the Living, whereas that

Bell. de Purg.
cap. 3. §. 10.

respects only the Dead: For he may as well infer the Dead to be the Living, as from this Purifying the Living by the Spirit of God, conclude a Purging and Satisfying for the Sins of the Dead in another state. And thus we have taken a view of their whole Force and Strength in the Old Testament; and I persuade my self there cannot be a greater Argument of the weakness of their Cause, a clearer Refutation of their shameful Obtrusions of this State on the Faith and Belief of a Christian Conscience, than what the naked recital and examination of their own Proofs must necessarily evince.

I proceed now to their Conclusions and Deductions from the New Testament.

The first Text which we meet cited by *Bellarmino*, is *Mat. 12. 32. But whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this World; nor in the World to come.* The main stress of the Argument from these words lies in that Expression; *Neither in this World, neither in the World to come;* that is, as *Bellarmino* and his Followers understand it, *neither in this World, nor in Purgatory.* Indeed *Saint Augustine* seems to infer some future Remission of Sins after this Life from this Text, but what Remission, or of what Sins, he declares he dares not aver; so that his Conjecture was far from the Cardinal's present imagination of a *Purgatory*, which determines what is remitted, *viz.* the guilt of some light Miscarriages; and also the way how it is remitted, *viz.* by a determinate endurance of Pains and Torments.

Secondly; Whatever Remission that holy Father conceived should be hereafter, it could be only a thing probable and conjectural, and therefore no ground for an Article of Faith, (which he tells us is to be founded on plain and indubitable Scripture) because he himself

was both Doubtful and Uncertain of it; as is apparent in Four distinct places of his Writings*. I confess it seems very strange to me how the World to come should here signify *Purgatory*, which is fix'd in an intermediate space of time between a Man's Death, and the Resurrection; since the Scriptures do so generally understand by it the Day of Judgment, or the Time after the Resurrection; as we read particularly *Luke* the 20. ver. 35. *Those that shall be accounted worthy to enjoy that World, and the Resurrection from the Dead.* The coming of Christ to Judgment is every where represented to us as the End of this World, so that the other must Commence from the time of his coming to Judgment; and this, † if considered, will take off all pretences of Impertinence in these words of our Saviour, without that *Purgatory Remission*, which the Cardinal infers as a *Salvo* for our Saviour's Discretion in expressing himself in these Terms, *Neither in this World, neither in the World to come*; for is it any Impertinence or Uncouthness to say, Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, is a Sin of that dreadful account, as shall neither be allowed Pardon in this World by the Absolution of Men, nor be pronounced or proclaim'd Pardon'd by Christ himself at the Day of Judgment; when he shall perfect and consummate the Remission or Punishment entred here on Earth, when he shall call the Righteous, *Come ye Blessed*, give the final Impression to their Pardon; but against the Ungodly pronounce, *Go ye Cursed*; eternally bind up those Sins which have, or ought to have been bound on Earth. And that which may confirm this Explication, is the Use and Manner of the Scriptures themselves, which all along express the time for the retributions of Rewards and Punishments to be the Day of Judgment, as *Mat.* 25. 32, 33. and indeed, this is elegantly explain'd

**St. Aug. Enchirid. ad Laurentium cap. 66. & cap. 68. Juxta finem in 8^o quest. ad Dulcit. Quest. 1. de fide & operibus, cap. 16.*

†*De Purg. cap. 4 & Respon- deo non sequi &c. sed tamen sequi secundum Regulam prudentiæ; quia faceremus Dominum ineptissime loquutum, inepte enim diceret hoc, &c.*

Bell. ibid cap.
5. ad secun-
dum dico in
fine. Et tamen
dicuntur hæc
eadem fieri in
novissimo ju-
dicio, quia
tunc sicut co-
ram toto mun-
do manifestif-
sime, & cum
summo hono-
re justorum &
ignominia im-
piorum, &c.

by the Cardinal himself, shewing us, how tho a particular Sentence passeth upon every Man in the day of his particular tryal after Death, yet the same is said to be done at the last Day, and that properly too, because then it is published before the whole World to the greatest Honour of the Righteous, and the highest Infamy and Reproach of the Ungodly: And does the Scripture any where suggest to us under the title of the World to come, any place or state distinct from Heaven or Hell, so that without inferring a third place in the World to come for Remission of Sins, according to *Bellarmino* himself, our Saviour's manner of speaking, may be allowed most clear and expressive.

Secondly; Since Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is here expressed a Sin of the most unpardonable provocation to God, since our Saviour repeats it with the highest Abhorrency, telling us twice, that tho all other Sins and Blasphemies may be forgiven, yet still that against the Holy Ghost shall not, may we not very agreeably to the whole Narration, here aver, that our Lord makes use of that Expression, *Neither in this World, nor in the World to come*, rather by way of Aggravation, or to express still the greater heinousness of the Sin, than tacitly to infer, that there remains a Remission and Forgiveness of other Sins in the World to come; rather to shew that this Sin shall be eternally Unpardonable, or as *St. Mark* expresses, *ver. 14.* never be forgiven at all, than to teach us that other Sins and Transgressions not forgiven in this, may yet be remitted in the World to come, and that too, before we enter into the other World, which is the case of Remission had by *Purgatory*. All that I find reply'd by the Cardinal to this, is, That by a like Aggravation we may shuffle off Hell it self, and call it an Aggravation when our Lord condemns the Wicked, *Go you into everlasting*

Eccl. de Purg.
cap. 4 §. at
contra, &c.

burnings; but by what Logick, or from what Premises he draws his Conclusion, it is past my Capacity to Conjecture: Our Lord in divers places, and upon several opportunities expressly tells us, *That the portion of the Wicked shall be everlasting Burnings*: Well, therefore when he says, *Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven, neither in this World, neither in the World to come*, he must either be understood to insinuate a Remission of Sins in Purgatory, or we may as reasonably conclude that there is no such Punishment as Hell Fire. Is not the Cardinal more Impertinent in this Induction, than he would infer our Saviour's Expression to be, were there no Purgatory-Remission after this Life? That this Expression is Hyperbolic and Figurative, St. Mark manifestly insinuates, briefly comprehending this more Figurative and ample Circuition of St. Matthew in that short speech, *Non remittetur in Aeternum*, shall never be forgiven. Indeed, Bellarmine says, St. Mark is no fit Interpreter of St. Matthew, but his reason for it is beyond the Cardinal himself, *viz.* Because St. Matthew writ more copiously and largely, and St. Mark's Gospel is but a Compendium of Saint Matthew: As if that Man which Contracts another Man's meaning, and that too by the guidance of an Infallible Spirit, were not to be allowed a Competent Judg of his Intentions. Or, again, As if the more Flourishing and Rhetorical, were to determine and over-rule the more Concise and Comprehensive. 'Tis certain St. Mark, who was guided by the same Spirit with St. Matthew, has delivered nothing different from, or discording with St. Matthew's meaning; and therefore since the whole tendency of the Scriptures may incline us this way, and St. Mark has explained it to this purpose, must it not be most consequential to infer, that, *To be forgiven neither in this World, nor in the*

Bell. quo supra s. Respondeo non debere.

World to come, imports no more but this, *shall never be forgiven*. As for this Induction which the Cardinal makes, either our Saviour spake the words as Saint *Matthew* relates them, or as *St. Mark*, or as both: If as *St. Matthew*, or as both, we have gain'd our Point, it will in no measure advantage his Cause; for tho he spake the very words of *St. Matthew*, yet he meant no more by them than *St. Basil* has explained: So that by consequence they are very far from evincing a Third Place for Remission of Sins after Death; or instructing us, that that Remission in the World to come, which he here denies of the Sin against the Holy Ghost, he tacitly insinuates to be competible to other Sins. The Cardinal himself acknowledges such an Inference as this to be no good Logick; and to argue by way of Instance: When the Scriptures affirm Hypocrisie is a Sin so hateful to God that he cannot bear it, may we rationally infer, that there be some other Sins of that nature, that his Infinite Purity can bear with them? Is it not more clear to affirm, that by this Expression the Scriptures only manifest the grievousness of this Sin of Hypocrisie, no ways tacitly affirm God can endure and bear with other Sins? So that according to the way of the Scriptures themselves, we may say that our Saviour in these words only aggravates the Odiousness of the Sin against the Holy Ghost, shewing it shall never be forgiven, but no ways advises us that there are other Sins which may be forgiven, if not in this, yet in the World to come. As to what the Cardinal alledges of the Impropriety of this Expression, *Neither in this World, nor in the World to come*; if there were no Remission in the World to come, it is Impertinent and to no Purpose, since those words do fully answer the purpose of our Saviour, and with the greater vehe-

Ecllerm. *ibid.**Ibid.*

mency deny all Remission whatever to that Sin: And although it would be improper to say, I will Marry neither in this World, neither in the World to come, because there is no such thing as Marrying and giving in Marriage there; yet it follows not that it must be as improper to say it shall neither be remitted in this World, neither in the World to come, because there is no Remission for Sins not remitted in this World, yet all Remission is said to be confirmed there, and the Scriptures usually acquaint us our Final Doom and Sentence shall be pronounced at the Judgment Seat of Christ.

Thirdly, That this Text advantageth not the *Papists Purgatory*, is farther clear, because it treats of the Remission it self of Sin, not satisfaction for some light failures, which is the chiefest Remission of their *Purgatory*. All that the Cardinal has to reply here, is no more but this, That in *Purgatory* there is also a Remission of Venial Faults. To which I answer, That Venial Sins, as they call them, have nothing to do with this place; for since they are the most Mortal Sins and Blasphemies, to which our Lord here compares the Sin against the Holy Ghost, declaring that tho' they might be forgiven, yet this should not, neither in this, nor in the World to come: Must it not follow, that if any Remission in the World to come be to be inferred from these words of our Lord, it must certainly be a Remission of Mortal Sins; and so the Cardinal as far to seek as ever for the establishment of his *Purgatory*, since from thence they profess all Mortal Sins excluded, so as that there is no Remission at all for them there. The Cardinal makes an offer of a return to this, but it is such a one, as may quite end the Controversie of a *Purgatory* from this Text; for he says, Our Saviour

spake here of a compleat and perfect Remission, which comprehends the Remission both of the Sin, and the Punishment, in which manner the most grievous Sins are said to be Remitted in another World, for this Reason, because their Remission is compleated there. But, first, What's all this to Venial Sins, or the Remission had in *Purgatory*, which according to his own Prin-

Eccl. ubi supra & tertio Respondeo Christus loquitur de perfecta Remissione quæ completur Remissionem culpæ, & pœnæ, quomodo gravissima peccata remittuntur in alio seculo quia ibi completur eorum Remissio.

ciples, has nothing to do with grievous Sinners? Again, How can the completion or perfection of all Remission belong to *Purgatory*, when the Scriptures every where refer it to the last Judgment by Christ? Secondly, If the most grievous Sins are said to be remitted in the other World, for this Reason, because their Remission is compleated there, then why may not this Expression, *Shall be forgiven neither in this World, neither in the World to come*, signifie one and the same Remission, the one, *viz.* That *in the World to come*, being only a Confirmation, and Completion of the other? Thirdly, If the Remission *in the World to come* be the same with *that in this Life*, only in a higher and more comprehensive Perfection compleating it, then how can these words infer a third State for Remission of such Sins as are no ways Remitted in this World. Indeed according to the Doctrine of Christianity, tho not according to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, the Remission of the Punishment always accompanies the Remission of the Sin, but yet it will not follow that this Text of Scripture which treateth of the Remission of Sins only, is agreeable or appliable, much less demonstrative of their *Purgatory*, wherein they pretend only to a Remission of Punishment, and some Penal Satisfactions for such Sins as are already Remitted

in

in this World. And thus I think by the help of the Cardinal, we have sufficiently disappointed them of the assistance of this Text in the support of their *Purgatory*.

The next place alledged, is *1 Cor. 3. 15. Shall be saved, yet so as by Fire.* The Cardinal tells us this is one of the obscurest, but yet most profitable Texts; so illustriously manifest is their Cause in the Scriptures, that its highest Advantages, are the deepest Obscurities; and its clearest Light treasured up in the profoundest Darknes. He also tells us it is reckoned by St. *Augustine* amongst those difficult Sentences St. *Peter* speaks of, which many wrest to their own destruction; and therefore we may all conclude what an incomparable Foundation it must be whereon to bottom an Article of Faith. If we consider the Circumstances of the whole place, we shall find them in no respect suiting with their *Purgatory*: For *Verse* the 13th, the Apostle tells us the Fire here spoken of, is that whereby, every Man's Work shall be made manifest, and therefore consequently, that all Men both bad and good, both Apostles and others, shall pass through the Tryal and Examination of that Fire here mentioned; which agrees, not with their notion of *Purgatory*, from which Apostles and Saints are wholly to be exempted. 2. As the examination of this Fire extends it self to all Men, so is its Force and Operation said to exert it self upon the Works, not the Persons of every Man, as in the latter part of the 13th *verse*, *The Fire shall try every Man's Work of what sort it is*; and so again *Vers. 14, 15. If any Man's work abideth, or if any Man's work shall be burnt.* Whereas the Fire of their *Purgatory* has nothing to do with the Works of Men, which are supposed to be accepted before an entrance therein, but wholly

exerciseth its Sting and Punishment upon the very Souls of Men. 3. If we consider the Day which shall thus declare our Works, we shall perceive that can no ways agree with their *Chimerical Purgatory*: For tho the Text tells us it shall be revealed in Fire, yet some interpret this Revelation by Fire, of the final Conflagration of the World; others, of such a one as shall flame out at the day of God's final Judgment; the last of which *Bellarmino* acknowledges to be the general Opinion of the Fathers, and also admits of, and allows it, for the most true. Now how from this Fire which shall be revealed at the Day of Judgment, we may infer a present Fire purging, and cleansing the Souls of Men immediately after their departure out of this Life, I confess I want the Cardinal's dexterity to make out? I suppose, according to their own Principles, the Fire of *Purgatory* shall be no more then (whatever it is now) at that last Judgment, and therefore how this Description or Insinuation of that examining and determining Flame which shall thus search, and prove the works of all Men then, can declare or manifest to us this Purging Fire at present, out of which Millions shall have escap'd before, and into which perhaps Millions shall never enter, viz. All remaining here in the Flesh at that terrible Day of the Lord, some of the Cardinal's Disciples would do very well to explain to us. As to all the particulars of this Text, such as are Foundation, Builders, Gold, Silver, Wood, Hay, Stubble, nay, the Fire which shall try every Man's work what sort it is, the Cardinal with Protestants interprets to have an Improper, and Metaphorical meaning, and then what agreement can this Clause bear to the rest if taken properly and in its literal signification? *Bellarmino* confesses one or two apparent Equivocations

Bell. de Purg.
lib. 1. cap. 6.
Tertio quia
Græcus, in the
end of the Pa-
rograph.

Bell. ibid.

Exposition, Understanding, whose works the Fire shall try, of a Metaphorical, and Figurative Fire; shall be saved so as by Fire, of a Material and Afflicting Fire: But it is the Incoherence of his own Imaginary Doctrines, not any variation in the Text it self, which forc'd and oblig'd him thereunto: For if we understand the whole in a Metaphorical way, we do no violence, but altogether clear up the Apostles meaning; for as so that Clause *ὡς διὰ πυρός*, so as by Fire, upon which all his stress depends, This certainly clearly manifests that Fire is here mentioned only Figuratively, or by way of likeness, or resemblance; as who should say, his works shall perish in the Fire, but the Workman shall escape, yet with that difficulty and hazard, as if that Examining Fire had got hold on and been ready to devour him; now the Cardinal acknowledges that Examining Fire to be Metaphorical: Indeed the Apostle seems carefully to have obliterated the Impropriety of the proper acceptation of that word *Fire*, here, by the interposition of that Particle (*ὡς*), nor can the Grammatical Construction any ways help out the Cardinal's imagination of such a Material Fire, which by its Pains and Tortures should actually save and restore the Person Tortur'd therein unto Life. As for what the Cardinal alledges from those words, *If any Mans work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss*, inferring that it meaneth that such a Person shall receive a Punishment: Tho a Loss and Punishment are very different things; the one being inflicted on us by another, the other many times the effect of a Man's personal Negligence, and Error; yet if we agree with the Cardinal in this *Punishment*, it will not follow, that the Punishment refer'd to here, must necessarily be a Punishment by Fire; is not the loss of all his Labours, and the experiencing them

Ibid. §. secundo ignis iste, is the end.

them, to be rather the works of Damnation than leading to a Reward, a very heavy Punishment? As for any other, there is not the least colour or pretence from the words. The most material Objection I find made to this Explication is this, That if the words, *So as by Fire*, are not to be understood of a Material and Tormenting Fire; then those Builders who are said to Build, Gold, Silver, and precious Stones, may as properly be said to escape so as by Fire, as the raising up of Hay, Wood, and Stubble; and so that distinction which the Apostle plainly suggests to be between them Insignificant, and to no Purpose. But this is easily removed, if we observe, that, tho they are all subject to this Fire of Trial and Examination, yet they are not all Obnoxious to the like hazard and danger by it; for tho it consumes and destroys the one, (*viz.* the Wood, Hay, and Stubble,) yet it does but illustrate and make more manifest the Worth and Perfections of the other, *viz.* the Gold, Silver, and Precious Stones. As I suppose two Men of unequal Qualifications, may run through the same Examination, tho the one with no hazard, but rather advantage to his Reputation: So that as Wood, Hay, and Stubble, which refer to such false, and unwarrantable Doctrines as shall be accountable for, at the Fiery Examination of God's fiercest Judgment, bear no relation at all to Venial Sins, which a small Penance, perhaps a supernumerary *Ave Maria* may wipe off in this Life, or at most a few Pangs in *Purgatory*, clear us from, long before that terrible Day, which shall declare our Works. So is the Fire here mentioned to try every Man's work of what sort it is; far from the nature of their *Purgatory* Scorchings, because they are only to Purge and Satisfy, these to Examine and make Tryal; in a word, the one is a *Probation*,

Bell. *ibid.* §.
Denique sequeretur, *in*
the beginning.

tory, the other a *Purgatory Fire*. There are those indeed which interpret this Fire of those Tribulations and Afflictions wherewith God often examines our Works and Doctrines in this Life, particularly *St. Augustine*, and *Gregory the Great*, whose Dreams and Delusions seem to have given the first occasion to this *Chimerical Purgatory*; but I shall not determin the time when God will exercise and examin us with this Fiery Trial, it being sufficient to shew, that the nature of this Examining Fire, let it happen when it will, is no ways suitable to that Imaginary one, fancied to be now burning in *Purgatory*, the property of that being to Try works, but the efficacy of this to Afflict and Punish Souls: And that this place is thus to be understood Metaphorically, we might Confirm by divers of their own Expositors: Besides many pressing Arguments urged by *Erasmus*, to evince that it makes neither for Venial Sins, nor a *Purgatory* for which *Bellarmino* declares it so profitable, *Suarez* cites *Sedulius*, *Lyranus*, *Cajetan*, and others, Interpreting it almost in our very words, tho indeed he himself will have the whole place understood of a Proper and Material Fire; but he brings no better Inducements to determin us on his side, than *Bellarmino* offers to make out, that tho Fire in one part of the Text must be meant Allegorically, yet *so as by Fire*, must necessarily be taken in a Literal and Proper meaning: Indeed the Instance by which the Cardinal undertakes to make it appear to us, that it was the manner and custom of *St. Paul*, thus to use the same word in divers senses in the same sentence is most Remarkable, and does abundantly Evince, that the Cardinal's Wit was more put to it to make out this Point, than his Conscience concern'd for laying down the Truth: The Text appeal'd to is this, *He hath made him Sin for us,*

Eraf. in locum.

Suarez Tom. 4. in Thom. disput. 45. §. 1. num. 25.

Ibid §. 1. num. 28.

Bell. quo supra §. secundo dico non esse insuetum, &c.

who knew no Sin; here the word *Sin* is to be taken in as different an acceptation as the word *Fire* in the former place: What? Was he made *Mortal Sin*, who knew only *Venial Sins*, or how is *Sin* here taken in a different meaning? Indeed *to be made Sin*, and *to know Sin*, have different meanings, but then they are also different Sentences; but as for the word *Sin*, that imports the very same in relation to them both; as to his being *made Sin*, it means no other than that that Spotless Lamb was sent by God to be the Sacrifice for our Mortal Sins; and the Punishment he under-went shews, that the Sins imputed to him, or for which in our stead he accounted, were those very Sins which he knew not, that is, which he had not been personally concerned in committing. What Agreement is here with Sins different, such as *Mortal* and *Venial*, with a resemblance of a Metaphorical and a Proper Fire? Or because we meet the one Expression, what countenance can it give to the other Inference and Deduction; they were the same mortal Transgressions which the Apostle intimated in the one place, and it was no doubt one and the same Metaphorical Fire which he represents and alludes to, in the other: But thus it is when Men will appeal to Scripture for the confirmation of such Doctrines, as differ from the very Spirit and Letter of the Scriptures, that they are compelled to such irrational and unconcluding Misapplications.

And thus I proceed to another place insisted on for the justification of a *Purgatory* by the Cardinal, and that is *Mat. 5. 25, 26. Agree with thine Adversary quickly whilst thou art in the way with him, lest at any time the Adversary deliver thee to the Judge, and the Judge deliver thee to the Officer, and thou be cast into Prison. Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence un-*

til

til thou hast paid the utmost Farthing. How! Shall he by no means come out thence, until he himself has paid his utmost Farthing? Then how can this Prison be imagined to be *Purgatory*, out of which, by the means of the Prayers, and Masses of the Living, the Dead are every day supposed to come forth, discharg'd from all Payments to be made by themselves? *Bellarmino* tells us, *St. Chrysostom* understands this place in its Literal meaning, that is, as having respect purely to enforce Peace and Reconciliation with our Neighbour in this Life; and *Emanuel Sa* testifies, *St. Jerom* explains it of a Reconciliation and Peace to be made with our Enemies in this World. If we consider the Design of the whole Chapter, which was an enforcement of those Christian Vertues, whereby we might ensure to our selves Peace and Happiness here in this World, as well as Comfort and Felicity in that which is to come, we shall perceive no Inconsistency, or Impropriety in such an Interpretation; for tho' *Bellarmino* insinuates Christ would not have so positively inferred, *He should not go thence, till he hath paid the utmost Farthing*; had he meant only the Imprisonment of Offenders against the Law of Man in this World, out of which they most frequently escape, without such Payment; yet as *Theophylact* upon the 12th Chapter of *St. Luke* suggests, this might be for the greater Terror, and more effectually to allure mean and carnal minds to Love and Agreement, with the frightfullest prospect of those Severities they seem most to dread; I say, it may very consistently and agreeably to our Saviour's intention in the Chapter, thus be taken in its most Obvious and Literal meaning: But it is, and hath been often explain'd in an Allegorical manner, but yet with no regard, or advantage to their *Purgatory*, as shall plainly be evinc'd

R r r r

out

Maldou. in Matth. 5. 25. Adversarius noſter eſt ille quem læſimus, quem raca aut ſtultum appellavimus, qui actionem apud Deum contra nos habet: Via eſt hujus vitæ tempus: Judex Chriſtus, qui dicturus quod uni ex his minimis feciſtis: mihi feciſtis: Miniſter Dæmon malus, qui in torquendis damnatis Deo miniſterium præbet: Carcer Infernus: quadrans minima culpa ad quadrantem ſolvere, pro ſummo Jure puniri proverbio dicebatur. Et poſtea quod autem dicit, nos inde non exituros, donec ultimum quadrantem perſolvamus, non ſignificat, ut ait Auguſtinus, exituros poſtea, ſed nunquam exituros: Quia qui in inferno ſunt, cum ſemper debitas pœnas ſolvant, quia pro quolibet mortali peccato infinitas pœnas debent, nunquam perſolvunt.

out of their own Expositors. Thus *Maldonate* in his Comment upon the place, gives us this clear and familiar account of it: Our Adversary here intimated, says he, is that Man whom we have offended, whom we have abusively called *Racha*, and *Fool*; for which he shall implead us at God's Tribunal: *The way*, is the time of this Life; the *Judg*, Christ, who shall then tell us, what we have done to the least of his, we have done to himself: *The Officer* is the Devil, or some evil Spirit by whom God afflicts Sinners; the *Prison* is *Hell*; and *the last Farthing*, the least Sins and Offences: And that this expression of *paying the last Farthing*, is proverbially used, to signify one to be punished after the utmost Rigour. And then further, when our Saviour tells us, *He shall not go thence till he has paid his last Farthing*; his

meaning, says he, is not, that they should go out afterwards, but as *St. Augustine* expresses it, that he shall not go out at all, for this reason, because those in Hell for every mortal Sin stand indebted in infinite Punishment, which 'tis impossible they should ever be able to satisfy. And *Stella* in his Comment

Stella in Luc. cap. 12. Non intelligas quod aliquando exiet, quia donec particula in Sacris literis æternitatem ſignificat, &c.

upon the 12th of *St. Luke*, farther explains the same in this manner; If a Man, says he, should infer from these words, *until he has paid*, that when he has paid he shall be released, he would not err, but then

this would be the same as never: Because there is no end of Infinite, and this Particle *Donec* in Scripture, signifies Eternity; and to oppose an equal match for the

†

the

the Cardinal, *Tolet* (who was both a Jesuit, and the first Cardinal of their Order) in his Comment upon the same place of *St. Luke*, explains it to the very same effect, telling us that it is to be applied to that Man who dies without Remission obtained in this Life, he shall certainly be sent to the Prison of Hell until he satisfies his Debt; not that he shall one day satisfy it, and so be released, for that shall never be, neither shall he be released for ever; but our Saviour uses this way of expression to shew, there is no other, and so by consequence no way at all of escaping or getting out. And this is most proper and agreeable to the Parable. And thus you see not only we *Protestants* in favour of a Heresie, but some plain-dealing Jesuits in vindication of the Truth, do honestly confront the Cardinal in his Proofs of a *Purgatory*.

The main Particulars on which he grounds the strength of his Reasonings from this Text, are these two: 1st. Our Saviour's making use rather of the Similitude of a Debtor, which relates I warrant to Venial Sins, than a Murderer, or an Adulterer, whose Offences are mortal indeed. The 2d. The force of this Particle *Donec*, which he would have to signify a time of Releasement after Payment. But to the first, Did not the Cardinal remember his *Pater Noster*, and that Christ himself has there comprehended the most mortal Offences under that expression, *forgive us our Debts*? Can any Sin be believed more mortal than those which are there numbred amongst our Debts to God? Had the Cardinal been more intent upon his *prayers*, he could never have been so zealously bent towards the maintaining such

Ann. 89, & 90. Applicatur dictum ei qui ante Tribunal Dei comparebit sine penitencia & remissione peccati in hac vita facti, mittetur profecto in Carcerem Inferni, quousque satisfaciatur debito, non quod aliquando satisfaciatur, id enim nunquam fiet, nec eripietur in aeternum, sed id solum dicitur quod non aliter liberabitur & iste sensus est germanus & Parabolae accommodatus.

Errors, with such Triflings as this. As to the 2d. The force of that Particle *Donec*, Is it not a wonder to see so great a Cardinal sheltering himself with so ignorant a Shuffle? Is not this word frequently used in the Scriptures with respect to Eternity, as *Psal.* 110. *Sit thou on my Right Hand, until I make thine Enemies thy Footstool?* Were his Enemies no sooner to be made his Footstool, but Christ was to be displac'd from the Right Hand of God, or do these words oppose his eternal continuance at God's Right Hand? This I think no Christian will affirm that believes the *Nicene Creed*, when it obliges us to confess his Kingdom shall have no end. Again, The use of this Particle is so frequent in Scripture, that *Theophylact* in his Comment upon the first Chapter of *Matthew*, tells us 'tis the Propriety of the Scriptures to use it in this Latitude, and from the force of *Donec peperit*, with *St. Jerom*, concludes *Joseph* never knew *Mary* at all; to be sure they signify not that he knew her afterwards, which I suppose the Worshippers of the holy Virgin, and Defenders of her perpetual Virginity, will no ways oppose. And as for the Inference the Cardinal draws from these words, *He knew her not till she had brought forth*, viz. *That they signified she should certainly bring forth: Whatever it was to his purpose, yet it was no ways agreeable to the Scope of the place, which was now to signify the entire Chastity of her Virginal Purity, when she Con- ceiv'd and brought forth our Blessed Lord; not to demon- strate his*

therefore I shall conclude the Controversy from these words, with the words of *Josephus*, telling us, first, That no Man could plead for a Person again, That

Amén. Concord. in locum,
cap. 20. pag. 180. non potest
quis recte ex hoc loco argere
procuratorem Purgatorii, &c.
vid. locum.

the Parable, sheweth that the Particle *Donec* manifests not that the Debt here mentioned shall one day be paid, but that the extreamest Justice shall be executed upon such a Debtor; and that he that shall unjustly offend his Neighbour, and so make him his Adversary, and afterwards will not endeavour a Satisfaction and Reconciliation whilst he is in the way here in this Life, but defer all till the Day that God cometh to Judgment, shall then feel the fear-fullest Judgement of God; and because he must be incapable to pay the Debt then, be tormented with everlasting Punishment. This is clear without Force or Straining, and therefore this Prison far different from the Goal of *Purgatory*.

And thus have I done with the Cardinal: But there have been other Wits at work since, and attempted to strengthen their Arguments with such Additions as these, the 1st of *Peter* the 3d Chapter the 19th Verse, *By which also he went, and Preached to the Souls in Prison, which sometimes were Disobedient, when once the Long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah.* Our Modern Arguers now, conclude here is a clear and manifest Illustration of their *Purgatory*, in this very dark and mystical Insinuation of Christ's Preaching in that very Spirit, by which he was raised from the Dead, to the Spirits in Prison in the Days of Noah. *Bellarmino* indeed in his Fourth Book *De Christo*, and the Thirteenth Chapter, makes use of these Words to prove Christ's Descent *ad Inferos*; contrary to the Exposition and Opinion of *St. Augustine*, but he brings them not to establish his Reasonings about *Purgatory*

Salm. in loc.

tory, and therefore we may conclude him moſt inclinable to the opinion of *Salmeron*, who tells us, That tho ſome underſtand them of a *Purgatory*, yet they are much more to the purpoſe of a *Limbus Patrum*: And indeed *Salmeron* urges them as a manifeſt Demonſtration of a *Limbus*, againſt *Beza*, taking them in another Senſe: But if they are ſo manifeſt for a *Limbus*, with what Face can they thus diſtort, and apply them to evince a place ſo different from it as *Purgatory*? Tho the place is Oſcure and Difficult, yet it is not ſo Intricate, but that we may clearly perceive it has nothing to do with *Purgatory*: For, firſt, It is clear from the words, that the Spirit in which he is ſaid here to preach to the Souls in Priſon, was that very Spirit by which he was raiſed from the Dead, which could be no other but as *Occumenius*, cited by *Salmeron* in his Comment upon the place, explains it, the Spirit of his Divinity: By reaſon he could not be raiſed from the Grave by virtue of any other Spirit whatever; and therefore this Preaching could have no relation at all to Souls in a ſeparate State: Which if he viſited, it was in the Spirit of his

Bell. de Chriſto lib. 4. Para. expoſit. 2.

Suarez Tom. 2. in Thom. Queſt. 52. Art. 1. Diſput. 42. Sect. 1.

Soul; and therefore *Bellarmino* concludes, that the Spirit here mentioned ſignifies his Soul; And *Suarez* avers the true meaning of the Text to be this, *Solâ anima Chriſtum predicaffe*, That Chriſt preached in his Soul only: Which is in direct words to contradict the holy Apoſtle, telling us, That being put to Death in the Fleſh, he was quickned by the Spirit, *ver. 18.* by which Spirit he went and preached to the Spirits in

in Prison, which sometimes were disobedient in the days of *Noah*; which manifestly suggests to us, that this going forth to Preach, was in the Spirit of his Divinity, and before his Appearance in the Flesh; and therefore no ways to be understood of his Preaching the Gospel after his Death, and before his Resurrection, to those who remained in certain Receptacles of the Earth. But secondly, That they were the Souls of Men living in this World, and not the Souls of those Departed, to whom in this Spirit of his Divinity Christ is said here to have Preached, further appears from the very Text, which tells us, *That the Souls to whom he Preached, were such as were then Disobedient, and that the time of their Disobedience, was before the Flood, when the Ark was building: And therefore that Long-suffering of God, which St. Peter speaks of, must denote Christ's Patience, who had call'd those Men, living thus in disobedience, to Repentance by his Holy Spirit, Preaching to them by the Tongue of Noah: And giving them farther Testimonies of his Love, and Mercy to them by that Preacher of Righteousness in the time that the Ark was a Building, which was a fair warning of their approaching Destruction, and therefore might well have won them to Repentance. What is there here any ways agreeable to the Souls of the Dead? Besides, Since they were the disobedient to whom Christ is said to have Preach'd in his Spirit; it is manifest that according to their own Principles it could not be those detained in Limbo Patrum, for they were the obedient Preachers of Righteousness themselves, viz. Noah, Abraham, Isaac, &c. Nor could it be the*

the

the Souls in *Purgatory*, for beſides, that there could be no ſuch ſtate before Chriſt had opened unto us the Gate of Heaven; to what end or purpoſe could he have Preached to theſe who muſt have obtained his full Remiſſion of all their Sins in this Life, who wanted no knowledg of Righteouſneſs, only ſome few ſatisfactory ſtroaks to introduce them into *Paradiſe*.

To conclude, Tho we take the words in the meaning which their own Expositors put upon them, yet we cannot poſitively infer there is a *Purgatory* from them, becauſe at laſt they may more clearly be underſtood of that Priſon, wherein they imagine the Righteous Patriarchs themſelves to have been detain'd; not that theſe could ſtand more in need of ſuch Preaching who are expreſſed by God's Holy Spirit both to have known before, and to have rejoiced when they ſaw the Day of Chriſt; as the Apoſtle fully explains to us, when he tells us how *Moses eſteemed the Reproach of Chriſt greater Riches than the Treasures of Egypt*. And therefore we may with the moſt reaſon conclude this Preaching was neither to the Souls in the one place, nor thoſe in the other: And that from this Text can be made out, no ſuch place as either of them is fancied to be.

Acts. 2. 24. is alſo cited by ſome of them, the words are, *Whom God raiſ'd up, having looſed the Pains of Death*: The ſenſe of which, as they explain it, is this, That when Chriſt died, and deſcended beneath in the Earth, he freed many from their

their Pains and Torments; not the Damn'd, because they are past all deliverance; not the Saints, because they endure no pains at all; therefore the Souls in Purgatory. But do the words intimate the least glimpse of any such releasement performed here by Christ? Do they not tell us expressly, that the Person loos'd was the Lord Jesus himself, whom they had crucified, *vers.* 23. And moreover, that the Pains from which he was loos'd, were those of Death, *ut supra*, *ut* *Savere*, as the words are in the Greek, by which 'twas impossible he should be holden. What's all this to Purgatory, or the releasement of Souls from its fiery Terrors? What a strange Zeal is here for a Purgatory, that can't allow of our Lord's Resurrection from the Dead, without his leaving such a Scate behind him?

Again, *Luke* 32. 42. *Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy Kingdom;* is applied to the same purpose, though the Thief, when yet alive, made this Request to our Saviour, yet this must necessarily argue an Opinion of a Remission after this Life; and though our Lord answers him, *To day thou shalt be with me in Paradise;* yet this disproves not a Purgatory, but must be look'd upon as an extraordinary Case that he escap'd that Prison, and an exemption to that general Rule of a Purgatory, which yet never was establish'd in the Gospel.

Again, when the Apostle, *Phil.* 2. 10. tells us, *That at the Name of Jesus every Knee shall bow, of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things*

SSSS

things under the Earth, he most convincingly informs us of a *Purgatory*; by reason (as they interpret it) those under the Earth, must necessarily be understood to be the Souls tormented there. But what Shifts are these, to advance an Article of Belief? Does not the Apostle here represent unto us the universal Sovereignty of Christ? And bowing of Knees here mention'd, denote that subjection, which not only every humane Creature, but even the Inanimate, nay the very Devils, trembling and quaking, confess due to Christ? Why must those in the Earth necessarily be the Souls in *Purgatory*? Are there not many Men, Women, and baptiz'd Infants, dead in the Faith, whose Bodies lie therein cover'd, besides many living Animals and Vegetables, which are frequently said in Scripture, to bow to, and glorify God in their kind, and according to the consistency of their Natures? Is not this sufficiently explain'd to us in the 5th Chapter of the *Revelations* at the 13th Verse; *All Creatures which are in the Heavens, and in the Earth, and in the Sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Praise, and Honour, and Glory, and Power, be unto Him that sitteth upon upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for evermore?* And sometimes we hear Holy David in like manner calling upon the Sun and Moon to praise the Lord with him. What Creatures are those in the Sea, which shall knowingly, and with a sense of veneration glorify Christ? May they not as reasonably fix a *Purgatory* in the Moon, or in the Waters, as in the Earth, from such Texts as these are?

I shall conclude all with that in the 21st Chapter of the Revelations, at the 27th Verse, *and there shall enter into it no unclean thing.* From whence they infer, that the Souls of the Faithful that are spotted with Sin, must be purg'd in the next Life, before they enter into the Kingdom of God, and so consequently a *Purgatory*. We need here but repeat the whole Verse for an Answer; which runs thus, *And there shall enter into it no unclean Thing; neither whatsoever worketh Abomination, or maketh a Lie, but they which are written in the Lamb's Book of Life.* For does it not clearly appear whom the holy Apostle meant by the *Unclean*? Were they not *the workers of Lies and Abominations*, or such whose Impenitence had excluded them the Lamb's Book of Life? And will this agree with the State and Condition of *Purgatory*, which receives not any thing unclean, but those just Persons who have obtain'd remission through his Blood, who are stop'd therein, not for any purification of Sins retain'd, but to make payment and satisfaction for some Debts forgotten to be discharg'd in this Life? I hope those Souls therein detain'd, are not such as are excluded the Lamb's Book of Life. Besides, though the Heirs of Salvation are yet unclean, still I hope Faith, with the Blood and Merits of Christ, are much better Refiners and Purifiers than the Fire of *Purgatory*: When once our Sins are purifi'd and cleans'd hereby, there is no fear we shall be bound by the way, or detain'd from the Kingdom prepar'd for us; since the Holy Ghost has so fully assur'd all such, *If our earthly House of this Tabernacle were dissolv'd,*

Job 1, we have a Building of God, a House Eternal in the Heavens. : CH. 5. 1. So far is this Doctrine of a Purgatory from being clear or apparent in the Scriptures, that he must want common Sense that shall be persuaded by such illogical Demonstrations to be made in its behalf.

THE END

ERRATA

PART I

Page 49. Line 15. for *now*, read *no*.
 P. 53. l. 1. r. of *the* place *this*?
 P. 60. l. 17. *Entich*, r. *Inter*. l. 18. *is* *dead*?
 P. 67. l. 23. *Cons*, r. *cons*.

PART II

Page 60. Marg. f. *hic*. r. *hi*. f. *recipiantur*, r. *rejuvantur*.
 P. 61. l. 3. f. *Silver*, r. *Silver*.

LONDON,

Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswell at the
 in St. Paul's Church-Yard,

The TEXTS examined which *Papists*
cite out of the *Bible* for the
Proof of their Doctrine

F O R

Prayers in an Unknown Tongue.

P A R T I .

I M P R I M A T U R .

Octob. 4. 1688.

Ja. Basset.

THE common Pretence of the Doctors of the Church of Rome, against allowing to the People the use of the Holy Scriptures, is their being so extremely liable to be misunderstood, and to have false and corrupt Senses imposed upon them. And indeed, whosoever impartially considers the wild and extravagant Senses which they themselves impose upon sundry Texts of Scripture, in defence of their own unscriptural Doctrines, will be very much tempted to suspect, that their Design was to make Instances of their own Sense, and to convince the World that

diffolv'd, we have a Building of God, a House Eternal in the Heavens, 2 Cor. 5. 1. So far is this Doctrine of a Purgatory from being clear or apparent in the Scriptures, that he must want common Sense that shall be perverted by such illogical Deductions as are made in its behalf.

T H E E N D

E R R A T A

P A R T I.

Page 479. line 15. for *now*, read *no*.
 P. 603. l. 1. r. of the place *this*?
 P. 604. l. 17. f. *which*, r. *what*. l. 18. r. *is dead*?
 P. 697. l. 29. f. *omne*, r. *omnia*.

P A R T II.

Page 605. Marg. f. *hic*. r. *hi*. f. *recipiuntur*, r. *reipiuntur*.
 P. 615. l. 3. f. *Stuer*, r. *Silver*.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswel at the Rose and Crown
 in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1688.

The TEXTS examined which *Papists*
cite out of the *Bible* for the
Proof of their Doctrine

FOR

Prayers in an Unknown Tongue.

— John Scott.

PART I.

I M P R I M A T U R .

Octob. 4. 1688.

Jo. Battely.

THE common Pretence of the Doctors of the Church of *Rome*, against allowing to the People the use of the Holy Scriptures, is their being so extremely liable to be misunderstood, and to have false and corrupt Senses imposed upon them. And indeed, whosoever impartially considers the wild and extravagant Senses which they themselves impose upon sundry Texts of Scripture, in defence of their own unscriptural Doctrines, will be very much tempted to suspect, that their Design was to make Instances of the truth of this their Pretence, and to convince the World how liable the Scripture is to be abused, not on-

T t t t

ly by the common People, but also by Men of Wit and Learning, when once they are lifted by their Interest to serve a bad Cause: And to strengthen this suspicion, I know no greater Argument, than their vain and impotent endeavour to justify from Scripture this most uncharitable and unchristian Practice of their Church, *viz.* their concealing from the People their publick Offices of Prayer in a Language that they do not understand: To expose the vanity of which Attempt, and let the World see what miserable Shifts the managers of it are put to, is the Design of the ensuing Papers; in which I shall,

- I. *First*; Examine the more general Proofs from Scripture which they urge for it.
- II. *Secondly*; Consider the particular Texts of Scripture by which they defend it.
- III. *Thirdly*; Produce our Scripture-Arguments against it.
- IV. *Fourthly*; Answer the Objections by which they endeavour to invalidate the Force of these Arguments.

First; I shall examine those general Proofs from Scripture which they urge for it. And for this Matter, we need seek no further than the *Catholick-Scripturist*, and the *Touch-stone of the Reformed Gospel*, which two Books are Collections out of *Bellarmino*, and other Popish Writers, of such Scripture-Proofs as they have pressed to serve and defend the disputed Doctrines and Practices of their Church; and the latter of which hath done little esse than just recited the former, and this, in my Opinion, with far less strength and advantage; so that when we have answered one, we have answered both.

Now as for the *Catholick-Scripturist*, the most specious Arguments which he urges in defence of their Latin Service (and which is wholly omitted by the *Touch-stone*) is the Practice of the Jewish Church; which from the Babylonish Captivity to the Time of Christ, had all her Scriptures, and as he tells us, *all her publick Service and Prayers (which was all taken out of the Psalms, the Law, and the Prophets) in that very Language in which they were written, viz. in the Old Hebrew, that is, in a Language well known indeed to the common People of the Jews, before their Transmigration into Babylon; but in their Captivity at Babylon, they lost the knowledge of their Old Hebrew Language, and consequently had all their Scriptures and Publick Service read in a Language unknown to the common People, and this for fourteen Generations—And this, saith he, before the Eyes of Christ and his Apostles, and they never did in the least reprehend it.* Which Argument, though it seems plausible enough at the first, I doubt not will appear, upon a more intimate enquiry, lighter than Vanity: And therefore in Answer to it, I shall briefly propose these four Things to the Reader's consideration.

Vid. Bellarm.
lib. 2. de verb.
Dei. cap. 15.

First; That long before this Captivity, God himself delivered the Scriptures, and consequently the publick Offices of Prayer contained in them to the Jews, in their native and vulgar Language; for it is agreed on all hands, that the Ancient Hebrew, in which God delivered to the Jews the Book of the Law, the *Psalms*, and the greatest part of the Prophets, was before this Captivity, the vulgar Language of the Hebrew Nation, which is a much better Argument that God would have the Publick Prayers of his Church performed in a known Language, than this pretended Practice of the Jewish Church is, that it is all one to God whether they

they be performed in a Language known or unknown : for supposing it were true, that the common People of the Jews did, under this Captivity, forget their Old Hebrew Language, and consequently that they understood not their Publick Prayers, which were still continued in Hebrew ; all this was accidental, and argues no more, than that God did permit the Jews to lose their Original Language, and consequently to offer up their Publick Prayers to him in a Language which they did not then understand. And what then, doth he not permit a great many things which he doth by no means allow ? Notwithstanding this permission, it might, for any thing that appears from it, be in God's esteem either a great Fault in their *Rabbins*, that they did not translate their Publick Prayers into the New Vulgar, or a great Fault in the People, that they did not take care to transmit to Posterity their knowledg of the Old Hebrew, and perhaps it might be a Fault in both. And doth it follow, that because God permitted them to be faulty, therefore he approved their Fault ? The Question is, Whether God did approve this their Practice, or no ? and till it appears that he did, God's permission of it is a very fallacious Proof of his Approbation. For it's evident from the many severe Animadversions our Saviour made upon the Practices of that Church, that God for a long time did permit a great many Corruptions in it ; and for all that yet appears, this may be one of them, and a very great one too ; and till such time as it's proved to be no Corruption, no Argument of the lawfulness of it can be fetch'd from God's Permission. Allowing therefore the Matter of Fact to be true, *viz.* That the *Jewish* Church for Fourteen Generations celebrated her Publick Services in a Language that was unknown to

the People, it's certain that for several Generations the Roman Church hath practised the same: Why then may we not as well argue the lawfulness of it from the practice of the later Church, as of the former, and so bring the thing in Question for a Proof of it self, than which nothing can be more extravagant from all the Laws of Disputation: But *this*, saith our Author, *was practised in the Jewish Church before the Eyes of Christ and his Apostles, and they never did in the least reprehend it.* Supposing this at present to be true, which (as I shall shew by and by) is notoriously false; yet even from hence there is no necessity of Consequence that therefore the thing is lawful, until it be first proved that there is nothing can be unlawful but what our Saviour or his Apostles have expressly reprehended; and this I doubt can never be proved: For how doth it appear that our Saviour reprehended every single Corruption in the Jewish Church? And if he did not, it's possible that this might be one of her Corruptions, though our Saviour never reprehended it; perhaps there might be some Things in her Worship so very absurd, as that they needed no reprehension, they being a sufficient reprehension to themselves; and among this number of Things, her *praying in an Unknown Tongue*, (supposing she was guilty of it) may, I think, as fairly claim a place as most things we can imagine; so that at best this Argument concludes but contingently. Had our Saviour judged this Practice unlawful, it may be he would have reprov'd it, and it may be he would not, either because he looked upon it as a practice that sufficiently exposed it self, or for some other Reason which we at this distance cannot arrive to: But, on the other hand, God's delivering to the Jews their Publick Service in their Native Language, is an unanswerable

Argument,

Argument, that it was his Will that they should offer up their Prayers to him in a Language that they understood; for he did not barely permit this to be done, but he himself chose to do it, by the Advice and Approbation of his own All-comprehending Reason, which upon full consultation of what was best and fittest to be done, determined him to inspire those Prayers they used in their own Language, rather than in a Language that was unknown to them; and seeing all Languages are alike known and easy to him, why should he chuse to dictate their Prayers in a known Language, rather than in an Unknown, had it been indifferent to him whether they prayed to him in the one or the other? To be sure his Design in giving them their Prayers in their own Language, and no other, was, that they should pray to him in their own Language, and not in any other which they did not understand; that so understanding all along what they prayed for, their Hearts might be duly affected with the Matter of their Prayers; and if this were his Design, then to be sure Prayers in an unknown Tongue are a direct Contradiction thereunto. God's giving the *Jews* therefore their Holy Prayers in Hebrew, which was then their Native Tongue, is as plain an Argument that it was his Will and Intention that the People should offer up their Prayers to him in a Language which they best understood, as the Church of *England's* publishing her Prayers in *English*, is, that her Members should from thenceforth no longer pray in an unknown Tongue; and therefore, though afterwards, during their Captivity, their Native Language was altered, yet seeing they had no reason to apprehend that God's Will and Intention was altered, they ought to have pursued that, and to have translated their

Prayers

Prayers into their own Vulgar, supposing that they had lost the knowledg of their Old Hebrew. They knew well enough that the Reason why God first inspired their Prayers in the Hebrew Tongue, was not because it was Hebrew, out of any particular respect he had to that Language more than to any other, but because it was their Native Language which they all understood ; and therefore as soon as they ceased to understand the Hebrew, those who were their Guides and Pastors, ought to have proceeded upon God's Reason, and to have translated their Prayers out of Hebrew into their new Native Language ; there being the very same reason why the People should understand their Prayers now when they spoke Chaldee, as there was when they spoke Hebrew. To illustrate this Argument by a plain Instance, The Wisdom of our Ancestors hath thought fit to publish our Statute-Laws in English, for this Reason, because they intended the People should so far at least understand them, as to know how to govern their Actions by them. Now suppose that hereafter *England* (which God forbid) should be conquered by some Neighbouring Nation, and thereupon receive the Language of the Conqueror, and in process of Time the common People (though continuing still under the same Laws) should quite forget to speak and understand *English* ; in this case, if the Reason of publishing the Laws at first in *English* were good, it certainly holds as good for the translating them into the New Language of *England*, there being the same Reason why the People should understand their Laws when they speak *French*, or *Spanish*, or *Italian*, as when they spoke *English*. This Consideration I have the longer insisted on, because, if I mistake not, it destroys the whole force of

†

our Author's Argument, supposing the whole matter of Fact from which he argues to be true. But then,

Secondly, It is farther to be considered, that it doth not at all appear that in this Captivity the Old *Hebrew* was so universally lost as is pretended, but rather the contrary: For considering that throughout all this Captivity, the *Jews* continued firm and stedfast to their Religion, the Precepts and Institutions whereof were Recorded in no other Language but their Old Native *Hebrew*, they could not but apprehend themselves very highly concerned to preserve and continue it; seeing without it they could have no access to their Sacred Oracles, which for the conduct of their Lives and Actions they had such frequent occasions to Consult: For, for a Nation to lose, or preserve a Language which is the sole Repository of the Religion to which they zealously and devoutly adhere, must doubtless be very far from a thing indifferent to them; it being impossible for Men that are truly Zealous for their Religion, not to be very tenacious of the Language in which its Laws are contained, when they are to be found in no other Language; and this, as our Author grants, was the case of the *Jews*, when they were lead Captive into *Babylon*; whither they carried no other Language with them but their Native *Hebrew*: But then considering the strange, if not Superstitious Veneration which the *Jews* have always retained for the *Hebrew*, it is not to be imagined that they would easily part with it; for they always looked upon it as the peculiar Language of God, and consequently as having in it something more Sacred than any other Language in the World; insomuch that they esteemed the holy Scriptures a Gift to be much more holy in the Original *Hebrew*, than when it was translated into another Language.

Nobility of those Sacred Books was very much Diminished when any Change was made in their Language or Characters *; and it is likely that they who had so high an esteem of this Language, should be remiss in their care of preserving it, especially considering that it was the only Language in which the Sacred Oracles of their Religion were contained? This to be sure must necessarily render all those who had any sense of Religion very careful and sollicitous to preserve it, and accordingly we find the *Jews* of all Ages to be very careful in this matter: Thus *Theodoret* tells us, *Other Nations have their Children speaking quickly in their own Mother-Tongue, but there are no Children of the Hebrews, who naturally speak the Hebrew Tongue, but the Language of the Country where they were Born. Afterwards when they grow up, they are taught the Letters, and learn to read the holy Scripture in the Hebrew Tongue.* And one of their Rabbins in *Pirke Avoth*, tells us, *That they taught their Children the Scriptures at five Years Old*; that is, to read the Scripture in the *Hebrew* Language; and to this day the *Jews* are very careful to teach their Children *Hebrew*, that so they may be capable to read and understand the Scriptures: and if now they teach them *Hebrew* when it is so difficult for them, the Languages where they are Born and Bred, having no affinity with it; how much more would they do it then, when it was so very easie, the *Chaldee* which was the Language of *Babylon*, being of all Tongues in the World the nearest a-kin to the *Hebrew*, its Letters being all the same with the *Hebrew*, and abundance of its words being derived from *Hebrew* Originals: And only differing from them either in their Declension or Formation: What their different Declensions are the common Rules of the *Chaldee* Language declare;

*Vid. Dr. Lightfoot, Vol. 2. p. 803, & 804.

Theod. in Quest in Gen. 59. 60.

Perec. 11

declare; and as for their different Formations, it consists either in changing or transposing the Letters of the Radical Words, or in detracting from, or adding to them, or in the transmutation of the Vowels; the main of all which differences are reducible to a few short and easie Rules*. So that supposing the *Chaldee* to have then the Vulgar Language of the *Hebrews*, yet by reason of the near alliance of those two Languages, they might with as much ease have taught their Children the pure *Hebrew*, as the *Scots* can theirs to understand pure *English*. And is it likely that they who are now so very careful to teach it to their Children when it is so difficult, should then neglect it when it was so easie? But as for that Assertion of our Author, *viz.* That in this Captivity they lost the knowledg of their old *Hebrew*; though I cannot but look upon it as a most absurd Falshood, yet I confess in him it is very pitiable, it being his misfortune to be imposed upon by much abler Heads than his own; and particularly by *Bellarmino*, from whom he commonly borrows all his Scripture-Proofs and Arguments. But how far this Assertion is from any probable shew of Truth, will, I doubt not, sufficiently appear upon a close enquiry into the matter: For considering the duration of this Captivity, it is hardly conceivable how in such a short space of time they should lose the knowledg of their native *Hebrew*, (though they had industriously endeavoured it); for a Native Language is not soon worn out, but must pass into disuse by slow and insensible degrees: For some considerable time to be sure the generality of the People must continue to speak it, because as yet they can speak no other, and after they have been a little initiated into a new Language, they will for a long time be apt, where they know they are understood,

* Vid. Buxtorf. observat. Commun. Lexic. Caldiac. prefixa.

De Verb. Dei, lib. 2. cap. 4.

to be speaking their old, that being as yet much more natural and easie to them, and so it must be a considerable time before they can be supposed to forget it. Thus when the *Jews* were lead Captive into *Babylon*, they carried thither no other Language with them but only their own native *Hebrew*, and therefore some time after they must necessarily speak it, or live in a state of perpetual Silence; and after they had got some smattering of the *Chaldee*, to be sure they express'd themselves in it with a great deal of difficulty; and therefore there is no doubt, but among themselves, and in their Families, they rather chose to converse in their native *Hebrew*, this being as yet far more familiar to them than the *Chaldee*, and by commonly speaking *Hebrew* in their Families, they could not but propagate the knowledg of it to their Children. Now this Captivity continuing but Seventy Years at most, its probable that a great many of the first Generation survived it, and how is it imaginable that they should forget the *Hebrew*, which was their native Language, and in which having yet no other Language they were forced to converse for several of those Seventy Years? by reason of which the next Generation, which made up a great part of those who returned from this Captivity, must also be supposed to have imbibed the *Hebrew* from their Parents, many of whom to be sure, especially of the Ruder sort, had for several Years no other Language to converse in; so that supposing them to have been indifferently affected to their new *Chaldee* and their old *Hebrew* Language, yet must their 70 Years Captivity be elapsed, before they could be so wholly accustomed to the one as quite to forget the other. And this will yet more evidently appear, if we consider that this very same People continued Captive in *Egypt* for the space of 200 Years,

and yet in all this long Tract of Time they lost not their native *Hebrew*, but, as all agree, brought it back along with them into the Land of *Canaan*. And is it not very strange that they who preserved it in one Captivity of 200 Years duration, should quite lose it in another of 70, when they had all the advantages of preserving it in the later, that they had in the former? There is no doubt but in both they intermingled their *Hebrew* with some words and phrases of the respective Languages of those Countries; and that they did so, is notorious of this later Captivity in *Babylon*, from whence they brought several *Chaldee* words, of which there are sundry Instances in the New Testament, such as *Bethesda*, *Golgotha*, *Akeldama*, &c. which yet are said *εβραϊσὶ λεγόμεναι*, to be so called in the *Hebrew Tongue*, because by common use they were adopted into the *Hebrew*, even as *Deboach*, *Intrigue*, *Embarrassment*, &c. are now adopted into the *Englisb*: But yet the deriving these foreign words into them, render neither the one nor the other a new Language; still the former continued *Hebrew*, as the later continues *Englisb*. And though perhaps every ordinary *Jew* understood not those *Chaldee* words any more than every ordinary *Englisbman* these *French* words, yet still the one understood *Hebrew* as well as the other understands *Englisb*: But that the *Jews* retained their knowledge of the ancient *Hebrew* under, and a long while after this Captivity, is evident, not only from the reason of the thing, but from much better authority than can be pretended for the contrary: For the main authority which the contrary Opinion depends on, is that of the *Jewish Doctors*, many of whom understood very little of their own Antiquities; and though in those Collections of their Writings from whence these Authorities are cited, it

cannot

cannot be denied: but that there are some things truly Ancient, yet even these are so notoriously sophisticated with the Inventions of their Modern Rabbins, that there is hardly any relying upon them for the truth of matters of Fact: And yet *Barradius* * quotes one Rabbi *Simon*, who affirms that *Nulla tempore nec scribendi nec loquendi modus mutatus est*; That there never was any time wherein the manner of either writing or speaking Hebrew was altered. Which if true, was a plain Argument that in all those times the Jews had never disused themselves from speaking it: and if what *Durandus* saith were true, *viz.* That the Jews that were Christned, had their Service in the Hebrew Tongue; it is certain that in that time the Hebrew was the Vulgar Language of the Jews, and that it was so even in *St. Jerom's* time, at least of a great many of the *Palestine Jews*, is evident from that Passage of his about *Paula's Funeral*, † *Tota ad funus ejus Palestinarum urbium Turba convenit* Hebræo, Græco, Latino, Syroque Sermone, *Psalmi in ordine personabant*; i. e. The whole multitudes of the Cities of Palestine met at *Paula's Funeral*, and sang *Psalms in order in the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syrian Tongue*. So that it seems in those days the Hebrew was as much the common Language of some Cities in Palestine, as the Greek, and Latin, and Syriack, was of others. And *St. Ambrose*, speaking of the Jewish Converts, hath this Passage, * "*Hi ex Hebræis erant qui aliquando Syria Lingua plerunque Hebræa in Tractatibus & oblationibus utebantur*: i. e. These were Jews who in their Sermons and Oblations used sometimes the Syrian, but most commonly the Hebrew Language. From whence it's evident that Hebrew was then more common among them than the Syriack. Against all this, it is objected by *Bellarmino*, and our Author, that when

* *Barradius*
lib. 5. cap. 24.

Lib. 4. c. 1.

† *Hieron. in*
Epitaph. Paul.

* In 1 Cor. 14.

the

the *Jews* returned from this Captivity into their own Country, *Eldras* was forced by himself and others to make the Law be interpreted to them, *Nehem.* 8. 13. From whence they infer that the *Jews* did not then understand the *Hebrew* Tongue, in which the Law was read to them. But what if by Interpreting, we understand not construing the words, but explaining the Sense of the Law? Why truly then this doughty Argument vanishes in *fumo*. But that so it is, is evident from *ver.* 8. where it is said, that *They read in the Book of the Law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading,* or meaning of what they read. But still our Author, from *Bellarmino* his Oracle, objects, "That when our Saviour upon the Cross did in the old *Hebrew* of the Psalm say as it was first written, *Eli, Eli, Lama sabacthani*; *St. Matthew* who did write his Gospel in that new kind of *Hebrew* the *Syriack*, which was vulgarly spoken by the *Jews* in those days, is forced to interpret these words, saying, which is being interpreted, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* For which reason also he interpreted several other *Hebrew* words, which is a manifest sign that they could not be understood by the *Jews* in whose Language he did write, without Interpretation. But now suppose in the first place that these words of our Saviour upon the Cross were *Syriack*, and not the old *Hebrew*, as our Author from *Bellarmino* will needs have them, why then it will very unluckily follow, that the *Jews* understood not *Syriack*, which yet both he and *Bellarmino* will needs have to be their Vulgar Language in our Saviour's time. For what need had *St. Matthew* to interpret *Syriack* words to the *Jews*, if at that time their Vulgar Language was *Syriack*? But if in stead of *Eli, Eli*, as it is in *St. Matthew*, the words of our Saviour

Saviour were *Eloi, Eloi*, as St. Mark reports them, the whole sentence is *Syriack*: And seeing the later part is so, I should think it more reasonable to conclude the former so too, than to make our Saviour speak two different Languages in so short a Sentence. But suppose that for once we should be so civil as to allow the whole to be *Hebrew*, yet St. Matthew's interpreting it, doth by no means infer that the *Jews* of that Age did not understand *Hebrew*: For what if St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in *Greek*, and not in *Syriack*, as our Author affirms; why truly then he is utterly undone again, for then all that can be inferred from St. Matthew's interpreting those *Hebrew* words, is, that all that understood *Greek* did not understand *Hebrew*, or at most that there were some of the *Helenistical Jews* that lived abroad in *Gentile Countries*, who since the Translation of their Scriptures into *Greek* (which was then the most Universal Language in the World), had quite forgot the *Hebrew*, and that for their sakes it was that Saint Matthew interpreted those *Hebrew* words of our Saviour, either of which we may safely grant without the least damage to our Cause, or advantage to our Adversaries. Now that St. Matthew did write his Gospel in *Greek*, is the current Opinion of a great many Learned Men both in his Church and ours; which Opinion of theirs is founded upon such Arguments, as I am apt to think will puzzle much Wiser Heads than his to answer: For upon the Rise of the Grecian Empire the *Greek* Language was so far diffused through all the Eastern Countries, that it became almost their Universal Mother-Language, and particularly in *Judea*, where by their own Rabbins it is stiled the *Mother-Language* *

* Vid. Lightfoot
Vol. 2. p. 103.

Brethren the *Hellenists*, or with Foreigners, even as *Lingua Franca* is now ordinarily spoke by the Natives all along the *Straits* in their Converse with Foreigners, though it be not their native Language; and from *Pilate's* writing the Title, or Accufation of Christ upon his Cross in those three Languages, *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin*, it seems very probable that they were all three very commonly understood by many, if not most of the *Jews*; for *St. John* tells us, That many of them read it, and it was written in *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin*: And therefore if they read it as it was written, they read it in all those Languages, and consequently understood them all: For as for the *Greek*, *Cicero* tells us, That it was understood almost among all Nations*. And *St. Jerom*, speaking of the *Galatians*, tells us, "Ex-
 cepto Sermone Græco quo omnis oriens loquitur, propri-
 am linguam, eandem habere quam Treviros †, i. e. That
 besides the *Greek* Tongue which all the *East* spoke,
 they had their own proper Language, which was the
 very same with that that was spoke at *Trevers*. And
 as the *Jews* commonly spoke and understood the *Greek*,
 so they preferred it before all other Languages in the
 World but the *Hebrew*, stiling it the fairest of the Tongues
 which belong to the Sons of *Japhet*, and affirming that
 the Law could not be translated according to what was need-
 ful for it into any other Language but *Greek* †. Seeing
 therefore the *Greek* was so universally understood, and
 so highly celebrated by the *Jews* of that Age, it's high-
 ly probable that *St. Matthew*, who wrote his Gospel
 purely for the *Jews*, chose rather to write it in this
 Language than in any other, this being most universal-
 ly understood by them, it being the Mother-language
 of the *Hellenistical Jews*, and a Language which a great
 part of the *Hebrew Jews* understood and could speak
 upon

* Cicero pro
Archia.

† In Prozm.
2. lib. Com-
ment. Epist.
ad Galat.

† Lightfoot,
Vol. 2. p. 103.

upon occasion ; besides which, in most of those places which St. *Matthew* cites out of the Old Testament, he follows the Greek Translation of the LXX, and not the Original *Hebrew*, which in all probability he would not have done had he wrote in *Hebrew*, the latter being of much more Authority among the *Jews* than the former ; upon which account it would doubtless have been more adviseable for him, had he wrote in *Hebrew*, to transcribe the *Hebrew* Text, than to translate the *Greek* Text into *Hebrew*. Upon these and some other Reasons, a great many Learned Men are of Opinion that St. *Matthew* wrote his Gospel in *Greek* ; and if this be true, then all the sputter that *Bellarmino* makes about his translating *Hebrew* Words, amounts to no more than this, that the *Helenistical Jews*, a great part of them at least, and *Gentile Greeks*, did not understand *Hebrew* : And this, if it be worth their acceptance, we readily grant, and much good may it do them, provided always that the *Hebrew Jews* who had their Scriptures in *Hebrew*, may be allowed to understand *Hebrew*, as there is no doubt but the *Helenistical Jews* did *Greek*, who had their Scriptures in *Greek*, for then both of them must have had their Service in a known Tongue.

Thirdly ; Supposing that after this Captivity the *Jews* did not understand *Hebrew*, yet the reason why they translated not their Scriptures, wherein their Publick Service was contained, into their New Vulgar, was peculiar to themselves, and such as is by no means justifiable upon Christian Principles. There was a superstitious Opinion, of very ancient Date, received among the Divines of all Religions, that some Languages were in themselves more Sacred than others, and hence it was that in their Religion they retained certain Names which they called ὀνόματα ἁγία, *i. e.* Names

X x x x

with-

without signification, such as *Mew, Threw, Mor, Phor, Fax, Asaph, Threux, Zoock*, and the like; which being borrowed from those Sacred Languages, they thought unlawful to translate, and so at last lost the signification of them. And *Iamblicus* in answer to that Question, Why among the significant Divine Names they preferred these barbarous Ones before their own, tells us, * ἐστὶ ἡ καὶ τὰς μυσικὸς ὁ λόγος. Διὰ τὴν γὰρ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐθνῶν, ὡς περ Ἀιγυπτίων τε καὶ Ἀσσυρίων, οἱ θεοὶ πῶ ἄλλω διάλεκτον ἱεροῦ βιβλῆν κατέδιδξαν διὰ τὸ τοῦ καὶ τὰς κοινολογίας ἰομεθεῖν ἐν τῇ συζητῆσει πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ἀξίει προσφέρειν. i. e. *The Reason of which Matter is mystical, viz. because the Gods do esteem the Languages of the Sacred Nations, such as the Egyptians and Assyrians, to be wholly Sacred; and therefore we conceive that our Discourses with the Gods ought as much as may be to be performed in these Sacred Languages, which are so near a-kin to them.* Where under the *Assyrians* he includes the *Jews*, who had such an high Opinion of the Sacredness of their own above all other Languages, that, as our Learned *Lightfoot* observes *, it is disputed by them, whether it be lawful to snatch the Holy Books out of the Fire on the Sabbath Day, when it cannot be done without some labour; and it is concluded without all scruple, that if they be wrote in *Hebrew*, they ought to be snatch'd out; but if in any other Language or Character, it is doubted: and Rabbi *Jose* affirms they are not to be snatch'd out, nor would they tolerate, as he there observes, the Version of the Book of *Job* in the *Chaldee* Language, much less the Version of the Law and the Prophets into any more remote and heathen Language. This therefore was one Reason why they were so shy of translating their Scriptures into any other Language, because they looked upon all other Languages as too

* De Myst.
Sect. 7. cap. 4

* Vol. 2. pag.
804.

prophane to express their Sacred Oracles. As for the *Hebrew*, they tell us that it is *Lingua divinitus creata & omnium perfectissima, & rebus ipsis convenientissima*; and that *Angeli majorem ejus rationem habent quam aliarum* *, that it is a Language of God's creating, and of all others the most perfect and agreeable to the Nature of Things; and that the Angels themselves have a higher veneration for it than for any other; and upon this superstitious apprehension, they look'd upon it as a kind of prophanation of the Holy Books to translate them into any other Language. Which is such a Reason as cannot with any modesty be pretended by the *Romanists* against our translating the Scripture into vulgar Languages, and much less against having our Publick Prayers in a known Tongue; for sure they will not pretend, either that their *Latin* is a more Sacred Language than another, or that their Prayers, which are for the most part of humane composition, are too sacred to be expressed in Vulgar Languages.

But then the other and main Reason why the Jews were so averse to the translating their Scriptures out of *Hebrew*, was, that they look'd upon the Scripture as their own proper Treasure; by being possess'd of which, they thought themselves advanced to a higher pitch of Glory than any other Nation, and therefore they could not indure to think of communicating it to the Heathen, whom they despised and abominated; they look'd upon it as a high prophanation of the Sacred Mysteries, to expose them to the view of the *Gentile* World, and to cast such precious Pearls before such unclean Swine, as they esteem'd all Nations but their own. And therefore when they were forced against their Wills, by *Ptolomy Philadelphus*, to translate their Scriptures into *Greek*, that day they accounted as bitter

unto *Israel*, as the day wherein the Golden Calf was made, and for a long while after they kept an annual Fast to bewail that Work of the Translation; and in the Translation it self they used an unprick'd Bible, in which the Words being written without Vowels, they might the better distort them divers ways, and into different senses from the Original; and if they were questioned, might point them so as to make them agree with their false Translations, by which means they industriously concealed a great deal of the true sense of their Scriptures from the *Gentiles*. But how justifiable soever this Reason might be in the *Jews*, (who were the peculiar People of God, inclosed by the Laws of their Religion, from all Sacred Communication with any other Nations, and with whom the *Gentile* World was legally unclean) to be sure now the middle-Wall of Partition is broken down, and the *Gentiles* received into free participation of all the Priviledges of the Church of God, no Christian Church or People can pretend to it; and unless the learned Part of the Church of *Rome*, who understand *Latin*, can advance the same pretence that the *Jews* did, *viz.* That they are the Peculiar of God, and that all illiterate Christians are to be look'd upon and treated by them as unclean Heathens, and Strangers and Aliens to the Common-Wealth of their *Israel*, it will doubtless be highly impious, as well as uncharitable, for them to pretend to act upon this Jewish Reason. Seeing therefore the *Jews* in not translating their Scriptures, acted upon such Reasons, as no Christian People can pretend to, their Example can be no Warrant for any Christian Church to follow them: for it is the Reason of Humane Actions, that either justifies or condemns them; and therefore though we should suppose these Jewish

Reasons

Reasons to be just and good in their State and Circumstances ; yet this can be no warrant for any Christian Church to act upon them, unless its State and Circumstances were the same : But if the State of all Christian Churches be in both these respects directly contrary to that of the Jewish ; that is, if all their Languages are equally holy, and all the People that speak them are equally intitled to the Priviledges of the Church of God, then the same Reasons that obliged the Jewish Church to do as they did, oblige all Christian Churches to do the contrary ; and consequently, the same Reasons which obliged the Jewish Church not to translate her Scriptures and Divine Offices out of *Hebrew* into other Languages, do equally oblige the *Roman* Church to translate her Scriptures and Divine Offices out of *Latin*, into the Vulgar Languages of all other Churches in Communion with her : And thus their mighty Argument recoils upon themselves, which is all that Men usually get by endeavouring to colour their foul Practices with false Pretences.

Fourthly, and lastly ; That supposing that after this Captivity, the *Jews* did not understand the *Hebrew* ; yet, whenever their Scriptures and Divine Offices were read to them in *Hebrew*, they had them always interpreted to them into their Vulgar Languages. After the *Hebrew* ceased to be the Vulgar Language of the *Hebrew Jews*, which in all probability was long after the days of our Saviour and his Apostles, they still continued in their Synagogues to read the Scripture to the People in the Original *Hebrew* ; the Understanding as well as speaking of which, being in process of Time in a great Measure lost among the Vulgar, they appointed in all their Synagogues an Interpreter, who being skilled in the Tongues, was to stand by him that

†

read

read the Law, and to render, Verse by Verse, what was read out of the *Hebrew*, into the Mother-Tongue concerning which Interpretation there were sundry accurate Canons made by their Doctors; as particularly this, *He that reads in the Law, let him not read at one time more than one Verse to the Interpreter*, (for which they give this Reason) *lest the Interpreter mistake*. By which practice of theirs, it's evident, that though for the above-named Reasons they were very averse to the translating their Scriptures out of the *Hebrew*, yet they look'd upon it as absolutely necessary in their Publick Worship, for the People to hear them in their Mother-Tongue, that so they might both understand God's Will from his own Word, and be able to join with understanding in those Scripture-Prayers and Thankgivings of which their Publick Worship did consist. Which practice of theirs effectually condemns the practice of the Church of *Rome*, who never takes any care to interpret her *Latin* Prayers to the People, tho the far greatest part of them understand *Latin*, no more than the *Jewish* Vulgar in those days did *Hebrew*; and therefore it's very impertinent in the *Roman* Doctors to urge this Example of the Jews in the vindication of their *Latin* Service; for if the Example were good, they are oblig'd to follow it in one part as well as another; nor will it at all justify them, that the *Jews*, as well as they, read their Publick Prayers to the People in an Unknown Tongue, unless they, as well as the *Jews*, interpret their Prayers to the People in their Mother-Tongue; which I doubt would be a Task too big for the skill of many a Mass-Priest; among sundry of whom, if I am not misinformed by their own Authors, *Latin* is a very scarce Commodity, infomuch that the Priest understands no more what he reads,

than the People what they hear, and so *the Blind leads the Blind*—:God avert the Consequence.

And now by this time I think I may presume upon it, that I have given a full and satisfactory Answer to this so-much celebrated Argument of our Authors, upon which I have the longer insisted, because I find it so often repeated by their Writers, and so little taken notice of by Ours. And if after they have given us so many Dishes of their twice twenty-times boiled Coleworts, there be any remaining Reason to expect from them a modester usage for the future, I would very fain hope, that before they repeat this Argument again, they will think themselves obliged to return some fair Reply to this Answer.

I now proceed, in the second place, to consider particularly those Texts of Scripture which they urge in defence of their *Latin* Service. And the only Texts insisted on, either by *the Catholick Scripturist*, or *Touchstone*, after the most diligent enquiry they could make among their own Authors, are *Levit. 16. 17.* and *Luke 1. 8.* in the first of which it is said, *Let no Man be in the Tabernacle, when the High Priest goeth in to make an Atonement in the Holy Place, until he come out and hath made an Atonement for himself and for his Household, and for all the Congregation of Israel.* In the second we are told, that while *Zacharias* executed the Priest's Office before God, his Lot being to burn Incense when he went into the Temple of the Lord, the whole multitude of the People were praying without in the time of Incense. But what Consequence, I beseech you, can be drawn from hence to justify the use of publick Prayers in an Unknown Tongue? *Why*, saith the Scripturist, *see you not here Publick Prayers made expressly*
for

II.

for the whole Assembly; and yet none of the Assembly permitted to hear or see what there was done by the Priest to God for them, even then when the Priest made an Atonement for himself, his Household, and all the Congregation of Israel. And then, saith the Touch-stone, *All the People were without, and the Priest within, how then did they understand him? therefore the Publick Service of the Church may be said as all the People understand it not.* But what most wretched Consequence this is, will, I doubt not, sufficiently appear upon these following Considerations.

1. That it doth not appear, that in the performance of this Sacred Office, there was any vocal Prayer used, either by the High Priest on the great Day of Expiation, or by the Priest in the Morning and Evening-Incense. The *Scripturist*, by falsifying the words of *Levit. 16. 17.* would fain insinuate, that the High Priest when he went into the Holy of Holies, offered up some publick vocal Prayer there for the People; for instead of [*Let no Man go into the Tabernacle of the Congregation, when the High Priest goeth in to make an Atonement in the Holy Place*] he reads, *When the High Priest goeth in to pray for himself and his House, &c.* From whence he infers, *See you not here Publick Prayer made expressly for the whole Assembly, &c?* Whereas in reality there was no Publick Prayer made, either by him, or by the Priest, during the celebration of these Sacred Rights; all that the High Priest did, during his abode in the Holy of Holies, (into which he enter'd, with a Censer of Coals in one Hand, and a Dish of Incense in the other) was offering the Incense, and sprinkling the Blood of the Sacrifices. When he offer'd the Incense, he enter'd in with a Censer of Coals in one Hand, and a Dish of Incense in the other, with which

he

he went up to the Ark; and there having set down his Coals, he emptied the Incense into his Hands, and laid it on the Coals; and having staid there till the Room was full of Smoak, he returned backwards from within the Vail, with his Face still toward the Ark: but all this while we do not find that ever he spoke one syllable; 'tis true, when he was come out from the Holy of Holies, the *Hebrew* Doctors tell us he made a short Prayer; but this he pronounced so audibly that the People heard him, and were thereby satisfied that he was not dead in the Temple*; and then when he went in again with the Blood of the Sacrifice, all that he did was to sprinkle it eight times, once upwards, and seven times downwards, between the Bars of the Ark, and so he returned as before, without offering up one syllable of Publick Prayers. 'Tis true, at the killing the Sacrifices, both for himself and for the People, he made a publick Confession, both of his own and the Peoples Sins; but this he performed in their presence and hearing: and in the close of the Solemnity, he offered up eight several Prayers; but this he also performed before the whole Congregation. So that all the Publick Prayers he offer'd, were made in the sight and hearing of the People, that so they might all join with him; which is a much better Argument that all Publick Prayers ought to be performed in the sight and hearing of the People, and neither muttered in a low Voice, so that the People cannot hear them, nor pronounc'd in an Unknown Tongue, so as that they were as good not hear them; then the High Priest's retiring from the sight of the People in the performance of those Sacred Rights, is, that the Publick Prayers may be lawfully so performed, as that

* Vid. Maimon. jom. Hakkipparim, C. 4. Sect. 1.

Y y y

the

the People cannot understand them; which is indeed no Argument at all, seeing in the performance of these Sacred Rights, no Publick Prayers were used.

And then as for the Priest's offering the daily Incense, the manner of it was thus, as the *Hebrew* Doctors inform us; after the *Althes* were gather'd from off the Altar by one Priest into a golden Vessel, another brought a Vessel full of Incense, and a third a Censer with Fire, and put Coals upon the Altar; upon which these three bowed themselves and went out; and then a fourth, whose Office it was to burn the Incense, upon warning given by the President, strewed it on the Fire, at which all the People withdrew out of the Temple from between the Porch and the Altar, and fell to their Prayers; and then when the Priest had burnt the Incense, he bowed himself and went his way*: In all which account there is not the least syllable of any Publick Prayer that was offer'd by him. 'Tis true, his offering the Incense was a symbolical Prayer, signifying his offering up the Prayers of the People by way of Intercession; but this, as I shall shew by and by, was peculiar to his Office; and the People having no part in it, it was no way necessary they should be present at it; but if they had had their part in it, they could as easily join with him when they saw him not, as if they had seen him; for they knew as well what he was doing as if they had been present with him, they certainly knew that when the President gave the Signal, *Sir, Offer*, he immediately strewed the Incense on the Coals, and there-withal offered up their Prayers

* Vid. *Maimon. of the daily Service.*
Cap. 3.

Prayers unto God: For sure a common Symbol of every days use is much more easy to be understood by illiterate People; than a *Latin* Prayer; the Action spoke as plain to them, and was as well understood by them as their Mother-Tongue; they saw their Priests carry the Coals and Incense into the Holy Place, and they knew it was in order to offering it up to God for them; they heard the President command the Priest to offer, and thereupon did as certainly know that he offer'd it, as if they had seen him do it. So that their not seeing him do it, did not at all obscure the meaning of that Sacred Right for them, as an Unknown Tongue must necessarily do the meaning of the Prayers express'd in it; and therefore unless it can be proved that it is as easy for our People to understand *Latin* Prayers, as it was for the Jews to know that their Priest was offering the Incense; and what he intended by it; though they saw him not, 'twill be a mighty wide arguing from the one to the other, though we should suppose the Jews to be as much obliged to join with their Priests in that Symbolical Prayer, as we are with ours in our vocal Prayers. The Jews did not see their Priest when he offer'd the Incense, but yet very well understood what he was doing; therefore we who see our Priest when he offers our Prayers, need not understand what he prays for: or thus, the Jews saw not this Symbolical Prayer of their Priest, which, yet they understood as well as if they saw it; therefore our vocal Prayers may be lawfully read to us by our Priests in an Unknown Tongue, which we do not understand at all. A wonderful wise Consequence this, and such as very

Y y y 2

well

well becomes such Logicians, as think themselves bound to say something, even when they can say nothing to the purpose.

2ly. That the Symbolical Prayer express'd by this facred Action of the Priest was peculiar to himself, and the People had no part in it; for it is agreed among all Christians that both the High Priest and Priests in these sacred performances were Types and Figures of Jesus Christ, and that particularly in their offering the Incense, they did prefigure his Intercession for us, wherein he offers up our Prayers to his Father perfumed and hallowed by his own Meritorious Sacrifice, in which it was impossible for the People to bear any part, they being the party interceded for; and seeing the Priests only, and not the People, were appointed by God to represent by this sacred Action our Saviour's Intercession for us, it had been a degree of Sacriledg in the People to assume any part in it; and seeing they had no part in it, what need had they to be present at it? No more sure than we have to be present with our Saviour at the Right Hand of his Father, while he is there making Intercession for us. But doth it follow that because the *Jews* were not allowed to be present at the Incense offering in which they had no part, therefore we Christians are not allowed to be present at the publick Prayers of the Church in which we have all our parts? No; This our Adversaries will by no means allow: And yet this I think is a much better Consequence than that of our wise Author's, *viz. Therefore the People need not understand those Prayers*, seeing it is to no purpose for them to be present at Prayers which they do not understand. But the People did not see what

what the Priest did when he offered the Incense, and what then? Why then they did not understand what he did. Suppose they did not, (which, as I shewed before, is notoriously false) doth it follow that because they understood not what the Priest did when he offered the Incense, in which they had no part at all, therefore we need not understand the publick Prayers which the Priest reads, in which we have all our parts, and are obliged to joyn? Or, that because the Jewish Priests did not permit the People to see the Incense offering, which was an Office peculiar to the Priesthood, therefore the Christian Priests need not permit the People to understand the publick Prayers which are the common Office of all Christian People? Dare any of our Adversaries affirm that Christians are no more obliged to pray with their Priests in the publick Prayers of the Church, than the *Jews* were to offer Incense with their Priests in their Incense-Offerings? No; Though we know they are daring enough at a bold Assertion, yet this I am apt to think they have hardly the confidence to adventure on. Well then; How doth it follow that Christians are not obliged to understand what they *are* obliged to act in? Because the *Jews* were not obliged to understand what they were *not* obliged to act in. Which is as much as to say, Because I need not understand that which I have nothing to do with, therefore there is no necessity I should understand that which is my duty.

3dly. That the reason why in this sacred Action the High Priest and Priests withdraw from the sight of the People was wholly Mysterious and Typical, and as such is not to be urged in Vindication of Christians.
Pray-

Praying in an Unknown Tongue. For as the High Priest and Priests were in this Act Types and Representations of our Saviour Interceding for us, and offering up our Prayers, so the Holy and most holy Place where they performed this Act, were Types and Representations of Heaven where he Intercedes. The truth of which is so Universally owned among Christians, that I need not insist upon the Proof of it. The true reason therefore why these Jewish Priests in their Incense-offering withdrew from the sight of the People into the Holy and most holy Place, was to represent our Saviour's withdrawing himself out of the sight of this lower World into the Heavenly Place, when he ascended thither to intercede for us at the Right Hand of God. Supposing then that the Jewish People did not understand what their Priest did while he was offering the Incense, because they did not see him, yet this will by no means justify the Christian Priests in not permitting the People to understand what they say when they offer up the publick Prayers, unless they can pretend to have the same reason to conceal the Prayers from the People by expressing them in an Unknown Tongue, that the Jewish Priests had to conceal the Incense-Offering from their People by performing it in the Holy, or most holy Place. And this, I think, without disparaging the confidence of our Adversaries, they have not yet forehead enough to pretend to. For sure their Priests were never intended for Types and Shadows of our Saviour; or if they were, their reading Mass was never meant to Typify the Intercession of our Saviour; or if it were, yet their reading Mass in an Unknown Tongue was never designed to represent our Saviour's

our's Ascension into Heaven, to intercede for us there. Why then do they pretend to justify this Practice of theirs by the Example of the Jewish Priests, when they have not the least shadow of pretence to the reason upon which they acted? Suppose we should be so civil as to grant them, that offering the Incense out of the sight of the People, and offering publick Prayers in an Unknown Tongue, were parallel Cases, (which I am sure is much more than they can justly demand) yet how doth the one justify the other? The Jewish Priests offered the Incense out of the sight of the People upon this Reason, because God required them thereby to prefigure the Ascension of our Saviour into Heaven, there to offer up our Prayers to his Father. What then, I beseech you? Why then the Christian Priests may lawfully offer up the publick Prayers in an Unknown Tongue. Say you so, Beloved! what whether they have the same reason or no? Yes, yes, reason or not reason, that's all one. I confess by this way of Arguing, one would think so; but hitherto Men always fancied, that the reason of the Law was the Law, and that when the Lawgiver took away the Reason, he took away the Law with it. But our Sage Authors, it seems, are resolved upon it that the Law shall stand in despite of the Reason. I must needs say if the *Jews* do not thank them for this Resolution, they are very ungrateful People, seeing it as well establishes their whole Ceremonial Law, as this.

4thly. That during the time of this sacred Action, the People had their prescribed Prayers for themselves.

†

selves in a Language which they understood. So the Text tells us, *Luke 1. 10.* That *the whole Multitude of the People were Praying without at the time of Incense.* And in the 50th of *Ecclesiasticus*, the whole Order of this Action is thus described; *The High Priest Simon the Son of Onias, offering to God the Odour of sweet smell, the Sons of Aaron cried out and sounded with Trumpets; then all the People together, made haste and fell on their Faces to the Ground, and besought the Lord most High in Prayer before the Merciful, until the Ministry of the Lord were done,* i. e. the Incense consumed, *and then Simon descending,* i. e. from the Sanctuary, *lift up his Hands over all the Congregation of Israel to give the Lord's Blessing.* From whence it's plain that while the Incense was offering, the People had their own peculiar Prayers appointed them; and what they were, the *Hebrew Doctors* acquaint us, *viz.* Three; which they recite, and call *The Peoples Prayers* *. All which Prayers being Collects of a considerable length, must in all probability be indited in a Language which they well understood; otherwise as they must have prayed for they knew not what, so it had been next too impossible for them to have recited their Prayers truly; which was a Circumstance upon which the *Jews* did very nicely (if not superstitiously) insist in all their Publick Offices. So that this Argument of our Author's from the Incense-Offering, if they do not handle it more cautiously, will go near to cut the Throat of their own dear Cause. For, first, it was no wonder at all that the People were not permitted to be present with the Priest in his Incense-Offering, seeing at the same time they

* Vid. *Light-foot*, Vol. 1.
 p. 946, 947.

they had their peculiar Offices of Prayer appointed them. They were to be Praying without in the Court of the *Jews*, which together with that of the *Gentiles* represented the lower World, while the Priest was offering within the Sanctuary, which represented the upper World; the design of which was to represent and shadow forth the Christian Church sending up its Prayers to Heaven from this lower World, whilst Jesus her High Priest is offering them up to his Father in the Heavenly Sanctuary. But had the Jewish Priest on the one hand been present with the People in their Court without, he could not have represented Jesus interceding for his Church in Heaven; or had the People been present on the other hand with the Priest in the Sanctuary, they could not have represented the Christian Church sending up her Prayers from Earth to Heaven. So that the nature of this whole Mystical Action was such as did require the Priest and People to be apart while they were performing their respective Offices. But, I beseech you, what Mystical Office have Christian People in the publick Prayers that can render it as necessary for them not to understand the Prayers, as it was for the Jewish People not to be present at the Incense-Offering? None at all, that ever I could hear of, so much as fancied or pretended to. The Jewish People were obliged, by the very part they acted in this sacred Solemnity, to be in a separate place from the Priest; and therefore till it be proved that Christian People have some part allotted them in their publick Worship that equally obligeth them not to understand the Lan-

Z z z z

grage

guage of their prayers; to infer the lawfulness of the later from the former, is just as good Logick as the Stick stands in the Chimney-Corner, therefore it must rain to Morrow.

But then, secondly, It is further observable, that there was no other Vocal-prayer used in this sacred Solemnity but what the People understood; seeing it is evident not only that they understood *Hebrew* in our Saviour's time, (as was proved before) which was the Language in which their Prayers were indited; but also that it had been extremely difficult for them truly to have recited three such long Collects, and utterly impossible to have accompanied the Matter of them with their devout Desires and Affections, (as was just now observed) had they not understood the Language in which they were express. And if this be so, then this Scripture-Instance which our Authors urge in their own Vindication, (if it be considered in all its Circumstances) argues point-blank against them; for then it will follow from it, that though it be not necessary that the People should be admitted to see, and (which is more than I need allow) to understand every Mystick Action of the Priest; (such as was that of the Incense-Offering) yet it is necessary that they should understand the Prayers in which they are obliged to joyn.

And thus, I think, I have sufficiently answered our Adversaries Texts, which at first view do evidently appear so far from their purpose, that their
urging

urging them is a plain Demonstration what a miserable Shift they are put to for Scripture-proof to justify this absurd and unscriptural practice of their Church. For certainly, could they have sheltered it under any fair colour of Scripture, they would never have lodged in such a deplorable Refuge, which in stead of defending it, doth only more expose it.

But there is one Text more urged by the *Scripturist*, which he mentions so faintly, that its plain intent was rather to Flourish, than to Fight with it; which I suppose was the reason why his modest Transcriber the *Touchstone*, left it out of his Copy. The Text is *Mat. 21. 16.* where when the Children cried out in the Temple, *Osanna to the Son of David, though they knew not what they said,* saith our Author, yet *Christ called it a perfect Praise, saying, that out of the Mouths of Infants and Sucklings thou hast perfected Praise.* But what makes our Author so confidently affirm, that *they knew not what they said?* Is it because the Text calls them Children? However it's plain, they were such Children as could go to the Temple, and consequently could speak and understand what they spoke. Or, is it because *Hosanna* is an *Hebrew* word, which Language, as our Author will have it, was not understood by the Common People, and much less by the Children? Suppose this were true, (though we have largely proved the contrary) yet why might not those *Hebrew* Children as well understood the meaning of *Hosanna*, as ours do of *Amen*,

Z z z z 2

which

which is an *Hebrew* word as well as that? *Hosanna* was a word of that common use, that they called the *Bundles of Boughs*, which they carried about in the Feast of Tabernacles, *Hosanna's*; *Hosanna*, i. e. *save, I beseech thee*, being the form of Acclamation which the *Jews* were wont to use in the Celebration of that Feast; and it being the manner of the *Jews*, as our *Lightfoot* observes *, to teach their Children from their infancy how to manage those *Bundles of Boughs*, and in their waving them to cry *Hosanna*, it is very fairly supposable that they did as well understand the meaning of the word, (allowing that they did not understand *Hebrew*) as our catechised Children do the meaning of *Amen*.

* Vol. 2. p.
225.

E. 162.

And now seeing our Author is so unfortunate as not to be able to make out his Point by Scripture, he is resolved to try what he can do by Illustration, for so he gravely tells us, That a *Petition well made, even when it's presented by a Petitioner who understands not the Language in which the Petition is made, obtains of the King, or Emperor, who understands it, as much as if the Petitioner had perfectly understood every word of it. Even so, &c.* But now suppose this King, or Emperor, should ask this Petitioner; Friend, do you know what it is you here petition for? and he should answer, No indeed, and it shall please your Majesty, I confess I do not understand one syllable of what is there contained; whether it be for Pardon for some Fault, or Protection from some Danger, or for some particular place of Preferment, I do not know, only this I am informed by those that do understand it, *That*
it

it doth contain a particular praise of your Majesty, (they are our Author's own words, with the necessary Variations) and a special Worship or Honour to your Person, and a peculiar recommending of my Necessities to you; and that it is a very decent Petition, approved by the Company of Petition-makers, and recommended by all the Learned of that Faculty, who very well understand it, though I do not. I strongly fancy, that how gracious soever our supposed King or Emperor may be, he would conclude such a Petitioner to be either a very rude Fellow that came with a design to mock him, or a very silly and impertinent one, and treat him accordingly; Even so, &c. But we have choice of Illustrations; and therefore seeing this will not do, let us try another.

A rich Jewel (as our Author proceeds) in the hands P. 163.
of an Infant or Clown, who knows not to penetrate the value of it, doth not for that cause cease to be truly of as great value; as when 'tis in the hands of a great Jeweller: So Latin Prayers in the Mouths of the Vulgar, be as precious in the sight of God, (when they be said with equal Devotion) as when they are in the Mouths of great Scholars. Very pretty indeed; but one misfortune is, that this precious Jewel is stollen Goods, filched, word for word, from Cardinal Antoninus*. And then there is another worse * Sum. Part. 3.
than this, that when all is done, it is not worth Tit. 23.
stealing! For as I take it, there is a great deal of difference between a good Prayer, and a precious Jewel. A Jewel is never to be rendred more or less precious to another, by any Act of my Mind; nor will my Desire, or Hope, or Love, raise the price.

price of it; and whether it be in my Hand, or Mouth, or Pocket, its value is the same: But surely it is not thus with a Prayer, the intrinsic value whereof principally depends upon the devotional Acts of the Mind. There is, no doubt, but the same Prayer is much better in God's esteem, when it is inspired with our Faith and Hope, Desire and Love, than when it is only written in a Book, or read or heard with a cold indifferency; and I cannot but think that a good Prayer is much more acceptable to God in a devout Man's Mouth, than in his Pocket, provided he understands it, attends to it, and joins his Affections with it; without which 'tis every whit as acceptable in his Pocket as in his Mouth: For a Form of Prayer, while it hath none of those devotional Acts of the Mind join'd to it, is only the meer Carcase of a Prayer, without the Soul that animates and enlivens it; and he who recites it without exerting with it any mental Act of Devotion, doth say a Prayer indeed, but he doth by no means pray. But how can a Man exert these devotional Acts in a form of words, which he doth not understand? How can he pray in Faith, when he knows not what he is to pray for? How can he confess his Sins with sorrow and remorse of Soul, when he confesses he knows not what? How can he desire or hope for the particular Blessings which the Prayer contains, when he knows not what they are? How can he cordially praise or give thanks, when he knows not either what it is that he praises, or what it is that he gives thanks for? Or, how can he know when to confess, or when to petition or give thanks, when

when he knows not whether the Prayer that is reading be a Confession, Petition, or Thanksgiving? And then how is it possible for him to attend to a Prayer which he doth not understand? He may attend indeed to the Sound and Figure of the Words; but not to their Sense and Meaning. And if this be all that is required, a Parrot may be as duly attentive as a Christian: So that all those devotional Acts which constitute a form of Prayer an actual Prayer, are under the direction of the Understanding; without which they cannot be exerted. But how can the Understanding direct these Acts, in a form of Prayer, which it doth not understand? How can it direct our Sorrow or Hope, or Desire or Gratitude, to go along with the Prayer, when it knows not what Sins they are that the Prayer confesses, or what Blessings they are that it asks or returns Thanks for? Though our Author's Jewel be every whit as precious in the hand of one that understands it not, as one that understands it; yet, by his leave, it is far otherwise in a Prayer. It may be as good a form of Prayer indeed in the one hand, as in the other, but by no means so good a Prayer, or so precious and acceptable in the sight of God. The Lord's Prayer written upon a Label, coming out of the Mouth of our great Grandfather's Statue, kneeling on his Monument, with its Hands and Eyes lift up to Heaven, is as good a form of Prayer as when it is pronounced from the Mouth of a devout Soul, with the highest Raptures of Zeal and Fervour. But sure no Man can think it to be as good a Prayer; indeed, from the one's Mouth it is

no.

no actual Prayer at all, but only a dead form of Prayer; for how can that be an actual Prayer, which is not actually prayed? But from the Mouth of the other, it is an actual, living, animated Prayer, which is sure to find acceptance with God. And I doubt the Case is near the same, between a Prayer for the Mouth of one that understands it, not, and one that understands it; from the one it is not so much a Prayer, as a form of words containing Matter of Prayer; for unless he desires the Matter contained in this form of words, he cannot be said to pray for it; but how is it possible he should desire it, when he knows not what it is? He may indeed exert a general undetermined Devotion while the words are saying, but it is impossible for him to determine his Devotion to the Matter and meaning of the words, because he doth not understand it. So that a *Latin* Prayer from one who understands not *Latin*, can be no more than a form of Prayer, because he can only say it, but cannot pray it: And therefore when our Author tells us, That *Latin Prayers in the Mouths of the Vulgar be as precious in the sight of God, (when they be said with equal Devotion) as when they are in the Mouths of great Scholars.* He supposes that which is not to be supposed, (if by Devotion he understands the Devotion of the Mind) *viz.* That he who understands not *Latin*, may pray over a *Latin* Prayer with equal Devotion with him who understands it; which is impossible, seeing a Man can no more pray a Prayer of which he doth not know the meaning, than sing a Tune of which he doth

not

not know the Measures; He may say over the words indeed with equal outward Devotion with him that understands them, but he cannot accompany them with equal Devotion of Mind, nor indeed with any at all; for how can his Mind go along with Words of which he doth not know the meaning? such Words can signify nothing to the Mind; and therefore the Mind can attend to nothing in them, unless it be in their Sound and Figure, which I am apt to think were never intended to be the subject Matter of our inward Devotion, though there are Writers of great Name in the *Roman Church*, of a quite contrary Opinion:

For *Snarez* tells us, That it is not essential to Prayer to think particularly of what he says, and that it is not necessary to think of the things signified by the Words. But I am not able to imagine, either how a Man can desire a thing which he doth not think of, or how he can pray for a thing which he doth not desire.

But yet he goes on to tell us, That it is not De Orat. l. 3. c. 4. necessary to the Essence of Prayer, that he who prays, should think even of the speaking of the Prayer. So that it seems a Man may pray, when he thinks neither of the words nor meaning of his Prayer; and if so, I see no reason why our Great Grand-father's Statue, as before described, may not as truly be said to pray, as our Great Grand-father himself.

Cardinal *Tolet* indeed tells us, That to attend to Instruct. Sacr. C. 13. N. 56. the words, so as not speak them too fast, or to begin
5 A the

the next Verse of a Psalm, before he that recites with you hath done the former Verse, is necessary. And this indeed disables the Reverend Statue from performing what is necessary to Prayer. However a well-taught Parrot, according to his Doctrine, may Pray very devoutly, For, as he goes on, There is an attention, which is by understanding the Sense, and that is not necessary (therefore say I, so far as it is necessary, Parrot you pray very well) for if it were, very few would do their Duty, when so very few do understand what they say. We may thank your Prayers in an Unknown Tongue for that. But then, saith he, There is an attention relating to the end of Prayer, that is, that he who Prays, considers that he is present before God, and speaks to him, and this indeed is very profitable, but it is not necessary: Why truly then, our devout Parrot must content himself with the necessaries of Prayer, and not aspire to this very profitable part of it. And even our own soft and smooth Representer tells us, That it is not necessary to have attention on the Words, or on the Sense of Prayers, but rather purely on God. Why truly, then, in my opinion, they were better use no words at all in their publick Prayers. For doubtless, their Minds would be better able to attend upon God in a deep Silence, than in the Noise and Clatter of a company of Words, of which they do not know the meaning.

Page 62.

But after all, our Author hath reserved (as he imagines) a very stinging period for the Close. *You who scorned (saith he) to use Latin Service, soon came to see your English Service with all scornful*

for the purpose of being used as a...
and that I could not do so...
and, since the matter is...
is a very...
could have...
foreign...
not the...
made our...
knowledge...
Priests, who...
United...
teaching, (which...
will) and...
performing...
for-Form...
not but...
clear...
Jesus...
but to...
interest...
were...
their...
not only...
also by...
prevailing...
(as we...
that...
and...
Lib...)

But we have now some...
Sorrowful...
1842

there is a certain Being in the World, that hath too many Children of his own Temper, whom neither they nor we, have any great reason to dote on; whose common Practice it is to tempt Men to Sin, and then to Expose and Accuse them for it.

The End of the First Part, the Second
will soon follow.

E R R A T A.

PAge 649. line 3. read (is it).

P. 658. l. 9. r. *ἐδνῶν*.

P. 667. l. 13. r. from.

P. 669. l. 30. r. withdrew.

P. 675. read *lodged* it.

P. 677. l. 25. *del.* Cardinal.

P. 680. l. 7. instead of [for] r. [from].

L O N D O N,

Printed by *J. D.* for *Richard Chiswel* at the Rose and Crown
in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, 1688.

The TEXTS examined which Foreigners
cite out of the Bible for the
Proof of their Doctrine

FOR

Prayers in an Unknown Tongue.

PART II

IMPRIMATUR

O. Feb. 22. 1683.

J. Mason

I Now proceed, in the third part, to show that the
Scripture-Arguments which are commonly used for
Prayers in an Unknown Tongue, are not only
very absurd in it self, and so far from being
all the Ends of Divine Worship, but that
one word of Scripture against them, is
Thing would be sufficient to convince
to all unprejudiced Men, that they are
as plain and express, as any thing that
have well expressed, that it is not
Scriptures to apply and interpret it.

15. The Scripture makes it necessary for our understanding, so far as it is capable, to concur with our Wills and Affections in all that Worship we render to God, which it is impossible for it to do when we worship him in an Unknown Tongue. Thus the Psalmist, *God is the King of all the Earth; sing ye Praises with understanding.* But when these Hymns of Praise that are to be sung in the Publick Worship, are in a Language the People do not understand, how can they sing Praises with understanding? And accordingly St. Basil, in answer to that Question, What is it to sing with Understanding? tells us, *That Understanding, when it refers to the words of the Holy Scripture, is the same thing as the Taste is to Meats; for as the Throat by tasting discerneth Meats, so the Mind doth Words: If therefore a Man be so affected in his Soul by the force of every Word (he sings) as the Taste is affected with Meats, he hath fulfilled the Commandment, which saith, Sing ye Praises with understanding*.* But how is it possible for the Mind to taste and relish words of which it doth not know the meaning? By these words, saith Theodoret, *the Psalmist instructs us, not only to employ the Tongue in singing of our Hymns, but to stir up the Mind to understand the Things that are spoken.* But we may stir our Hearts out before we can understand them, when they are spoken to us in an Unknown Tongue. *To sing with Understanding, saith Athanasius, is so to sing, as that there is a spiritual Harmony between the Soul and the Words; and they who sing after such a manner, as to join the Symphony of the Spirit with the Melody of the Words, singing with the Tongue, and also with the Mind, do greatly advantage, not only themselves, but also those that hear them.* But what Harmony can there be be-

Psalm 134

* Psal. Eccl.
134. 2. 9.

Theod. in Loc.

Epist. ad Mar-
cel. To. 1. p.
279.

tween the Soul and the Word...
otions keep Time with them...
one syllable of their meaning...
obliged to sing Prayers with...
equally obliged, for as we understand...
what we sing; and how can we...
in a Language we do not understand.

Again, the Apostle...
tion to those drunken...
Bacchanals, To...
Hymns, and...
in their Hearts to the Lord...
bility respects not...
tion, as their public...
that public...
rended to their...
their public...
liged to make...
that is, to...
inward hearts...
they are capable...
Hymns, which...
which they...
pose the...
loss, so...
and...
to the Lord...
Hearts to the Lord...
Hearts to the Lord...
stand singing with...
affection, to the...
Hymns which they...
bles*. But how is...

to, or be duly affected with the matter of words whereof they do not know the meaning? either therefore the Obligation of these Apostolick Precepts must be quite worn out, or the Church of *Rome* must be highly to blame, who by wording her sacred Hymns in an Unknown Tongue, renders the performance of them impossible to the People.

2dly. The Scripture makes praying in an Unknown Tongue inconsistent with the Edification of the Church; so in sundry Passages of *1 Cor. 14.* where the Apostle throughout the whole Chapter purposely disputes against Preaching and Praying in an Unknown Tongue; for in those days the miraculous Gift of Tongues being very common in the Church of Christ, many of those who were inspired with it, were too apt to over-value themselves upon it, insomuch that to gratify their own Vanity and Ostentation, it became a usual Practice among them (and that particularly in the Church of *Corinth*) to preach, and pray, and sing Psalms in Languages unknown to their Auditory, without ever interpreting what they said into the Vulgar Tongue, either through wilful neglect, or for want of the Gift of Interpretation; against which evil Practice of theirs, the Apostle purposely opposes himself throughout this whole Chapter, and that principally upon this very Argument, that it was not consistent with the Edification of the Church, which he applies as well to Praying as to Preaching: So *ver. 2. 3, 4, 5, 6.* *For he that speaketh in an Unknown Tongue, speaketh not unto Men but unto God, that is, he speaks to the Understanding of none but God, who equally understands all Languages; for no Man understandeth him, howbeit in the Spirit he speaketh Mysteries; but he*
that

that prophesieth, that is, expoundeth Scripture in a known Tongue, speaketh unto Men to Edification, and Exhortation, and Comfort; he that speaketh in an Unknown Tongue edifieth himself, provided he understands what he speaks; but he that prophesieth edifies the Church: I would that ye all speak with Tongues, but rather that ye prophesied; for greater is he that prophesieth, that is, he is much more useful to the Church, than he that speaketh with Tongues. Now, Brethren, if I come unto you speaking with Tongues, what shall I profit you, except I shall speak to you either by Revelation, or by Knowledge, or by Propheying, or by Doctrine, i. e. either by expounding sacred Figures, or communicating my Knowledge in great Mysteries, or interpreting difficult Scriptures, or by a Catechistical Instruction of you what you ought to believe and do. So again, ver. 18, 19. I thank my God, I speak with Tongues more than you all; yet in the Church I had rather speak five words with Understanding, that by my Voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an Unknown Tongue: in all which places the Apostle doth as expressly condemn Preaching in an Unknown Tongue without interpreting what is preach'd, as words can do it. But you will say what is this to us? We do no more preach in an Unknown Tongue than you do: And as for the Controversy in hand, 'tis only about praying in an Unknown Tongue, of which hitherto the Apostle hath taken no notice: To which I answer, First, That the Roman Mass contains in it not only Prayers, but sundry Portions of Scripture and pious Lessons, the latter of which as well as the former, are read to the People in an Unknown Tongue. Now either these Scriptures and Lessons are read for no end at all, or for the same end with:

with Preaching, which is to instruct the People; and therefore the reason which the Apostle urges for Preaching in an Unknown Tongue, *viz.* the Edification of the People, doth equally inforce the reading of these Scriptures and Lessons in a known Tongue. But then, secondly, The Apostle applies this reason of his as well to Praying as to Preaching in an Unknown Tongue, and therefore if for that reason the one is not to be allowed, neither is the other: The reason why he forbids them to preach in an Unknown Tongue is, that it was a hinderance to the Edification of the People, and this very Reason he urges against their Praying in an Unknown Tongue: So *Ver. 14. For if I pray in an Unknown Tongue, my Spirit, i. e. my Gift of Tongues prays, but my Understanding is unfruitful,* that is, it is unfruitful to others. So *Theodore*, *For the Fruit of the Speaker, saith he, is the Profit of the Hearers; and when the words of the Prayer are unknown to those that are present (saith St. Basil) the Mind of him that prays is unfruitful, because it profits none; but when those who are present do understand the Prayers so, as that it is capable of profiting them, then he who prays hath the Fruit, viz. the bettering of those that are profited by him**: and that this is the Apostles meaning he himself assures us, *ver. 17. for thou verily givest Thanks well, i. e. thou, it may be, mayst be very devout in thy own Heart and Affections whilst thou art praising God in an Unknown Tongue; but the other, that is, he that doth not understand the Tongues thou speakest, is not edified.* So that the Apostle proceeds upon the same reason against Praying as against Preaching in an Unknown Tongue: And this our Catholick Scripturist acknowledges, for so he expounds those fore-
cited

Theod. in loc.

* Basil. Reg.
Brev. p. 278.

cited words, *ver. 14.* [*but my Understanding is without Fruit*] *that is*, saith he, *without the Fruit of Instruction, or edifying others*; and therefore by the way, that Passage of his is a little surprizing (tho it is only what his Master *Bellarmino* had taught him) where he *would have his Reader note that until Verse 14.* *St. Paul only speaks of using an unknown Language in Preaching, Exhorting, Interpreting, and Teaching, in all which Exercises we still use the Vulgar Tongue, so that hitherto he hath nothing against us*, no not when he himself confesses that *St. Paul* urges the very same reason against Praying in an Unknown Tongue, in which they of the Church of *Rome* agree with those *Corinthians* against whom he argues, that he had urged before against Preaching in an Unknown Tongue, in which they disagree with them. Whether the reason hold as good against the one as the other, I leave *St. Paul* and him to dispute it out; but certainly while a Man is urging the same reason against one thing as he afterwards intends to urge against another, he intentionally levels it at them both, and consequently, seeing *St. Paul* urges the same reason against Praying, which just before he had used against Preaching in an Unknown Tongue, it's a plain case, that while he was urging it against the one, he all along intended it against the other; and if the unedifyingness of an Unknown Tongue in either be a good reason against both (as it must be at least in *St. Paul's* Opinion) then while he urges it against an Unknown Tongue in one, he must necessarily condemn it in both; so that by our Author's good leave he and his Church are as much concerned in what *St. Paul* pronounces in the seven first Verses of this Chapter, where he only mentions Preaching in an

P. 165.

De verb. Die
lib. 2. c. 16.

P. 163.

Unknown

Unknown Tongue, as in what he afterwards discourses from *vers.* 14, to the 18. where he treats of Praying in an Unknown Tongue, seeing he proceeds upon the same Reason in both: And therefore if notwithstanding this Reason, Praying in an Unknown Tongue be allowable, Preaching must be so too, seeing the same Reason in *St. Paul's* Opinion, acquits or condemns them both. Is Preaching in an Unknown Tongue allowable? No, saith our Author, No saith his Master *Bellarmino*: But why, I beseech you? because *St. Paul* condemns it as being unedifying to the Auditors. Is Praying in an Unknown Tongue allowable? Yes, very allowable say both: But doth not *St. Paul* urge the same Reason against this as the other? 'Tis true indeed; Why then, it seems *St. Paul's* Reason is good where it doth not condemn Holy Churches practice; but where it doth, away with it; that is, in plain English, it's Good or Bad as it serves our turn.

34. The Scripture condemns performing Religious Offices in an Unknown Tongue, as directly contrary to the natural End of Speech. The natural End of Speech, is, to communicate our Minds to, and make our selves be understood by one another, to which there is nothing can be more contrary, than speaking in a Language that is not understood by those that hear us, because hereby we do no more communicate our Minds to them, than if we did not speak at all. And thus *St. Paul* himself argues, *Vers.* 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. *For even things without Life giving sounds, whether Pipe or Harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? For if the Trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the Battel? So you, except ye utter by the Tongue words*

words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the Air. There are, it may be, so many kinds of Voices in the World, and none of them without signification; therefore if I know not the meaning of the Voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a Barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a Barbarian unto me. The Design of all which is to shew, that the end of speaking is to be understood; and that therefore he who speaks in a Language that is not understood, whether it be in common Conversation, or in Religious Offices, speaks to no purpose. Which Reason is equally applicable to speaking in Prayer, as in Preaching, since if it be not understood, it is as much in vain in the one as in the other. The *Romanists* would fain justify their using an Unknown Tongue in their Religious Offices, upon this Pretence, that it is only in Praying they do it, not in Preaching. But should you ask them why they speak in a Known Tongue in Preaching, their Answer doubtless would be to this purpose, because we would be understood; which is the proper End of speaking: But then, why do they speak in an Unknown Tongue when they pray? sure they will not answer, because they would be understood. But then, to what purpose do they speak at all, seeing, by speaking in an Unknown Tongue, they lose the proper end of speaking, and consequently speak in vain? And if to speak without End or Aim, be an absurdity in common Conversation, it is doubtless prophane as well as absurd in Religion: And I should think it much more excusable in the Mass-Priest to hold his Tongue, and turn his Congregation into a Silent Meeting, while he is acting over his set-form of Ceremonies, than to speak out the

Publick Prayers to them in a Language which they do not understand, it being far more seemly, in a Religious Exercise, not to speak at all, than to speak to no purpose : And St. *Paul*, I am sure, is fully of this Opinion, for 'twas upon this Reason that he required those who had the Gift of Tongues, *if there were no Interpreter, to keep silence in the Church, and to speak to himself and to God*, vers. 28. For either words are of some use in Publick Prayer, or they are not : if they are not, doubtless it would be far more becoming that Sacred Office to lay them wholly aside ; if they are, it must be either upon God's account, or Mens ; not upon God's to be sure, who understands our Thoughts and Desires, as well without words as with them. If upon Mens account, it must be either wholly upon the Priest's that pronounces them, or upon the Peoples also ; if it be wholly upon the Priest's account, it must be to raise his Devotion, and then he himself must understand the meaning of them, (which their Lack-Latin Priests cannot pretend to) for how can the Devotion of his Mind be raised by words that signify nothing to his Mind ? or if he doth understand them, why may he not as well raise his Devotion with them by reading them to himself alone, as by reading them out to the People, seeing by reading them to himself, he follows the Apostolick Precept of suppressing his Unknown Tongue, and of *speaking only to himself, and to God*. But if words are necessary in Public Prayers upon the Peoples account also, then it must be either to direct them what to pray for, or to unite their Desires in the same Petitions, neither of which can be performed by such words as they do not understand ; so that I cannot apprehend of what use the reading

or

or speaking Latin Prayers can be in a mere English Auditory (suppose) 'tis no more than breathing of so many empty Sounds (that signify nothing) into the empty Air, whilst the Priests and People are mere Barbarians to one another, that like two senseless Ecchoes, speak and respond they know not what, and to no purpose.

4thly, The Scripture expressly declares Praying in an Unknown Tongue, to be contrary to the Design and Nature of Religious Worship; which being a *reasonable Service*, requires, That our Rational Faculties should closely attend to, and concur with it; for the Life of Divine Worship consists in the Internal Acts of the Mind, such as Desire, and Love, and Hope, and Fear, and Reverence, &c. And unless these concur with the external significations of our Worship, (that is, our Words and Actions) and inform and animate them, it is all but a dead Formality. But how is it possible for us to join these inward Affections of our Minds, with those outward Significations of our Worship, when we know not what they signify? How should I accompany my Kneeling or Prostration in Prayer, with my inward awe and veneration, while I am perfectly ignorant of the meaning and signification of those Gestures? And when I lift up my Hands and Eyes to Heaven, how can I exert with it an inward aspiration of my Soul to God, if I do not know that by the one, I signify the other? In short, how is it possible for my Mind, in any Instance, either in Fact or Fiction, to join the Thing signified with the Sign, when I know not what the Sign signifies? And as it is in Actions in Prayer, so it is in Words, to which it is impossible for us to join those Desires and Hopes

... we do not know
... Men say know
... it is impossible for
... from them; and whilst
... Prayers, that they are so
... in the Ears of God. And upon
... the Apostle himself disputes against
... Tongue, in the 15th and 16th
... Chapter; *What is it then? I*
... *Spirit, or Gift of Tongues, and I*
... *the Gift of Tongues is wont to pray, viz.*
... *Language that he, and those who pray with*
... *understand. I will sing with the Spirit, and I will*
... *sing with the Understanding also. Else when thou shalt*
... *with the Spirit, or thy Unknown Tongue, how*
... *shall he sing or say Amen at thy giving of Thanks, seeing*
... *in all Publick Prayer, that he who*
... *the Congregation, should pray, or at*
... *us Prayer in the Vulgar Language of*
... *for this Reason, because, unless*
... *the Language of his Prayer,*
... *of praying with him; and if*
... *Language they do not understand,*
... *is manifestly inconsistent with*
... *And hence, in the following*
... *parties this Reason) he sup-*
... *who are to join in the Pub-*
... *(as it is notoriously evi-*
... *understand the sense*
... *and*

and meaning of the words. This is the Apostle's own Argument, and when once our Adversaries have made it appear, that Men may truly pray in a Language unknown to them; for my part, I shall readily yield that they have fairly baffled Us and *St. Paul* together: But in the mean time this Argument stands in force against them in despite of all their Cavils and Evasions, which shall be considered in their proper place.

5thly, The Scripture makes praying in an Unknown Tongue utterly inconsistent with that joint Concurrence of Devotion that is required in Publick Worship: That in all our Publick Assemblies for Divine Worship it is required that we should joyn our Hearts and Affections in the same Confessions, Petitions, and Thanksgivings, is evident, as from sundry other Arguments, so particularly from that Response, *Amen*, which the People of God did always make at the close of their Publick Prayers, by which they express the consent of their Hearts and Affections with those Petitions and Thanksgivings that were offered up in their publick Assemblies. So in their publick Imprecations upon themselves and others, the Jews were expressly commanded to respond *Amen*; and in the close of the Psalm of Praise which *David* order'd to be sung by the choir in the Temple, we are told that *all the People* said *Amen*, and praised the Lord; and so also when *1 Chron. 16. 36.* *276*, in a publick Assembly of the Jews, *blessed the Lord the great God*, it is said that *all the People answer'd Amen, Amen, with lifting up their Hands*: And this practice of theirs the Psalmist himself expressly orders and directs, *Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting and World without end, and let all the People* *Psalm. 106. 48.* *(4) Amen*. And accordingly we find this very Practice conti-

Deut. 27. 15.

1 Chron. 16.

36.

Nehem. 8. 6.

Psalm. 106. 48.

which they express and signify, if we do not know their signification. Whilst therefore Men say their Prayers in an Unknown Tongue, it is impossible for them to join their Affections with them; and whilst their Affections are separate from them, they are so far from being acceptable Prayers, that they are only so many empty Sounds in the Ears of God. And upon this very Topick the Apostle himself disputes against Praying in an Unknown Tongue, in the 15th and 16th Verses of the aforecited Chapter; *What is it then? I will pray with the Spirit, or Gift of Tongues, and I will pray with the Understanding also; i. e. as he who hath not the Gift of Tongues is wont to pray, viz. in a Language that he, and those who pray with him, understand. I will sing with the Spirit, and I will sing with the Understanding also. Else when thou shalt bless with the Spirit, or thy Unknown Tongue, how shall he that occupieth the room of the Unlearned, or hath not thy Gift, say, Amen at thy giving of Thanks, seeing he understands not what thou sayest?* Where the Apostle makes it necessary, in all Publick Prayer, that he who is the Mouth of the Congregation, should pray, or at least interpret his Prayer in the Vulgar Language of the People; and that for this Reason, because, unless the People understand the Language of his Prayer, they are not capable of praying with him; and if they cannot pray in a Language they do not understand, then an Unknown Tongue is utterly inconsistent with the Nature of Prayer. And hence, in the following Verse (where he still pursues this Reason) he supposes it necessary for those who are to join in the Publick Service *to be edified, i. e. (as it is notoriously evident from the whole Context) to understand the sense*
and

and meaning of the words. This is the Apostle's own Argument, and when once our Adversaries have made it appear, that Men may truly pray in a Language unknown to them; for my part, I shall readily yield that they have fairly baffled Us and St. Paul together: But in the mean time this Argument stands in force against them in despite of all their Cavils and Evasions, which shall be considered in their proper place.

5thly, The Scripture makes praying in an Unknown Tongue utterly inconsistent with that joint Concurrence of Devotion that is required in Publick Worship: That in all our Publick Assemblies for Divine Worship it is required that we should joyn our Hearts and Affections in the same Confessions, Petitions, and Thanksgivings, is evident, as from sundry other Arguments, so particularly from that Response, *Amen*, which the People of God did always make at the close of their Publick Prayers, by which they express the Consent of their Hearts and Affections with those Petitions and Thanksgivings that were offered up in their Publick Assemblies. So in their publick Imprecations upon themselves and others, the Jews were expressly commanded to respond *Amen*; and in the close of the Psalm of Praise which David order'd to be sung by the Quire in the Temple, we are told that *all the People said Amen, and praised the Lord*; and so also when *Exra*, in a publick Assembly of the Jews, *blessed the Lord the great God*, it is said that *all the People answer'd Amen, Amen, with lifting up their Hands*: And this Practice of theirs the Psalmist himself expressly orders and directs, *Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting and World without end, and let all the People say Amen*. And accordingly we find this very Practice

Deut. 27. 15.

1 Chron. 16. 36.

Nehem. 8. 6.

Psal. 106. 48.

conti-

* Apol. 2.

continued in the Primitive Church, for so *Justin Martyr* * tells us, that the People always concluded the Divine Service with a solemn *ευφημια Αμην*. By all which it's evident that the People of God always esteemed themselves obliged to concur in their Hearts and Affections, and to make some Expression of their Concurrence with the Publick Prayers, which, how is it possible for them to perform when those Prayers are read to them in a Language which they do not understand? how can their Hearts follow, where their Understandings cannot lead? And in short, how can they hope, desire, or give Thanks for they know not what? Nay, and when they know not whether the words which they hear, contain a Petition or a Thanksgiving? And this is *St. Paul's* own Argument, *ver. 15, 16.* *I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the Understanding also. I will sing with the Spirit, and I will sing with the Understanding also.* I do allow that you may lawfully use your Gift of Tongues in your Publick Worship; but then you must be sure that you interpret your Tongue that so you may be intelligible to others, *else when thou shalt bless with the Spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the Unlearned say Amen at thy giving of Thanks, when he knows not what thou sayst?* Where it is first implied that the common People ought to say *Amen*; that is, to consent with their Hearts and Affections in the Publick Prayers, and to express their Consent in them. And, secondly, it is expressly asserted that this they are not capable of performing, if they do not understand the Language of their Prayers; and if the unlearned *Corinthians* could not say *Amen* to those inspired Prayers for this reason, because *they knew not what*
- he

1. Cor. 14. 16.

he who dictated and pronounced them *said*; for the same reason neither can the common People in the Roman Church say *Amen* to their Latin Prayers, because they know as little what is said when they are read to them. So that by expressing her Publick Prayers in a Language unknown to the People, the Church of Rome renders their Duty of saying *Amen* to them impracticable.

6thly, The Scripture represents Prayers in an Unknown Tongue as a great Indecency in Publick Worship: For what an extravagant Spectacle would it seem to a Stranger that knows nothing of the matter, to see a company of People assemble together, with a mighty appearance of Devotion, only to see or hear a Priest officiating to them in a form of words, of which neither they nor he himself perhaps understands one Syllable! Suppose that this Stranger should go from one to another round the Congregation, and ask them every one in their Ear, Good Sir, you seem to be mightily concern'd and affected with what yonder Man in the gay Garment is reading; for my part, I understand not one word that he says, I would fain know whether you do? and suppose they should all of them answer, No truly, Friend, we understand no more than you. But why then do you ejaculate your Eyes, lift up your Hands, and beat your Breasts as if you did understand them? Why as for that we can give no other reason, but that we believe they are very devout words, and 'tis an old fashion among us thus to behave our selves whilst they are reading. What would this Stranger think of these People? Would he not laugh at their Simplicity, and be apt to suspect some flaw in their Brain-pans? And yet just thus doth

St.

St. Paul represent the case, *ver. 23.* *If therefore the whole Church be come together in one place, and all speak with Tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned or Unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad? But why will they say so? Because those that come to your Meeting, knowing that you meet upon a Religious Account, come with an intent to understand your way of Worship, to hear what you pray for, and to learn what you teach, instead of which you only fill their Ears with a loud Rattle of unintelligible Sounds, which convey no other Notion to their Minds but only this, that you are out of your Wits, seeing like so many Mad-Men you speak and hear without any end or aim; For to what purpose can you speak, when you do not speak to be understood? Or, to what purpose can you hear, when you do not hear to understand? And if speaking in an Unknown Tongue was so great an Indecency in those *Corinthian* Assemblies, as that in St. Paul's Opinion, it represented them more like Congregations of Mad-men than of Worshippers. I doubt if St. Paul had the censuring of the Latin Worship in the Roman Churches, where in most places scarce one in five hundred understands it, it would hardly pass for a very reasonable Service.*

7thly, The Scripture declares an Unknown Tongue in Divine Service to be of no other use, but only to give Evidence to the Truth of the Christian Religion, which use it serves not, as it is acquired by natural means; but as it is miraculously infused for the Gift of Tongues, was one of those Miracles by which God gave Testimony to the Truth of the Gospel, which it testified no otherwise than as all other Miracles did, *viz.* as it was a sensible Effect of the Divine Power, and this

this is all the use that the Apostle allows it in the Publick Exercise of Religious Worship, *ver. 21, 22. In the Law it is written, With Men of other Tongues and other Lips will I speak unto this People, and yet for all that, will they not hear me, saith the Lord*; i. e. though I intend to speak unto them in a miraculous manner, *viz.* by inspiring those by whom I intend to speak with the miraculous Gift of speaking unknown Languages, yet still they will continue obstinate in their Unbelief, from whence he infers in the next Verse, *Wherefore Tongues are for a sign not to them that believe, but to them that believe not; but Prophecy serveth not for them that believe not, but for them which believe*; i. e. the great end of speaking unknown Languages in your Religious Assemblies is, that by this miraculous Gift you may convince Unbelievers of the Truth of the Religion you teach: But the Gift of prophesying, or explaining to the People the Holy Scripture in their Vulgar Language serves for the Edification of Believers, and not for the Conviction of Infidels; seeing therefore that the proper use of speaking in an unknown Language in Religious Assemblies, was to give a miraculous Attestation to the Truth of Christianity, it thence necessarily follows, that when speaking an unknown Language in our Religious Assemblies doth not serve this use, it serves no Religious Use at all: but the Latin Tongue, as it is used in the Religious Assemblies of the Roman Church, can be no miraculous Attestation of the Christian Religion, (unless you will suppose it a Miracle for a Mass-Priest to understand it) and therefore it can be of no Religious Use there. If therefore an Unknown Tongue, even when it was miraculous, and as such, did serve the common end of Miracles, was not to be used in Publick Worship without an

Interpreter, how much less should an unknown Tongue be used that is acquired by meer Natural Means, and if the use of it were allowable upon this account only, because it was a Miracle, then when it is no Miracle, it is no longer allowable at all; suppose Latin to have been one of those Unknown Tongues that was spoke in those *Corinthian* Assemblies, if *St. Paul* condemned the use of it without an Interpreter in that Church, even though it was miraculous, and as such, was a Sign to convince Unbelievers, how much more would he have condemned it now in the Roman Church, where it is only an acquired Endowment, and as such, can be no Sign at all, unless it be of the Folly and Wickedness of those that impose it.

IV. I now proceed to the fourth and last Head of Discourse proposed, which is to consider and examine the Objections which the Romanists urge against these Arguments of ours, which are all of them reducible to one General Head, which is this, That in *1 Cor.* 14. whence we deduce the main of our Arguments, the Apostle there treats not of the stated Liturgy or Worship of their Publick Assemblies, but of certain Extemporary Exercises of Preaching and Prayer performed by them, by the immediate Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, in the latter of which they allow that *St. Paul* disapproves the use of an Unknown Tongue, at least without an Interpreter, but not in the former, so *Bellarmino* (a), *Vane* (b), and our Catholick Scripture (c). To which I answer.

1st, That it doth not appear either from this Chapter, or any other part of this Epistle, that they had any other Liturgy of Prayers in their Publick Assemblies (excepting the Lord's Prayer) than what was performed

(a) De Verb. Dei lib. 2. c. 16.
 (b) *Lost-sheep*. p. 355.
 (c) p. 164.

formed extemporaneously by inspired Persons; and indeed whilst immediate Inspirations were so frequent and ordinary among the Pastors of the Church, and particularly of this Church of *Corinth*, there seems not to have been that urgent occasion for stated Forms of Liturgy, as there was afterwards when immediate Inspiration ceased, or became less common; for as by this Gift of immediate Inspiration the Pastors were secured from all Errors and Indecencies in these their extemporary Effusions; so the People having a moral assurance that the Prayers which were offered up in their Publick Assemblies were immediately dictated by the Spirit of God, could safely concur with them in their Hearts and Affections without making any pause to examine either the truth or lawfulness, fitness or propriety of each particular Passage, to which great Inconveniencies, both Pastors and People are unavoidably exposed whilst they joyn in such Extempore Prayers as are immediately dictated from the Invention of the Speaker; to prevent which, when the Gift of immediate Inspiration ceased, or at least became more rare, it is highly probable that the Bishops and Pastors of the several Churches collected from the Prayers of these inspired Persons such Confessions, Petitions, and Thanksgivings as they thought most proper, and composed them into set-Forms of Publick Prayer; so that stated Liturgies seem to have been substituted in the room of Inspired Prayers, and designed to supply the discontinuance of immediate Inspiration; for it's very strange, that if from the first beginning of Christianity there had been stated Liturgies prepared either by Christ or his Apostles for all Christian Churches, there should no mention be made of them, either in Scripture or Primitive Antiquity; for, as for those Litur-

gies that go under the venerable Names of the Apostles, such as St. *James's*, St. *Peter's*, and St. *Mark's*, it's now agreed by almost all the Learned of all sides, that though some parts of them are very ancient, and seem to have been introduc'd into the Christian Assemblies long before the close of the first Century, yet none of them are of that prime Antiquity they pretend to; but for Men so confidently to affirm, that besides these inspired Extemporary Prayers, there was at the same time a stated Liturgy used in the Publick Assemblies of the Church of *Corinth*, when they have not the least shadow of true Authority for it, is a suspicious sign that their Faces have at length out-worn the mean Infirmity of blushing. But if it be true that stated Liturgies were introduc'd to supply the room of inspired Prayers, then there is the same reason why the former should be express'd in a known Tongue as the latter, because where one thing is placed in the stead of another, they must be both designed for the same end; and therefore seeing that to obtain the end of an inspired Prayer, it was necessary it should be express'd in a known Tongue, it is no less necessary to obtain the end of a set-Form of Prayer, the end of both being the same.

2ly. I Answer, That all those Reasons which the Apostle assigns against the use of an Unknown Tongue in an inspired Prayer, make as effectually against the use of it in a stated Liturgy, or form of Prayer. This I doubt not will evidently appear, upon a just examination of those pretended Disparities which our Adversaries make between the one and the other, which yet are only in three of those seven particular Reasons assigned by the Apostle: So that though we should allow these three to be real, yet till they find out four Disparities

disparities more, there are four substantial Arguments of the Apostle will still remain in force against them; and I am apt to think, that unless the four to be yet found out, prove better than the three that are found, it will appear in the main Issue that they have taken a great deal of pains to seek for that which they had much better have lost than found.

The first Disparity they pretend, between using an Unknown Tongue in an inspired Prayer, and a stated Liturgy is, That those inspired Prayers were intended for the Edification of the People; but so are not stated Liturgies, and therefore there is not the same necessity why the latter should be in a Known Tongue as the former. Thus *Fisber* (a). *Dr. Vane* (b). The Catholicick Scripturist (c). And *Bellarmino* himself (d).
 To which I Answer,

First; That stated Liturgies ought to be designed for the edification of the People, as well as those inspired Prayers were: And therefore when the *Romanists* tell us that they are not so designed, we give them free leave to speak this for themselves, and for their own Liturgy; and the greater shame we think it is, both for them and that; but we can by no means allow them to say this for us, or for any other Christians in the World, there being none but themselves that we could ever hear of, that have the Face to affirm, that their Publick Liturgies were never designed for the edification of the People, which perhaps is one of the worst things that can be said of a Liturgy; for the great end of Publick Liturgies (as I shall shew by and by) is to direct the Devotions of Christian Assemblies, into a common concurrence, with such Confessions, Petitions, and Thanksgivings, as are most conducive to their Spiritual Benefit and Advantage, to prescribe.

(a) Apud Dr. White P. 374.

(b) P. 358.

(c) P. 166.

(d) Ibid.

to them such Confessions of Sin as are most apt to inspire them with sorrow for, and hatred and abhorrence of it, such Petitions for Mercy as are most apt to affect them with the sense of their Wants, and of their dependance upon God for Supply and Relief, with such Praises and Thanksgivings as are most apt to excite in them a grateful sense of the Divine Goodness, a flagrant Love of God, and a profound Admiration of his Perfections, together with an active Resolution of transcribing and imitating them in their Conversation. In a word, the End which God aims at in requiring us to pray to him, is not merely that we may pray to him, and acost him with our bended Knees, and humble Supplications; but, principally, that by Praying to him we may improve our selves in all those Holy and Devout Dispositions wherein the perfection of our Nature doth consist; and this the *Trent* Catechism it self acknowledges, *viz.* That the especial End of our Praying to God, is, *That by conversing with him, we may be the more ardently excited to the Love and A-*

* Part. 4. c. 2.
sect. 7, 8.

• Cor. 14. 26.

doration of him *. And this, as all agree, is the greatest and most valuable part of our Edification. And if the Church of *Rome* intends that the Publick Prayers should minister to this End, *viz.* the Peoples Edification, doubtless she ought to let the People understand them; for how they can be edified by hearing such Prayers as they do not understand, I am not yet able to comprehend; but if she doth not intend it, I doubt that God's Intention, and hers, will be found directly opposite to one another: I am sure St. *Paul* requires, that in our Religious Assemblies *all Things should be done to edifying*: Not so, saith *the Scripturist*, for the greatest part of what is done there, *viz.* the stated and ordinary Service of the Church, is not to be done to edifying: So then it seems, the meaning of *let all Things*

Things be done, is no more than this, Let some few Things, and those the most inconsiderable, be done to edifying. Bellarmine indeed speaks something more warily, telling us, That *the Instruction and Consolation of the People, is not the principal End of Divine Offices.* De verb. Dei. lib. 2. c. 189.

But then it seems it is an End, and therefore though it be not the principal One, it ought to be aimed at. But how can they at all aim to instruct the Peoples Understandings, by such Divine Offices as they do not understand? Or, how can they intend the Peoples Consolation by such forms of Words as convey no Sense or Meaning to their Minds? Well, but what then is the principal End of these Divine Offices? Why (*the Worship of God, saith Bellarmine.*) But to what purpose serves their Worship of God? do they worship him purely to worship him without any further End and Prospect? If so, I am sure they fall short of God's End in requiring Worship from his Creatures; for it is not for any advantage to himself that he requires our Worship and Service: *Our Goodness extends not to him, saith the Psalmist; nor is it any Gain to him that we make our Ways perfect:* And therefore if he aim at any Good or Advantage at all in it, it must be at Ours; that by these our solemn Adresses to him, we may be inspired with such an awful sense of his Majesty, as is necessary to oblige us to our Duty, that thereby we may be accomplished with all those Heavenly Graces and Perfections that are necessary to our own Happiness; and if for this End (which is in other words our own Edification) God requires our Worship, for this End we ought to render it to him; 'Tis true, saith *the Scripturist*, this was the End of those inspired Prayers St. Paul makes mention of, *viz. To edify the Brethren assembled, to excite him to love, to honour, and to praise God,* not

Ibid.

Psal. 16. 2.

Job 22. 23.

P. 154.

in-

intending chiefly to pray to God for the People, as we do in our Liturgy. But do they design at all to edify the Brethren, &c. in their Liturgy? If not, I am sure their Liturgy falls short of one of the common Ends of Divine Worship: if they do, all that he talks is dull impertinence, seeing an Unknown Tongue doth equally obstruct the edification of the Brethren in a composed Liturgy, as in an inspired Prayer.

2ly. That there are sundry parts of the Roman Liturgy which can serve no End at all, unless it be the Peoples Edification; such are the Lessons, the Creeds, and pious Exhortations, which make a considerable part of it; the reading of which in their Publick Assemblies, can be of no other use, but only to instruct and edify the People. The Prayers, as they pretend, are the Prayers of the Priest only, whose peculiar Office it is to offer them up for the People, and therefore there is no need that the People should understand them. But sure they will not say that their Creeds and Scripture-Lessons are the Priest's only, or that it is his peculiar Office to be instructed by the Word of God, and make confession of the Christian Faith, or that he is to understand for the People, and confess the Faith for the People, as well as to pray for them; for if so, I doubt the Priest at last must go to Heaven or Hell too for the People, seeing he it seems must either perform or neglect for them a principal part of their Religion; unless therefore they will allow that the Scriptures, and Creeds, in their Publick Service, are intended for the edification of the People, I cannot imagine to what End they serve there, unless it be, like the Dead Pictures in Arras, to entertain the Eye, and make an empty shew of doing

something, while they do nothing. But if they are inserted there for the edification of the People, why are they inserted in an Unknown Tongue? Is it possible that the People should be edified by that which they do not understand? or that their Minds should be at all informed by that which conveys no meaning to their Minds? The Apostle tells us, That *all Scriptures are profitable for Instruction.* And that *whatsoever Things were written afore-time, were written for our Learning;* he means, for the Learning of the People sure as well as the Priest. But how can the Scriptures in the Roman Service be profitable, for the instruction and learning of the People, when they are all shut up from them in the dark Lanthorn of an Unknown Tongue, and not permitted to transmit to them the least Ray of Light and Information? It's certain therefore, whatever End these Scripture-Lessons are design'd for, they cannot be design'd to serve the End of Scripture, because the End of Scripture is to instruct, which it can never do in an Unknown Tongue.

We are told by the Council of Trent, That *the Mass contains very plentiful Matter of Instruction for all faithful People* * : And truly if it doth not, in my Opinion, * *'tis a very jejune and fruitless Office of Publick Worship:* but *notwithstanding it doth so,* (say those goodly Fathers) *it doth by no means seem expedient to us, that it should every where be celebrated in the Vulgar Tongue;* or indeed, that it should be any where so celebrated, for immediately afterwards they decree, *That the Custom of every Church in this Matter should be every where retained, i. e. that the Mass should be every where celebrated in Latin,* that being then the Custom of every Church in Communion with the Church of Rome; which is in effect

effect to make this open Declaration to the People, Good People, you must know, that in this same *Mass-Book* of ours, there is contained such excellent Matter for Edification, as if you would come at it, would do you a world of good, and make you much wiser, and better Christians than you are: But for Reasons best known to our selves, we think it expedient to lock it up from you in an Unknown Tongue: and therefore pray satisfy your Hunger with the belief, that here is great store of Spiritual Food for you, though you never be permitted to taste of it; and if you can subsist by believing, or make shift to live upon the Picture of a Feast; or, which is the same thing, to feed and nourish your hungry Souls with the sound of Words, without the Sense of them, with all our Hearts, much good may it do you. Good God! what shameful Battering is this, in a Matter of infinite Moment? Are not the People most extremely obliged to these tender-hearted Fathers, that only talk to them of Bread, but give them a Stone? But here all on a sudden, a Pang of Fatherly Compassion seizes them; But *lest* (say they immediately after) *the Sheep of Christ should hunger, and the little Ones desire Bread, and there be none to break it to them, the Holy Synod commands Pastors, and all that have the Care of Souls, by themselves, or others, while the Mass is celebrated, frequently to expound some part of those things which are read in it.* This indeed is something, but in reality amounts to very little: for,

First; They knew very well, that abundance of their Priests at that very Time, understood the Language of their Mass no more than the People, and so were incapable of expounding it to them.

Secondly; They could not but foresee, that several of their Priests who were able, would yet, through negli-

negligence, very often omit the expounding it, as it is notorious they have done ever since, and do to this Day; in which Cases, let their Mass contain never so much Matter of Edification, it is impossible it should edify their People, or render them either the better or wiser; and so notwithstanding this their pretended Charitable Provision, they have so ordered the Matter, that abundance of their *little Ones who desire Bread*, are in danger of starving for want of it, they having lock'd it up from them in an Unknown Tongue, and left them to the courtesy of such *Oeconomists* as do sometimes want Will and sometimes Ability to distribute it to them; whereas had they but taken care to have it set before them in their own Native Language, those of them who were truly hungry would have made a shift, when ever they wanted help, to help themselves, but this will by no means down with that Church's Politiques, which stints the People to the Priest's allowance, and so reduce them to a perfect dependance, proportions them no more Spiritual Food than just what he thinks fit to carve them. But then,

Thirdly; 'Tis only *some part* of the Mass that they oblige the Priests to expound to the People, they do not prescribe how much, but leave that wholly to the Priests discretion, who may expound as little as he please; if they expound but one in an hundred of those Sentences wherein this matter of Edification is contained, the Injunction is satisfied, tho there are ninety nine of the hundred for which they are never the wiser; so that the far greatest part of this their *pleasiful matter of Edification* doth, notwithstanding this Injunction, remain incapable of edifying for want of being expounded: for the reason why they expound any part of it is, because it cannot edify the People

Priests frequently, or as often as they please, to bring it forth and break it to you in your own Native Language. Truly we are much obliged to your good Fatherhoods for injoyning our Priests to use us as they please, or, which is much the same, to feed us as often as they shall reckon themselves obliged by this loose and undetermined *frequently*; but God help our poor Souls that are thus abandoned by you (who should have taken better care of them) to the meer Mercy and Charity of every slothful, or vicious, or ignorant Priest.

Fifthly, and lastly; The *Exposition* here injoined is not at all specified or determined; they tell us that those Prayers and Religious Discourses which *St. Paul* treats of, were designed for the Edification of the People, and therefore it was necessary they should be interpreted into their Vulgar Language. Was it so? Then pray what was the *plentiful matter of Edification* in your Mass designed for? To be sure if for any thing, it was for the Edification of the People; and if so, the same reason obliges you to interpret it into the Language of the People; and therefore, if by expounding it they do not mean interpreting it into the Vulgar Language, by their own Confession, *St. Paul's Reason* is as much against their matter of Edification in Latin, as against those Sermons and Prayers in an Unknown Tongue; so that unless by their Exposition of this matter they mean interpreting it into the Vulgar Language, *St. Paul's Reason*, even by their own confession, doth as much conclude their Priests to be Men that *speak into the Air*, and *Barbarians* to their People; and doth as much oblige them to *keep silence in the Church*, as it did those inspired Speakers in an Unknown Tongue, against whom he levels it; but that
by

by expounding, they do not mean this sort of Interpretation, we have the much reason to believe; not only because no such Interpretation is practised among them, or at least very rarely, but also because their own Divines tell us, that the sense of the Council was, That the People should be instructed in Sermons, and that such a Verbal Interpretation during the Celebration of the Mass, was condemned by the Council as the cause and seed-plot of many Errors †: by which it seems that by expounding, they meant no more than preaching upon, or expounding some Doctrine or Ceremony contained in the Mass; and if so, it is no more an expounding of the Mass than of any other Book in which such Doctrine is contained: so that I cannot apprehend to what purpose all this plentiful Exposition in the Mass-book serves; nor can I see any reason to be given, for why then should it be read to the People? Ay, but it may be read to them: but to what purpose? when such effectual Care should never be the wiser for it? What is the use of it, when it may be expounded: but sure it may be read when it is not expounded? The People are continually harrassed with a multitude of words which signify nothing to their Minds? They contain in them edifying matter, will say: But what does this edifying matter signify, when it is so worded that it cannot edify? Therefore, all this plentiful matter of Edification which the Council assures us their Mass contains, is only a Cipher to the People; while it is continued in an Unknown Tongue, it's read to them with as little effect as if it were read only to their Church-wa-

for Prayers in an Italian Language.

being impossible that they should be edified by hearing that which they do not understand, nor can be confirmation they require, at all, and the matter being, that they do not mean receiving it into the vulgar Language, without which their reading is all in vain, and if they did, yet still their reading is all in vain and pertinent; for to what purpose can their reading of edifying matter serve, while they read it in a language which cannot edify, unless it be to show that they have Learning enough to read Latin. So that the pretended Disparity between the Latin Liturgy of the Church, and those Italian Prayers and Sacraments of which St. Paul speaks, was that the use was designed for Edification and the other not, accounts for nothing; both because Publick Languages ought to be designed for Edification, and a great part of the Latin Liturgy must be so designed as well as their Italian Prayers and Sacraments, and consequently the use is the same as the other ought to be expressed in the vulgar and vulgar Language, without which neither can be.

2dly, Another Disparity may be observed between the Liturgies and their religious Exercises, the chief of, is, that in the latter the People were to be joyned, but not in the former. Thus the Sacraments of Prayers, i. e. the Sacraments of Prayers are chiefly appointed to be used by the People, and to offer them up to God for the People, and the chief end of the Liturgy is to pray for the People. So also Bellarmine, The Prayer of the Church is not for the People, but to God for the People, and therefore he says, we need that the People should understand it, so that they may be profiting by it, but it is sufficient that God understands it, which he illustrates by one Man's praying for another, and the King for another.

* Vid. Ledesm.
c. 15. Sect.
Decret. Con.
Trid. n. 2.
† Vid. Epist.
Cler. An. 1660.
P. 52.

by expounding, they do not mean this sort of Interpretation, we have too much reason to believe; not only because no such Interpretation is practised among them, or at least very rarely, but also because their own Divines tell us, that the sense of the Council was, *That the People should be instructed only by Sermons**, and that such a Verbal Interpretation, *during the Celebration of the Mass*, was condemned by the Council *as the cause and seed-plot of many Errors* †: by which it seems that by *expounding*, they meant no more than preaching upon, or expounding some Doctrine or Ceremony contained in the Mass; and if so, it is no more an expounding of the Mass than of any other Book in which that Doctrine is contained: so that hitherto I cannot apprehend to what purpose all this plentiful matter of Edification in the Mass-book serves; not to edify the People to be sure, for why then should it be lock'd up from their Understanding? Ay, but it is there that it may be read to them: but to what purpose is it to read to them, when such effectual Care is taken that they should never be the wiser for it? Why, it is read that it may be expounded: but sure it may be expounded whether it be read or no; and then to what purpose is it read, when it is not expounded? Why are the Peoples Ears continually harassed with a tedious jangling of words, which signify nothing to their Minds? They contain in them edifying matter, you will say: But what does this edifying matter signify, when it is so worded that it cannot edify? In short therefore, all this plentiful matter of Edification, which the Council assures us their Mass contains, is only a Cipher to the People; while it is continued in an Unknown Tongue, it's read to them with as little effect as if it were read only to their Church-walls, it
being

being impossible that they should be edified by hearing that which they do not understand, nor doth the Exposition they require, at all mend the matter, seeing by that they do not mean rendering it into the Vulgar Language, without which their reading it is all in vain, and if they did, yet still their reading it in Latin is impertinent; for to what purpose can their reading of edifying matter serve, whilst they read it so as that it cannot edify, unless it be to shew that the Priest hath Learning enough to read Latin. So that this pretended Disparity between the stated Liturgy of the Church, and those inspired Prayers and Discourses of which *St. Paul* treats, *viz.* that the one was designed for Edification and the other not, amounts to nothing; both because Publick Liturgies ought to be designed for Edification, and a great part of the Roman Liturgy must be so designed as well as those inspired Prayers and Sermons, and consequently the one as well as the other ought to be express in the known and vulgar Language, without which neither can edify.

2dly, Another Disparity they make between stated Liturgies and those Religious Exercises *St. Paul* treats of, is, that in the latter the People were obliged to joyn, but not in the former; thus our Scripturist, *These Prayers, i. e. the set-Forms of Prayer in our Liturgy, are chiefly appointed to the Priest, who well understands them, to offer them up to God for the People; and elsewhere, The chief end of the Liturgy is to pray to God for the People.* So also *Bellarmino, The Prayer of the Church is not made to the People, but to God for the People, and therefore there is no need that the People should understand it in order to their profiting by it, but it is sufficient that God understands,*

Pag. 166.

Pag. 168.

De verb. Dei.
lib. 2. c. 16.

plainly

Apud Dr. White
P. 374. 375.

plainly implies that in the Church's Prayer the Priest only prays for the People, but not the People for themselves. And thus also *Fisher* more expressly, *The Publick Service is for a continual daily Tribute or Homage of Prayer and Thanksgiving to be offered publickly, and paid unto God by his Priests.* And from hence they conclude, that tho it was very necessary that those inspired Prayers should be spoken in the Vulgar Tongue, because all the People were obliged to joyn in them; yet as for stated Liturgies, provided the Priests understand them, whose Prayers they properly are; it is no great matter whether the People understand them or no, they being not obliged to pray them: it is needful indeed *that the People know what is done in general, viz. That God is worshipped and honoured, that the Priest prays to him; that good things are asked of him for the People, and Thanks given to him; that the Memory of Christ and his Passion are celebrated, and the Sacrifice offered to God; and this no Clown is ignorant of, and this is sufficient:* * To which I answer;

* *Lectima*
C. 21. n. 23.

First; That tho the People were not obliged to joyn in the stated Offices of Publick Prayer, yet there is the same reason why they should understand the Language of them, as why they should understand any thing at all appertaining to them; they themselves confess that in their Publick Liturgy there are sundry things, at least, which the People ought to understand *either by Actions, Ceremonies and Circumstances; or by Custom, Affinity with the Vulgar, or Books interpreting and containing Prayers correspondent to every part wherein the Auditory is concerned* †, and that by publick Signals they should be taught *when to kneel, to adore, to knock their Breasts, when to rise, when to stand, or to do any thing else that concerns them, or is proper for them to do* ||: it is enough, say the

† *Protest. desist.*
of Scrip. Proof,
P. 9.
|| *Cath. Scrip.*
P. 166.

Rhemists, that the People can tell this holy Oraison, (viz. Pater Noster) to be appointed to call upon God, tho they do not know to what Petition their part pertaineth; and sure if this be enough, then so much is needful: But why is it necessary for the People to know these things, viz. that *Pater Noster* is a form of words appointed to call upon God, unless it be to excite them by the sound of these words to call upon God, or that such and such *Actions, Ceremonies, and Circumstances*, are intended for Signals to them when to kneel, to adore, to knock their Breasts, &c. unless it be to stir up their Hearts to that inward Devotion and Compunction which these Actions of theirs do express and signify; and if this be the reason, then certainly it is at least as necessary that they should call upon God when *Pater Noster* is pronounced, and be inwardly devout and contrite when the Signals were given to kneel, &c. as to know those things which are but the means of these Ends. There can be no Religious Purpose served by the Peoples knowing that now the Priest is calling upon God, unless it be to excite them to call upon God also; and if it be necessary for them to know that God is invoked, to the end that they may invoke him, then sure it is as necessary for them to invoke him, as to know that he is invoked; and if it be necessary that the People should be instructed, when the Priest is praying to the end that they may pray also, sure it is necessary they should be instructed in such manner as is most effectual to excite them to pray; and then I would fain know whether plain and intelligible Words are not far more instructive than dumb Shews and Signs? or, whether an illiterate English-man would not be far better instructed in order to his being excited to pray, by *Our Father*, which he understands, than by *Pater Noster*,

which he understands not ; or, which is the same thing, whether Mens devout Affections are better excited with their Understanding or without it? for I would fain know, Are the People obliged to call upon God when they hear those words *Pater Noster*, or to confess their Sins with Contrition of Soul when they hear *Miserere*? If they are not, what necessity is there that they should know that *Pater Noster* is an Invocation of God, or *Miserere* a Confession of Sin to him? seeing in point of Duty they are not at all concerned in it: if they are, I desire to know again, whether they are obliged to call upon God and confess their Sins in that form of words, or in some other: If in that form, then in the first place, the People are obliged to joyn with the Priest in the Publick Prayer, which is the Point we contend for: And secondly, they ought to understand the sense and meaning of those Forms, it being impossible for them to express the Devotion of their Minds in a form of words which they do not understand: if in some other, the Church ought to have provided such other Forms as the People might understand (which it yet never did) otherwise, whilst the Priest, who hath less need of a Form, is praying and confessing by Form, the People who have more need must be left to pray and confess *Extempore*: and for what good reason this should be I cannot apprehend, seeing not only the matter of the *Roman* Prayers, but the words too (if they were translated into the Peoples Language) are generally as proper for the People to pray and confess in, as for the Priest: either therefore the People are bound to pray in time of Publick Prayer, or they are not; if they are not, I see no necessity why they should be instructed in any thing appertaining to the Publick Prayers, seeing their Duty is not at all concerned in them;

if

if they are, what good reason can there be assigned why they should not pray in those Forms of Prayer which the Priest reads to them? seeing the matter of those Prayers is as proper for the People to pray, as for the Priest, and consequently so would the Prayers themselves, if they were but express in the Peoples Language.

Secondly, That there is no part of Publick Worship in which the Duty of the People is not as well concerned as of the Priest. The Publick Worship of Christians consists either of Prayers, Praises, and Thanksgivings, or of Communion in the Christian Sacraments; to all which I think no Christian will deny but the People are as much obliged as the Priest; and therefore to quote Scripture-Proofs for this, would be the same thing as to cite Chapter and Verse to evince that all Christians are obliged to believe in God and in Jesus Christ: And if in all these Instances all Christians, as well Laity as Clergy, are obliged to worship God, then either they are obliged to it in private only, or in publick also; if in private only, to what purpose should they frequent the Publick Worship wherein they have nothing to do? for what can they have to do in Publick Worship, but to worship? if in publick also, then either they must joyn with the Priest in their Acts of Worship, and pray, and praise, and give Thanks with him in the same stated Forms, which is the thing we contend for, (and which draws after it an absolute necessity of having those stated Forms in the Vulgar Language, it being impossible for them to pray and give Thanks for they know not what); or else they must perform their Worship separately from the Priest, either in distinct Forms of Prayer, and Praise, and Thanksgiving, or from their own Extemporary Invention,

which (besides what hath been said against it under the former Head) must necessarily introduce a vast Confusion into the Publick Worship; for at this rate it will be impossible for them ever to unite their Hearts and Affections in the same things, which is the peculiar advantage of Publick Worship; that there is a concurrence of Hearts in the same Acts of Worship, and an union of Desires in the same Petitions throughout the whole Congregation, which renders them more acceptable and prevalent: but whilst the People are left to pray separately from the Publick Liturgy, in all probability there will be as many different Hopes, Desires, and Affections in their Worship, as there are different Men in the Congregation; here will be one confessing his Sins, there another returning Thanks for Mercy; and whilst this Man is praying for Heaven, another will be praying for a good Harvest, a third for Repentance or Pardon, a fourth for a sick Wife or Child; and whilst a fifth is imploring of assistance against Temptations, a sixth will be deprecating Thunder and Lightning, Storms and Tempest; and so there will be as vast a Confusion of Affections in their Worship, as there was of Languages among the Brick-layers of *Babel*: if therefore the People are at all obliged to pray, and praise, and give Thanks in the Publick Worship, which one would think no Christian should deny; it is impossible for them otherwise to perform it with any decency or order, but in Conjunction with the Priest in the Publick Prayers, or Liturgy; and this they can never do, unless they understand the Language of it. And then as for the Sacraments, seeing the People as well as the Priest, do by partaking of them enter into and renew their Vow and Covenant with God, which, so far forth as they are capable, must be their own free and

volun-

voluntary Act, it is necessary they should joyn and concur in them either by their *Sponsors*, who act for them, as in Baptism, or by themselves, acting for themselves, as in the Eucharist; for how can they perform a Federal Right between God and themselves without concurring in it by their own free Act and Deed? We are told indeed by the *Representer*, *That the Mass being a Sacrifice, wherein is daily commemorated the Death and Passion of Christ, by an Oblation made by the Priest, of the Body and Blood of the Immaculate Lamb, under the Symbols of Bread and Wine; according to his own Institution, 'tis not the business of the Congregation present, to imploy their Ears in attending to the words, but their Hearts in contemplation of the Divine Mysteries, by raising up fervent Affections of Love, Thanksgiving, &c. And for this, he tells us, there is little need of Words, a true Faith without these is alsufficient.* Now granting all this to be true, about the Mass's being a Sacrifice in the Roman Sense; yet, by this good Author's leave, I cannot apprehend, but that if the words they use in the Celebration of it, were plain and intelligible to the People, and apt and proper for the Occasion, *their imploying their Ears in attending to them,* would very much assist *their Hearts in contemplation of the Divine Mysteries, &c.* Nor can I think their *Faith so alsufficient*, especially in a Point so contradictory to their Reason, (as Transubstantiation is) as not to need the assistance of plain, instructive, and persuasive words. The Apostle tells us, *That Faith it self comes by hearing;* and that which begets it, to be sure must nourish and increase it: But if Words are of no use at all in the Celebration of the Mass, in the Name of God to what End do they use them? and why are the People *commanded* (as just before he tells us they are.)

are) *to assist at the Church-Service, and to hear Mass,* when in this they are instructed not to understand the Words, but to know what is done? What confounded Gibberish is this! the People must hear the Words of the Mass, but *not employ their Ears in attending to the Words*; that is, they must hear them, so as not to hear them. Again, they must hear the Words of the Mass, *and be therein instructed not to understand the Words*; that is, they must hear the Words to no purpose, so as to be never the better or wiser for hearing them. Once more, they must hear the Words of the Mass, which they do not understand, so as to understand by them *what is done* in the Mass; that is, they must understand by Words, which they do not understand. Well, go thy way for a bold Heroick Self-contradictor, thou mayest defy the best Master of Nonsense of them all, to vouch in so few Lines, so many direct Repugnancies. But to pass by all this; Is there nothing in their Mass but only the Sacrifice? Are there not Lections and Sequences proper enough to edify the People, were they permitted to understand them? Are there not Responses appointed to them, in which they might express their devout Desires, did they but know the meaning of them? In a word, are there not Post-Communions, in which, together with the Priest, they might offer up their Prayers and Praises to God, did they but understand the Language of them? Without which it is impossible for them to join in them; and this they themselves confess, by pretending this disparity between those inspired Prayers St. Paul treats of, and their Latin Service, *viz.* That in the former, the People are obliged to join, but not the latter; which supposes, that they must understand the Service they are obliged to join in; and consequently, that they cannot join in
the

the Latin Service, because they do not understand it; for could they join in the latter, as well as the former, this Disparity could be no Reason why the one should not be in a Known Tongue as well as the other. In short, we argue, that there is the same necessity that the People should understand the stated Prayers of the Church, as that they should understand those inspired Prayers which *St. Paul* treats of, because they are obliged to join in one as well as the other. And we confess, say our Adversaries, were this Reason good, there would be the same necessity; but therefore we assert, that there is not the same necessity, because, tho we allow they were obliged to join in those inspired Prayers, yet we utterly deny that they are obliged to join in the stated Prayers of the Church, this must be their Sense, or this pretence of Disparity between these two sorts of Prayer must be Nonsense: and therefore seeing the whole of their Service is worded in Latin, which is an Unknown Tongue to most of their People, it necessarily follows, that the most of their People are not obliged to join in any part of it, and consequently in those Congregations, where neither the Priest, nor any of the People, understand Latin; their Prayers are read, and no Body is obliged to pray them; and their Worship is performed, and no Body obliged to worship by it; which is a plain confession, that that which they call their Publick Worship, is no Worship; or which is the same thing, a Worship that no Body is concerned in, or obliged to.

Thirdly; That the Publick Prayers of the Church have been always look'd upon as Prayers that were common to the People with the Priests; for so it's plain, that the Publick Prayers of the Temple were common to all the People, and that they joined in them; not only from their responding *Amen* at the close of them,

(as

(as was observed before) but also from several passages of Scripture; such as, *In the Temple doth every one speak of his Glory. And I went with the Multitude to the House of God, with the Voice of Joy and Praise.* And again, *Exalt him in the Congregation of the People, and praise him in the Assembly of the Elders.* All which do shew, that the People were to join in those Publick Prayers and Praises that were offered in the Service of the Temple. And indeed it was an ancient Canon of the Jewish Church, (as their own Doctors tell us) *He who prays, ought always when he prays to join with the Church: And they tell us particularly of Eighteen Prayers in their Publick Service, which the People were every day obliged to pray; or at least, if they were hindred by Business, or indisposition of Mind, to pray one Prayer, which was the Summary of them all; and these Prayers they were obliged (if they had time) to repeat after the Minister of the Congregation; as appears by that Rule of theirs, When a Man goes into the Synagogue, and finds the Assembly praying the additional Prayer, (that is, a Prayer which the Minister added to the Eighteen, as the close of all) if he is sure he shall begin and end, so that he may answer Amen after the Angel of the Church, let him say his Prayers, i. e. his Eighteen Prayers, or at least the Summary.* And that the Christian, as well as Jewish People, did always join in the Publick Prayers, might be demonstrated; if it were needful, from innumerable Authorities of the Fathers: Of which it will be sufficient at present to cite three or four; *Justin Martyr* tells us, That in their Administration of Baptism, *the whole Assembly being gathered together, did put up Common Prayers for themselves, for the Baptized Person, and for all others throughout the World, with an attentive Mind;* and

Vid. *Lightfoot*,
Vol. 2. 156.
158.

Apolog. 2. p.
97, 98.

and that in their Sunday's Service, after they had heard the Scriptures and Exhortations, *they rose up together and poured forth their Supplications*. And that they all joined in the same Prayers, is evident, not only from the Apostolick Constitutions *, where the substance of the Prayer, they used in Baptism is recorded, under the Title of, *The Prayer for the Faithful*; but also from that account which *Clemens Alexandrinus* gives us of their Publick Worship *; *The Terrestrial Altar of the Christians, is the Assembly of such as join together in Prayers,* * Lib. 8. c. 10
μὴν ὁμοῦ ἐχόντων φωνῶν ἢ κοινῶν ἢ μὴν γνάμνον, having, as it were, one Voice or Sentence; so that there may be properly said to be in the Church, ὁμοψωνία, a breathing together the same Breath; for the Sacrifice of the Church is the Word that ascends as Incense from the Holy Souls, their whole Minds together, with their Sacrifice, being made known to God. * Strom. 7. p. 717. *Origen* in answer to *Celsus*, who charges Christians with using barbarous Words in their Worship, tells him that it is utterly false, That *the Greeks in their Prayers, used the Greek, the Romans, the Latin; and that every one prayed to God, and praised him in his own Dialect: and so the Lord of all Dialects, hears them praying to him in every Dialect, expressing, with one Voice, in divers Tongues, the Things which those divers Tongues signify; for he prefers not one Tongue before another, whether it be Greek or Barbarous, as being either ignorant of, or not regarding what is spoken in other Languages* *. * Cont. Cels. P. 402.
 By which it's evident, that Christian Assemblies did then, not only pray the same Prayers, (for otherwise how could they be said to pray with one Voice?) but also that their Prayers were all expressed in their own Vulgar. *St. Cyprian* expressly tells us, That *in their Assemblies with the Brethren, they celebrated the Divine Sacrifices of Prayer and Eucharist, together with the Priest*

* De Orat.
Dom.

of God *. And to name no more, St. Basil in his Apologëtick Epistle for his Monks, tells the Clergy of *Neocæsarea*, That at break of Day, we all in common, as from one Mouth and Heart, offer a Psalm of Confession to God, every one making the Penitential Words his own; and if you shun us for these things, you must shun the Egyptians also, both the Libias, those of Thebes, Palestine, Arabia, Phœnicia, Syria, and the Inhabitants near Euphrates; and in a word, all those that have any esteem for Prayers, and Vigils, and Psalmodies *. Which plain-

* Ep. 63. p.
95.

ly shews, that it was then the manner of all Christian Assemblies, to join together in the same Prayers; and that they did not only pray them, but vocally repeat them after the Priests, is evident from what he elsewhere tells us; and St. Ambrose from him, viz. That from the Prayers of Men, Women, and Children to God; a mixed Sound was heard in the Church, as it were of a Wave dashing against the Shore *. A great many more Authorities might be produced to this purpose †, but these I think are sufficient to satisfy any modest Man, that in the Publick Prayers, both of the Jewish and Christian Church, the People were always look'd upon as obliged to join and bear their parts: And if in this the Church of Rome be singular from all other Churches, (as our Authors will have her) the more is her shame; and though this be bad enough, I wish to God it were the only criminal singularity she is guilty of. But,

* Hexam.
Hom. 4. To. I.
p. 46.
† Vid. A Treatise in Consutat.
of the Latin
Service.

Fourthly, and lastly; The Church of Rome it self must be forced to own, that the People are obliged to join in her Publick Prayers with the Priests, or to confess her self guilty of the highest absurdity; for both in her Mass and Breviary, the Priest is ordered to preface a great part of the Prayers with *Oremus*, i. e. *Let us pray*. Now, I beseech you, who doth the Priest mean by

by *us*? I cannot think he means himself only, for then he must split himself in twain to make an *us*, and divide himself by his Christian-name, from himself in his Sir-name; and so *Joseph* must call to *Mumford*, *Let us pray*; and if he means not this, (as sure it is not imaginable he should mean so wild an Absurdity in such a serious Matter), he must mean himself, and the People: but then, why should he call upon the People to pray, if they are not obliged to pray with him? If it be said, that he only calls upon the People to pray, but not to join with him in the same Prayer; besides that there can be no Reason assigned, why the People should not join in the same Prayers; and a great deal, why they should, these Prayers containing nothing in them, but what is as proper for the People as the Priests: besides this, I say, it's evident that the Intention of this *Oremus* is, to excite both Priests and People to join together in the same Prayer; for the Priest speaks to himself, conjunctly with the People, *Let you and I pray*; and therefore his meaning must be the same to both, but to himself his meaning is to excite himself to pray the following Prayer, and therefore it must be the same to the People: As for instance, when in the Office of *the Vigils of Pentecost*, the Priest saith, *Let us pray: O God, who hast commanded us, by the Mouths of the Prophets, to forsake temporal Things, and pursue Eternal, &c.* it's plain, that he admonishes himself to pray this very Prayer; because immediately after he is to read a portion of Scripture; and therefore he must either read one Prayer, and pray another, or pray that Prayer, or none: and if the meaning of his *Oremus* be to excite himself to pray that Prayer, it must be to excite the People to do the same; which necessarily supposes the People to be obliged to join with the

Priest in the same Prayers, otherwise the *Oremus* signifies nothing; and indeed, take it at best, it signifies nothing to the generality of the People, few of whom understand the signification of it; and suppose they all understand that it signifies, *Let us pray*, yet are they never the wiser for it; For what must they pray? Why they must pray, *Deus qui nobis per prophetarum Ora, &c.* But, good Sir, what is that? Why it is Latin. Is it so? truly had it been *Welsh* or *Arabic*, it had been all one, we understand neither the one nor the other. Understand! what is that to the purpose; I tell you, you must pray it whether you understand it or no. That is a very hard case indeed, for a company of silly Souls as we are, to be required to pray we know not what; or, which is the same thing, to desire and hope for good things *in nubibus*, where we know neither what they are, nor of what importance they are to us; and the truth of it is, it is not only hard, but impossible; for seeing it is the knowledge of good Things that renders them desirable, how is it possible for Men to pray for, or desire of God the good Things contained in a Prayer, of which they have no knowledge, and which, for all they know, may be a Charm instead of a Prayer, or an Imprecation of Mischiefs, instead of a Supplication for Mercies. But let this be as it will, it is a plain case, that whenever the Priest pronounces his *Oremus*, (which he is very frequently obliged to do) he calls upon the People to join with him in the same Prayer, which supposes them obliged so to do: and if they are so, it's evident our Disparity-makers depart as far from the Sense of their own Church, as from the Truth, when they tell us that the People were obliged to join in those inspired Prayers which *St. Paul* treats of, but not in the stated Liturgy of the Church;

and that therefore there is not the same necessity why the latter should be in a Known Tongue as the former.

3dly, and lastly; Another Disparity they make between these two sorts of Prayer, is in respect of the Languages in which they were express'd, *The Apostle, saith Bellarmine, speaks of that sort of Prayer and giving of Thanks which was performed by the Gift of Tongues, in some Language that was utterly extraneous, which nobody understood, as Arabick, or Persick, and which he who spoke it many times did not understand, but he doth not speak of the Divine Offices, which being compos'd in Greek, were understood of many**; and to the same purpose *Fisher †, Vane ‖, and the Rhemists **, who tell us, *The Apostle condemns a barbarous Tongue, but not that which is understood by learned and civil People in every great City, as Hebrew, Greek, and Latin*: and to the same Note cants our *Scripturist*, who is sure never to boggle at an Absurdity where-ever his Master *Bellarmino* leads the way, *St. Paul*; saith he, *doth not so much as mean here to exclude the use of such well-known Tongues as Greek and Latin were, that is, such as were the Languages well known to all the better-bred sort of most Nations; so that here is nothing against the Mass said in Latin through the Latin Churches, or in all those Western Parts, where all knowing and understanding Men very commonly know this Language.* To which I answer,

First; That this pretended Disparity perfectly contradicts the two former, *viz.* That the stated Prayers of the Church are not designed either to instruct the People, or for the People to joyn in them, for both which purposes those inspired Prayers, of which *St. Paul* discourses, were directly intended; and therefore, tho' it was very needful that the People should understand the latter, yet it is altogether indifferent whether they

* De verb. Dei

lib. 2. c. 16.

† Ibid. p. 372.

‖ Pag. 358.

¶ Annot. p. 461.

Pag. 170.

under-

understand the former or no; and if it be so, it's all one what the Unknown Language is, whether it be Barbarous, or Civil, Arabick, or Greek, or Latin, provided that the Priest understands it, and if he doth not, he may as well officiate Mass in Arabick written in Latin Characters, as those Priests do in Latin, who understand neither Latin nor Arabick. To what purpose therefore do they tell us, that *the Apostle condemns only a Barbarous Tongue which no body understands, but not that which is understood by learned and civil People?* Is it needful or no for the People to understand their Prayers? if not, why should the Apostle condemn a Barbarous Tongue which no body understands, and which no body needs to understand? if it be, their two former Disparities vanish into Air, there being no other imaginable Reasons why it should be needful for them to understand their Prayers, but only that they may be instructed by them and inabled to joyn in them. The Apostle, you say, *means to exclude Barbarous Tongues, such as Persick and Arabick:* And pray why doth he so? because no body understands them: But what need any body understand them? (and if none need, the Apostle meant to exclude them without reason) unless it be that they may be directed what to pray for, and instructed to joyn in the Prayer; and if so, then it seems it is needful both that the People should be instructed by, and joyn in the stated Prayers of the Church as well as in those Extemporary inspired Prayers. And thus to establish a third Disparity, you have fairly tript up the Heels of the two foregoing; *The Apostle doth not mean, you say, to exclude the use of such well-known Tongues as Greek and Latin were, which were understood by all the better-bred sort of most Nations,* and why not these as well as Persick and Arabick?

why, because these are better understood. *Ware Hank,* I beseech you! this is a very dangerous Reason, and if I may advise you, do not meddle with it; for then it will unluckily follow, not only that Publick Prayers ought to be celebrated in such Languages as are best understood (and I am apt to think English in *England* is better understood than Latin) but also that the People ought (at least those of them *that are better bred*) to understand their Prayers, that so they may be instructed by them and joyn in them, and then good night to your two preceding Disparities: but this is the common fate of Men that are lister to serve a bad Cause, that their Reasons generally fall foul upon themselves, and instead of encountering their Adversaries, run a-Tilt at one another.

Secondly; That if this Objection signify any thing, it allows it to be very needful for Men of Learning and Education to understand their Prayers, but not for the Unlearned, which is notoriously false; for it grants that the Apostle condemns the use of such Barbarous Tongues in Prayer as nobody understands, but not of such as are understood by Men of Learning and good Education: from whence it must follow either that the Apostle doth needlessly condemn such Barbarous Languages in Publick Prayer as the Learned do not understand, or that it is needful that the Learned should understand the Publick Prayers, but not the Unlearned, which is directly contrary to the sense of the Apostle, *Else when thou shalt bless with the Spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the Unlearned say Amen at thy giving of Thanks, seeing he understands not what thou sayst?* Where he plainly condemns the use of an Unknown Tongue in Prayer, not so much for the sake of the Learned as the Unlearned; for it seems the Un-

known

known Languages in which they pray'd were, some of them at least, such as the Learned among them did as well understand, and consequently could as well say *Amen* to, as the Learned among us do the Latin Prayers in the Roman Liturgy. But this would not suffice our Apostle, tho it very well suffices our Objectors; it is sufficient, say they, that the Publick Prayers be express in a Language that the Learned in all Countries and Congregations understand, and can say *Amen* to, this is not sufficient, saith the Apostle, the Language of your Publick Prayers ought to be such as the Unlearned as well as the Learned understand, and can say *Amen* to. Here are two contradictory Sentences, which of them is in the right, I leave St. *Paul* and them to dispute; but our dapper *Touch-stone*, who in his Road of Controversies rarely ventures a step farther than *Bellarmino* leads him, here thinks he may make as bold to contradict his Guide, as he doth to contradict St. *Paul*: and truly so far I conceive he is in the right; but then presently after he is as much in the wrong again, For, saith he, *St. Paul's saying how shall he that occupieth the room of the Unlearned say Amen? shews that such giving of Thanks was not accustomed to be made in the Vulgar Tongue, and requires, or rather supposes, that in the Services of the Church there should be some other to supply the room of the Unlearned, that is, one that should have further understanding of the Tongue in which the Service of the Church is said; but had the Service been in the Vulgar Tongue, there needed no Man to have supplied the place of the Idiot that understandeth not*: So that then it seems they had a Learned Clark in every 'Congregation, who perfectly understood that Unknown Tongue, in which the Service of the Church was said, and said *Amen* to it for the Ideots and Un-

learned;

learned; in which choice Period the good Man, to shew his Impartiality, contradicts himself as well as *Bellarmino*, for a little before in answer to this Text of *St. Paul* he very gravely tells us, that *there were two kinds of Prayer, or giving Thanks, in the Church, the one private, which every Man saith by himself alone; the other publick, which the Priest saith in the Name and Person of the whole Church. As concerning Private Prayer, no Catholick denies that it is very expedient that every Man pray in his own Tongue, to the end he may understand what he says.* Pag. 139.

So then it seems the Prayer in an Unknown Tongue which *St. Paul* condemns, is only private Prayer *which every one saith alone by himself*, otherwise to what purpose is all this? And if so, our Clerk's place will be void again; for how great plenty of Clerks soever there might be in the Primitive Ages, I can hardly imagine that every one in the Congregation had a Clerk at his Elbow ready to say *Amen* to his private Prayer as soon as it was finished; but if the Prayer in the first Sentence be Publick Prayer (as our Author affirms it is when he calls it *the Service of the Church*) and the same Prayer in the second Sentence be a Private Prayer, (as it must be, or the whole must be impertinent); I see no way he hath to vindicate himself from a plain self-Contradiction, but to dismiss his Distinction and his Clerk together. But instead of doing this, in the next Paragraph he falls bloodily foul upon the poor Ministers of *Geneva*, for attempting to turn his imaginary Clerk out of his Desk by rendring *St. Paul's* words *most deceitfully and maliciously thus; He that is an* Pag. 36.
Ideot how shall he say Amen? instead of he who supplies the place of an Ideot. A wise Man one would think when he thus lays about him should make some distinction between his Friends and his Enemies; but our wise

Ibid. ut supra.

Author here deals his blows at random, and makes no distinction between those hated Ministers and his own dear Master *Bellarmino*, but mauls them both together; for they both agree in the same Interpretation, and are equally guilty of interpreting our dear Clerk out of his Place and Function; for so *Bellarmino* tells us, *That those words of the Apostle, ἰκανὸν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδεοῦ, according to the Greek Phrasology, doth not signify one that acts for, or instead of the Ideot, but one that sits in the place of the Ideot, or is an Ideot, or of the class of the Ideots, as St. Chrysostom and Theophilact upon the place, of which he gives several Instances; and then in the next Paragraph but one he tells us, that in the times of the Apostles all the People did respond in the Divine Offices, and that there was no Man constituted to respond for them, for which he quotes the afore-cited Passage of Justin Martyr at the end of his second Apology; and then he goes on to shew that the same Custom was continued for a long while after, both in the Eastern and Western Churches, which he proves unanswerably from St. Chrysostom's Liturgy, and from St. Cyprian's Sermon on the Lord's-Prayer, and St. Jerom's Preface to his second Book on the Epistle to the Galatians, to which, if he had thought fit, he might have added several other Authorities: all which our Author would have done well to consider before he fell into those raving fits against the Ministers of Geneva, in which, instead of correcting them, he only forces them to take up the Primitive Fathers and his own dear Master together, and lashes them most unmercifully upon their backs.*

Well then, after all, it seems this Objection of our Adversaries is as direct a Contradiction of *St. Paul* as of us, he tells you that he means to exclude praying in

all such Languages as the *Unlearned* do not understand, and therefore cannot say *Amen* to. No, say our Adversaries, by your good leave *St. Paul*, your meaning is only to exclude praying in such Languages as the *more learned* do not understand; so that it seems they understand *St. Paul's* meaning better than *St. Paul* himself. But why should he mean to exclude such Languages only as the more Learned do not understand? Is it because Scholars only are obliged to pray? This I think is such a Reason as no Christian will admit. But what other Reason can you assign why Scholars should understand the Language of their Prayers, but only this, that thereby they may be the better inabled to pray? for if they can pray as well without understanding their Prayers as with it, there can be no imaginable need why either the Learned or Unlearned should understand them, and consequently this provision of *St. Paul* for the Learned will be wholly needless and impertinent; but certainly if to understand the Language of our Prayers be any advantage to us in Prayer, the Unlearned must have an equal right to it. with the Learned, seeing both are equally obliged to pray; as for the Learned they understand their Prayers as well in the Vulgar as in any Learned Language; but the Unlearned understand them only in their own Vulgar; Why then should the Unlearned be excluded from this great advantage of understanding their Prayers, whereas would the Church but give leave, they might enjoy it in common with the Learned? But if there were a necessity of excluding one or the other, I should think it much more charitable to exclude the Learned, the other being incomparably the greatest number; for if the advantage of the Hearers be at all to be regarded in the Service of the Church, then certainly the advantage of the most Hearers is most to be regarded.

Thirdly ; That St. Paul condemns the use of an Unknown Tongue in Prayer, not because it is Barbarous, but because it is Unknown ; and this his reasoning against the use of it doth all along shew, because he that uses it *speaks not to Men*, because he *doth not edify the Church*, because *his understanding is unfruitful to others*, because *he doth not teach or instruct others* ; and because others *not understanding him, cannot say Amen to him*. All which, in other words, amounts to no more than this, because the Tongue being Unknown, can convey no Notices of the Speaker's Mind to the Hearers. To what purpose then do these Men talk of barbarous and learned Languages ? whenas if a Man speaks in Latin to those who understand not Latin, he is far from speaking to them ; teaching and edifying them ; and if he prays in Latin, his Understanding is as unfruitful to them, and they are as far from being able to say *Amen* to his Prayer, as if he spoke and prayed in *Arabic* or *Persick*. But *Latin* is a Language which all Scholars understand. What then ? The Question is not, whether some or all Scholars understand it, but whether the People understand it, of whom the Religious Assemblies do consist ? for if they do not, it is an Unknown Language after all. There were in some of those *Corinthian* Assemblies, such as could Interpret the Unknown Languages that were spoke there, and consequently understood them ; notwithstanding which St. Paul condemns the use of them, because they were unknown to the People. We are told indeed, by the sage Author of *Protestancy destitute of Scripture-Proof*, that their *fixed Forms of Divine Offices, are in a Language the most certain, and the most intelligible, not only in Christendom ; but in every Auditory*. Which if it be true, the Controversy is at an end, for we desire no more but to have the Publick Prayers performed in such a Language as is most intelligible to every Auditory.

Auditory. But, good Sir, are not your Divine Offices in Latin? And do you seriously believe that English is not incomparably better understood in our English Auditories than Latin? I am sure if you do, your Faith is of a peculiar make from all the World's: But, pray, how is it most intelligible? for hitherto this seems to me one of the wildest Paradoxes that ever was published to the World: why, you must know it is not intelligible as all other Languages are, by the particular form and articulation of its Words. No! then I dare boldly say, it is so intelligible as never any Language was since the confusion of Languages. But how then, I beseech you? Why, it is *intelligible to every one, by either Actions, or Ceremonies, or Circumstances, &c.* I confess for such an Action, to speak so or so, or that this or that is the Language of such a Ceremony or Circumstance, are figurative Expressions, common enough in most Languages; but for a Language, to speak, or to be intelligible by Actions or Ceremonies, is such a Schem of Speech, as no Figure will warrant that I ever yet heard of, unless it be the Figure *Blunder*; we will allow your Actions, your Ceremonies and Circumstances to be very significant, and their significations to be very intelligible: But pray what is this to your Language? A *French* Shrug, or an *Italian* Grimace may be intelligible enough to a Man that understands not one word either of *French* or *Italian*; and so may the Cringings, and Bowings, and Prostrations of a Mass-Priest be to the People, tho they understand not one word of all the Latin Service he recites to them; but still, if they understand not the Language, it is in *St. Paul's* sense unknown to them, how well soever they understand the Ceremonies; and for my Life, I cannot see how the Intelligibility of the Actions & Ceremonies of their Prayers should excuse their expressing them in unintelligible words: For to what end serve these:

theſe intelligible Actions and Ceremonies, unleſs it be to inſtruct the People? and in what are they to inſtruct them, but in the Prayers and Divine Offices to which they appertain? And if it be needful that the People ſhould be inſtructed in the Prayers, (as it muſt be, or theſe Actions and Ceremonies muſt be needleſs) I would fain know which is the more likely way to inſtruct them, whether by dumb Signs and Shews, or by intelligible Words, or whether the People would not better underſtand the Prayers by hearing them pronounc'd or read in their own Language, than by ſeeing a Priest perform the moſt ſignificant Actions or Ceremonies of Prayer? and if they would, pray how doth your uſing the leaſt effectual means to inſtruct the People, excuſe your wilful neglect of the moſt effectual means? ſo that in all this Pretence, there is nothing but perfect ſhuffling. The Queſtion between you and us is, Whether the People underſtand the Language of your Prayers? for if they do not, it is Unknown to them, and under that Notion is condemned by *St. Paul*: Some of the People, you ſay, do underſtand it, that is, one in 500 perhaps underſtand it; and ſo many it's probable of the *Corinthian* People underſtood *Arabick* and *Perſick*: or ſuppoſe it were but one in a thouſand, the Caſe is ſtill the ſame; if the generality of the People are the People: and the generality of our People do no more underſtand *Latin*, than the generality of the *Corinthians* did *Arabick* or *Perſick*, the one as well as the other muſt be an Unknown Tongue to the People; and if it be ſo, I ſee no way you have, after all your tricking, ſhuffling, and doubling, to juſtify your Latin Service, but by appealing from *St. Paul's* Authority.

Fourthly, and laſtly; That ſuppoſing the People did underſtand Latin when they hear it, yet this will not at all excuſe their muttering their Latin Prayers in ſo low a Voice that the People cannot hear them. The *Repreſenter* tells

tells us, That if their Prayers were in their Mother-Tongue, he should receive but little advantage by it, because the greatest part is said in so low a Voice, that it is not possible he should hear it. And if this be true, I am fully of his Mind, because words which he doth not hear, can doubtless signify no more to him than words which he doth not understand: but this is only excusing one Fault by another; for if it be a Fault to perform the Publick Prayers in an Unknown Tongue, it is doubtless as great a Fault to perform them in an Unheard Tongue, seeing what is unheard must be unknown: But why do they mutter them in so low a Voice, contrary to the current sense and practice of the Primitive Church? I confess, if the Language of them be unknown to the People, (as I doubt it is) it is no great matter how low the Voice is in which they are pronounc'd; for to what End should the People hear that which they cannot understand? But if they do understand a Latin Prayer when they hear it, (as some of their bolder sort of Authors would fain insinuate they do) I am sure they do not understand it when they hear it not: An Unknown Language in Publick Prayer is forbid, because it hinders the People from understanding the Prayers; and in my Opinion it is as hard for the People to understand the Prayers in a Known Language when they do not hear it, as in an Unknown Language when they do hear it; but if they can understand it, notwithstanding they neither know the Language, nor hear the words of it, truly they are much greater Conjurors than ever I took them for.

And thus, I think, I have returned a full Answer to all the Cavils of our Adversaries, the very best of which are so very thin and transparent, that if I might advise them, they should tamper no more with 1 Cor. 14. And seeing there is no perswading St. Paul, either by fair means or foul to be reconciled to their Practice, even to let him

alone.

Vid. Hof-
meist. in 1
Cor. 14. P.
272.

alone for the future to abound in his own Sense; and this some of their own Authors have judged the most advisable course, who having tried all manner of Artifice to vex and torture the Text into a compliance with their Church's Service, and all to no purpose, were at last forced to betake themselves to this Resolution, *That the Church doth not at all offend in departing from this Institution of St. Paul, it being left free to the Church, not only to violate this Institution of St. Paul, but also the Institutions of God himself, supposing it to have been once profitable to the Church, but now to be unprofitable.* And this I confess is a full Catholick Answer, not only to what St. Paul, but also to what God himself hath said or can say: but before they attribute to their Church such an exorbitant Authority over the Word of God, it concerns them to beware, lest while they seek to evade St. Paul's Authority, they verify his Prophecy in 2^d Thess. 2. 3, 4. where he tells us that the Day of Christ *shall not come except there come a falling away first, and the Man of Sin be revealed, the Son of Perdition: who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the Temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.*

T H E E N D.

E R R A T A.

PAGE 710. l. 4. instead of *for*, read *of*. *Ibid.* for *would*, r. *could*.
P. 725. l. 11. read *ἕχων*. *Ibid.* read *γυβίμων*.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswel at the Rose and Crown
in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1688.

The **T**EXTS examined which *Papists*
cite out of the *Bible* for the
Proof of their Doctrine

CONCERNING

The Celibacy of Priests, and Vows
of Continence.

By William Payne

PART I.

I M P R I M A T U R.

Octob. 23.
1688.

Hen. Wharton, *R^{no.} in Christo P. ac*
D. D. Wilhelmo Archiep. Cantuar.
à Sacris Domest.

THERE is nothing more specious in the Church
of *Rome*, and carries a greater shew of more
than ordinary Purity and Self-denial, than
their professed Celibacy and Virginitie, and
the vowed Continency of their Priests and others;
this seems a very high degree of Mortification and
Abstinence from the allowed Pleasures of Sense, and
from all low and carnal Enjoyments, and such an over-
coming the strongest, but the most mean and brutish
Passions and Inclinations of our Bodies, that it has all the

appearance of an Angelical Perfection, of a more singular and exalted Sanctity than what is common to most Men; and so helps to beget amongst some People a great esteem and veneration, of those who thus affect and pretend to a more seemingly severe and more spiritual way of living; but the unhappiness is, that those who have been the most remarkable for these affected Abstinences, Mortifications, and Self-denials, above other common Christians, have been generally Men of no greater Vertue or Religion than others, but only have had something more in them, either of Superstition, or Design, or both. The Hereticks of the first Ages who lie under as bad a Character for vileness and lewdness as any Persons whatever, yet were great pretenders to some thing of this Nature; the Gnosticks in the beginning *condemned Marriage, and abstained from Fleish, that under these Pretensions, as Epiphanius says, they might draw others into their Snares* *. The Ebionites, and Encratites; and *Aquarii* that spawned from them, *carefully abstained from all Fleish, and were every day baptized, and celebrated the Eucharist only in Water, for fear of being defiled with the taste of Wine* †. And those who were the most famous for those extraordinary Severities, such as *Marcion, Montanus, and Manichæus*, were the greatest Pests and Disturbers that the Church ever had; and generally they that are so much for overdoing and bringing in some imaginary Perfections, beyond what God has required of them, and raising and refining Christianity, above that low and ordinary State which Christ left it in, by some singular and peculiar Improvements of their own, these are very unfortunate, and do always miscarry in their new Projects and Designs, whereby they would make themselves wiser than God, and mend and improve his

* Epiphanius.
Hæres. 23.

† Id. Hæres.
30.

Laws, by some higher Perfections than he requires, or calls for; but they betray great Ignorance and great Superstition, and do not truly understand either the Nature of God, or of Vertue and Religion, who think there is any great Matter in all these forced Severities, and unnatural Abstinencies from what is innocent, and lawful, and allowable; and that these are any way good in themselves, or higher degrees of Perfection; or that they are a proper Means, either to merit of God, or to procure his Favour, or recommend us the more to him; or that it is any way evil and unlawful, or less pure and perfect, to use those natural, and free, and innocent Liberties and Enjoyments which God has no where forbidden and restrained us from, and which are not in themselves either matter of Vice or Vertue.

The False-teachers in the Apostles Time, first set up such Severities and Abstinences, especially from Meats and Marriage, with a *touch not, taste not, handle not*: And they were apt thereby to cheat the World, and delude weak and unwary People with a false Opinion of their greater Sanctity. These things had a shew of Wisdom, as the Apostle says, *Colos. 2. 23. and neglecting the Body, without any regard to the Flesh for its satisfaction*. These mortified Saints seemed to be above the Body, and to have very little care or concern for it; but yet the Apostles speak against them as the very worst of Men, and the greatest Seducers, and as preaching the Doctrine of Devils: How far they are guilty of this, who censure the Marriage of the Clergy as Carnal and Impure, and therefore unbecoming the Sacred Office and Employment, I shall consider more fully afterwards: I premise this, to take off any such foolish Prejudice and Mistake which is got into the Heads of some weak and superstitious admirers

Οὐκ ἐστί πρῶτον
πρὸς τὸ
πληρωθῆναι
τὸ σῶμα.

of Celibacy and Virginity, who neither consider the Nature of Things, nor the Nature of the Gospel and Christianity, so wisely and fully as they ought to do; for the one of these makes it sometimes absolutely necessary for the Priests to marry; and the other does so plainly allow and approve it, that I wonder our Adversaries should ever attempt to bring any thing against it out of the Bible. The Priests of the Old Testament, under which God required some peculiar Purities of Body, were all married, and their Marriage was necessary to the very being of their Church, and a thousand times more so than Infallibility is now: For had any of their Enemies designed to destroy their Succession, the taking the present Method of the *Roman* Church, and forbidding the Priests to marry, had effectually done it; Marriage was as necessary then to preserve the Church, as it was to people the World. And before that, in the Time of the Patriarchs, the Elder Son, who was the Head of the Family, and was to keep it up, was a Priest: And all the Men that are now in the World, derive their Rise and Original from a Priest, who both sacrificed, and was a Preacher of Righteousness.

As to the New Testament, there is not any Alteration made by our Blessed Saviour nor his Apostles in this Matter; which there ought to have been very expressly, had any such thing been intended or designed by them. But though a new Order of Priests is there set up, who were not to beget and to propagate their own Order as the Jewish were; yet their having Wives and Children is particularly mentioned, not as necessary, but as allowable in their Characters and Qualifications; so that were not our Adversaries Men of Courage and Resolution, that can face a Canon's Mouth,

Mouth, and run up to it though it thunder never so loudly, and be levelled never so directly against them, they would never offer to meddle with Scripture, and to turn that against Priest's Marriage which every where speaks for it, and expressly allows it; but they resolve to try to make good their own vile Character and abuse of Scripture, that it is a Nose of Wax that may be wound any way as one pleases; and that one may prove any thing whatever by it, and make it speak even Contradictions. *Hobbs* I remember, and *Spinoza*, do very often quote Scripture for some of their Principles against the Truths of Religion, as *Milton* does for Divorce, and *Ochinus* for Polygamy: And all these may with as much Reason make use of it for to justify their Opinions, as the *Papists* produce it against Priest's Marriage. How Scripture can be brought off to plead against it self, and to condemn a Bishop; a Priest; or a Deacon's having a Wife, when it says of every one of them, *Let them be the Husbands of one Wife*, is hard to imagine, unless our *Roman* Adversaries can by their Infallible Power of interpreting Scripture, make one Wife in all those places to signify no Wife at all; for according to our Heretical way of understanding the Scripture by our own private Spirit and Judgment, or as they call it, *Fancy*, it must have another meaning.

Father *Mumford* the Jesuit, in his *Catholick Scripturist*, brings that very place of *1 Tim. 3. 2.* thus translated according to them, *It behooveth therefore a Bishop to be the Husband of one Wife.* To prove the single Life of Priests; It will require, sure, great Art to improve it to that purpose; but thus he does it; 'In the first Birth of Christianity, Virginity was so rare, both among *Jews* and *Gentiles*, that it was not possible to find Men en-

'dued.

‘dued therewith, who were both of sufficient maturity
 ‘in Years and Knowledge, &c. as is requisite in Bishops
 ‘and Priests; yet even then the Apostles would have
 ‘this at least observed, that no Man who married a se-
 ‘cond Wife, should be made a Bishop, no nor a Dea-
 ‘con, nor Priest. And therefore ever after none of
 those should be any Husband, or have any Wife at all;
 that should have been put in to make up the Argu-
 ment, *they should now be the Husband of one Wife,*
hereafter of none, which the Apostle could easily have
 added, had he designed any such thing as the Jesuit
 would have him.

Since we are fallen upon this place, and they at-
 tack us even in our own strong Hold, I will first make
 good this, and some other places against them for
 Priests Marriage, and then examine what they can
 pick up or bring against it. But this is such an impregna-
 ble Defence for us, that none of their little Attempts up-
 on it can ever shake or move it. For can any thing in
 the World be plainer, for God’s allowing and approving
 of the Marriage of the Clergy, than those Rules and
 Directions of St. Paul; *A Bishop must be blameless, the*
 1 Tim. 3. 2, 4. *Husband of one Wife—having his Children in subjection*
 Tit. 1. 6. *with all gravity; and if any be blameless, the Husband*
of one Wife, having faithful Children, he was fit to be
 ordained an Elder. And so, *Let the Deacons be the*
 1 Tim. 3. 12. *Husbands of one Wife, ruling their Children and their*
 11 *own Houses well—and even so must their Wives be*
grave, &c. How contrary are these to the quite diffe-
 rent Qualifications now required in the Church of
 Rome, that they vow Continance, and profess Virginitie,
 and have neither Wife nor Children. And what can
 be said to such plain places as these are? Why, Father
 Mumford hath told us, That it was the great rarity and

difficulty of finding such as profess'd Virginity in the beginning of Christianity, who were fit to be Ordained, that was the Reason of this allowance: and I believe this will be a lasting Reason for it, that it will not be possible to find a sufficient number of Men to discharge the Sacred Office, who will profess, and let me add, keep those Vows of Virginity. But how does he know that this was but a temporary Allowance? Does the Apostle give any such intimation by his words? And may we not as well suppose, from any thing we find in them, that the other Rules and Directions about a Bishop's *being given to Hospitality, not given to Wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy Lucre,* were but temporary too? Yet even then, says he, *the Apostles would have this at least observed, That no Man who married a second Wife, should be made a Bishop, or a Deacon, or Priest.* Well, although the allowance of a first Wife be quite different from allowing none, yet why not a second sometimes? when there may be the very same Reasons for that as for the first; and the Considerations of *not burning, and avoiding Fornication,* may as much justify and oblige to the taking a second Wife as a first: A Bishop, a Priest, or a Deacon, were to be the Husbands but of one Wife, but why may not that mean but of one Wife at once, and not one Wife in all? *Why, 'tis otherwise understood by the Councils and Fathers unanimously:* And Father Mumsford is sworn, we know, to interpret the Scripture according to the unanimous Consent of the Fathers, But has he consulted *Theodoret* upon the place, who is expressly against him, and says, *The Apostle has not herein rejected second Marriages, which he often commands.** But *it was the Custom of the Greeks and Jews to have many Wives at the same time; and they*

* ἡ δὲ λέξις
 τὴν ἐξέτα-
 λε γάμον ὅτι
 πολλὰς αὐτο
 γένειαι κελύ-
 στας, Theod.
 in loc.

used to divorce and put away their Wives, for slight Occasions, and to marry another; which was not a thing of so good Fame and Credit, though it were allowed by the Laws, that he should be made a Bishop who had done

* Εἰ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸς τῶν ἀρετῶν ἐπιβαλὼν ἴτερά συνελθὼν κήρυξας ἀξίως καὶ ταπεινῶς ὑπερβύθη, οὐδὲ τὸ βίαιον τοῦ ἀνατίθεαι διέλευσε τῶν ἀρετῶν - Ibid.

so: For if he put away his former Wife, and join himself to another, he is worthy of reprehension, and liable to blame; but not so, if Death took away his former Wife *. So

that he plainly embraces this Explication, which St. Chrysostom and other Fathers do also agree in, (which it is not my business to examine, since he is enough to spoil our Jesuit's pretended Unanimity) that a Bishop should be the Husband of one Wife, that is, not have two Wives living at the same time, one married after the Divorce of another, as many other Christians probably had, especially before their Conversion, which was such a blot to their Reputation as would have too much blemished and stained the sacred Function; but *This*, says our Jesuit, *is shewed evidently not to be the meaning of those words, namely (that they never had at one and the same time more Wives than one before their Conversion) for he useth just the same Words and the like Expressions when he could have no such meaning; for Chap. 5. where he speaketh of chusing a Widow (for the end there intended) he in like manner saith, She should be a Widow, having been the Wife of one Man, ver. 9. How ridiculous is it to say that here (where there is just the same Expression) the meaning is, that only such should be chosen to be Widows (for the end here appointed) who had had but one Husband at one time before her Conversion; for neither Jews nor Gentiles did ever permit Women to have more Husbands than one at once, it had been therefore ridiculous to require that which could not but be: But did not both Jews and Gentiles often put away and divorce*

their Wives? Nay, was it not a Custom for some Women to divorce themselves from their Husbands, as appears by *Justinian* *? and might not the Wives, when so divorced, marry again to other Husbands? and so a Woman might have been the Wife of two Husbands living at the same time; of one from whom she was divorced, and of another to whom she was married after such Divorce; but this not without some Scandal and Imputation to her Credit, which made her unfit in the Apostle's judgment to be chosen into the number of Church-Widows. This I hope may give our Jesuit Satisfaction in this matter; but if it do not, what mighty advantage will it be against the Marriage of the Clergy, if they were to have but one Wife? What is there more, either of Inconvenience by involving Men in Worldly Cares, or of Undecency by performing the Conjugal Acts in the repeating of Marriage, than in the continuing it? All their Arguments from those Topicks against the Marriage of the Clergy, will hold as strongly, if there be any strength in them, (which I shall examine by and by) against first Marriages as second; and I am afraid the same superstitious Whimsy and Conceit which first opposed the one, was the true cause of the dislike of the other; tho' bating some Accidents of the Wives dying young, before those natural Ustions and Fervors are gone off, which the Spirit of God, which best knows our frame, hath made a necessary Reason of Marriage, there is nothing of that Danger or Temptation to private Persons, or that Scandal to Religion in general by the prohibition of second Marriages as of first; and therefore the Greek Church which has preserved the Tradition of Priests Marriage from the time of the Apostles, and has only

limited it to the Times before Orders, but does not afterwards either dissolve the Marriage, or forbid the use of it, is nothing so blameable as the Church of *Rome*, which hath usurped an unreasonable Power to do both, against the Laws both of Christ and of Nature, and against the original End and Institution of Marriage.

I might bring other very probable places of Scripture for Priests Marriage, as that of *Heb. 13. 4. Marriage is honourable in all, i. e. in all Persons, without any-exception to Priests; for the πᾶν may possibly be of the Neuter Gender and signify Things, yet there is no reason to exclaim so much as they do against that Translation which renders it Persons, since the Apostle so immediately speaks of Persons in the same Verse, as opposed to these πᾶν who are married, but Whoremongers and Adulterers God will judge; and those words being added with the Particle δὲ, plainly shew that the other πᾶνς ἄλλοις are to be taken affirmatively, and that the Verb which is understood, is to be in the Indicative Mood, and not in the Imperative; and yet these are called by the Tragical Name of a *double Imposture* by our learned and innocent Jesuit, who tells us further, that if we stretch those words to *all Persons*, and so to Priests, we may add that Marriage is honourable also *among Brothers and Sisters, Father and Daughter*; I add, so it is, *in or among* all those Persons, but not *between* them; for the difference is very plain, and the evasion is ridiculous Sophistry, tho *Bellarmino* also gave it when he was in straits and in haste, since the one is plainly contrary to a Divine Law, which the other cannot be pretended to be.*

I call that also a probable place for the Clergy's Marriage in 1 Cor. 9. 5. *Have we not Power to lead about a Sister a Wife as well as other Apostles, and as the Brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?* Here St. Paul asserts his own Power and Right to lead about ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα, and tells us that *Cephas* and the other Apostles did so; Now the only Question is, whether γυναῖκα ought to be translated Wife or Woman? we own it signifies both, but when ἀδελφὴ *Sister* comes before, which includes Woman in it, to make γυναῖκα signify only Woman again, we think would be a great Tautology, and therefore it ought to be translated *Wife*: and we are confirmed in this, because the other Women did also attend and accompany the Apostles in their Travels, and were useful to them on some Religious Accounts, yet since we know *de facto* that most of the Apostles had Wives, all of them, say the Fathers, except St. John and St. Paul, tho *Ignatius* *, and *Clemens Alexandrinus* † expressly affirm, that St. Paul himself was married, (tho not when he wrote this Epistle) it is not likely, nor would it have been so credible to have left their own Wives, and without them to have carried other Women about with them: so that with our Jesuit's good leave we cannot think our Translation of this place to be a soul Corruption, but rather theirs to be a great Imperitinnence.

* Ignat. Epist. ad Philadelph.
† Clemens Alexand. Stromat. 3.

I might give in those other places of Scripture, *It is better to marry than to burn*; and, *to avoid Fornication, let every Man have his own Wife*, as Evidences to justify the Marriage of the Clergy, since they belong to them as much as to any other, unless God made them of such cold Complexions that burning could not belong to them,

them, or their Character were to ensure them from these natural Burnings of Concupiscence, and there was no danger of their ever falling into Fornication, which the Church of *Rome* has shamefully disproved; and therefore they under such Circumstances are as much obliged to marry as the rest of Mankind, and perhaps something more, since the Scandal and Mischief which arises to Religion by their failings, for want of that due Remedy which God has provided, is much greater than in any others. But I shall more largely consider, and more fully press those places upon them, as that also of the Apostle, *1 Tim. 3. 4.* who calls the forbidding of Marriage the Doctrine of Devils, when I come to examine their Vows of Continence.

But I account those clear places of *St. Paul* about a Bishop, a Presbyter, and a Deacon, their being the Husbands of one Wife, such a Demonstration for the Marriage of the Clergy from Scripture, that as nothing need to be added to them, so 'tis the highest Impudence to bring any thing against them; and before I proceed to a particular Examination of what is cited by them to that purpose, I shall make these two General Remarks and Observations upon them.

First; That no good Reasons can be brought out of Scripture against that which the Scripture so expressly allows and approves; for it must be a high Reflection upon Scripture and the Author of it, to make it thus oppose and contradict it self: Whatever our Adversaries produce out of Scripture against Priests Marriage,

15

is to show either the Inconvenience or Unfitness and Undecency of it; now it is very strange that God should approve of that which at the same time is charged by him to be either undecent or inconvenient, as it must be acknowledged to be very arrogant and assuming for any Church to judg better of those things than God himself, and to condemn that as unfit which he allows, so to make him himself condemn it is much worse, and a down-right charging him with the folly of making a Law, and at the same time owning it to be unreasonable.

Secondly; If the Scripture were against Priests Marriage, then why are our Adversaries generally so modest, which the Council of *Trent* it self seems, also to be *, as to make Celibacy to be annexed to Holy Orders only by Ecclesiastical Right, and not by that which is Divine or Apostolical? this seems to be a plain Confession that Scripture has no where declared against it, and therefore to what purpose do they produce any thing out of it? since if there were any positive Divine Law then against it, the Church, as they own, could not dispense with it as it has often done, and as it now permits the Greek Priests, who are amongst them, the use of their Wives; and if any such Reasons could be brought against it from thence, as are founded in Nature, and result from any intrinsic Evil, or Turpitude in the thing it self, or a proper unagreeableness between that and the Sacred Function, which most of their Arguments drive at, then it would be a natural and indispensable Law; I ask therefore, to what purpose they bring places out of Scripture for that which is acknowledged to be only of

* Non obstantē
lege Ecclesiastica.
Canon. de Sacram.
Matrim.
Sess. 24.

De Cler. l. 1.
c. 19.

cal Institution? *Bellarmino* owns, *there is no Precept in all the Scripture against Priests Marriage*, which it is strange there should not be if it were either so inconvenient, or so indecent as they make it, and how then he could lay Celibacy upon an Apostolical Precept, without contradicting himself, as well as the Apostle *Paul*, in those places I have mentioned, wherein the Apostle is so far from giving any such Precept, that he allows the quite contrary, I cannot understand. But let us hear what they can bring out of Scripture: for what they own, the Scripture nowhere commands, the Clergy's Celibacy.

The first place brought by *Bellarmino*, tho omitted by *Mansford*, (for I am for keeping to my two Men in this matter, to the one because so learned, and the other because so late) is that of *Titus* 1. 8. *A Bishop must be sober, just, holy, temperate*, which they translate *continent ἐνχεστῆς*, and so indeed it does signify the one as well as the other, and they both mean the same thing, to wit, governing a Man's self as to his bodily Passions and Inclinations, so as to abstain from whatever is sinful and unlawful; and *σωφρονα*, which both we and they translate sober, may, if *Bellarmino* pleases, signify chaste; but then this Chastity and this Continence belongs as well to the Married State as to Celibacy, for else the Apostle would not have required those two Vertues in one that he just before called the *Husband of one Wife*, this plainly shows that true Continence and true Chastity, such as God requires as a Christian Vertue, and will reward as such, and such as the Apostle makes a Qualification of a Bishop, is as truly consistent with a married as an unmarried State:

for

for St. Peter^s commands ἐνυπόστατα to all Christians as well as St. Paul to Bishops, 2 *Per.* 1. 6. and that sure was not a total containing from their own Wives, or other lawful Enjoyments: 'Tis both a stingy, unnatural, and unscriptural Notion to make those Vertues lie rather in a precise Abstinence from what God has left free, and what is agreeable to our present state and to the good of the World, than in that which is a true Foundation for Vice or Vertue, observing a Divine Law, and abstaining from what is thereby made sinful and unlawful; every thing else is left indifferent, and is like a *Common* lying between Vice and Vertue, that belongs to neither of them, but is open and free to every Man's choice and liberty, and is good or bad only by accident, as it happens to be a means or instrument to promote the one or the other, and is accordingly to be made use of by our own Prudence; he that abstains from a lawful Pleasure is not to be counted vertuous for that, for there is no Law which makes it be so, and without a Law, as there can be no Sin, so there can be no Vertue, but as this Abstinence from what is lawful is a means to preserve him from what is unlawful, so it is an occasion or a help to Vertue, and that is all. It has been the ground of mighty Superstition, as I shewed it was in the old Hereticks; and of a foolish conceit of Merit and Supererogation to think it to be a great and extraordinary Vertue to do what God had not commanded, and to abstain from what he had not forbidden; which, how it can be so without a relation to a Divine Law, I do not see, since *that* is the only Rule of our Actions, which makes them either good or evil: but this is by the by, to settle a right Notion of Moral Vertue, the want of which, is the cause of most Superstition, and the *πρᾶτον ψευδὸς* of that immoderate

moderate admiration of Virginity, and of that contempt and reproach of Marriage, which got very early into some weak, tho' devout and well-meaning Heads, who neither understood Nature and Philosophy, nor had any true and Manly Thoughts of Religion, but who, in the Apostle's Character, *had a Zeal, but not according to knowledg*; and tho' this Humour got too soon into the Church, or at least into a great party in it, yet the Hereticks were the first and original Authors of it.

The second place cited by our Adversaries against Priests Marriage, is that of *2 Tim. 2. 4. No Man that warreth, entangleth himself with the Affairs of this Life, that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a Soldier*: From whence they infer, that Clergy-men should not entangle themselves in Secular Businesses and Worldly Affairs, such as Marriage will certainly engage them in: but there are some Clergy-men, I am afraid, who are not married, who do as much and a great deal more entangle themselves in Secular Businesses and Worldly Affairs than those who are, who are for governing the World, and managing the Affairs of States and Kingdoms, and carrying on Secular and Politick Intrigues where-ever they come; which are much more unagreeable and contrary to the Sacred Function, and do more involve them in Worldly Concerns, than Marriage, or the Care of a Family; where a Clergy-man by committing those lesser Concerns to the Care of a Wife, may be in great measure helped, and be more at leisure for the Duties of his Function; however 'tis not intangling ones self in the Affairs of this Life, so far as a moderate and prudent Care of a
Wife

Wife and Family may oblige one to, which is here forbid by all the Apostle, for he would then forbid it to all Christians as well as Clergy-men; for not only *Timothy*, but all Christians in general, are all the Souldiers of Christ, who ought not so to entangle themselves in the Affairs of this Life as not to mind Religion, and the far greater ones of another; and this is all that seems here forbidden. The Apostle indeed in another place says, *He that is unmarried careth for the things of the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married, careth for the things that are of the World, how he may please his Wife*, 1 Cor. 7. 32, 33. and this they bring also against the Marriage of Priests, but if it proves any thing against any Marriage, it proves too much; for it is as much against the Marriage of all Christians as that of Priests; but those words, and the whole of that Chapter wherein *St. Paul* exhorteth not Priests only, for he speaketh not particularly of them, but of all Christians, to whom he wrote, rather to continue unmarried at that time than to marry, unless upon some necessary Reasons, have a special and particular relation to those times of Danger, Hazard, and Persecution which Christians were then in; and therefore he expressly says, *ver. 26. It is good for the present distress that a Man do not marry, and yet he blameth them not if they did, but tells them that such should have trouble in the Flesh*, *ver. 28. i. e. they should meet with such Troubles and Distresses at that time, that the free and unmarried would be much better provided for than they that had a Wife and Children, the Care and Loye of which would oblige a Man to take care of the things of the World how he may please his Wife, and provide for his Family; whereas the unmarried had*

5 L

nothing

nothing to do but to mind and be concerned for Religion, and to prepare himself to suffer for it, and so to care for the things of the Lord, how he may please the Lord. That this is the full and true meaning of the place, will appear to any one who carefully reads the Context, where St. Paul gives them notice of some present Danger and Trouble falling upon them, *ver. 29. But this I say, Brethren, the time is short; it remaineth that both they that have Wives be as tho they had none; i. e. 'twill now very shortly come to pass that they that have Wives shall be as they that have none, i. e. forced to leave them, and be all in great and equal danger; and they that weep, as tho they wept not; and they that rejoyce, as tho they rejoyced not; and they that buy, as tho they possessed not; and they that use this World as not abusing it: for the fashion of this World passeth away; i. e. they that weep now, shall be as those that do not weep; those that rejoyce as those that rejoyce not; they that are rich and purchase, as those that possess not; those that use this World, as those that use it not, i. e. the circumstances of Christians, however different now, shall be made all one by the change of Affairs which is suddenly coming upon us; for a new face of things appears, and the present fashion of them will pass away, and be changed like a Scene, and all will become very dangerous and troublesome: And then he adds, *But I would have you without Carefulness: He that is unmarried careth for the things of the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married, careth for the things of the World, how he may please his Wife.* I have been the longer in giving this Paraphrase and Account of the Context, because it is a true Key to let us in to the Sense, not only of those Words, but of the whole Chapter, which our Adversaries*

aries make so great advantage of against Marriage, for want of understanding the true scope, and design, and meaning of it, but we must forgive them, for they are not much used to read Scripture, and they count it dangerous to understand it by their own private Spirit and Judgment.

The remaining places produced by them against the Clergy's Marriage, are to show a sort of impurity and undecency in the Act of Marriage, which renders it unfit and unsuitable to the performing such Sacred Offices as Priests are daily to be employed in. To which I answer in general, That there is not any such impurity; for the Apostle calls the Marriage-Bed *ἐμαρτὸς, without any Impurity*. And Christianity knows no Impurity or Uncleanness, but what is of a moral Nature, that is, what is against some Law. Turpitude, and Filthiness, when they are applied to moral Acts, are only figurative and metaphorical Expressions, borrowed from sensible and corporeal Matters, to represent the rational and intellectual Acts of the Mind. And so are those Platonick Phrases of the beauty and pulchritude of Vertue; and that fine saying, *That if those could be seen by corporeal Eyes, they would mightily ravish, and extremely enamour those that beheld them*. Which is at most but a Platonick Fancy, and that perhaps too much dipt in Sense and Matter, drawing Vertue like a beautiful Cupid, as Painters do the Pictures of Angels, by some Face they admire; and all this is but an imaginary representing Things of another Nature, by corporeal Images and Ideas; whereas the true Essence and Nature of these, of all moral Actions, lies only in their agreeableness or unagreeableness

ness to some Law of God and Nature, and their tendency to promote such Effects to the Good of the World. This is the true Rule and Measure of them, and not a fancied Purity or Impurity, bearing any imaginary Likeness or Analogy to something that is corporeal; this is meer Fancy, and a very weak and low Conceit of Things of a moral Nature. A Man's Mind can no more be defiled by a Physical Impurity of the Body, than a Sun-beam is by the Vapours of a Dunghil, or a Thought by an Inopostume in the Head; or, I may add, than the Divine Essence, by its presence in all places; 'tis only such Thoughts of the Mind, or Acts of the Will, which are contrary to a Moral or Divine Law *that defile the Man*, as our Saviour declares in a like Case *, against that Pharisaical Fancy and Opinion, that some outward uncleanness of the Body did so. He who acts with his Body, or consents with his Mind and Thoughts to what God disallows and forbids, he defiles himself with a Sin, which is the only Defilement the Soul is capable of, and without that to suppose it to be defiled by a bodily Pollution, is to destroy Morality, and to make any such Pollution unfit, or unqualify a Man for the Offices of Religion, is to bring the Rituals of Judaism into Christianity: and yet this is, and always has been, the strongest Prejudice against Priests Marriage, and the whimsical Foundation of their *Celibacy* and *Virginity*, as having in it a greater Purity both of Soul and Body. But I hope what I have said, may help to set our Thoughts right as to that Matter; I proceed to examine those places of Scripture which they bring to countenance any such charge.

*Mat. 15. 18.

The

The first is that of *1 Cor. 7. 5.* wherein the Apostle supposes, and approves, not commands, as *Bellarmino* would have it, that married Persons *abstain, by consent, for a time, that they may give themselves to Fasting and Prayer.* From whence they thus argue, that if other married Persons are to do so for those Ends, then Priests who are daily to give themselves to Prayer, and the Sacred Offices of Religion, are always to abstain.

To which I Answer; That Priests are not to give themselves daily to such Prayer as the Apostle here means, for that was a set and solemn, and extraordinary time of Prayer and Fasting both; and I suppose Priests are not obliged, nor do think themselves to be so, from this place, to such a daily Fasting: All Christians are to pray daily, and to pray continually, as well as Priests; and yet are not by that always obliged to abstain, but it may become both, upon some solemn and extraordinary Times of Devotion and Humiliation, to abstain from the Acts of Marriage, as well as from their Food, though there be no impurity in either: and this is all the Apostle means, who does not however absolutely require it.

But, say they, in the words of the *Catholick Strip-
sist, Even in the Old Law, the Priests who offered the
Holy Host for the People, did not so much as stay in
their own Houses, but were purified, and so separated for
that time from their Wives. Luke p. 23. And it came to
pass, that after the days of his Office were expired, he
(Zacharias the Priest) departed unto his House, and af-*

1007

ter these days his Wife conceived. Our Priests of the New Law being to offer daily Sacrifice, are daily to observe Virginal Purity.

Now here I would ask our Jesuit, where he finds any such Order or Command of God in the Jewish Law, that the Priests should be separated from their Wives during the performance of their Office in the Temple? There was a Command given to Aaron and his Sons, *Levit. 20. 9.* *That they should not drink Wine nor strong Drink, when they went into the Tabernacle of the Congregation; And this was to be a Statute for ever throughout their Generations, that they might put difference between Holy and Unholy, and between Unclean and Clean; and that they might teach the Children of Israel all the Statutes which the Lord had spoken unto them by the Hand of Moses.* And there were a great many legal Pollutions which made them unclean; so that whilst under them they were not to Sacrifice, not to eat of the Holy Things, *Levit. 22. 3, 4, 5.* as being a Leper, or having a Running Issue, or touching any thing that is unclean by the Dead, or touching any creeping thing whereby he may be made unclean; but among all those which are particularly and punctually reckoned up, there is no mention of any conjugal Uncleaness, nor were the Priests any where commanded, even by the Jewish Law, which made so many ritual Uncleanesses for peculiar Reasons proper to their gross Conceptions, and their childish State, to abstain from their Wives, or the Acts of Marriage, during the time of exercising their Sacred Function. So that as to the Priest's ministring in the Tabernacle and Temple, by
such

such Turns and Courses, and being absent from their Wives at those Times, as in the Instance of *Zacharias*: This was a meer accidental Thing, by reason of his living in the Hill Country of *Judea*, far from *Jerusalem*, and so leaving his Wife and Family when he came up to minister in his Course, for they were not at all obliged, by any Law, to be from their Wives at that Time, nor to be separated from them during these their Courses of Ministration, which were not appointed till about four hundred Years after *Moses*, when *David*, for greater Order and Convenience, distributed the Priests into so many Classes, that were to attend at the Tabernacle by turns; so that no such Pretence can be alledged of any such Absence or Abstinence before; nor did *David* make any such new Order or Provision, when he settled this new Combination of the Priests. Nor is the Instance of *Zacharias* any more to their purpose, than of a King's Chaplain who lives in the Country, leaving his Wife there during his monthly Attendance at Court; and yet that of the Priests was much shorter, to wit, only seven days. But such things must be pick'd up to make a shew of Scripture to no purpose, but only to assume to themselves the new Name of a *Catholick Scripturist*, which is almost as absurd and ridiculous in their sense, as that of *Roman Catholick*: But every one may Christen his own Child by what Name he pleases, though that does not make him of ever the better Family.

Luke 1. 39.

1 Chron. 24.

But though I have done with my *Jesuit-Catholick Scripturist*; if I may mend the Name by that glorious Addition, yet I must go on with the Argument, as 'tis managed.

Preterea in Veteri Testamento continentiam ab uxoribus videmus in primis fuisse requisitam in iis qui Deo propinquaturi, vel rem aliquam sanctam tractaturi erant. Nam Exod. 12. precipitur ut comesturi Agnum Paschalem rebus suis accingerent, quo significabatur—debere eos carnis voluptatem edomare qui Agnum Paschalem comedunt. *Bellarmin. de Cler. l. 1. c. 19.*

managed by others: And here *Bellarmin* tells us, That in the Old Testament, Continnence from Wives was especially required in those who were drawing nigh to God, or handling any Sacred Matter, as those who were to eat the Paschal Lamb, were to have their Loins girt; whereby was signified that they ought to tame all Carnal Pleasure. Now of all Arguments, and of all places of Scripture, these Mystical and Allegorical Ones are the most un-

answerable; for had he gone on with the Allegory about purging their Houses from Leaven, and made that to signify putting away their Wives at that Time, it would, in my Mind, have done full as well, and the one would have answered the other, and was as much intended by it, as by eating with the Loins girt, the subduing Carnal Pleasure, or abstaining from their Wives, when another plain Reason of that is added, *They were to eat it in haste, vers. 11.* as they came out of Egypt. But when a Man's Fancy is set upon Allegorizing, which in English is going a *Wool-gathering*, even the Priest's Breeches which they were commanded

Item Exod. 28. precipit Deus ut Aaron & filii eius cum ingrederentur tabernaculum sceminibus lineis à repibus usq; ad femora tecti essent quo significatum esse debere Sacerdotes Novi Testamenti aut Virgines esse, aut contracta cum uxoribus scedera dissolvisse. *ib.*

to wear when they ministred at the Altar, *Exod. 28. 42.* these shall be made a Symbolical Argument, that Priests now should have no Wives, as they are by the great Cardinal, because, forsooth, *these Breeches were to reach from the Loins to the Thighs.* When his Hand was thus

in at Wit and Fancy, he had even as good have undertaken to prove, that the Priests must necessa-

necessarily be without their Wives at that time, because they themselves then wore the Breeches. But let us leave these Allegories, which are, I suppose, to make us more merry than wise in this Matter; though *Bel-larmine* produces them very gravely, and brings very grave Authorities for them, which I will not injure so much, as to examine them. Allegories in a Controversy may be spared and let alone, as Women and Children in a War, because there is no strength nor no danger in them.

But there are two plain places, and Matters of Fact produced to prove this: The one is that of *Abimelech's* refusing to give the Holy Bread to *David* and his Servants, unless they had kept themselves from Women, *1 Sam. 21. 4.* Now would they prove from hence, that the Priests who are to eat the Holy Bread under the Gospel, namely the *Eucharist*, are therefore to keep themselves from Women? This will not do, though the Shew-bread were a Type of the *Eucharist*; for the Priests themselves, to whom alone and their Families it belonged, according to the Law, to eat this Holy Bread, were not obliged to keep themselves from their Wives in order to it; for they were to eat it, I suppose, every day, their Wives and Children were to eat it with them, and there was no such Command in their Law, that they should contain from their Wives when they ate it; but by this Example used to this purpose, rather Lay-men, such as *David* and his Young-men were, are to keep themselves from Women upon that occasion than the Priests. But the Truth is, *Abimelech* here, in an extraordinary and unusual Case, when he gave the Holy Bread to those to whom it did

not belong by the Law, would make up this, by requiring a more than ordinary legal Purity; or at least he spoke those words with some such design, *If the young Men have kept themselves at least from Women.* But I dare say, without any the remotest meaning against Priests Marriage, or total abstaining from their Wives. The other is that of the Peoples not coming at their Wives for three days, when they were sanctifying themselves to receive the Law at Mount *Sinai*, *Exod. 19. 15.* But if this proves any thing, it proves, that the People as well as the Priests are to contain from their Wives, upon extraordinary approaches to God, for here is nothing peculiar to the one more than to the other; and when God shall be pleased to come down in so miraculous, and dreadful, and sensible a manner, as he did at Mount *Sinai*, we ought to meet him with all that purity of Soul and Body which he requires. Under the Law he required them to be free from legal and ritual Pollutions; and therefore washing their Clothes was as much required here, as not coming to their Wives; but under the Gospel nothing is required, when we draw nigh to God, but moral Purity, that is, a right disposition of Mind, a freedom from Sin both in Soul and Body; for that is the only Pollution that defiles a Man under the Gospel, and without that nothing can any more make us unclean before God, than washing with Water can make us clean again, as it did among the *Jews*. The truth is, all that fancy of greater Purity in any such Abstinences, and of Pollution in the Acts of Marriage, is nothing else but rank *Judaism*; and instead of a true Christian and Moral Purity, 'tis a bringing us
back

back to that which was purely Ritual and Ceremonial, and a setting up the Jewish State and Oeconomy, *which stood only in Meats and Drinks, and divers Washings, and Carnal Ordinances imposed on them until the time of Reformation*; wherein many such things were required as were to *sanctify as to the purifying of the Flesh*, tho as pertaining to the Conscience they signify nothing; but ^{as} is not a carnal and external, but an inward, and spiritual, and moral Purity, by which God will now be *sanctified in all them that draw nigh unto him*; and the Priests are thus with David to *wash their Hands in Innocency, and so to compass the Altar*; and if with a gross and Jewish, and Unphilosophical Conceit we make any mere bodily Pollution to hinder them, or render it less fit or decent for them to perform the most sacred parts of their Office, we may as well bring in all the Jewish Uncleanesses, of touching a Dead Body, or a creeping thing, or any other Person that is thus unclean, and the like; and I can see no more reason why Priests upon any such score of a fancied Impurity should be kept from marrying, or a lawful use of it by reason of their sacred Function and Office, any more than that upon the same account they should be prohibited to make an Issue, or to take Physick. There is a natural Shame indeed attends those and other Acts of Nature, and therefore she always draws the Curtain of Modesty over them; and there is a Physical Impurity in these and other bodily Evacuations, but none of them do render a Man less fit for the Service of God, or unqualify him for the administration of holy things, nor is there any good ground, that I know of, why the one should do it more than the other; yet all the old Enemies to Priests Marriage have always beat upon this

miſtake, and could never get this childiſh and low
 Fancy out of their Heads, that there was an Impurity
 in it that unfitted and unbecame the Sacred Order, and
 to prevent this they have brought in a real and horrid
 Impurity into it, by allowing ſometimes, as they have
 ſcandalouſly done, or at leaſt by occaſioning that Con-
 cubinage, and Fornication, and other unlawful and abo-
 minable Uncleannels, which their own Authors do all
 along witneſs and complain of in their unmarried
 Clergy; and therefore this mighty pretence and con-
 cern for higher Purity, which was as hypocritically
 boaſted of by the firſt Hereticks as by the late pretended
 Catholicks, and the forbidding Priests to marry upon
 that account comes very near, I doubt, to that Doctrin
 of Devils, of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *1 Tim. 4. 3.*
where he gives theſe Characters of the Teachers of
it, that they ſpeak Lies in Hypocriſy, and forbid to mar-
ry: Whoever then they are that forbid to marry, and
make a falſe and hypocritical pretence to greater Puri-
ty by the doing ſo, theſe ſeem very plainly to be charg-
able with the Doctrin of Devils: and then let the
Infallible Church look to it, for I know none are more
like to be found guilty of this than they are. I know
they would ſhift off this black Charge and Indictment
to the Marcionites and Manichees, and other early He-
reticks; but however it may be meant of thoſe ancient
and original Antichriſts, yet others are ſtill as liable to
it as they were: For they did not forbid Marriage to
all, but only to their Elect, ſo that they did no more
condemn it univerſally than the Papiſts do; and
St. Paul ſpeaks not here of Perſons, but of Doctrines,
and there could hardly be any worſe than to diſparage
Marriage; the wiſe Ordinance of God to preſerve the
 World,

World, and his own Primitive and Original Institution in the State of Innocence, than what the Roman Church, and the chief Heads and Teachers of it, the Popes, who prohibited Marriage to the Clergy, have openly published and maintained. *Siricius* the first of them who did this, did it for these Reasons, as appears by his Epistle to the Bishops of * *Africa*, because they * *Siric. Epist. 4. c. 9.* that were in the Flesh, (i. e. who were married) could not please God; and to the pure all things are pure, but unto them that are defiled with Marriage is nothing pure. This was making Marriage an Impurity with a witness, and a State of unlawful Carnality, that neither Priest nor Layman could live in it, and be a Christian. I don't know any Heritick who had called himself a Christian, could ever have given a worse Representation of Marriage than this is, and could have put a greater Abuse either upon that, or upon Scripture.

After him Pope *Innocent* gave as bad Reasons in his Decree against Marriage of the Clergy, for when they, says he, ought to be and are called the Temple, and Vessels, and dwelling of the Holy Ghost, it is unfit for them to serve the Beds of Unclean-ness (b); and it is not lawful to admit them to Holy Offices which use carnal Company with their Wives, because it is written, Be ye holy, for I am holy *, which makes Marriage to be in it self unholy. Afterwards when Pope *Gregory* the Seventh came with more Fury and Violence to establish the Celibacy of Priests, he calls their Marriage by no other name than *Adultery*, and *Concubinary*, and the inveterate Disease of *Fornication* in the Clergy (c); and then as their Marriages were

(b) Quam enim ipsi templum vala & Sacrum Spiritus Sancti debeant esse & dici, indignum est eos cubilibus & immunditiis deservire. *Distinct. 28. can. 2.*

* *Distinct. 82. Proposuit...*

(c) Inveteratum morbum fornicationis Clericorum. *Greg. 7. l. 2. Epist. 30.*

made

made null and void, as Pope *Innocent* the first had long before decreed them to be, their Wives were called by no other Names than of Whores, and Concubines, and their Children branded with the Infamy of *Bastards*, and it was made even Heresy, the Heresy of the *Nicolaitans*, to defend or believe the lawfulness of Priests Marriage; and if this were not to make it evil in it self, and so to teach the Doctrine of Devils, I know not what is! To make it Heresy, Fornication and Adultery, and a state of Filthiness, Uncleaness, and Carnality, such as in the use of it renders a Man altogether carnal, and unfit for Divine Things, as *Bellarmino*

(d) Qui hominem reddit totum carnalem & ineptum ad divina. Bellarm. de Cler. l. 1. c. 18.

(e) Est majus malum sic nubere quam fornicari. Bellarm. in l. 2. de Monach. c. 34. G. & alibi.

(f) De Celibatu sacerdotum. c. 17. Prop. 9.

(g) Reprehenditur à Philippo Pighius qui non verè magis quam pie scriptum reli-

quit, minùs peccare sacerdotem qui ex infirmitate carnis in fornicationem sit prolapsus quàm qui Nuptias contraxit. Turpis illi videtur hæc oratio contra Catholicis honestissima. Pighius Confess. c. 46.

(h) Quod Sacerdotes mariti fiant gravius esse peccatum quam si plurimas domi meretrices alunt. Cardinalis Campesius apud Steidan. l. 4.

does (d), and to make it better and more lawful for a Clergy-man to commit Fornication than to marry, which is the avowed, tho scandalous Doctrine of their greatest Men, even of *Bellarmino* himself (e); and is not only to be fathered upon so little a Man as *Coster* (f), but is taught by *Pighius*, and Cardinal *Hosius*, who tells us that this, tho it seems a filthy Doctrine to others, yet to Catholics it seems most honest (g); so that another Cardinal openly pronounced it before the Magistrates of *Strasburgh*, to be a greater Sin for Priests to be married, than to keep several Whores in their own Houses (h). If all this taken together, do not match, or out-do the worst things that ever were or can be said against Marriage, and do not therefore as justly deserve the Character of the Doctrine of Devils, I am very much mistaken.

What

What abominable and even unnatural Impurities have been brought into the Church by the forced Celibacy and forbidden Marriage of the Clergy, to the scandal not only of the Sacred Order, but of Religion in general, has been the loud complaint of their own Authors and Historians, and they who, upon pretence of a greater Purity, have prohibited their Clergy to have Wives, yet have allowed them Concubines at a certain rate; and as knowing the Straits and Necessities they have brought them into, have relieved them with Licenses and Dispensations at a set Price, and as we are told, have made these pay for them that did desire or use them with an *habeant si velint, & qui non habet Uxorem loco illius Concubinam debet habere*; as 'tis in the old Edition of *Gratian's Decretal* *, * *Distinct. 34.* tho 'tis now changed into *licet habere*: And the zealous Popes who have forbid any to hear Mass of a Priest that was married, yet have not only tolerated, but built publick Stewes in the City of *Rome*, which have had such a good Trade and Custom, that they could pay 20000 *Ducats* a Year to their Exchequer †; † *Agrippa dei vanit. scient. c. 64.* so that one would shrewdly suspect it was not out of a mighty Concern for more than ordinary Purity, that they allow not their Priests to have Wives, tho they are willing to cover their other Designs with that specious pretence, but for some other Ends more politick and more advantageous to the Interest of Holy Church, which is hereby not only vastly enrich'd, as being made Heiress to those Estates which would otherwise go to a Wife and Children, but keeps her self and her Clergy more independent upon the Civil State and Government, as having given no such Pledges.

*

* Rodolpho
Pio di Carpo.

Pledges and Securities to them as the Married have done; And therefore an Italian Cardinal * in the Council of *Trent*, where the Marriage of Priests was greatly prest to be granted by many Catholick Princes, wisely told the Council, *this Inconvenience would follow from it, that having House, Wife and Children, they will not depend on the Pope but on their Prince, and their Love to their Children will make them yeild to any prejudice of the Church, and they will seek to make the Benefices hereditary, and so in a short time the Authority of Apostolick See will be confined within Rome* †. So that 'tis this is a good Pillar to maintain the Greatness of the Roman See, and to keep the Clergy in a more strict dependance upon it; and therefore it is observable that the same Man who so strenuously promoted it, did at the same time strive to advance the Papacy to the highest pitch of Glory above any of his Predecessors, and to make it trample upon all other Kingdoms and Empires who were to fall down and worship it; I mean Pope *Hildebrand*.

† History of the
Council of
Trent, l. 5.

Our Age has sufficiently taught us, that 'tis not a Love of great Purity, but of great Liberty and Looseness, that causes an aversion to Marriage, as *Augustus* told the *Romans* of old, who had got the same Humour among them, *licentiam libidini ac lascivia vestra exercendae queritis*. And *Aventinus* says this upon *Gregory* the Seventh, forbidding Marriage to the Clergy, *Gratissima hac fuere scortatoribus quibus pro unâ Uxore sexcentas Mulieres inire licet*.

I would no way detract from the honour of Virginity, nor would have others do so from that of Marriage;

riage; they were both of them States of Innocence and of Paradise; Christ has consecrated both, who was born of a Virgin, and yet of a married Woman. I would not have any Contention for Preference between them, for sure like other States of Life, they are equal and indifferent in themselves, there is no internal Excellency or Perfection of the one above the other, but the advantages to either of them are only accidental, and depend upon Circumstances, as they are capable of being improved into such Vertues as tend most to the Glory of God and the good of the World, and which of them do most serve those ends is impossible to be determined for all Times and for all Persons: The Apostle seems to favour and advise the one in a particular case of outward Distress and Persecution, but he absolutely commands the other in case of inward Burning and Temptation; for the one seems to be a safer Haven against the Storms of the World, and the other against those of the Flesh; but there are a great many more I am afraid perish by the latter than the former.

Whether it be more vertuous to destroy and extinguish those Passions which God and Nature has put in us, or wisely to govern and use them, was an old Dispute of the *Stoicks*, and other Philosophers, and may be very fairly applied to the case of Marriage and Virginitie; the one side ranted bravely against the low, and animal, and brutish Affections and Inclinations of our Bodies; but the other, thought it unnatural wholly to destroy those that were a true part

of human Nature, and that it was a forgetting we were Men, to set Vertue to such a Romantick height and perfection, which was not proper or suitable to our present State.

Virginity calls it self an Angelical Perfection, and Marriage seems to have more of Flesh and Blood in it: but we cannot attain to the one, nor be without the other whilst we are Men: we must therefore exercise the proper Vertues of our State and Nature, and that is the highest Perfection we are capable of. The Angels are pure Spirits, who are neither capable of Virginity nor of Marriage, and so can never be proposed as Examples of those things to us, and 'tis a great mistake to think our Saviour meant any such thing, when he said, *That in the Resurrection they neither marry nor are given in Marriage, but are as the Angels of God in Heaven*; Mat. 22. 30. which was only spoke against the Sadducees, who ask'd, whose Wife she should be in the Resurrection who had seven Husbands upon Earth?

The greatest Saints in Heaven, at least those that the Scripture speaks of, which is most to be trusted, were married while upon Earth, and this was no hinderance to their utmost Perfection here, nor their highest Happiness hereafter. Virginity is no more an Heavenly or an Angelical State than Marriage; for they neither of them belong to Heaven or to the Angels, but are only Conditions of Life proper to this World; but in the other there is neither Male nor Female, Virgin nor Married, Husband nor Wife, Father nor Child,
but

but all these Worldly States and Relations are dissolved, and a full end is put to all the parts we acted, or the Persons we appeared in on this Scene here below.

As to its being a more pure and a more spiritual State, not drench'd in Bodily Passions, nor annoyed so much with the impure Vapours of what is fleshly and sensual, I have shown what a Whimsy that is, how there is no Impurity of the Body can affect the Mind; nor nothing defile the Soul but what is sinful and unlawful, and that this is the true rule and measure of Moral Purity, and there is no other fancied Uncleaness under the Gospel. That as to the Minds being sullied or annoyed with any such impure Vapours rising up from the Flesh, that is more to be feared in the unmarried, where the Fire of Natural Concupiscence not having vent, it burns and glows the more within; and as a great Man speaks upon this occasion, *Profecto fumus qui non exhalatur, totam domum perpetuo reddit fuliginosam, secus est si aptato camino erumperet*: The Mind and Thoughts are kept pure by having those fuliginous Steams carried off another way, that would otherwise perpetually smoke and foul it, and when the rising Springs of Passion and Desire, and the most strong and impetuous Inclinations are calmed and quieted by being put into their proper Channels, the Soul is in a more serene, and composed, and undisturbed Temper, and more fitted for all the Duties and Exercises of Religion. The immoderate and undue admiration of Virginity made

5. N. 2.

Marri-

Marriage to be contemned, and at last to be forbidden to the Clergy, as a State of Life unfit and improper for holy Persons, and therefore I have briefly adjusted the matter between them. At last the vowing of Contenance was supposed to be annexed to Holy Orders, and made a New Obligation against Priests Marriage; which will be considered, with the Scriptures they bring for it, in a second Part that will quickly follow this.

E R R A T A.

PAge 751. line 21. for *credible*, read *creditabile*.

P. 757. l. 2. dele *all*.

P. 768. l. *genule*. for *than*, r. *thou*.

P. 771. l. 12. add *nos*.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for *Richard Chiswel* at the Rose and Crown
in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, 1688.

The TEXTS examined which *Papists*
cite out of the *Bible* for the
Proof of their Doctrine

CONCERNING

The Celibacy of Priests, and Vows
of Continence.

By William Fagius

PART II.

IMPRIMATUR.

Octob. 23.
1688.

Hen. Wharton, *Rmo. in Christo P. ac*
D. D. Wilhelmo Archiep. Cantuar.
à Sacris Domest.

THE Places brought by our Adversaries out of
Scripture for their Vows of Continency, are
these three;

Luke 1. 34. *How shall this be, seeing I know not a*
Man?

Matth. 19. 12. *There be Eunuchs, which have made*
themselves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven's
sake.

1 Tim. 5. 11, 12. *But the younger Widows refuse; for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry; having damnation, because they have cast off their first Faith.*

From the first of these they thus Argue; If the Blessed Virgin had not been under a Vow of perpetual Continency, she could not have made such a return to the Angel, when he told her, she should conceive and bring forth a Son; nor proposed such a Question as that, *How shall this be, seeing I know not a Man?* For she being then espoused to *Joseph*, might have conceived by him and brought forth a Son hereafter, though she knew not a Man at present, if she had not been under the Obligation of a Vow to the contrary, that had hindered her from knowing a Man for the future. But I suppose the Virgin might make such an Answer very easily and pertinently, without regard to any such Vow; for the Angel speaking to her of this as a Thing not to be done a great while hence, but as what was immediately to come to pass, nothing could be more natural for a Virgin to say, who was told this, than how can this be, seeing I know not a Man? We may as well deduce from those words, if we strain them too hard, an infidelity and disbelief of the Divine Power, or at least a disbelief of that famous Jewish Prophecy of the *Messiah*, which could not well be unknown to *Mary*, that he should be born of a Virgin, as her being under the Obligation of a Vow of Continence: But the plain Design of them is only this, to shew that she was a true Virgin who had not known Man, as she then asserted her self to be to the Angel. But there is no such thing implied, or follows from them, as that she would not, or could

not

not know a Man for the future. There seems plainly to have been no Revelation before this made to the Virgin, of her being the happy Instrument to bring forth our blessed Saviour: Neither had *Joseph* any such thing made known to him before she was found with Child, and an Angel appeared to him, on purpose to satisfy him about it, *Matth.* 1. 20. so that they could not be supposed to have either of them made any such Vow in order to such an End, as the forged and spurious Gospel of *St. James*, the Foundation of this imagined Vow in the Virgin, would have us believe. There is a great deal more Reason to think that both of them afterwards, upon such Heavenly Visions and Revelations made known to them, and out of regard to that great Honour which God had vouchsafed them in making them the Parents of his own Son, might resolve to be so of no other, but to preserve that Womb from any common use, that had been sanctified and set apart to one so great and extraordinary, though I see no necessary ground to make this an Article of Faith. But it seems not a little strange and improvable, that before they knew any thing of this wonderful Dispensation, they should be under such a Vow, which was an unusual, or rather an unlawful Thing among the Jews; and yet resolve to marry, which was not a very likely way to keep it; or that after they were married, both of them (for the one could not then make such a Vow without the other) should, without any knowledg, or any revelation of that great Matter, which is made the Ground and Occasion of this Vow; and which they were no way acquainted with till this coming of the Angel to *Mary*, who was then greatly surprized at it, that they should both enter into such a Vow, which must have added extremely to the sup-

posed Guilt of the Virgin in the Opinion of her Husband, when he thought to put her away privily; though there is not then the least intimation of any such thing, which is therefore no small Argument against it. It was necessary that Christ should be born of a Virgin, according to a Divine Prophecy, and tho as a True Man he was to be born of a Woman, yet that he should come into the World in a miraculous and extraordinary way, above that of other Men: and had not this Virgin been espoused, and under the covert of her legal Husband, she had been liable to Death by the Jewish Law; so that it was necessary that she who was the Mother of Christ, should be in those Circumstances that *Mary* was: But there was no necessity, nor no manner of reason that she should be under a Vow of Continece, since every thing might be duly transacted without that.

The Virgin *Mary* did immediately conceive, upon the Angel's Salutation and Message to her, and did know that to be the meaning of his words; and therefore she had reason to make that return to them, *How can this be, seeing I know not a Man?*

From our Saviour's words in *St. Matthew*, Chap. 19. 12. *There be Eunuchs, that have made themselves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake*; They suppose that this voluntary Eunuchism must necessarily be from a Vow, by which these Eunuchs are brought under this Obligation, that they cannot but contain; and that not from a natural Impossibility, but only from a moral and voluntary one, which must therefore be a Vow. But I suppose, whoever freely and voluntarily abstains from Marriage, upon a good and religious Account, as *St. Paul* seems to advise in the 7th Chapter of the First Epistle

Epistle to the *Corinthians*, namely, that in the time of Distress and Persecution, he may be more loose and free from the Troubles of the World, or may be at more liberty to go up and down and preach the Gospel, and wholly to mind the Business of Religion; whoever does this, though without a Vow, makes himself an Eunuch for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake. *He that standeth stedfast in his Heart, as the Apostle speaks, having no Necessity, but hath power over his own Will; and hath so decreed in his Heart, that he will keep his Virgin, doth well,* vers. 37. that is, if he fully purposes and resolves with himself to live unmarried, though without bringing himself under a Vow, which is the mighty thing that makes it an Act of Merit and Supererogation with our Adversaries: But there was nothing of this Nature among the *Jews*, or Disciples, to whom our Saviour spake these words; and 'tis observable, that he speaks of this as a thing past or present; *There are Eunuchs, that have made themselves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake*; whereas had it been, there *shall* be Eunuchs which shall make themselves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake, this would, no doubt, have been improved by our Adversaries, if not into a Prophecy, yet to a more direct pointing at their future Votaries, and would have made the words have looked something fairer for votive Eunuchism afterwards, rather than to be so meant at that Time when no such thing was in use: And the Apostles, to whom our Saviour made this answer, spake not at all of vowing Continence, but only of the greater Expediency of not marrying; and therefore our Saviour had no reason from their words to speak any thing of such a Vow.

That:

That this voluntary Eunuchism is not to be understood literally, as it was by *Origen*, is agreed by all, and our Adversaries are so much against it, that they make it an utter incapacitating a Priest from his Office, if not destroying his Character; and since this Eunuchism is to be understood in a Figurative and Metaphorical Sense, I see not why it should be understood in so strict and narrow a meaning, as that whoever abstains from all forbidden and unlawful Pleasures of that nature, out of a Principle of Vertue and Religion, should not upon that account be said to make himself an Eunuch for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake, as well as he that does not marry; for Metaphors are not to be strained so far as to touch in all Points; and tho' the Apostles speak only of not marrying, yet our Saviour may as well be supposed to take an occasion from thence to speak of abstaining from unlawful Pleasures, as of making Vows which are full as remote from the Question proposed to him about Marriage.

The third and great place for these Vows of Continency, is that of *1 Tim. 5. 11, 12.* concerning those Church-Widows, who, because they will marry, the Apostle says, *they have Damnation, as having cast off their first Faith*, i. e. that Vow of Continnence, say they, which they made when they were admitted into the Order of those Church-Widows. But how do they prove that that is meant by this *first Faith*? Is Faith ever in Scripture used to signify a Vow? Or, can they prove that any such Vows were made in the Apostles Times, or long after? this we are sure they cannot; And why then should Faith be taken here in such a sense as it is no where else understood in the Scripture? Or, why should we apply that to a supposed Custom, which

*

which we have no certain grounds for any where else? So that we must first precariously imagine such a Custom, and then bring this place to prove it, and so grant the thing before 'tis proved, or else this place is no manner of proof of it.

Those Church-Widows who being poor and without Friends, *μεμενονωμενοι*, as the Apostle calls them at the 11th Verse, *left quite alone*; for if they had any Friends, he obliges them to provide and take care of them, and shews that Christians should thus *show Piety at home, and requite their Parents*, ver. 4. relieve and maintain them out of Gratitude, which he says *is good and acceptable before God*, and what they were bound and obliged to, not only by their Christianity, but by common and natural Duty. *For if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own House*, he hath denied the Faith, and is worse than an Infidel, ver. 8. These Widows were taken in as Pensioners to be maintained by the Church, and to be kept out of that common Stock of Charity which was raised for these and other Uses; whether they were not to be employed in some proper Offices of the Church, as *Presbyterissa*, or *Diaconissa*, which we meet with in Antiquity, and to be serviceable to take care of the Poor, and of Strangers, I shall not enquire; but they were certainly to be maintained wholly by the Church; and the Apostle speaks of this and of nothing else, but *their continuing in Prayers and Supplications Day and Night*, i. e. attending wholly to Religion, and to constant and set times of Devotion, as being taken care of for every thing else. Now the Apostle would have *Timothy* very careful who were taken into this number, and would have none be so *under threescore Years*, ver. 9. because then they were past their Labour, and were not able

to get a Livelihood for themselves, and so the Church would not be oppressed with too great a number more than it was able to maintain ; and this he takes care of, *that the Church be not charged, that it may relieve them that are Widows indeed*, ver. 16. There was no necessity, I suppose, for these old Women to be under any Vow of Continence, but without that, their Age and Circumstances supposed them to continue unmarried, and to have a full purpose of so doing, and wholly to give up themselves to the Service of God, and of the Church. Now the younger Widows who might be better able to keep themselves, or might marry again, and that perhaps to either Jews or Gentiles, which would be very scandalous, or who might be subject to other Temptations, these the Apostle would by no means have admitted into the List or Roll of these Church-Widows, who were a sort of Grave and Godly Matrons that were in no such danger ; *But the younger Widows refuse, for when they have began to wax wanton against Christ they will marry, having Condemnation, because they have cast off their first Faith*. Now their waxing wanton against Christ, and so having Condemnation because they have cast off their first Faith, does seem most plainly to mean one of these two things much rather than a Vow of Continency.

1. That by committing some Acts of Wantonness and Lewdness, contrary to their Christianity and the Religion of Christ, they brought themselves under great Guilt and Condemnation, as having cast off their first Faith, *i. e.* their Baptismal Covenant, wherein they renounced all the unlawful Lusts of the Flesh, and so by being guilty of any of those, they cast off and violated their first Faith, wherein they bound and tied themselves to Christ, and so were unfaithful to

him

him, and to their Promise and Covenant in Baptism.
Or else,

2. That they might cast off even their Christianity, by marrying either to Jewish or Gentile Husbands, as some of them did, as the Apostle intimates concerning them, when he says, *ver. 15. Some are already turned aside after Satan*; that is, Apostatized from Christianity; which may very fairly also be the meaning of *their waxing wanton against Christ*, or growing weary of him, as the words will bear, or at least of that strict and religious course of Life they were engaged in, and so they might be tempted loosely to throw away that and their Religion together, and to marry again to such Husbands as were not Christians. However, if by their first Faith were not meant either their Baptismal Covenant, or their Christianity, which they thus cast off by waxing wanton and marrying again, but only their purpose and engagement of not doing so when they were received as Church-Widows, yet this, tho without a formal Vow, being scandalous, and of no good report, they might be subject to just blame for it, which may be all the meaning of the word *νεμιμα*, which we translate Condemnation.

But suppose that there were such a Vow taken by these Church-Widows, which cannot be proved; and that those who made themselves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven, did this by vowing Continence; and that the Virgin *Mary* had made such a Vow when she said, *How can this be, seeing I know not a Man?* granting all this, that our Adverſaries have been so feebly and weakly proving by no other Arguments but little Surmises and probable Conjectures at the most, yet what is all to a Vow of Continence to be made by all Priests when they enter into Sacred Orders? those Widows and the Virgin
could

could not be in that number ; nor could those Eunuchs, had they been literally so, have been any more Priests, according to our Adversaries, than the Women ; nor does that Metaphorical Eunuchism belong to Priests any more than to any others, from any thing we can gather from our Saviour's words. If particular Persons, who have the Gift of Continency, do think fit to make any Vow and Resolution against Marriage, as *standing stedfast in their own hearts, having no necessity, but having power over their own Will*, and knowing by sufficient Experience of themselves, their freedom from any Danger or Temptation, which we no way argue against, nor do absolutely condemn all Vows, as our Adversaries falsely charge us ; yet what is this to the imposing such a Vow upon a whole Order of Men ? and making it to be absolutely and in it self annexed to Holy Orders, and obliging all those who enter into them to this perpetual Continence by such a Law as not only forbids them to contract Marriage, but nulls and voids it when contracted ? so that the Marriage of Priests hereby becomes, and is accounted by them not only a breach of an Ecclesiastical Law, but a breach and a violation of a Vow, and the use of it no better than Fornication or Adultery ; for so it must be, if according to them, the Marriage it self be null and void ; which is making a Law in a matter that is not within the compass of Church-Power and Authority, and requiring a Vow of what is impossible to be observed, and the highest violation of a Divine Ordinance by putting asunder those whom God hath joyned together ; And yet all this is done by the late Infallible Council of *Trent* *, upon this groundless and mistaken Principle, that all may have the Gift of Continency, and that it is denied by God to none that pray for it,

* Can. de Sa-
Matrim.

and use other means to obtain it. Which is I confess the main issue by which their Vows of Continency are to be tried, and the chief Hinge upon which this Controversy about them does turn and depend: for if this Continence be not a common, but a peculiar Gift, so that all have not Power to attain it, but only those to whom it is peculiarly given by God, then it must be confessed to be unlawful to vow that which is not in our Power to perform; and then it may be lawful to break such a Vow, because it is necessary so to do, and there is an Obligation not to keep it prior and antecedent to the taking of it. Let us therefore carefully examine these two Points according to Scripture.

1. Whether this Gift of Continence may be had by all?

2. Whether such who have not this Gift, may not lawfully marry, notwithstanding any Vow or Church-Law to the contrary?

1. Whether this Gift of Continence may be had by all? Now this is hard, if not impossible to be known any other way than by Revelation; for no Man can judg of the strength and violence of Natural Concupiscence in all others: It is certain there are none of the Race of *Adam* wholly without it; it seems to be the natural Result of our frame and make of Flesh and Blood, and the Irregularities of it are owing to such a General Cause, as takes in all the fallen and degenerate Off-spring of our first fore-Father: The greatest Saints and the greatest Votaries have complained of it; and by the unusual and extraordinary Methods which they used to cure it, have acknowledg'd how strong and powerful the Disease has been upon them; for why else need *St. Benedict* to have roll'd himself very

often naked upon Thorns, and St. *Francis* in the Snow, if there had not been great occasion for Nature to have been thus cooled and corrected by such Penances as these? This natural inbred Fire may burn stronger and fiercer in some than in others, according to the different Tempers and Complexions of their Bodies; but we can have no certain Gage by which we can judg of those degrees of Heat which it may cause in others, but only what we feel in our selves; neither can we be able to determine for all the rest of Mankind, Whether it be possible to flake or conquer it any other way, than by that lawful and ordinary one of Marriage, which God himself has appointed? He alone who knows our Frame, and whereof we are made, who searches the Heart and the Reins, he can only certainly tell and resolve this; He, who for the good and continuance of the World, put this strong Passion and Inclination in our Nature, can alone know what Bounds he has set to it, and how far it will go, and what Checks and Restraints it is capable of: Our own common Experience, and general Observation of the World, seems to give us pretty good notice and information, how incapable all Men are of this perpetual Continence; but Scripture has done it so clearly, that it can hardly admit of any Contradiction, were not our Adversaries forced to it for the defence of their otherwise indefensible Cause about Vows of Continence.

All Men, says our blessed Saviour, cannot receive this saying, to wit, of not marrying, save they to whom it is given; Mat. 19 11. And tho St. Paul wished that all Men were even as he himself, i. e. unmarried, yet every Man, saith he, hath his proper Gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that, 1 Cor. 7. 8.

and

and he goes on further confirming this, *I say therefore to the Unmarried and Widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn, ver. 8, 9.* And about Virginity, *If need so require, let them marry, ver. 36. Nevertheless, he that standeth stedfast in his Heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own Will, and hath so decreed in his Heart that he will keep his Virgin, doth well, ver. 37.* Can any thing be plainer for the necessity of Marriage, and the impossibility of Continence in all Persons, than these places are? and does not that Divine Spirit, which thus speaketh in Scripture, better understand Human Nature, and all the Passions and Inclinations belonging to it, than all the Popes or Priests of the Church of Rome, who have yet given no great Evidence of this their Doctrine, that 'tis in the power of all that please to contain? but if their own Historians are to be believed, have shamefully confuted it by their own lewd Practices to the contrary. And tho we might suppose it abstractedly considered, to be just possible for any one Person whatever to contain; so that he were not under such a perfect necessity, but that, by the careful use of great and extraordinary means, he might be able to contain: yet considering the general Temper and Inclinations of Mankind, and the State and Condition they are in in this World, it is, *de facto*, impossible that all should be able to keep to this total and perpetual Continence; so that there is, if not a Physical, yet a Moral Impossibility lies against it, and *all cannot receive that saying*, according to our Saviour, and *some cannot contain*, according to St. Paul: By what Shifts and Artifices our Adversaries evade such plain places as those are, which

which seem directly contrary to this their Fundamental Principle of Vows of Continnence? They have no other places of Scripture to oppose against them, nor nothing to prove that this Gift of Continnence may be obtained by all that desire it, but that general Promise, that *whatsoever we ask of God, it shall be given us*; and they might from hence as well pretend, that all may obtain Power to work Miracles, or remove Mountains, or speak with Tongues, or obtain any such extraordinary and miraculous Gift by their Prayers, as this of Continnence; for that general Promise they know is to be bounded with some Limitations that will utterly cut off this peculiar Gift of Continnence, which God has no where promised to all Men, and at all Times, and which is no way necessary to their particular Salvation, or to the Edification of the Church, or promoting of Religion; for all those Ends may be as well attained by the lawful use of Marriage as without it: there may indeed be some special and peculiar occasion for to pray and expect this Gift, when other lawful and usual means fail, as in the case of long Absence, or sickness of either Party, or any other Infirmary which Providence may bring upon those who are married; then God will not be wanting in an extraordinary Assistance, where ordinary and common means do fail, *and will not suffer us to be tempted above what we are able*; which is another place as impertinently brought by them; but 'tis a great Presumption, and a down-right tempting of God, to neglect those means which he appoints, and depend upon an unpromised and an extraordinary Relief, that God is not obliged to afford us, and to run our selves into such Dangers and Temptations as we may easily avoid

void upon a groundless Belief, that God will endue us with an extraordinary Power to perform that which he no way requires of us.

It must first be proved, that these Vows are agreeable to the Divine Will, and that they are undertaken in pursuance to the Commands of Heaven, or else we have no reason to hope that God will grant us an extraordinary Power and special Grace to perform in them; but such rash and unadvised Snares, whereby we have intangled our selves, will only admonish us more fully of our own Weakness, Folly, and Temerity; and God may justly suffer us to fall, because we presumed too much, either upon our own Strength, or upon his unnecessary and extraordinary Assistance, where he had otherwise provided ordinary means.

Bellarmino * owns, that a Vow rashly undertaken, is that *Snare* which the Apostle speaks of, 1 *Cor.* 7. 35. * De Monach. l. 2. c. 29.

which he *would not cast upon* those whom he advises at that Time to continue unmarried; that is, he would not have them so resolve against it, as to run themselves into great Danger and Jeopardy, which they must certainly do, who without sufficient knowledg or trial of themselves, at those early Years of vowing, or of Priesthood, do intangle themselves with such a Vow or Obligation, as 'tis very uncertain whether they are ever able to perform. 'Tis a very difficult thing for any to know, especially at that Time, whether they have this Gift of Continence, and whether they shall always have it hereafter; and therefore to vow it, must be a sad intangling their-Consciences, and exposing themselves to manifold Temptations.

Bellarmino says, *A Will to make this Vow, is this Gift of Continence*; as if willing and doing were all one, and a Man had always a Power given him to do what he is

willing

willing to do, though it be neither necessary nor commanded. A Man may be very willing, and very glad and desirous, that he had all his bodily Passions, and lower Inclinations, in such perfect government and subjection, that they might never rise up in his Mind to disturb and disquiet the ease and composure of it; and that he might never have an angry any more than a lustful Passion: But whilst we carry this Body of Flesh and Blood about us, we must not expect to be wholly without the impressions and motions of it upon our Souls; and we must use all fit Means to prevent their being irregular, and betraying us to what is sinful and unlawful: And since many may find themselves in great danger, and under extream Temptations, without the Remedy of Marriage; and the Scripture assures us that all cannot contain, and commands rather to Marry than to Burn, and requires a Man to have his own Wife to prevent Fornication, when without this there is danger of it; 'tis very unsafe and unlawful to abridge either ones self, or any other, of what may be thus necessary for them: And since 'tis very difficult for any Man to know and be certain whether he shall never be under those Dangers and Temptations, therefore he ought not to bring himself under the obligation of a Vow, nor deprive himself of *that* liberty whereby it may be always free for him either to Marry, or not to Marry, as he pleases, and as he finds it most safe or most expedient for himself. We have a great many in our Universities and Colledges who live unmarried, and are required to do so in those places, but without any Vow, which is a most grievous and horrible Snare, that none ought to lay upon themselves or others, who consider the weakness and infirmity, or the necessities of Humane Nature, which God, who best

best knows, has sufficiently intimated to us in those places; *All cannot receive this saying, but those to whom it is given: Every Man hath his proper Gift, one after this manner, and another after that, &c.* Let us see how our Adversaries endeavour to avoid the force of those places; which must, by their own confession, ruin their whole Cause, if they prove, as they seem to do, very manifestly and fully, that the Gift of Continence is not to be had or obtained by all, and therefore ought not to be required, either by Law or by Vow.

They tell us then, that this is not the sense and meaning of those places, nor is any such thing to be deduced from a right translation, and a right understanding of them. For as to the first, *That all cannot receive this Saying, but those to whom it is given.* This they tell us is not rightly rendred, for the word *cannot* is not in the Original, but only *do not*; 'οὐ μὲν οὖν χωρεῖν, *Non omnes capiunt, All do not receive this Saying*; which will make a great alteration in the sense, and will take off the whole force of them against them: for they readily acknowledg that all do not receive that Saying, but they utterly deny that all cannot. Now we say that both the word *χωρεῖν* does mean and signify *cannot receive*, and that the context and design of our Saviour in those words do plainly and manifestly carry that meaning; *χωρεῖν* signifies to hold or receive, as a Vessel of such a measure holds so much; as a Bushel or a Sack, or a Bag, will hold so much Corn, or so much Mony: but when any of these are said not to hold or receive so much, the known meaning is, they are incapable of holding or receiving it, or they cannot hold and receive it, and so ἢ *χωρεῖν* should be rendred *non sunt capaces*.

or else *non capiunt* must be understood in that sense ; and it is plain our Saviour did so mean, because he immediately speaks of such as were uncapable, namely of Eunuchs that were so born or made so by Men ; and he adds at the latter part of the verse, *He that can receive it, let him receive it*, which necessarily supposes that some cannot ; and here the very word *δυνάμει*, *he that can*, is put in, so that there can be no cavilling for the want of it.

As to the second place, where St. Paul wishes that all were at that time like himself, unmarried, *But every one*, saith he, *hath his proper Gift, one after this manner, another after that* : To this they say, That Continnence is indeed the gift of God, but it is attainable by all by the Divine Grace and Assistance ; as Faith and Repentance is the gift of God, but all may by the Grace of God attain to them ; so no doubt they might to this Continnence, if that were as necessary to their Salvation as Faith and Repentance. But why does the Apostle call this a *proper Gift*, if it were common to all ? It would be a very good excuse to those who do not believe or repent, if the Scripture, when it advised us to those Duties, had said, *But every one hath his proper Gift, one after this manner, another after that*, as St. Paul does here when he advises them not to marry ; for that plainly supposes, that Marriage, as well as Continnence, is the Gift of God ; and that neither of them are given indifferently to all, but are peculiar to some, whom God hath by his Grace and Providence disposed and called to them.

As to the third ; *If they cannot contain, let them marry* : Here they cry out again of false translation, and that the word *cannot*, upon which the stress of all lies,

lies, is put into the Text, and that it ought to be translated only thus, *if they do not contain*; but the word ἐγκρατεύομαι, strictly and properly signifying, having power over one self, as the common and known Etymology of it shews; ἔχει ἐν κρατε, from whence ἐγκρατής, and so ἐγκρατεύω; those words ἐὰν οὐκ ἐγκρατεύομαι may, and ought to be rendred with the greatest exactness, *if they have not power over themselves*; or, which is all one, *if they cannot contain*; and what the Apostle adds in the next words, and the same verse, do fully make out this sense and meaning, if the word ἐγκρατεύομαι did not; *for it is better to Marry than to burn*, which shewed that they must either Marry or burn, and therefore that they could not contain.

The last place of giving the Virgin in Marriage, if need so require; nevertheless, he that standeth steadfast in his Heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own Will, and hath so decreed in his Heart that he will keep his Virgin, doth well. This, saith Bellarmin, may be understood either of a Man's own Virginitie, or of some Virgin under his power and disposal, as his Daughter, or one that is betrothed to him; if by Virgin there be meant Virginitie, as St. Hierom, by Bellarmine's Confession, understood it. And the Apostle seems to speak of the Person himself, who is to give his Virgin in Marriage, *that he standeth steadfast in his Heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own Will, and hath so decreed in his Heart that he will keep his Virgin*, which could hardly be said of a Father, or any one in respect of anothers Virginitie; but only what by experience and knowledg of himself, he may determine of his own; if the words be so meant, as

they seem most fairly to be, though *Bellarmino*, without bringing any Reasons to the contrary, will by no means allow it; then they are very clear and evident, that this Virginal Continnence cannot be observed by all, but only by him *who stands fast in his Heart, and hath no necessity*; which shews, that there is sometimes necessity to the contrary, and that every one hath not always power over his own Will; nor can, though he be willing, resolve or vow not to Marry; and though this be not an absolute Necessity, as *Bellarmino* says, but only a conditional one, yet considering the weakness and infirmity of Humane Nature, and the strength and violence of those Passions which dispose it to Marriage, and the many dangers and temptations it may be otherwise exposed to, 'tis such a Necessity as no Man can wisely and safely struggle and contend withal. But if this place be meant of marrying, either a Daughter, or a Virgin betrothed, as most Interpreters understand it, though those words in the 37. v. *Nevertheless, he that standeth stedfast in his Heart*, seem plainly to carry it for the other Sense, and to have nothing of that force in them without it, which the Apostle lays upon them, especially if they are understood of a Daughter, and not of a Virgin betrothed to a Man's self; yet however, let the Virgin be whoever she will, it is plain *that need doth sometimes require*, and that there may be *a necessity* for giving her in marriage: But this, says *Bellarmino*, may be some other extrinsecal Necessity, not the Necessity of Marriage, for the want of the gift of Continency; but what Necessity that can be is very hard for him to guess, but it is very easy to see that the Apostle means no other, but such as was necessary

cessary to avoid *Burning*, and *Fornication*, throughout that whole Chapter. The foundation therefore of their perpetual and vowed Continnence, to wit, that it is a common Gift attainable by all that desire it, is wholly taken away, and appears to be plainly and expressly contrary to Scripture, which determines, *That all cannot receive this saying; and that all cannot contain, but only those to whom it is given; and that every one hath his proper gift, one after this manner, and another after that.*

I come now to consider, Whether it be not lawful for those to marry who have not this Gift of Continnency, notwithstanding any Vow or Church-Law to the contrary? Against this they bring all those places of Scripture for performing of Vows; *Vow and pay unto the Lord their God, Psal. 76. 11. Pay thy Vows unto the most High, Psal. 50. 14. When thou vowest a Vow unto God, defer not to pay it: Better is it that thou shouldst not vow, than that thou shouldst vow and not pay, Eccles. 5. 4, 5. If a Man vow a Vow unto the Lord, or swear an Oath to bind his Soul with a Bond, he shall not break his Word, he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his Mouth, Numb. 30. 2. When thou shalt vow a Vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it; for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee; and it would be Sin in thee. That which is gone out of thy Lips, thou shalt keep and perform, even a free-will Offering according as thou hast vowed unto the Lord thy God, which thou hast promised with thy Mouth, Deut. 23. 21, 23. And in the New Testament, the younger Widows, who, being under a Vow to the contrary, married, are by St. Paul said to have Dam-*

nation,

*nation, because they have cast off their first Faith, 1 Tim. 5. 12. So that they exclaim most tragically against those Persons, who in the beginning of the Reformation, married, after they had been in Orders in the Roman Church, and so taken this Vow of Continen- ce upon them, as the most filthy and perjured Persons, and the most shameful Vow-breakers, and Violators of what is the most sacred, and the most binding and obliging that can be. To which we give this plain and short Answer; That though all Vows lawfully made are to be observed, according to those places of Scripture brought by them, yet these Vows of Continen- ce are not lawfully made by those who have not the Gift of Continen- ce, as I have proved all have not; and therefore in such a case they do not oblige, because there is a prior and antecedent Obligation to marry in such Persons who find themselves under great Dangers and Temptations without doing so; and this plainly according to those Rules and Commands of Scripture, *It is better to marry than to burn*; and, *to avoid Fornication, let every Man have his own Wife*; and, *if they cannot contain, let them marry*; and *I will that the younger Widows marry*, tho they were as much under a Vow as those who are said to have *Damnation, because they have cast off their first Faith*. But I have largely considered that place before, which is the only one which they can pretend to bring for marrying after vowing Continen- ce; but how little serviceable it is to any such purpose, I have fully shewed. Indeed there are no such things as Vows to be found in the New Testament; they seem for some particular Reasons to be peculiar to a former more imperfect Dispensation than that under*

der

der the Gospel, where there is no instance to be found of vowing, or promising that to God which we are not otherwise obliged to; for that, according to our Adversaries, is the strict notion of a Vow. That which seems to look the fairest for it, is that of *Ananias* and *Saphira*, who may be supposed to have devoted all their Estate to God; and therefore to have been so severely punish'd because they sacrilegiously kept back part of what they had so vowed; but there appears no proof or evidence of a Vow in that matter: for St. *Peter* tells him, *While it remained it was his own, and after it was sold it was in his own power*, which it could not have been had it been vowed or devoted; but their horrid Dissimulation, and lying to the Holy Ghost, and offering to deceive the Apostles, as if they had not been inspired with it, was a sufficient Aggravation of their Crime, and justifying of their Punishment; without any additional breach of a Vow. As to the first Christians leaving all that they had, Lands, and Houses, and Possessions, this they did without any Vow of Poverty, as our Adversaries weakly pretend; for this was not a perfectly free and voluntary Act in them, but what was absolutely necessary at that time when they could not hold their Estates and their Christianity together; neither was the forsaking their Wives then, any more the effect of a Vow, as 'tis sometimes made also by those who want better Arguments to prove their Vows of Continnence, than the forsaking Father and Mother, and all other Relations, which was only a hard Circumstance that they were unwillingly forced to in those Pressures and Difficulties; and they may as well make going
to

to Prison, and being whipped and scourged, to be matter of a Vow, and Counsels of higher Perfection, as well as those other parts of their Sufferings and Persecutions. But however lawful it may be to make Vows under the Gospel in some cases, which I cannot say are universally to be disallowed; as *Peter Martyr* seems to be of Opinion in his excellent Book, *De Votis contra Smithanum*; tho there be no Instances of them to be found in the Gospel, nor no Command about them, for I take them to belong to Natural Religion, and not to be peculiar to the Jewish Oeconomy; and therefore we find *Jacob* and the Patriarchs so often making Vows to God before the Law; yet it is neither lawful to make such rash Vows, as the Priests and others of the Church of *Rome* are supposed to do, of perpetual Continence, neither is it always necessary to observe them; 'tis a case indeed which falls not under a particular Instance or Resolution of Scripture, because there is no Example of any such Vow there to be met with; for I take not the Church-Widows in *1 Tim. 5.* to be under any such Vow, but if they were, *St. Paul's* Determination is clear for the younger to marry, notwithstanding that; but there are other plain and general Rules, by which it may be certainly and easily determined, as those I mentioned: *It is better to marry than to burn; and if they cannot contain, let them marry; and to avoid Fornication, let every Man have his own Wife.* These plainly declare Marriage to be necessary in such cases, and then no Vow can oblige against it, nor can any Man by a voluntary Tie bind himself to that which is contrary to what God has by an Antecedent Necessity

*

cessity and Prior Obligation bound him to, nor ought any Man to commit a Sin, or to hazard and endanger himself with great Temptations upon the score of any such rash and unadvised Vow, which is the Opinion and Determination of St. *Cyprian*, St. *Austin*, *Epiphanius*, and other of the Fathers agreeable to those Rules of Scripture, and the Consequence of right Reason drawn from them, as may be seen in a late excellent Treatise of the Celibacy of the Clergy *.

* Pag. 44. 49.

Bellarmino perceiving the plain Disadvantage of those Scriptural Directions to his Cause, and to an Opinion that seemed so evidently contrary to them, uses all his Art and Sophistry to shift them off and evade them, and because he must unavoidably meet with them and engage them, he bears up very boldly to them, and does all he can to break the force of them; *First*, says he, *I assert that in none of those places, those are called to Marriage who are tempted by the Sting of the Flesh, but only those who live incontinently, so as to pollute themselves with Lewdness. Secondly, I assert, that those who do live incontinently, are not yet called to Marriage by an absolute Command, but only an easy Remedy is shown them, and an Haven as it were, into which they may betake themselves; but yet that it is still free to them to aspire to greater things. Thirdly, I assert, (for 'tis the Confidence of the Assertion must do the business, and serve instead of Reason) That this Counsel, or Permission, or Remedy is not given by the Apostle to those who have vowed Continence, but only to those who are loose and free.*

Bell. de Monach. l. 2. c. 30.

I shall examine these Assertions distinctly.

First, then, by Burning, he will have meant not the strongest Ardors of Natural Concupiscence, nor the

5 R

fiercest

fiercest inward Fires of Lust, nor any the most violent and insuperable Inclinations whatever ; but only actual Incontinence and Fornication ; and when they are broke out into this, then the Apostle's advice takes place, *It is better to marry than to burn* ; that is, than to live in Fornication and Incontinence. But must a Man then stay till he has actually bin guilty of those Sins ? and though he feels himself under the greatest Ustions, is he not obliged by this Advice of the Apostle, till they are broke forth into the utmost Act of Lewdness and Wickedness ? This would be letting the Fire be unquench'd till it has burnt down the House, and then bringing the Engin to stop it : this may hinder indeed its spreading further, and may restrain any further acts of Sin ; but 'tis much better to prevent all : And 'tis that we are obliged to by those words, and which no doubt the Apostle intended ; and a Christian who knows every such wilful Sin to be damnable, and to put him into an ill state, ought not to run so much hazard, nor to venture his Soul upon such great Peril and Jeopardy, when he is sensible of the strong and violent Temptations he is daily exposed to. For though the first Motions of Concupiscence, *er*ich are as natural as those of Thirst and Hunger, may not be sinful in themselves, nor can have any guilt in them till the Will is brought some way or other to consent to them ; yet when they frequently annoy and disturb the Mind, and indispose it for Spiritual and Religious Duties, by having the Imaginations filled with impure Fancies and *Ideas*, and the Brain clouded and overcast with the Storins and Vapours rising from the Flesh ; this is so plain an Indication of the Disease that it sufficiently

ciently directs to the proper Cure of it, which is Marriage; and to suppose the Apostle not to prescribe that, when he tells us, *it is better to marry than to burn*, till this is gone so far as to the Commission of some Acts of Fornication or Uncleanness, is to make him, like an unskilful Physician, not to prescribe the Remedy till the Disease is become Mortal, and the Person is destroyed by it, for want of the timely use of that which might have prevented it.

Bellarmino compares Marriage to a Haven, into which, according to him, tho a Man be tost never so much with the storms of Lust, and be in never such great danger of being cast away by them, yet he is not bound to betake himself, till he is actually Shipwrack'd: Which how far it is from the Apostle's Mind and Advice given in those words, I may leave any Man to judg, who has not too light thoughts of Fornication, and too hard ones of Marriage. But now if a Person, under this Vow of Continnence, shall yet burn in *Bellarmino's* Sense, *i. e.* shall be actually guilty of Incontinence and Fornication, is it not then better for him to marry, than thus to burn? And does not the Apostle's Direction then reach him, and oblige him to marry, rather than thus to burn, notwithstanding his Vow? If this were allowed to be the meaning of the word, then sure he must be acquitted of his Vow, and it must be owned to be better for him to marry than to burn; for burning in this sense, that is, by actual Incontinence and Fornication, is, I hope, as much against his Vow, and as great an evil as marrying. No, this great Man will by no means allow that; for tho he cannot but own it to be against the Vow, yet not in

so high a degree, nor so much Evil in it self as Marriage.

This he positively avers: and tho both of these be evil, both to marry and to burn, i. e. to fornicate, yet he declares it to be a worse evil to marry, however their Ad-

* Nam utrumque est malum, & nubere, & uri imò pejus est nubere, quicquid reclamant Adversarii, præsertim ei, quæ habet votum solenne. *Bellarmin. de Monach. l. 2. c. 30.*

† Nam qui uritur—peccat solum contra temperantiam & votum, si fornicationem significat, quæ vero nubit post solenne votum, peccat contra temperantiam, contra votum, & contra ipsum conjugium, cum sub nomine conjugii tegat perpetuum sacrilegium. *Ibid.*

versaries exclaim against it, especially to one that has made a solemn Vow*; for the Person which is guilty of Burning, as it signifies Fornication, sins only against Temperance, and against the Vow; but she who marries †, (or he either, I suppose, for there can be no difference in the Sex, to make any alteration in the Case) after a solemn Vow, (which though it be not made by the Priests, yet is by the Monks as well as the Nuns) sins both against Temperance, and a Vow, and also against Marriage it self; when under the name of

- *Marriage she covers a perpetual Sacrilege.* This distinction of a solemn and simple Vow, which is common amongst them, depends only upon some outward Forms and Solemnities in making it, but signifies nothing to the intrinsecal Obligation of it, no more than the taking an Oath publicly before a Court, adds any thing more to the binding power and force of it, than if it were done privately. But *Bellarmin* goes on, and roundly pronounces, *That if one marry after a simple Vow, though the Marriage be true, (which they deny after a solemn Vow) yet she sinneth more in some sort than if she fornicateth, because she renders her self unable to keep her Vow, which she who*

Quæ solum nubit post votum simplex, illa verum matrimonium contrahit, tamen aliquò modo magis peccat quam quæ fornicatur, quia reddit se impotentem ad servandum votum quod non facit, quæ fornicatur. *Ibid.*

who fornicateth doth not. Which is so scandalous an Assertion, and such a preferring one of the greatest moral Evils that God has forbidden, to marriage which is God's own Ordinance and Institution; that I bring it here not to confute it, (which it needs not among any that have a sense of Religion) but to shame it, and to spread confusion upon such Persons, and such a Cause, that are driven to say this, to defend it.

This *Bellarmino* was forced to, to maintain his Third Assertion, to wit, That those Rules and Directions of the Apostle, *It is better to marry than to burn; and if they cannot contain, let them marry,* do not belong to those who are under a Vow, but only to those who are free and loose from it. But where does the Apostle make any such Exception? Are not those Rules given generally to all, without a particular limitation to any? And does not the very Reason of them take in all Persons whatsoever, so that whoever burns, it is better for them to marry than to do so; and whoever cannot contain, let them marry?

Ay but this after all *is but a Permission*, says he, not a Command; *there is no Command to marry in all those places, for the form of speaking is not imperative*; for the Apostle does not use that Mood in his words; and he gives a Reason, which shows he is not making a Law, for *it is better to marry than to burn*. Here our great Man plays the Grammaticaster as bad as he did the Divine before, for sure there

* Volo junio-
res nubere.
Vulg. Lat.

ἢ ἄλλο ἰουαῖον.
ἢ ἄλλο ἰουαῖον.

there may be a Command given without an Imperative Mood, as in what is very much to our present purpose, *I will that the younger marry* * ; and a Command, I hope, is not spoil'd, but enforced, by having a Reason given of it: And yet to please him, the Apostle has put it in the Imperative Mood; *Nevertheless, to avoid Fornication, let every Man have his own Wife.* And if these be not such Rules as amount to a Command in such and such Cases; to wit, that if Persons cannot contain, they should marry; then there is no Command in Scripture against burning in *Bellarmino's* Sense, or to avoid Fornication, or not to run our selves into danger and temptation. For my part, I cannot but think this to be sufficient to oblige a Man to make use of a lawful means to secure himself against what may put him into so great peril and hazard of his Salvation: And were I a Priest of the Church of *Rome*, and found my self under those Burnings that disturbed both Body and Mind, I would not in the least doubt to marry, notwithstanding any supposed Vow, or any Law of the Church to the contrary, but rather think my self obliged to do so, than to tempt God, and endanger my Soul by nourishing an inward Fire, whose sooty Flame sullied a Man's Thoughts, and fouled his Imagination, till it was stifled, and when it usefully broke forth, which it was ready to do upon every occasion, would be infinitely mischievous and destructive, both to my self and others: and therefore though it be one of the greatest Charges and Imputations brought by our Adversaries against some

ct

of the first Reformers, that they married after they had been in Popish Orders, and took to themselves Wives upon their forsaking that Church; which their Enemies aggravate to the highest degree of Wickedness; and some of their Friends excuse by no softer a word than those of a blamable Imprudence. Yet I think they are capable of so full a Vindication, that they may not deserve in the least to be either censured or condemned for so doing; for though the light breach of a Vow be justly accounted a very great Fault, and that which is to free and excuse from it, is a confession and acknowledgment of a great Weakness, which has something of Shame, though nothing of Sin joined with it; so that the ignominious Character of Lustful and Vow-breaker is put together, and clapt as a Mark of the greatest Infamy upon them; though one saying of Scripture does wholly wipe it out, *Marriage is honourable, and the Bed undefiled*; and what follows, does stigmatize generally those who bring it, *but Whoremongers and Adulterers God will judge*, yet to clear those worthy and good Men, and to be just to the Church of Rome, which needs not to have a greater Load laid upon it than it deserves; I must own that it does not impose any such Vow of Continence upon its Priests or Clergy; nor is there any such thing made by them, or required of them in their Ordination, or at any other time, as this Vow of perpetual Continence.

But why then do we charge them with this? and why

why do we so grossly misrepresent them in this Point?

I answer, That they misrepresent themselves, and endeavour all they can to prove there is a Vow where there is really none, and so to make their Church more Tyrannical, and themselves worse than they really are; and here we are willing to come in and vindicate them even against themselves.

There is no such Vow mentioned or expressed in their Ritual or Ordinal, nor is any such thing put to the Clergy, or made by them in any of their Forms of Ordination; but they would have an *Implied* and *Interpretative* Vow then made, and they would some of them suppose this to be annexed to Orders even by Divine Right, so that it is always inseparable from them: But then how could a Bishop, or a Priest, or a Deacon have been ever the Husband of one Wife, even in the Apostles time, as *St. Paul* supposes them to be beyond all Contradiction? The more moderate therefore amongst them will have it annexed only by an Ecclesiastical Law. But how a Vow can be annexed to Orders, without the Person's making such a Vow who is ordained, I cannot understand? For a Vow is a free and voluntary Act of him that voweth; so that were the matter of it never so necessary and obliging, yet it is not bound upon us by a Vow, till we our selves do freely and voluntarily make it; there may be other Obligations arising from the nature of the thing, or the Command of a Superior; but for the Obligation of a Vow or a Promise (for a Vow is but a Promise to God)

God) that none can bring upon us but our selves; so that were a Priest obliged to this perpetual Continnence by never so many Laws, either of God or Man, yet he were not obliged to it by the additional force of a Vow, till he had by his own Act freely made it; for I think it is as plain a Contradiction, to say a Man vows what he does not vow, as to will what he does not will, or to say what he does not say; so that this Interpretative and implied Vow will at last come to no Vow at all. The Writers of the Church of *Rome*, as in most other cases, they are forced to soften their Doctrines by palliating Abatements and Extenuations, so in this they over-rigorously strain and press, it on the other side, and make it a great deal harder than it in truth is, or ought to be; so that they can both condense and rarify them as they see fit, and shrink or stretch them as is most convenient for their purpose. It had been very easy for the Church of *Rome* to have put in an express Vow of Continnence into their Offices of Ordination, and to have obliged all the four Superior Orders to have actually made them, had not the Scandal and Novelty of it hindred them from so doing, or had they not believed it impossible to have found out a sufficient number who would have been ordained upon such hard terms; for with how much Struggle and Opposition this Tyrannical and Unreasonable Law gained upon the Western Clergy in all places is very well known, but falls not under my present Province to relate; for I doubt not but to this day a great many of the best of the Roman Clergy are secretly married, as the *Bavarian* Embassador gave it in to the Council of *Trent* for the Clergy of his

Time and Country; and what the worst of them do has been in all Ages very well known, and very loudly complained of: for after all, there is no such thing as a Vow to restrain the Romish Clergy, meerly as such, from marrying, without entring into Monastick Vows, and 'tis only an Ecclesiastical Law, at most, not of the whole Church, but only of their own, that forbids and prohibits this; and I can by no means allow the Universal Church, much less a particular one, as that of *Rome*, to have a sufficient Power to make any such Law contrary to the natural Freedom and Liberty which God has left all Men in, much more contrary to that necessity which he may put upon some Men who *cannot contain, nor are able to receive that saying*, and in a word, such a Power as is not for *Edification*, but for *Destruction*, which is a standing limit and boundary to all Ecclesiastical Power, that it must never exceed or transgress. But I design not here to meddle with that Subject, tho' it lie something in my way, because it would lead me a great deal further than I am to go at this time; nor had it been at all necessary, to consider and examine their Pretences from Scripture for their Vows of Continence, had they no otherwise imposed them upon their Monks, and Nuns, and Regulars, than they do upon the Clergy, who I think do neither make them, nor are required to do so by any Constitution even in the Church of *Rome* it self; and therefore I hope I shall be the more easily pardon'd for laying open the true faults of the Church of *Rome*, when they see I am so willing to excuse and vindicate her in a matter wherein I think she is over-charged, and that I

am

am so far from any Misrepresentation of her, which they sometimes are pleased to charge us with, that I have taken all the care I can she should not misrepresent her self by a pretended Vow of Continence, which she no where obliges her Clergy to make, and which they themselves, one would guess, do not think they are under any very great Obligation to observe, either by an Implied and Interpretative Vow, or by any Law of their Church, which are both equally null and void in themselves.

T H E E N D.

E R R A T A.

PAge 779. line 21. for *improbable*, read *improbable*.
P. 798. l. 28. f. *for*, r. *against*.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for *Richard Chiswel* at the *Rose and Crown*
in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, 1688.

ANNALS

OF THE

ROYAL SOCIETY OF LONDON

1880

PRINTED BY RICHARD CLAY AND COMPANY, BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

The **T**EXTS examined which *Papists*
cite out of the *Bible* for the
Proof of their Doctrine

-CONCERNING

The Visibily of the Church.

By *John Samuel Rebbury*

IMPRIMATUR.

Nov. 23. 1688.

Guil. Needham.

IN that part of the Controversy which we have with those of the Church of *Rome*, under this Head of the *Visibily of the Church*, it is absolutely necessary to state the Case with all clearness imaginable; because by doing this, it will on the one side appear, that those *Texts* which are cited by the *Romanists*, have no other Concern than with the *Church Militant* here on Earth, generally considered: And on the other side, that those of the Learned *Protestants* that have defended the *Invisibily* of the Church, have mainly refug'd themselves under the Notion of the *Church Universal*. For this is certain, if this be the Definition of the Church, that it is *Cetus Fidelium*, or, *the Company of the Faithful*, that is, the Company of all those that are already possess'd of their Eternal Happiness with God, and of all those

that are now in the way toward that Happiness; as also of those who to the End of the World shall be ever-call'd to the obtainment of it; if, I say, we take all this in, as necessary to the Definition of the *Church*, then, all the Proofs of Scripture that are brought to argue the diffusiveness, and most glorious Figure the *Church* hath made in this World, are impertinent to the purpose, as to its *Visibility*; because, as to that part of it which is in Heaven, and as to that part of it which is not yet in being, only in the Eternal Purpose of God, it must still be to *Us* invisible; neither can it possibly be suppos'd (under this Notion) as one common Society united under any one mortal Man as its *vicarious* and substituted Head, or indeed under any other Government than that which the Blessed *Jesus*, the Lord of all, universally maintains.

Again, if the Notion of the *Church* were to be limited (as some have done) to those only who from Eternity were Elect and Predestinate, and in Time are effectually call'd by the Spirit of God, and inwardly endu'd with those Graces and Vertues that are necessary to qualify for everlasting Happiness; then also, there is no possible Proof can be alledg'd to make the *Church* (thus consider'd) in any Age *Visible*; because God only knows the Hearts, and tries the Spirits: These Graces are inward, and however they may and will (according to the Notion such have) unavoidably exert themselves in most excellent Fruits of a good Life; yet they are such as may be so counterfeited by the Hypocrite, that they cannot be always distinguish'd, but by the All-seeing Eye that discerns into the very Root and Principle of all. So that, under either of these Notions, the *Church* is *invisible*, nor can it possibly be otherwise. And thus

consider'd (as some have rightly observ'd) the *Church* is the Subject of our Faith, and not our Sight; to which therefore they have apply'd that Article in the Apostles Creed, *I believe the Holy Catholick Church*; that is, tho I cannot possibly see it as it is *Catholick* and *Universal*, yet I believe it.

There is no Question, but as to the Notion of the *Church* in general, it is, (as *Bellarmino* himself expresseth it, deriving it from the word *ἐκκλησία*, *Cætus Vocatorum*) the whole Company of the Faithful, or those that are called to the knowledg, and belief, and profession of the Truth: But then, as I have said, 'tis as certain, that the *Church*, thus consider'd, is *invisible*. For tho the Persons, who in their Turns upon the Stage of this World, have or do embrace the Truth, who are baptiz'd into, and live in the profession of it, tho these may be actually seen, and known, and convers'd with, and link'd into one common and *visible* Society; yet, take the *Church* in its *aggregate Sense*, as the whole Company of those that have, or do, or shall thus profess, as so it must needs be *invisible*, unless to that Eye only that can see all things, *uno actu & intuitu*, by one act and view:

That therefore in which this part of the Controversy is concern'd, is the *Church* indeed; but it is that part of the *Church* only, which we express by the *Church Militant*. And it is the *Cardinal's* own Title, when he enters upon this Dispute; *De Ecclesiâ Militante*; that is, that part of the Church that is conversant in this World, that have embrac'd the Faith of the Gospel, that have taken up the Profession of it, and do maintain this Profession in the use of the Holy Rites and Sacraments which Christ hath instituted and commanded to be observ'd. And here one would

Bell. de Eccl.
Milit. lib. 3.
cap. 1.

think, that the Question between us should be, Whether the Visibility of the Church, as thus consider'd, is not so firmly assur'd to us in the Holy Scriptures, as that there neither hath been, nor ever will be any one part of Time or Age, wherein there shall not be a *visible* Society of Men professing the True Faith, and maintaining the True Religion in Doctrine and Worship, as it hath been taught and establish'd by Christ and his Apostles; or, whether it is possible for the Church, in any the least space of Time, from its first rise and beginning, to the end and consummation of the World, wholly and entirely to fail? But this is not the Question; tho' the *Papists* would sometimes in their *Anguings* seem to make it so: And some *Protestants* (at least as to any publick or visible profession of the Truth) have seem'd to own and maintain that there hath been, or may be such an entire *defection* in the Church, as that it may have even universally fallen off as to some of the very Fundamentals in Christianity.

As to this, taking the Question in its due latitude, there is *really* no Controversy betwixt the Church of Rome and Us. For as the *Romanists* will not content themselves with some little reserv'd number of Men professing the Truth, that that should go under the stile or Notion of the Church; so the *Protestants* on the other side, however some in the warmth of Dispute, or the *bias*s of Contradiction may have given themselves too great a liberty in asserting the *Defectibility* of the Church; yet in their sober Reasonings, there are none possibly of the Writers, nor indeed of the whole Reform'd Communion, that rightly understand *what they say, or whereof they affirm*, but do so securely depend upon the Truth and Faithful-

ness

ness of Christ's blessed Promises to his Church, as to assure themselves, that there always were, and always will be a *visible* part of Mankind that shall profess his Truth. *Visible* (I say) not perhaps in any glorious Splendor, or with external Pomp or Observation; Christ himself never design'd to make that an inseparable Note of his Church, as appears when he tells us, that *the Kingdom of God comes not with Observation*: But *visible* so, as that it may be apparently discern'd by those that will not shut their Eyes, even by such as (if I may so express it) are themselves *without*, and much more by those who are of the same Faith and Communion. This indeed, those places in the Scripture give us just ground to hope and believe, that tell us, that upon that Confession St. Peter had made, *Christ would build his Church, and the Gates of Hell should not prevail against it; that he would be with them to the End of the World.* And that, *where two or three are gathered together in his Name, he will be in the midst of them.* It is so small a number as two or three will make a gathering together, and that smallest Collection of Men, is Christ ready to own as his Church, by *being in the midst of them.* The Church is therefore call'd *the Pillar and Ground of Truth*, and the Apostle tells us, *the Foundation of God's Church sure, having this Seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his.*

Luke xvii. 20:

Math. xvi. 18.

Mat. xxviii. 20.

Mat. xviii. 10.

1 Tim. iii. 15.

2 Tim. ii. 19.

Herein, I say, we may be suppos'd to agree with our Adversaries; that the Church, generally speaking, neither ever did, nor ever will, as to the Fundamentals of Christianity, totally and entirely fail, but in one part of the World or other, will in every Age maintain even its *Visibility* to the End and Consummation of all things. When the *Arrian* Heresy had so far prevail'd that it became proverbial, *Athanagus contra*

Mundum

Mundum, & Mundus contra Athanasium: Athanasius against the World, and the World against Athanasius: it is true, so far as that Heresy prevail'd, there was an absolute Defection in some of the Essentials of a Christian Church, and that Defection was of vast Extent, and look'd something like Universal, when they had gain'd over to themselves the Secular Power to encourage and cover them: But yet, even then all Church-Histories agree in considerable numbers of Bishops, and Fathers, and their Churches, who were contemporary with Athanasius, and maintain'd the Orthodox Faith with all clearness and steadfastness against all the Subtilty or Cruelty of their Enemies. So I may add as to the Church of Rome, it is not to be deny'd but the very Fundamentals of Christianity, as they are summ'd up in that which we call the Apostles and the Nicene Creed, they are still kept up and profess, and have always so been, tho miserably blended with many impious and impure, both Doctrines and Usages, which for some hundreds of Years have been creeping in, and are now in their full height, being of that Quality, that tho they do not directly and immediately cut them off from all Title to a Christian Church, yet ex consequenti, mediately and by necessary Consequence they seem to strike at and overthrow the Foundation of Faith, and that so far that it absolutely binds and obliges all Persons that know and are aware of it, upon pain of Damnation, to separate from her, in such Faith and such Practices. Such, for instance, as their Doctrines of Merits, Transubstantiation, Sacrifice of the Mass, praying to Saints and Angels, the worshipping of Images, the Obscurity of the Scriptures, Purgatory, with some others. And yet, even as to this part of that Church's Apostacy, were

it

it not something foreign to the design of these Papers, it might be fairly enough made out, that in all Ages, by the Confession of their own several *Writers* and *Historians*, there have still appear'd, sometimes whole Communities of People, and other times particular Persons of fam'd Learning, remarkable Piety, and strong Interest in the World, who have either noted and complain'd of, or openly oppos'd and resisted, at least dissented and kept themselves free from the Errors, Corruptions, and Superstitions, as they sprung and grew up in the Times wherein they liv'd.

This therefore is not the Question really betwixt the Church of *Rome* and *Us*, Whether the *Church* may in any Age so entirely fail as to become no where *visible*? But that which is plainly in dispute, and that which our Adversaries would pretend under this Head of the *Visibility of the Church* to prove from the *many Texts of Scripture* which they alledge, is this, *viz.* That it is necessary, from the Prophecies in the Old Testament, and the Promises that Christ and his Apostles have left with us in the New Testament, that the Church should in all Ages appear in its just Splendor, Diffusiveness, Succession, and regulated Form, in the Visible Profession of its Faith, and uniform use of its Sacraments, under its stated Governors and Pastors, subordinate to one Monarch or Head of the Church thus constituted. And that the Church of *Rome* hath throughout all Ages appeared thus *visible*, and was *that Church* thus pointed out by Prophecies of old, secured by infallible Promises, and could *digito monstrari*, be always shown and view'd in its Succession, in its Numbers, and in its Visible Head, and Monarch under Christ, whose Vicar he

is,

is, *viz.* the Pope or Bishop of Rome: That this, and no other, is the State of the Question, may be made out from all or most of the *Romish* Writers, both from the Definitions they give of *their* Church, the drift of their Arguments, and the scorn they generally throw upon the *Reform'd* Church, charging it with Novelty, slenderness of Number, weakness of Interest, and want of Succession. I shall pitch upon *Bellarmin*, and observe it from the Definition he gives us of the Church when he is setting himself to argue its *Visibility* from Scriptures, Reason, and the Fathers. His Definition is this, * *It is a Company of Men knit together in the Profession of the same Faith; the Communion of the same Sacraments, and under the Government of lawful Pastors, especially of that one Vicar of Christ upon the Earth, the Bishop of Rome.*

* Nostra autem sententia est, Ecclesiam unam tantum esse & non duas, & illam unam & veram, esse certum hominum ejusdem Christianæ Fidei Professione, & eorundem Sacramentorum Communione colligatum, sub regimine legitimorum Pastorum, ac præcipue Unius Christi in terris Vicarii Romani Pontificis. *Bell. de Eccles. Abbat. lib. 3. cap. 2.*

colligatum, sub regimine legitimorum Pastorum, ac præcipue Unius Christi in terris Vicarii Romani Pontificis. *Bell. de Eccles. Abbat. lib. 3. cap. 2.*

This is his Definition, and this we are to suppose he sticks to in all the Proofs that himself, or indeed after him the *Catholic* Scripamist, and the Author of the *Tauch-stone of the Reformed Gospel* do alledge to justify it. So that he and they make the Church of Rome, as comprehended in its numerous Communion, and as govern'd under its splendid and glorious Head and Monarch, the *Bishop of Rome*, to be *the One and True Church*, and wholly the Subject of those *Tears* which they cite, either from the Prophets of Old, or from the New Testament. In considering of which, it will not be amiss to shew,

I. That

I. That it is not in the stile or usual manner of describing the Church, especially in the Books of the New Testament, to insist much upon the Numbers, or the outward Pomp and Splendor of the Church, but rather to the contrary.

II. That none of those places of Scripture which either the *Cardinal*, or the *Touch-stone of the Reformed Gospel*, or the *Catholic Scripturist* have cited, do prove any thing of the *Visibility of the Church*, as suppos'd (in *Bellarmino's* Definition) under the Government of *one Visible Head, Christ's Vicar upon Earth, the Bishop of Rome.*

I. The first I shall touch at but briefly, *viz.* That it is not in the stile or usual manner of the Scriptures, especially of the Books of the New Testament, in describing the Church, to insist much upon the Numbers, or outward Pomp and Splendor of the Church, but rather to the contrary. I confess, many of the Prophecies in the Old Testament, and those particularly which the *Catholic Scripturist* hath mustered up in such plenty, do speak of Glorious Things that should in time befall the Church; but these (as shall be shewn in their proper place) are generally to be understood of the vast diffusiveness of the Gospel, that it should run through all Nations, should shine into the darkest and most distant Corners of the World; or else they respect the Spiritual, and not the Carnal or Temporal Estate of the Church; or else they are restrain'd, some of them, meerly to the recovery of the Jewish State from its Captivity, toward whom such kind of Ex-

Cath. Script.
3 Points

preffions were proper and accommodate to their Oeconomy; or, in a word, may point at the last upshot and consummation of the Church. Otherwise, in almost all the Passages that concern the Church in the Books of the New Testament, she is generally describ'd in another kind of stile. Our Saviour calls them by the name of *a little Flock*. He discourseth them continually under the supposal of Persecution and Poverty, great hardships of Life, perfect scorn and contempt in this World, &c. He never so much as hints to St. Peter the Grandure of his Successor, the Riches of his See, the Extent of his Dominion, his Supremacy over Kings and Emperors, or the uncontrollable Interest he should have with so many States and Principalities in the World. But when the Apostles were contesting a little Superiority amongst themselves, he checks the Dispute as fond, and foreign to their Character; he reproaches them for affecting what might become only the Heathen Potentates and Great Ones in the World, who were then making Power and Extent of Government their main Design and Endeavour. *He said unto them, The Kings of the Gentiles exercise Lordship over them—— But ye shall not be so; but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger, and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.* Nay, the Apostle St. Paul speaks of himself, and those who in common with him, bore the mighty Character of *Apostles*, and *first Publishers* of the Gospel, that they are *made as the Filth of the World; and the Off-scouring of all Things unto this Day.* We are told indeed of the falling away of the Church in a great part of it, and that part of the *Apostacy* is; I confess, set forth to us in some splendor; when *the Man of Sin shall be revealed,*

Luke xii. 32.

Luke xxii. 24,
25, 26.

1 Cor. iv. 13.

vealed, the Son of Perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, and is worshipp'd: So that he as God sitteth in the Temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. This Text of Scripture (if they please to accept of it) we heartily allow them for the proof of *their Church* and its *Visibility* for many Ages. 2 Theff. ii. 3, 4.

But to proceed; We find in the Book of the *Revelation of St. John*, a Book wherein the *Romanists* themselves will acknowledg that some great *Revolutions* of the Church are determinately set down; there the Church is represented under the Character of a *Woman flying into the Wilderness*, fed and maintain'd there by the mere Providence of God. It is true, she is describ'd in terms that proclaim her great and illustrious enough; *she is clothed with the Sun*, she hath the *Moon under her Feet*, and upon her Head a *Crown of twelve Stars*. Revel. xii. 6. But all this points plainly at her *Spiritual State*: and as she is suppos'd to be elevated above this World and all *sublunary Things*: Whereas the *Apostatiz'd* part of Mankind, set up in opposition to the True Church, is described under the Character of a *Woman* too, but in a very gaudy Dress: She is *array'd in Purple and Scarlet-colour*, and *deck'd with Gold and precious Stones and Pearls*, with a *golden Cup in her Hand*, &c. Ibid. v. i. All which intimates to us the *Secular Grandeur* by which that *Apostatiz'd* Party that were in direct opposition to the *True Church*, should make themselves so notorious and remarkable. Rev. xvii. 4.

And so all along throughout the whole Book, we may observe the *True Church*, (unless in her last *Consummation*, when she appears adorn'd as becomes the

own'd and acknowledg'd Bride of the Holy Jesus) her Circumstances are generally represented as very low and discourag'd, trampled on, and triumphed over, prophesying in Sackcloth, made merry upon amongst her succesful Enemies, bearing still the afflictive and tragical Part throughout every Scene: A thing which those of the Church of Rome themselves seem so convinc'd of, that some of their Writers, in the Descriptions they make of that *Antichrist* whom they have feign'd and imagin'd, tell us, That *in the Reign of Antichrist, the external State of the Roman Church, and publick intercourse of the Faithful with the same, shall cease, and that there shall be only a Communion in Heart with it, and Practice in Secret*; so the Rhemists confess. And Suarez declares, *Diebus Antichristi, omnem cultum Divinum cessaturum*; That *in the Days of Antichrist, all Divine Worship should cease*. Here one might by the way, put in a remembering Question, *viz.* Where then will our Adversaries place the *Visibility* of the Church? But,

Vid. Rhem.
Annot. in
2 Theff. ii.
Sect. 10.

Vid. Suarez
Tom. 2. Qu. 59.
Art. 6. Sect. 6.

II. Come we to consider that none of those places of Scripture, which either the *Cardinal*, or the *Touchstone of the Reformed Gospel*, or the *Catholic Scripture* have cited, do prove any thing of the *Visibility* of the Church as defin'd by *Bellarmino*, *viz.* a company of Men—*knit together under the Government of Christ's Vicar on Earth, the Bishop of Rome*.

And here, before I set my self to examine the Scriptures by which the *Cardinal* pretends to confirm or illustrate this Argument, I must beg the Reader's pardon, that I so much as mention most of them, because they

they are so very impertinent to the purpose for which he quoteth them, that were not his Writings everywhere in the hands of the Learned, it would seem impossible to persuade those that could not consult them, that ever so great a Disputant as *Bellarmino*, on so publick a Stage of Learning, wherein his Writings, both in his own and future Ages must be conversant, should so extravagantly trifle, in first pretending so solemnly to the Scriptures, and then pitching upon such Passages, that one would think a Man in jest while he is propounding them.

He tells us, first, he can prove it from all those Scriptures where the *Church* is so much as named. For (saith he) where-ever we meet with the Name of *Church*, there a *Visible Congregation* must always be understood; upon this he quotes *Numb: xx. 4. Why have ye brought up Ecclesiam Domini, the Congregation of the Lord into this Wilderness?* Here (saith the *Cardinal* gravely) that most known and noted People of *Israel* is call'd the *Church*, or *Congregation of the Lord*. This is strict reasoning indeed! The People of *Israel* were many in Number, and visible enough at that time, to every Eye that then had the good fortune to meet or converse with them, and this *visible* Company of the *Israelites* are here call'd *Ecclesia Domini, the Congregation of the Lord*, therefore the *Church* is always *visible* to the World's End, under the Government of one *Visible Head*; the *Bishop of Rome*. He follows this mighty Blow of his with another irrefragable Text, wherein he tells us the Scripture expressly speaks of the *visible Church*: *1. Kings viii. 14. The King turned his Face about and blessed,*

Bell. de Eccl. mil. lib. 3. cap. 12.
vid. Bell. ubi supra.
omni.

omni Ecclesiæ Israel, all the Congregation of Israel, and all the Congregation of Israel stood. Now, had we been so lucky in our Translation as to have render'd it the Church of Israel, as the Vulgar hath it, Ecclesia Israel, we should long before this time have been convinc'd that God had a Visible Church then, and not have been so hardy as to have ventur'd the Lists with the Romanists about their Visible Church now. But this it is to out-face an Argument through our meer ignorance of a Latin word!

His next Citation from Scripture is that of *Matth. xvi. 18. Upon this Rock will I build my Church*: A place which the *Catholic Scripturist* mentions indeed, but tells us he will not insist on it. Whether he was convinc'd it was nothing to the purpose? or whether he thought it a Text so plain and cogent, that it would be but holding a Candle to the Sun, to enlarge much upon it? as he hath not thought fit to tell us, so we dismiss him. The Cardinal however spends his Remarks upon it, and gives his Adversary pretty good scope too; he finds he can play with him here, and yet take him at last; for he tells us, "Whether by this Rock we understand Christ, or the Confession of his Faith, as the Hereticks would have it? Or, Whether by this Rock we understand Peter, as the Roman Catholics do? still the Foundation of the Church is something sensible, and therefore the Church it self must be sensible too, or visible. For tho we see neither Christ, nor Peter at present, yet they were both of them at that time view'd by bodily Eyes, and at this time are both seen in their Vicar or Successor. I was willing to lay before the Reader the whole weight

Cath. Script.
3. point. pag.
41.

Vid. Bellar.
ubi supra.

weight of the Argument, that he himself may judge how very unanswerably the *Cardinal* hath urged it. However, since he hath given us our choice to understand *this Rock* of the Confession that *St. Peter* then made, we will take it so, and then see how the Argument will go. As to the understanding of *St. Peter* himself to be *this Rock*, I need only refer the Reader to those several *Treatises* that have of late been publish'd upon the Subject of the *Pope's Supremacy*, and particularly that that sets it self to examine the *Texts* by which the *Papists* pretend to prove it. And so proceed to consider, Whether, if we take *this Rock* to be the Confession that *Peter* made of *Christ*, that he was the *Son of the Living God*, and that *Christ* upon this Confession of his, promis'd that this should be the Foundation upon which he would build his *Church*; whether from hence it must unquestionably follow, that the *Church* shall be always *visible*, under the known Government of that *one Pastor*, the *Bishop of Rome*; or Vicar of *Christ*? I grant that, could it be made out, that by *this Rock* the Person of *Peter* was immediately intended, and in his Person the *Pope* was unavoidably included as his direct and perpetual Successor, this Text might carry some force in it, and *Christ's Promise*, that the *Gates of Hell* should never prevail against it might be made to speak something of an endless and unalterable Succession secur'd to that See: But since none but the *Romanists* could ever so much as have dream'd of such an Interpretation as this, and so many Tracts have formerly and of late so strenuously vindicated this Passage from so false a gloss; and the *Cardinal* hath said, that we should not understand it of the Person of *St. Peter*, yet his Argument

ment holds good; let us consider it in the true sense it must, and only must bear.

Our Lord, having asked his Disciples what the World generally, and afterward what they themselves thought of him, *Simon Peter*, usually the most forward in any thing of this kind, makes a very plain and home Confession, *Thou art Christ the Son of the Living God*. Upon this, our Saviour, approving this hearty Confession, tells *Peter*, with some allusion to his Name, that this Confession of his was the very *Rock* or Foundation upon which he would build his Church; that is, That whoever should hereafter heartily believe and profess *Jesus* to be the *Son of God*, i. e. the true *Messiah* and Saviour of the World, that every such Person should be entituled to this relation with Christ; he should be esteemed a Member of that Society which should make up *his Church*. *And the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it*; that is, the Belief and Profession of this great Truth should never hereafter be rooted out, but still there shall be always some in the World who, notwithstanding all the opposition of Hell it self, shall own and profess this Faith.

This, in the event, hath hitherto been accomplish'd ever since it proceeded from our Saviour's Mouth; and this we question not will for ever be. In every Succession of Ages there will still be some whom Christ shall own and acknowledg as his Church, from this Fundamental Confession of him. And thus far of the *Church's Visibility*, that is, that it shall never fail, but some numbers of Persons shall still be known and distinguish'd as the Followers of Christ; I have already

ready said, is the undoubted Promise of our Lord, and so believed and embrac'd by every good *Protestants*. And here let me further add, that as it may be made out, that there have not wanted in all Ages since the first depravation of the Church, some who still have born their witness, and asserted the pure and unblended Truth against the Corruptions and Superstitions of the Church of *Rome* it self; so upon the strength of this very Promise we still depend, that there will never fail a Generation of Men that shall keep themselves unspotted from these *Garments of the Flesh*, shall never drink of the Cup of *Babylon's Fornications*, and shall keep the Truths of God intire and inviolate, notwithstanding all the Force, the Frowns, the Blood and Destruction which the Church of *Rome* hath hitherto wrought, or is still meditating against any in this Cause, by which she hath gain'd a considerable Title to the *Gates of Hell* mentioned in the Text. But how from hence should be collected that there shall be always a splendid *visible* Church under the Headship of that great *Monarch* the Bishop of *Rome*, and that whoever are not under the Government of this *Monarchy*, or within the Communion of this Society, are to be suppos'd as not having made *St. Peter's Confession*, that *Christ is the Son of the Living God*; this, as the *Text* doth not seem to point toward it, so the *Cardinal* hath not so much as attempted to make it out.

His next *Text* is *Mat. xviii. 17. Tell it to the Church*; Bellarmin. ubi supra. but if he neglect to hear the Church, &c. Certainly (saith the *Cardinal*) this could by no means be observ'd, were the Church *invisible*. It were an hard case (saith the

Touchstone Re-
form. Gosp. cap.
8. pag. 22.

Cath. Script.
point 3. p. 41.

Teo. hist. ubi
supra.

Touchstone) to be condemn'd as an *Heathen* for not telling or hearing a Church which hath so closely lain hid, that no Man could hear, see, feel, nor understand it for a thousand Years. The *Catholick* *Scripturist* mentions this Text, and enforceth it the same way. Here if the Question were asked, To whom did our Saviour then speak? It must be answer'd, To his Disciples surely, to St. Peter probably, and the rest of the Apostles. Who then was the Church that they must tell the Offence of their Brother to? Was St. Peter at that time seated in his Pontifical Throne, and had he his *Consistory of Cardinals* about him to receive the Complaints and Accusations of his Subjects one against another? If not, then the Church might be invisible at that time, notwithstanding Christ's Directions to tell the Church. The *Touchstone* puts the Man into the Condition of an *Heathen* or a *Publican*, if he do not tell as well as do not hear the Church; that I have nothing to say to at this time, only perhaps he did not well understand the *Author* he took it from.

Well! but for once we'll suppose that this is a Direction for the Church in future Ages; when it should come to be form'd and establish'd in its just Government. Then we must only suppose that when there is such a Church, it must be apply'd to, and told; not that there shall be always such a form'd and visible Church. It is, we must all acknowledg, a most wholesome Rule, that notorious and publickly scandalous Offences should come under the Cognizance of the Church, and the Offender some way or other subjected to her Censures. But then, this must be only when the Church is in that Condition, that

makes

makes her capable of throwing a just awe upon Criminals by the infliction of Punishments tremendous and dreadful; and nothing further is here suppos'd or commanded. Nor is it to be doubted (as I have already said) but that there will always be such a Society of Men, I mean, so much of the Church of Christ *visible* in all Ages, wherein this Rule may perpetually be of great use and influence, where any notorious and scandalous Offences of its Members may be so represented as to meet with their due Check by Rebukes, Instructions, Excommunication, or otherwise, as the Offender may need or deserve; tho I must, also here add, that by Experience it appears how much more effectual these Methods have prov'd when the Church is in the lowest and most persecuted State, and acts by its own more peculiar Instruments of Correction and Discipline. And therefore, notwithstanding the Rule, and the usefulness of this Rule, there is nothing in it from whence can be pick'd out such a *Visible* Church, as *Bellarmin* defines. Much less is there in some following *Texts* which he proceeds to cite, which I shall but name, as he himself hath done, with this Remark only, that the *Cardinal* in merely quoting them seems very well assur'd in this his first Head of arguing, that where-ever the Name of Church is, there also it is evidently *visible*, and under its requisite form of Monarchical Government, whose Head is Christ's Vicar upon Earth. His *Texts* are these, *Acts* ix. 28. Take heed therefore to your selves, and to all the Flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, to feed the Church of God, &c. How, saith he, can they feed the Church which they know nothing of? Again, *Acts* xv. 3. Being brought on their way

way by the Church, they passed through Phoenice, ver. 4. And when they were come to Jerusalem they were received of the Church. Acts xviii. 22. When Paul had gone up and saluted the Church. Again, 1 Cor. xv. Gal. i. Phil. iii. St. Paul tells us of himself, that he persecuted the Church. And bespeaks Timothy, These things I write unto thee, that thou mayst know how thou oughtest to behave thy self in the House of God, which is the Church of the Living God, 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15. These Texts prove (as the Cardinal gravely observes) that Christ had a Church in being at that time: So they do; and so may twenty more of that kind do, for any Dispute we have with him in that matter.

Vid. Bellarm.
ubi supra.

From these Proofs where the Church is named, the Cardinal proceeds to others, where she is not nam'd, but plainly described: Thus Psal. xviii. (to us Psal. xix.) *In Sole posuit Tabernaculum suum; He hath set his Tabernacle in the Sun*, so Vulg. hath it from the LXXII. but we render it, *In them hath he set a Tabernacle for the Sun*: I will not contend which of them followeth the Original the nearest. The Argument the Psalmist is upon will bear either of them: For, speaking of the Visible Testimony that is given to the Power and Providence of God from the mighty Fabrick of the Heavens, and that all Nations in the World may see enough of God, in the Frame, and Order, and Influences of those vast and glorious Bodies, it may very well be said of God, That *he hath set his Tabernacle in the Sun*, i. e. he hath made himself very visible in that glorious piece of his own Workmanship, that whoever beholds that, may contemplate and adore the

the Divine Power and Goodness, who hath fram'd so goodly and so useful a Body as that is. But if it be render'd as we have it in our Translation, then it refers to the *Heavens*, and the *Firmament*, which, *v. 1.* the *Psalmist* tells us, did every-where declare the Glory of God; they do it in all their several parts, but more especially, and more conspicuously in the Sun, for which the *Heavens* are made a Seat and *Tabernacle*. And what then is this to the *Visibility* of the Church? Yes: Doth not the Apostle, when he is upon the Subject of the universal publication of the Gospel, make use of the words immediately foregoing? *Their Sound went into all the Earth, and their Words unto the end of the World*, Rom. x. 18. What then! He does not even there cite this Expression particularly, *He hath set his Tabernacle in the Sun*. Or, if he did unquestionably refer to those words in the *Psalmist* which he seems to quote, it were not very absurd to suppose,

(1.) The Apostle upon the same Argument with the *Psalmist*, that is, that all Nations, both Jew and Gentile, had been already effectually preach'd to, by the mighty Works of the Creation, which had been so long, so conspicuously, so universally seen, and might have been contemplated by all the Rational World, *Their Sound went into all the Earth, &c.*

But, (2.) to allow this, that the Apostle is upon the extensive and universal Promulgation of the Gospel, yet does he not seem to bring in this Passage of the *Psalmist* as a Proof, but allusively only, and by way of accommodation.

However, (3. and lastly) Suppose we to the utmost, that the words, as utter'd by *David*, were Prophetical, and

The Texts examined which Papists cite

and they are brought in by the *Apostle* in proof of the fulfilling of this Prophecy; yet all that could be made out thence, would be only, that the Gospel was diffusively publish'd, not only throughout all the Region of *Judea*, but amongst the Gentiles too; which we readily grant, and have infinite reason to bless God for it, because the Glad Tidings have reach'd even our remotest Isles too. And what is this still to the perpetual *Visibility* of the Church under the Government of one great Pastor and Vicar of Christ the Bishop of *Rome*?

Having mention'd this, that this last Text cited by the *Cardinal*, if it be any way referr'd to by the *Apostle*, it must be understood of the vast publications of the Gospel, both in *Judea* and amongst the Gentiles: Our due Observation of this, will cut short a great deal of Work, and serve as one Answer to a great heap of *Texts* which the *Catholick Scripturist* hath fetch'd out of the Old Testament, in proof of his third Point about the *Visibility* of the Church, and its continuance still, from one Age to another, *under lawful Pastors*.

We are to consider, that one great Subject of the Prophecies of old was, not only the coming of the *Messiah*, but the Consequence of that, *viz. breaking down the middle Wall of Partition*; and enlarging the Boundaries of the Church, which in the Prophets Time were kept within the Pale of the Jewish Nation, at least within the Communion of their Rites and Usages, and the Seal of their Covenant. And this will appear a Subject fit for the *Prophets* to have

have been very lofty and very large upon, if we consider,

(1.) How prejudic'd the Jews were in their Conceptions about the eternal duration of their present Oeconomy, that it was never to be alter'd, much less abolish'd, for the bringing in of the Gentiles to so near an Affinity and Relation with God.

Or if we consider (2.) how mighty and signal an Event and Revolution of Providence this would be when it once came about. For the Christian Religion to spread it self into so large a compass, to gain over to it self such vast Empires and Kingdoms, to break in with its Light into the darkest, the most barbarous and uncultivated Parts and Corners of the World, to triumph over strongest Oppositions, to level greatest Mountains, to plain the roughest Passages, to prevail upon the most prejudic'd and opposite part of Mankind, reducing them from the greatest ignorance of God, and aversion to Good, to the Knowledge and Love of God, and the practice of all Vertue and true Goodness, and this in places most distant from one another; and all from such small and inconsiderable Beginnings, the appearance of one Person in the World, who in his outward guise was poor and contemptible to a Proverb, scorn'd and hated to the most cruel and ignominious Death that could be thought of, and for the generality followed only by Persons of the meanest Figure, and lowest Education; a few poor and unlearned Fishermen, whom he appointed the first Publishers of his Gospel, and by whose means notwithstanding, it became so diffus'd and universal. This was a Subject worthy the noblest Thoughts, and the most flaming Expressions they could

The Texts examined which Papists cite

could be deliver'd in by inspir'd Prophets, who accordingly enlarg'd and expatiated upon it, in great variety of phrase, which every-where occurs in their Writings.

Having thus prepar'd a just Light to set those *Texts* in, which the *Catholick Scripturist*, without any Order or Method, but in great number, hath huddled together in proof of his *Roman Church*, as now under the Government of those whom he calls *Lawful Pastors*: Having thus done, I say, I need give my self or the *Reader* very little trouble in examining them further than barely propounding them; in the reading of which, when rescu'd out of some of his uncouth and barbarous Translations, every one may see how little to *his purpose* they are brought in by him.

Cath. Script.
part 3. p. 31.

Thus he quotes *Psal. LXXXIX. 3, 4. I have made a Covenant with my Chosen, I have sworn unto David my Servant. Thy Seed will I establish for ever, - and build up thy Throne in all Generations.* This he tells us is verified in none but Christ, and hath rightly enough apply'd to it that Passage of the Angel, *Luke 1. 32. The Lord God shall give him the Throne of his Father David, and he shall reign over the House of Jacob for ever, and of his Kingdom there shall be no end.* Thus far we are satisfied, if the *Scripturist* be so too, we own it all, and let him make his best on't.

Id. Ibid.

Then he tells us, that these Promises are of that Kind and Nature, that they cannot be made void or prevented, even by the Sins of *David's* Posterity; and

and for this, he citeth several *Verses* in the same *Psalms*, from *vers. 29*, to *vers. 38*. *If his Children forsake my Law, and walk not in my Judgments, &c.* All which we own as most assuredly true, but still nothing to his purpose.

Of the same intent and meaning is that Promise made by *Nathan* to *David*, quoted by the *Scripturist*, *2 Sam. vii. 16.* primarily intended to assure *David*, that his Posterity should inherit the Throne after him, which *Saul's* did not. And, *secondarily*, that his Kingdom should be everlasting in him who is Lord of all, and who should in time proceed from *David's* Loins.

To the same purpose is that long Passage out of *Psal. lxxii. vers. 5.* and so on, which with other Quotations of the same and greater length, I shall take leave not to transcribe, because I would not swell the bulk of these Papers too much, but refer the Reader to their perusal himself, assuring him that though he will apprehend nothing in them to the purpose of *this Author's* Argument; yet he will not lose his labour, but meet with something therein that is very useful and comfortable.

So those many Texts he cites from *Isaiab's* Prophecy; they do indeed represent the care and faithfulness of God to his Church; the unchangeableness of his Love, and his wise over-ruling all things for their Protection, or for their seasonable Deliverance in his own Time; which as they were originally design'd for the support of the *Jewish* Church under

her Bondage, and the Hardships of her Captivity, giving her frequent assurances of Restoration and Deliverance in due time: So also, in some Analogy, they have, no doubt, a prophetic respect to the Church under the Dispensation of the Gospel, both as to its enlargement and diffusiveness amongst the Gentiles, as also its seasonable Supports, or Vindication under all her Oppressions, and the Violences of her Enemies.

Isa. XLIX. 14, 15, 16. Chap. LIV. vers. 9, 10, 11, 12. Chap. LX. 15, 18, 19, 20. Chap. LXI. (the Verse misprinted in the Author) vers. 8, 9. Chap. LXII. vers. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12. All which, if the Reader will consult, as they are render'd in our Bibles, or indeed, as they are in the barbarous Translation wherein *this Man* hath quoted them, he will find (as I have said) some things very useful, and very comfortable, and especially not unfit for that part of Christ's Church to converse with, who are at this present Time under most severe and deplorable Circumstances, through the merciless Cruelty of those that would pretend themselves the only Visible Church.

Id. Ibid.

Cath. Script.
R. 36.

But this *Author's* choicest Remark is, upon his last Quotation from *Isa. LXVI. 21.* where he tells us, is very clearly express'd, that the True Church shall have a perpetual Succession of *Priests and Levites*: *I will also take of them for Priests and Levites, saith the Lord: For as the New Heavens, and the New Earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your Seed and your Name remain.* This Prophecy, in all probability, did primarily concern a very particular Instance of Providence to the *Jews*, whom the *Romans* and *Greeks* in their *Macedonian*

cedonian and *Syrian* Wars, finding in Captivity; should restore them to their Liberty, and send them back with Honour into their own Country: So the Learned *Grotius* conjectures; and then, that those who were of the *Priestly* and *Levitical* Order, under what state of Servitude and Drudgery soever, they had lain hid and obscure in the Time of their Captivity; should be restor'd to the Dignity and Service of their Office and Function in their own Country. But if (as in most of the Prophecies of this kind, we may reasonably conceive) the Prophet points toward the State of the Church under the Dispensation of the Gospel, it does indeed mean no less, than that the Gospel should spread it self into the Regions and Countries before-mention'd; that it shall have its Ministers to publish it, and that the Church, from one Age to another, shall remain and have its being to the End of the World: This *Calvin* himself owns in his Commentaries up-^{Vid. Calvin. in loc.} on the place, who yet is no Friend to this *Author's*, or *Bellarmino's* *Visibility* of the Church. Nor indeed is the *Emphasis* to be laid upon the Expression of *Priests* and *Levites* (as our *Author* would seem to do) to assert from thence the *Certain* and *Visible* Succession of *Lawful Pastors* in the Church, particularly of that *one Pastor* the Bishop of Rome. For, besides that the *Priestly* and *Levitical* Order under the *Mosaick* Law, is not to be look'd upon as typifying the *Episcopacy* and *Ministry* of the Christian Church, but of the *Lord Jesus* only, the *great High Priest* of our Profession, who himself offer'd the only proper and propitiatory Sacrifice that made all the other for ever cease; besides this, I say, where can the

the Church of Rome at this instant show its Succession, or Pastoral Authority and Jurisdiction in any parts of *Africk*, I may add of *Greece* either, which yet our *Author* is so angry with our *Bibles*, that they have avoided to translate the proper Names of *Tharshish*, *Pul*, and *Lud* into.

Cath. Script.
P. 37.

His next Transition is to the Prophet *Jeremy*; and the first Passage he remarks upon in him, is pretty observable, both for the Text it self, and his own Note upon it. The Text is this, *Jer. xxx. 2.* *Though I make a full End of all Nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full End of thee, but I will correct thee in measure.* In which words it is evident, the Church may be scattered among Nations that are his profess'd and victorious Enemies, and consequently not in so flourishing a condition upon the Face of the Earth, as he elsewhere expresseth it, and contend's for. And his own Comment upon it in this place is, *That the Church indeed may be chastised for a while, but never brought to Consummation.* Which in the meaning of it, is true, but the Phrase of *being brought to Consummation*, as he useth it, hath an elegancy in it very extraordinary, perhaps an Original.

Ed. Pag. 34.

His next Texts out of *Jeremiah* are of the same purport and design with those I have already noted from him out of *Isaiab*, viz. the glorious Progress the Gospel should make, and its continuance against all Opposition, that it should no more fail than the *Ordinances of Heaven*, the *Sun and Moon*, *Day and Night*. The Texts are, *Jer. xxxi. vers. 35, 36, 37.*
Chap.

Chap. xxxii. 38, 39, 40. And again, Chap. xxxiii. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. All which (as formerly) I refer to the Reader's own perusal; only cannot without some indignation remark, that those Expressions of the *Prophet*, which cannot possibly belong to any other than the Holy Jesus only, he blasphemously applieth them, more than once, to his pretended *Vicar the Pope*. So upon Jer. xxxiii. 17. *David shall never want a Man to sit upon the Throne of the House of Israel*; he makes his remark in a Parenthesis, *Christ must successively have his Vicar, or Vice-gerent in all Ages*. Again, where the Prophet in the same Chapter, vers. 21. expresseth it, *Then may also my Covenant be broken with David my Servant, that he should not have a Son* (a Vicar, or Vice-gerent, saith the Author) *to reign upon his Throne*.

The *Texts* out of *Ezekiel* are of the same kind; Ezek. xxxiv. 22, 23, 24. Chap. xxxvii. 23, 24, 25, 26. Chap. xlvi. 35. In all which there is nothing further remarkable, but that he still drives at that blasphemous Thought, to make whatsoever is spoken by God, of the glorious and endless Reign of *David his Servant*, that is, of *Jesus the Messiah*, and *Son of the Living God*, to seem primarily designed and fully accomplish'd in the *Pope*, or Head of the *Roman Church*. However, we *Protestants* have one invincible Argument that the *Letter* of some of these *Texts* which *this Man* hath cited, is not fulfilled in every Age, and in every part of the *Christian Church*; that particularly of Ezek. xxxvii. 23. *Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their Idols*,

Pag. 38.

Ibid. pag. 39.

Idols, nor with their detestable things, &c. We know there are some parts of the World who call themselves *the Church*, who do *pollute themselves with Idols*; ho we also believe and assure our selves that there will come a time when this part of the Prophecy, so far as it respects the Christian Church, shall be literally accomplish'd, that is, when all the wretched Idolatry which as yet any where prevails, shall for ever cease; that time when *Babylon the great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations*, shall be doom'd to its Fall and Ruine; and when *those Kings that have committed Fornication with her*, shall come to *hate the Where, and make her desolate and naked, and eat her Flesh, and burn her with Fire*; which we are assur'd by the Holy Ghost, will all in due time come to pass. Rev. xvii. 5, 16. Amen! even so Lord Jesus. This Author cites but one Passage from *Daniel, Chap. ii. 44.* which we also easily allow him may be interpreted of that Kingdom, which Christ should set up in the times of his Gospel, but this is wholly spiritual, and refers to his Mediatory Administration.

And now, the *Scripturist* having so largely prov'd (as you may imagine) what he design'd from those numerous *Texts* in the Old Testament, he thinks he hardly needs to offer at any from the New; only *ex abundanti* is pleased to throw us in two or three from thence, which I shall briefly consider:

His first is that of *2 Cor. iv. 3.* *If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost.* This also the *Touche-stone* hath noted. The *Apostle* is indeed speaking here of the plain and

and perspicuous *Revelation* of the Gospel, that they had preached it in all simplicity and plainness, without any of the Arts, which Seducers were wont to gloze or cover their Fallhoods with; and besides their Preaching, they had asserted the Truth of what they publish'd, with such miraculous Powers deriv'd upon them from above, that those who would not discern and embrace it, being thus plainly and convictively tender'd, must be inexculpably blind, and perish through their own fatal Obduracy. What is this to the Visible Constitution of the Church, under the great Head of all at Rome? Could any body but a *Priest of the Society of Jesus* have smelt or suspected that the meaning of this Text is, that whoever do not see and acknowledg the Bishop of Rome to be the *Vicar of Christ, and Head of the Church*, is lost and must perish? There may be something perhaps pick'd out from this Passage, that looks a little askint at one darling Opinion of the *Romanists* concerning the *Obscurity of the Scriptures*, but nothing to their advantage, as to this part of our Controversy with them.

His next Text is that which the *Cardinal* cites too; *Ephes. iv. 11, 12, 13. He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers, till we all come in the Unity of the Faith, &c.* This place doubtless expresseth to us the unspeakable Bounty and Goodness of God in Christ Jesus, in supplying his Church with such variety of Officers and Ministers, who in the discharge of their several Functions, should sufficiently publish and make known the Gospel, and should form and constitute.

Vid. Bellar. de
Eccles. Milit.
lib. 3. cap. 13.

stitute the Church under some Government, and that this *Ministry* in the Church (at least in one or other of its Characters) should continue till the Church had attain'd its perfected State in the other World. But what! Will you say it is necessary that all these Offices should continue, that the Church might not *fail* or prove *invisible*? Where then are the Offices of the *Apostles*, or *Prophets*, or *Evangelists* still vested? Either they were not necessary to the continuance (however they might be to laying the Foundations) of the Church, or else the Church hath failed ever since those Persons dy'd off, for the Character it self dy'd with them. Or, are the *Apostle*, and *Prophet*, and *Evangelist* all together center'd in the Bishop or Pope of *Rome*? Is he an *Apostle*? where was his immediate Ordination by Christ? Is he a *Prophet*? Where does he utter his Predictions, and confirm them with Miracles? Is he an *Evangelist*? What Regions and Countries doth he travel into to publish the Gospel? I confess, if ever there had been any reason to have mention'd the Bishop of *Rome* as a necessary Universal Monarch, who must in all Ages successively have continued visibly seated in his Throne, to whom the whole Christian Church should be subordinate, here had been the opportunity the *Apostle* would have taken to have laid it before us. But since the Holy Spirit of God hath not thought fit upon so fair an occasion, so much as to point toward it, the *Cardinal*, and those that work under him, might have had some Modesty, and not ventur'd upon that for proof, which seems so directly against them.

Bellarmin
Supra
Cath.

The next Quotations are made both by the Cardinal and the other ~~with~~ *Mat. T. 11. 15.* The Arguments are, *the Light of the World* is now *Catholic* sticks, *not hid under a Bushel* and *a City on a Hill*. It is pity that *the City* had not been *seven Hills* and *then the Cross* had been *invincible on Rome's Hill*. We know where *Rome* is *defensible*, and *in what manner*, by *its very Situation*, which in time may *make it invulnerable*. But the plain and *intended meaning* of these *Texts* is, that the *Apostles* and *the Followers* of the *Gospel*, were *Persons* which were to *bring* into the *World* a *mighty Light* which would make them very *conspicuous* and *remarkable*, and therefore they are *caution'd* both as to their *Work* that they should not be *faint* or *negligent* in *publishing* so great a *Truth*, they should not *hide* the *Light* that was put into their *hands*, for that very reason that they might *display* it *everywhere* abroad. And then as to their *Behaviour*, they are further *caution'd* that that may be *blameless* and *irreprovable*, because, as a *City on an Hill*, they were in the *view* of all *Men*. Besides, I may add, *Similitudes* make no *Proofs*, much less do *Parables*. Which may be an *Answer* in *short* to the *Parable* of the *Mustard-Seed* urg'd by the *Scripturist*; and to *Bellarmin's* *Parables* of the *Floor*, the *Net*, the *Sheepfold*, and the *Feast*, &c.

Cath. Script.
pag. 41.
Bellarmin de Recl.
lib. III. c. 1. 10

They further quote that of *Matth. xxviii. 20.* *I will be with you to the End of the World.* "The Apostles (saith *Bellarmino*, and after him the *Scripturist*) could not continue to the End of the World,

Cath. Script.
P. 42.

“the Person of such as shall succeed them in Teaching and Preaching, &c. Our Lord certainly will be both with his Church, and with his Ministers; he takes this Character to himself, that *he walketh in the midst of the seven Golden Candlesticks, and holdeth the seven Stars in his Right-hand.* Our Adversaries shall not rob us of the Comfort of this, and all the precious Promises of this kind: We are hereby most infallibly assur'd of the Care and Inspection of Divine Providence over his Church, and all her faithful Pastors and Governours, even when they may seem to be reduc'd to the greatest Extremities.

Cath. Script.
 p. 42.

And here the *Scripturist* should have ended, but that he could not forbear one blasphemous Suggestion, as if the Pope of Rome was intimated by that *Paraclete*, or Holy Spirit of God, which Christ promis'd should *come and abide in his Church*; for, to no purpose can he be supposed, by the Series of his Discourse, to have quoted that Text, when he brings it in thus; *Again in the like sense he saith, Joh. xiv. 16. And he will give another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever.* That blessed Spirit of God whom our Saviour promis'd immediately to the Apostles; whom he designed as *his great Advocate* in the World, as well as *their Comforter* (for so the word *παράκλητος* may be doubly render'd) that is, should as well plead his Cause, and *convince the World of Sin, Righteousness and Judgment*, Joh. xvi. 8, 9, 10. as inwardly support and instruct them in their greatest Difficulties. That Blessed Spirit, whom after his Ascension he so visibly sent amongst them

them according to the Promise by which ~~it was~~ ^{it was} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~Prophecy~~ ^{Prophecy}, the *Messiah*, and *Son of the Living God*. This Holy Spirit of God, and his ~~Gift~~ ^{Gift}, was the immediate Subject of this Promise, and yet would this *profane Trifler*, intimate amongst his negligent and ignorant *Readers*, as if this were a *Text* proper to prove the Bishop of *Rome* deputed by *Christ*, from one Generation to another, to be his Vicar and Substitute.

And thus I have, as briefly as I could, examin'd all the *Texts* that were worth any notice, and brought by the *Romanists* in proof of their Doctrine of the *Visibility of the Church*. By which we may see with what sort of Weapons they are now us'd to fight. For, would we but excuse their *Sophistry*, *Figures*, or real *Antiquity*, at which we may conceive them to rely awkward, we may reasonably presume they have other kind of Arguments with which they could much more skilfully, and with better success manage their Cause.

T H E E N D.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswell at the Sign of the Gun
in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1721.

The TEXTS examined which *Papists*
cite out of the *Bible* for the
Proof of their Doctrine

O F

M E R I T S.

[Thomas Sykes]

I M P R I M A T U R .

Decemb. 3. 1688.

Hen. Wharton.

THE Doctrine of *Merit*, although it was a great occasion of that happy Reformation which was made by the first Protestants from the Errors and Superstitions of the Church of *Rome*, yet has of late been so refined and new-modell'd by some of that Communion, that we and they are made to agree even in that Point which was in a great measure the cause of the first separation betwixt us.

We were wont to be charged with denying the necessity of good Works, and that Mens Salvation does at all depend on them. But now that Objection is laid aside, and our greatest Crime, as to this Doctrine of *Merit*, is, That we charge those of that Church with what they do not hold, and pretend a difference when both Parties are of the same Mind.

Now that I may wipe off this Scandal which the Bishop of *Condom* and others are pleased to lay upon us, I shall endeavour to state the case fairly betwixt us, and then to shew that the Scriptures produced in the defence of that Doctrine of Merit which we find fault with, give no countenance at all unto it.

As to the stating the Case aright, consider,

First, That we agree an eternal Reward to become due upon the performance of such Conditions for which God has been pleased to promise to bestow it. Some of the Church of *Rome* (as will be shewn by and by) go further, and make the Reward to depend upon something else besides God's Promise, but they all agree it to be plain from Scripture that God has promised it; and if so, then there is as much reason to expect it upon the account of such a Promise as upon any other account whatsoever. For it would be contrary to God's most excellent Nature. It would argue either want of Power or Righteousness in him, not to make good what he had promised.

So much therefore is on all hands maintained both by them and us, that an eternal Reward will certainly be bestowed where Men take care to perform the conditions upon which it is promised.

Secondly, We agree good Works to be the conditions without which an eternal Reward can never be obtained. Although we do not set so high a value upon good Works as some of the Church of *Rome* do, yet we go so far with them, as to assert them to be the means prescribed by God for the obtaining of Salvation. We declare that *without Holiness no Man shall see God*, and that *with fear and trembling* we ought to work out our own Happiness, and thereby teach as great a necessity of good Works as they who place so much trust and confidence in them.

In the beginning of the Reformation such mighty things were spoken of Faith, that some of the Church of *Rome* imagined that the first Reformers did wholly exclude good Works from having any thing to do in Mans Salvation. Whereas they were so far from thinking any thing of this nature, that they accounted Faith it self a good Work; and when they explained the Nature thereof, they always discoursed of it as *working by Love*, and productive of an holy and vertuous Behaviour. The reason why they magnified Faith at such a rate was the same with what happened in the beginning of the Church in the Apostles Time. For as the Apostle *St. Paul* then found many to rely too much upon Legal Performances and Pharisaical Observances, so likewise did the first Reformers in the beginning of the Reformation find those of the Church of *Rome* to depend above measure upon external Performances, such as Alms-giving, Pilgrimages, abstinence from Meats, &c. To wean them off from doing which, they imitated the same Apostle in extolling Faith, and the Merits of a crucified Saviour. Although at the same time they likewise taught that belief in Christ would avail them nothing, unless they added thereunto an holy and vertuous Conversation.

Sofar therefore we are willing to go along with those of the Church of *Rome*, as to assert good Works to be so far forth the cause of an eternal Reward, that it cannot be obtained without them.

Thirdly, We agree God's Grace to be necessary to enable us to do any good Work. Although there has been found amongst those of the Church of *Rome* such as have run into *Pelagius* his Error, in asserting Works done without God's Grace and Assistance to be good: yet these have been but few, and such their Opinion

bell. de Just.
l. 5. c. 13.

has; as *Bellarmino* relates, been condemned by two of their own Popes, *Pius V.* and *Gregory XIII.* The generality do affirm it to be necessary in order to render them capable of any Reward that they be adopted the Sons of God, and have his Spirit dwelling in them, for enabling them to perform any sort of vertuous Actions. And this is what we assert as well as they.

Fourthly, We are ready to affirm it to be agreeable to God's Wisdom and Goodness to bestow a Reward upon good Works, although he had never promised it. For good Works are performed by the Assistance of God's Grace, they are done with great difficulty, they carry a resemblance to what is always inherent in the Divine Nature, they flow from the Love of God, and are pleasing and acceptable unto him. For which reasons it may well become so wise and gracious a Being, as God is, to bestow some signal Mark of his Favour upon them. For by this means he shews the distinction betwixt good and bad Deeds, he encourageth the love of Vertue and Holiness, and gives publick testimony of his pure and excellent Nature in approving only those things which are worthy to be approved by him.

Fifthly, We allow that the word *Merit* may be used in an improper sense, so as to signify to procure or obtain, without ever considering the worth of the Person, or the Work it self. For thus several *Ecclesiastical Writers*, as well as others, have used it; and when the *Fathers* call good Works *Merits*, as they often do, they mean no more thereby than that they are acceptable to God, and will procure a Reward for those who perform them. In which sense several *Protestants* have used the word in their publick *Confessions*. And although when we speak of good Works, we forbear now adays to use the word *Merit*, yet it is not because we dissent from the *Fathers*

Wertemberg.
Confess. de
bon. Op.
August. Con-
fess. Artic. 6.

in

in the use of it, according to the more general signification, but because they of the Church of *Rome* have used it in a signification which we can no ways allow of.

For, *Sixthly, Merit*, in the more proper signification; importeth Action, or Actions, to which there is a Reward in Justice due, *viz.* when it doth not flow meerly from the kindness of the Giver, but from respect to the worthiness of the Action, so as that the Doer has reason to complain of Injustice done him, if it be not bestowed upon him.

Now it is this signification of the word which has given occasion to such Disputes betwixt us, and them of the Church of *Rome*, concerning the Doctrine of Merit of good Works. But yet we do not differ alike from them all. For,

1. There has been at all times in that Church such as have with us disclaimed all kind of *Merit* in this last sense, and have frankly owned that by Grace they were saved, and not upon the account of their own Works: Amongst whom we may reckon three of their own Popes, as *Gregory the Great*, who affirms that the *best Men will find no Merit in their best Actions.* *Urban IV.* who in a Commentary upon the *Miserere*, has these expressions, *I do not beg for my own Merits sake, or for thy Justice or my own — or for my Works sake, wherein I have miserably gone astray, but for thy great Mercy.* And *Adrian VI.* who positively asserts *our Merits to be a broken Reed which pierce the hand of him that leans upon them, that our best Actions are mixt with Impurities, and when we have donerall that we can, we are unprofitable Servants.* As well as others both before and after the Council of *Trent*. Now with these we heartily agree, and by what they have declared in this matter, do think we have

Moral. l. 9, 2.

Discourse concerning the merit of good Works, p. 7.

Adrian de Sacr. Eutch. f. 61.

By Officers Consulting.

Dr. Still. rec. of the Council of Trent.

Gerhard. Conf. Cath.

have a mighty advantage of such of the Church of Rome as pretend *Tradition* for their Doctrine of *Merit*, as they do for other things; since it is so easy to shew them that nothing like it was known in the first Ages of the Church, and that many great Men of their own Communion have all along taught contrary to it.

2. There have been others, who although they seem to make a Reward to depend wholly upon God's Promise in Christ, yet at the same time will needs have it that good Works may be truly said to be meritorious of it. Thus *Bellarmino* after he has proved at large good

De Just. l. 5. c. 14. Works to be meritorious, has a Chapter on purpose to shew, That God's Promise is requisite to make them so. Thus the Bishop of *Condom* declares it out of the Council of *Trent*, to be the sense of the Catholick Church,

Expos. of the Doct. Sect. 7. That eternal Life ought to be proposed to the Children of God, both as a Grace, which is mercifully promised to them by the Mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and as a Recompence which is faithfully rendered to their good Works and Merits in virtue of this Promise.—— And that God will have those Gifts which he bestows upon them to be their Merits. Thus likewise the Representer makes the good

Papist misrepr. & repr. ch. 6. Catholick to affirm, That through the Merits of Christ the good Works of a just Man proceeding from Grace, are so acceptable to God, that through his Goodness and Promise they are truly meritorious of eternal Life.

Now as to these, all that we can charge them with is with speaking improperly. We say as well as they that the Reward depends upon God's Promise, but then we say likewise that this destroys the nature of true Merit. For true Merit consists in having upon the account of the worthiness of the Action, a just Right and Title to a Reward; so as that although he had no promise thereof, a Man might lawfully complain of Injustice

stice done him, should it not be bestowed upon him, but he who wholly depends upon a Promise for what is bestowed, cannot be properly said to have such a Title as this is. For it is the Promise which gives such an one a Title to the Reward, and not his own Worthiness, which is that which is always supposed in the nature of true Merit. And therefore to say, as the Representor does, That good Works through God's Goodness and Promise are truly meritorious, is the same thing as to say, That God's Promise of a Reward does make good Works to be in themselves deserving of a Reward, although there had been no Promise made of it: Which is certainly a very improper way of speaking. But yet we should be glad, had we nothing more to charge any of the Church of Rome with, as to this Doctrine of Merit, but impropriety of Speech. Whereas to our great trouble we find others gone so far as,

3. To assert, That God's Promise is indeed annexed to the Works of just Men, but yet that belongeth no way to the Reason of the Merit, but cometh rather to the Works which are already not worthy only, but also meritorious. Thus Vasquez with a great deal more to the same purpose in several parts of his Writings. Which is agreeable to what Bellarmine asserts, viz. That the good Works of just Persons do merit eternal Life condignly, not only by reason of God's Covenant and Acceptation, but also by reason of the Work it self, so that in a good Work proceeding from Grace there may be a certain proportion and equality unto the Reward of eternal Life. As likewise to that of Cajetan, That the good Works of just Men are meritorious of eternal Life condignly, although there were no Divine Compact, &c.

Vasquez Com-
ment. in 1. 2.
qu. 114. disp.
214. c. 8.

Bell. de Just. i.
l. 5. c. 17.

Cajet. in 1. 2.
qu. 1. part. 3.

Now this is the Doctrine which we find so much fault with, and that upon these following accounts.

1. Be-

1. Because we are bound to pay all manner of Obedience to God, although we were not sure of any Reward hereafter, and that upon the account of our Creation, and that constant supply of outward Blessings, such as Life, Health, &c. which God is pleased to afford us; and likewise, because such is the nature of all vertuous Actions, that they do really tend to promote even our present Ease and Advantage. For where we are out of Gratitude, present Interest, and upon the account of God's Supreme Authority over us, bound to make our Actions as good as we can, although there were no future Reward: in such a case, how can we be said truly to merit any thing further from him than what we at present enjoy?

2. Because although many of our Works are good, yet many of them are evil too; and if God should deal strictly with us, instead of rewarding our good Deeds, he might, if he pleased, punish our evil ones. Such indeed is his Mercy, that for the sake of a crucified Saviour he is willing to allow of Repentance for what is past, but since nothing which we can do could have merited even this at his hands, much less can our best Actions, when our Transgressions are so many, give us a Title to an eternal Reward.

3. Because even our best Actions are imperfect, and stand in need of God's Clemency and Forgiveness to cover their Defects, and then what just Claim can we have to a Reward upon their account?

4. Because, whatever is praise-worthy in us, is not performed by our own power and Skill, but by the Assistance of God's Grace. God may, if he pleases, reward his own Gifts, but it would be no good manners in us to pretend that he was bound to do it, or that his own Gifts can properly be called our Merits.

5. Be-

5. Because there is no equality or proportion betwixt the best Actions of us finite imperfect Creatures, and the eternal Favour of an infinitely wise and gracious God.

Having thus set down what in the Doctrine of Merit we find fault with, and for what reasons I know it will be objected, that in this case I oppose only the Opinion of private Men, and that the Council of *Trent*, which is the Standard of true Catholick Doctrine, has taught otherwise.

I answer ;

1. That since there has been such in the Church of *Rome*, and those Men of great note too, who have taught this Doctrine of Merit, and since it has had, and has I doubt still a very great influence upon several of that Communion, so as to make them place too much Religion in external Performances, it is very requisite it should be opposed whether the Council of *Trent* teach it or no.

2. That if the Council of *Trent* should be supposed not to have taught this Doctrine in exprefs terms, yet there is great reason to believe that it did at least intend to give great countenance unto it. For,

1st. The Council knew well enough that such a Doctrine was maintained by some of that Church, that the Practices thereupon ensuing were very scandalous, that the first Reformers clamoured mightily against it, and therefore unless they had had a mind to countenance it, why did they not give the World satisfaction by declaring expressly against it? *An.* 1354 we find one *Guido*, an *Austin* Friar, for holding this Doctrine, sentenced by the Chancellour and the Theological Faculty of *Paris*, to make this following Recantation, *I said against a Batchelour of the Order of Predicant Friars in conference*

Eiblioth. Patr.
tom. 14. p. 347.
Edit. Colon.

with him, that a Man merits eternal Life by way of Con-
dignity, i. e. That he would be injured if it were not be-
stowed upon him. And I writ that God would do him an
Injury in such a case. And this Opinion I then approved,
I now revoke it as false, heretical, and blasphemous. Now
why did not the Council take some such course as this
was, to express their dislike of such a Doctrine? or,
since they were so free of their *Anathema's*, if they did
not approve it themselves, or were not desirous that o-
thers should, why did they not *Anathematise* all such as
held good Works to be truly meritorious? But they were
so far from doing this, that,

2dly. We find an *Anathema* denounced against him
who asserts, *The good Works of any justified Person to
be so much the Gifts of God, as not to be also the Merits
of the same justified Person; or that he who is justified by*
Sec. 6. can. 32. *the good Works which are done by him through the Grace of
God, and Merit of Jesus Christ, of whom he is a living
Member, does not truly merit increase of Grace, eternal
Life, increase of Glory.* Whatever may have been their
Opinion who did make this Canon, or however they
may have expressed themselves in other places, it is
plain that the manner of expressing themselves in this
Canon, is sufficient enough to make the generality of
People believe, that they held good Works to be meri-
torious in the strictest sense. They do not indeed ex-
plain what they mean by *true merit*; but because they
have not done it, this is enough to make it suspicious
that they at least intended it should be understood ac-
cording to the most proper and most usual significati-
on.

And that it has been thus generally taken, may appear
from these following Observations.

1. That several Divines of the Church of Rome,

Dr. Stilling. the
Council of
Trent exam.
P. 59, 60.

some of which lived in the time of the Council, have shown, that *truly to merit* must be opposed to any improper signification of the word.

2. That in the *Index Expurgatorius*, set out according to the Order of the Council by Cardinal *Quiroga*, an. 1584, several passages, which deny the merit of good Works, are commanded to be blotted out of several Books, as more particularly out of the Works of *Erasmus* and *Johannes Ferus*. But that which is most remarkable in this Case, and which has been taken notice of by several Learned Men who have treated of this Subject, is, That out of a publick Office of the Church these following Questions and Answers were by the said *Index* ordered to be expunged.

By *Urbans Chal-*
enge. p. 421.
Dr. Still. Coun.
of Trent. exam.
p. 61.
Gerhard. Con-
fess. Cath. l. 2.
p. 3. art. 23. c.
8. p. 769.

Q. *Doſt thou believe that thou ſhalt come to Heaven not by thy own Merits, but by the Virtue and Merit of Chriſt's Paſſion?*

A. *I do believe it.*

Q. *Doſt thou believe that Chriſt died for our Salvation, and that none can be ſaved by their own Merits, or any other way, but by the Merits of his Paſſion?*

A. *I do believe it.*

3. That the *Rhemists* who when for the benefit of good Catholicks they by publick permission explain the Scriptures, must be supposed to do it according to the sense of the Council, do maintain the Merit of good Works in the strictest sense. For they assert, That *Mans Works done by Chriſt's Grace do conſignly or worthily deſerve eternal Joy.* And That all good Works done by *God's Grace after the firſt Juſtification be truly and properly meritorious, and fully worthy of everlaſting Life, and that thereupon Heaven is the due and juſt Stipend, Crown or Recompence which God by his Juſtice oweth to the Perſons ſo working by his Grace.* For he rendreth or repayeth Hea-

Rhem. Annot.
in Luc. 20. 35.

Idem. in 2 Tim
4. 8.

ven, say they, as a just Judge, and not only as a merciful Giver, and the Crown which he payeth is not only of Mercy, or Favour, or Grace, but also of Justice.

Dr. Sill. Conv.
of Trent exam.
p. 73.

4. That several, even of late years, when they give us the sense of the Council about this matter, do expressly say, that the Council did intend to establish such a Merit of good Works as bears a proportion to the Glory of Heaven.

These Observations make it evident what has been generally thought to be the sense of the Council of Trent as to this matter; and all that can be replied in defence of the Council is what the Bishop of Condom has picked out of the Council's manner of expressing it self, viz.

That although the Council asserts good Works to be meritorious, yet,

1. It supposeth those good Works to be done by the Assistance of God's Grace.

2. It proposeth an eternal Reward as a Recompence which is faithfully rendred to Mens good Works in virtue of God's Promise.

I answer;

1. That although we should allow the Assistance of God's Grace, not to destroy the nature of true Merit, as it really does: yet even good Works performed by God's Assistance, cannot be said to be truly meritorious; because they are still imperfect by reason of that mixture of humane Infirmary which still accompanies them. Were they the effects of God's Grace alone, this might give them a Title to a Reward; but that Alloy which humane Weakness gives them, abates their value, and makes the free Grace of God to be absolutely necessary for the acceptance of them (although done by his Assistance) to that Reward which they were not otherwise deserving of.

2. That

2. That since the Council propofeth an eternal Reward as a Recompence which is faithfully rendred to Mens good Works in virtue of God's Promise, they either dealt dishonestly in afterwards establishing good Works to be meritorious, without fo much as making mention of the Promise, and thereby giving countenance to the Opinion of those who held good Works to be in their own natures truly meritorious; or else if they were sincere, they expressed themselves in very improper terms; since the dependance upon God's Promise for a Reward, does (as we before observed) wholly destroy the nature of true Merit.

3. That we do much rejoice if any of the Church of *Rome* are sincerely and truly of the same mind with us, as to this Doctrine of Merit, or that they can any way shew the Council of *Trent* to have said nothing about it, but what we teach. But it is evident that several of that Church, and those Men of great Authority, have been of another Opinion themselves, and likewise thought the Council of *Trent* to have taught otherwise about it than we do. And therefore the Bishop of *Coadom* and others are much to be blamed for charging us with misrepresenting their Council as to this point, since we lay nothing to its charge but what we can sufficiently prove to have been maintained by those who have both as much right to interpret, and as much reason to understand the Council's meaning as they can pretend to have.

4. That altho these new Modellers, when they speak of good Works being meritorious, according to the sense of the Council of *Trent*, do intermix something concerning the Promise of God, as if it were necessary to make them so, yet they never explain to us the nature of true Merit, they never in express terms tell us

(as

(as they ought to do) that good Works in themselves are not truly meritorious of a Reward, but (as the Council of *Trent* before them) they use such ambiguous and doubtful expressions as may both enable them to defend themselves; as if they held nothing more than what we hold; and at the same time give countenance to the Doctrine of Merit in the most proper and strictest sense.

5. That the Faith and Practice of the generality of the Church of *Rome*, in relation to Purgatory, Indulgences, Works of Supererogation, Penance, &c. (all which have a near relation to this Doctrine of Merit) are still as false and scandalous as ever, and therefore it is much to be suspected, That the Doctrine of good Works being in themselves truly meritorious, is likewise now as generally believed, and as much thought to be the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, as any other of their false Doctrines.

Having thus cleared our selves from the Imputation of laying that to the charge of those of the Church of *Rome*, which, as is pretended, they do not hold, I shall now proceed to shew that the Scriptures produced by *Bellarmino* and others upon this occasion, do give no countenance to the forementioned Doctrine of Merit which we find so much fault with.

Now the Texts of Scripture which are quoted upon this occasion being very numerous, I shall chuse to follow *Bellarmino's* Method, who has reduced them under several Heads, and endeavour to shew that the Inferences which he makes from them are false and absurd.

The first Head of Scriptures is of such where eternal Life is called a Reward or Wages.

Mat. 5. 12. Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your Reward in Heaven.

Mat.

Mat. 20. 8. *Call the Labourers, and give them their Hire.*

From whence it is urged, that if eternal Life be properly called a *Reward* or *Wages*, then may good Works, upon which it is bestowed, be rightly stiled *Merits*.

I answer ;

1. That *Wages* or *Reward* does indeed, according to the strictest sense, denote a proportion betwixt the Work done, and what is bestowed ; but according to the more loose signification of the word, nothing more is meant than that some wished for, and expected advantage does accrue to another upon his performance of such and such conditions, although there be no proportion betwixt such an advantage and the performance of them, but the bestowing of it does wholly depend upon the bounty of him that gives it. Which distinction is approved of by *St. Paul*, when he makes a difference (as he does, *Rom. 4. 4.*) betwixt a *Reward of Grace*, and a *Reward of Debt*. And therefore we may as well say, that because the word *to buy* does commonly suppose a price either given or to be given, therefore it is so to be interpreted in that passage of *Isaiah, chap. 55. 1. Come, buy Wine and Milk without money, or without price* : or that *Nebuchadnezzar* that wicked King did really *merit* something from God, because it is said, *Ezek. 29. 19.* That he gave him *Egypt as Wages for his Army* : as that where-ever the word *Reward* or *Wages* is found, there must necessarily be an equality betwixt it, and those good Actions of which by the Grace and Favour of God, it is made the Consequent, when otherwise it would not at all have belonged to them.

2. As to the Parable of the Labourers, it is so far from countenancing the Doctrine of Merit, that it directly tends to overthrow it. For,

(1.) If

(1.) If the Hire, here spoken of, was bestowed in proportion to the Labourers Work, how came it to pass that he who came early into the Vineyard received no greater Wages than he who worked but one hour?

Janfen. Conc.
Evang.

(2.) The design of the Parable is (as *Janfenius* a Popish Writer has observed) to shew that in the last Day those who were here last should be accounted first, *i. e.* That the Apostles and others who seemed Men of mean condition shall be preferred even before the Scribes and Pharisees; and that the Gentiles who were last converted shall be made equal to the *Jews* who were first called to work in the Vineyard of the Lord, and had the Gospel first preached to them. All which tends to set forth the Goodness and Liberality of God, and at the same time to suppress the vain Conceits of such who might be apt to rely too much upon their own Merits.

3. It is fit that we here observe, that an eternal Reward is in Scripture stiled an Inheritance; *Col. 3. 24.* *Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the Reward of the Inheritance; for we serve the Lord Christ.* Now as it is an Inheritance, it depends upon the free Gift of God, whose Children we are by Adoption, and consequently it cannot be reckoned as a Debt that is properly due unto us upon the account of our Works. *Bellarmino* indeed will needs have it both to be an Inheritance, and a Debt due to us upon the account of our Works, because it is more honourable for us, he saith, to receive something upon the account of our Works, than wholly to depend upon the Promise of God for it. In answer to whom it may be returned, that we ought not to consider what would be most honourable for us, as how things in their own nature, or according to God's Appointment, are.

Bell. de Just.
l. 5. c. 3.

We find it impossible that our best Deeds should be truly meritorious of an eternal Reward, and then we
must

must not go about to assert that they are meritorious, because it would be more honourable for us if they were. It is honour enough for us that God is pleased to take pity of us when we don't deserve it, and to make us Partakers of an inestimable Reward which we have no pretence to. And therefore we ought to give him the Glory thereof, to whom it is due, and as long as we are happy, not be so arrogant as to pretend that our own Works are the meritorious cause thereof.

Another Head is of such Scriptures, wherein the Heavenly Reward is said to be given to Men according to the measure and proportion of their Works and Labour.

Psal. 62. 12. — For thou rendrest to every Man according to his Work.

Matth. 16. 27. For the Son of Man shall come in the Glory of his Father with his Angels; and then he shall reward every Man according to his Works.

Luke 6. 38. With the same measure that ye meet withal, it shall be measured to you again.

Rom. 2. 6. — Who will render to every Man according to his Deeds.

1 Cor. 3. 8. And every Man shall receive his own Reward according to his own Labour.

Gal. 6. 8. For he that soweth to his Flesh, shall of the Flesh reap Corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap Life everlasting.

Revel. 22. 12. And behold, I come quickly, and my Reward is with me, to give every Man as his Work shall be.

From which Scriptures it is inferred that since they assert a Reward to be given according to the measure of every ones Work, therefore in the giving the Reward respect is had not only to the Promise, or Liberality, or Indulgence of God, but likewise to the Dignity and Efficacy of the Works themselves.

I answer;

1. That *Bellarmino* does in this Inference suppose that in giving a Reward respect is had to the Promise as well as to the Efficacy of the Works. Now if he meant thereby that the Reward does at all depend upon God's Promise, and that without a Promise no Claim could have been made to it, then does he at the same time, as he would establish the Merit of good Works, destroy it. For where there is true Merit, there he who gives it, was bound to have given it, whether he had promised it before or no.

2. That if all the fore-mentioned Places could be interpreted (as all they cannot, although some of them may) with respect only to good Works, and not to bad ones also; then might the Reward said to be given to every one according to his Works be considered with respect to those several degrees of Glory, which good Men shall be made partakers of in another Life. As God has, out of his infinite Liberality, been pleased to promise an eternal Reward, so has he likewise taken care that they who make the greatest improvement in Vertue and Goodness shall be received into a more happy Estate than they who have made less. [Thus the Apostle,

1. Cor.

1. Cor. 3. 8. discoursing of the several ways by which the first Preachers of the Gospel had been useful, saith, that *one planteth, and another watereth, but both these were one*; i. e. had the same excellent design in hand, viz. to make Men Converts unto Christianity, and to establish them in the most holy Faith; and then adds, — *And every Man shall receive his own Reward according to his own labour*; i. e. As every one has been more servicable in the Ministry, so shall his Reward be greater.] But then here is nothing of Merit in the case: for both the lesser Degrees of Glory, as well as the greater, depend upon God's Establishment; and although this be an excellent Motive to make us more industrious to serve and please God, yet we have no reason to value our selves upon any such account. For although he should be pleased for such our Industry to bestow some of the higher degrees of Glory upon us, yet we did not deserve even the lesser at his hands.

3. That although some of the forementioned Passages, having regard only to Mens good Works, may be interpreted with respect to the different degrees of Glory in another World; yet there are other which have respect to Mens bad Deeds as well as to their good ones: Such is that in *Matthew 16. 27.* — *And then he shall reward every Man according to his Work.* For our Saviour having in the forepart of the Verse declared his coming to Judgment, *For the Son of Man shall come in the Glory of his Father with his Angels,* he immediately adds, — *And then he shall reward every Man according to his works*; i. e. as it is expressed, *John 5. 29. They shall stand forth*

forth they that have done good unto the Resurrection of Life, and they that have done evil unto the Resurrection of Damnation.

Now if the fore-mentioned Passages are considered with respect to evil, as well as good Deeds, then they do only denote that different Success which good and bad Men will have in the other Life; the former of which will be eternally happy, the latter eternally miserable. But this wholly depends upon God's Decrees; and however Sinners may be said to merit Damnation, there is nothing here implied to be in Man, which can any ways be said truly to merit so inestimable a Reward as is prepared for such as live holy Lives.

Good Deeds it's true may be compared with their own Reward, as well as with bad Deeds. But these places of Scripture do not so much consider them, as compared with their own Reward, as with bad Deeds; and therefore all that they intimate, is, that in the other World the Event will not be alike to the Good and to the Bad, but that as has been every ones Behaviour here, so shall he be either punished or rewarded hereafter. And therefore that was a good Distinction of Pope Gregory, — *That it is one thing to reward a Man according to his Works, and another to reward him according to the Merit of his Works, or for the sake of his Works.* To reward one according to the Merit of Works, or for the sake of Works, denotes some Proportion betwixt the Reward and Works: but to reward according to Works, signifies no more than that things will not happen out alike to all, that all will not be saved, nor all damned, but that all good Men will be

be saved, and all wicked and impenitent Sinners damned.

A third Argument fetched from Scripture for the Proof of good Works being meritorious, is deduced from such places as do declare an eternal Reward to be so bestowed upon good Works, that they place the very reason why eternal Life is bestowed in the good Works themselves.

Matth. 25, 34, 35, &c. Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the Foundation of the World.

For I was hungry, and ye gave me Meat, I was thirsty, and ye gave me Drink, I was a Stranger, &c.

And in the same Chapter, *ver. 21.*—*Because thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee Ruler over many things, enter thou into the Joy of thy Lord.*

Rev. 7. 14. These are they which came out of great Tribulation, and have washed their Robes, and made them white in the Blood of the Lamb.

Rev. 15. Therefore are they before the Throne of God, and serve him Day and Night in his Temple; and he that sitteth on the Throne shall dwell amongst them.

In those places, saith *Bellarmino*, the reason of the Reward is declared to be the doing of good Works, therefore they are meritorious.

I answer,

First, That in the first Passage, *Come ye Blessed, &c.* the Reward spoken of is called an *Inheritance*, for

it;

The Texts examined which Papists cite

it is said, *Come and inherit the Kingdom.* Now, as I before observed, good Men being Christ's Children by Adoption, and their Reward being their Inheritance, it depends upon God's Bounty towards them, and not their own Merit. And this the Elect themselves are so sensible of, that even in this Chapter they seem to be amazed at God's loving-kindness towards them, as knowing that all the Good which they could do, bore no Proportion to that immense Reward which was promised to be bestowed upon them.

Secondly, That although *Bellarmino* in that other Passage of *St. Matthew* inserts the Word, *Because; Because thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee Ruler, &c.* Yet is not any such Word to be found in the Greek Text, nor in our Translation. And therefore the reason for his grounding his Argument for Merit upon that Passage, is wholly taken away.

Thirdly, That in the Passage quoted out of the Revelations, *These are they which came out of great Tribulation, therefore are they before the Throne of God, &c.* *Bellarmino* leaves out [*have washed their Robes, and made them white in the Blood of the Lamb.*] Which Words do plainly denote Christ's Merits to be necessary for the rendering their good Actions acceptable to God, and consequently that they were not meritorious in themselves.

Fourthly, That these Particles, *For, Because,* do not always denote one thing to be the true and proper cause

cause of another, but only the Connexion that is betwixt one thing and another. Thus *1 Tim. 1. 13.* *But I obtained Mercy, because I did it ignorantly in Unbelief.* Now no Man can assert the Faults of Infidels, committed through Ignorance, to be the immediate cause of God's Mercy towards them. No more from these Passages, where there is only declared a Connexion betwixt good Deeds and an eternal Reward, ought it to be concluded that the former are the meritorious cause of the latter. They are such things as must precede an eternal Reward. They are the Conditions upon which it is promised to be bestowed, and so far forth they may be reckoned the cause thereof, that it cannot be obtained without them. But they cannot truly be said to be the cause thereof, so as that it does depend upon them as a necessary Effect. Neither do the fore-mentioned Particles which do only connect good Deeds, and an eternal Reward together, and shew one to be the Consequent of the other, at all denote any such thing.

The fourth Argument for the Proof of our good Deeds being meritorious, is fetched from such Scriptures, as do declare that a Reward in Justice ought to be given to Mens good Deeds.

2 Theff. 1. 4. *So that we our selves glory in you in the Churches of God, for your Patience and Faith in all your Persecutions and Tribulations that ye endure.*

Ver. 5. *Which is a manifest Token of the righteous Judgment of God, that ye may be accounted worthy of the Kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer:*

Ver. 6. *Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense Tribulation to them that trouble you;*

Verse.

Verse 7. *And to you who are troubled rest with us.*

2 Tim. 4. 7. *I have fought a good Fight, I have finished my Course, I have kept the Faith.*

Ver. 8. *Henceforth there is laid up for me a Crown of Righteousness which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me at that day.*

Heb. 6. 10. *For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of Love.*

Now as to these and the like places, where mention is made of God's *Righteousness*, and that as a just Judge, he will reward the Actions of righteous Persons, it may be replied,

That God may be said as a just Judge, to reward such Actions, not because such Actions do in themselves deserve any such Reward, but,

First, Because our Saviour has merited it for us. Although there are no Merits in us, yet there are in our Saviour. He by his Death and Passion has made an Atonement for our Transgressions, and has established in his Blood a new Covenant betwixt God and us; and therefore eternal Life being the purchase of his Sufferings for us, God may in Justice be said to give us it, although what we do our selves be no ways deserving of it.

Secondly, Because God has promised to bestow an eternal Reward upon such good Actions. He is said to be just and righteous who keeps his Promises. Now God has solemnly promised that he will bestow an everlasting Reward upon all such as be-
have

have themselves dutifully towards him, and live up to the Conditions of the Gospel ; and thereby, as Saint *Augustin* speaks, has made *himself their Debtor, not by receiving any thing, but by promising.* And therefore they who do behave themselves as they ought to do, have a Right and Title to such a Reward, but it is only upon the account of God's Promise, and not upon the account of their own good Deeds. For should God even after he had promised a Reward, refuse to bestow it, he would indeed (what it is impossible to suppose of him) act contrary to his most excellent Nature, and must needs be thought to want much of that Perfection which is always inherent in him, and Men could not any longer entertain those worthy apprehensions of him as they did formerly, but at the same time they could not complain of any Injury done them, because since they did not deserve to have any such Promise made to them, neither could they merit to have it observed after it was made.

Aug. in p. 83.
Debitorem
Dominus ipse
fecit non acci-
piendo, sed
promittendo.

In this therefore consists God's Justice in giving us a Reward, not in that we could oblige him to it by our best Performances; but in that he has obliged himself to it by Promise, which it would be contrary to his Divine Perfections not to make good.

The fifth Argument to prove good Works to be meritorious, is fetched from those Scriptures where eternal Life is promised to good Works.

Mat. 19. 17. *If thou wilt enter into Life, keep the Commandments.*

Ver. 29. *And every one that hath forsaken Houses, or Brethren, or Sisters, or Mother, or Wife, or Children, or Lands for my Names sake, shall receive an hundred fold*

fold, and shall inherit everlasting Life.

1 Tim. 4. 8. *Godliness is profitable unto all things, having the Promise of the Life that now is, and of that which is to come.*

James 1. 12. *Blessed is the Man that endureth Temptation; for when he is tried, he shall receive the Crown of Life which the Lord hath promised to them that love him.*

In these Places, saith Bellarmine, a Promise being made with the condition of doing something, does not only make the thing promised to be due upon the account of such a Promise, but likewise that he who performs the Work, may be said to have merited the thing promised, and to have just reason to demand it, as what does of right belong to him.

I answer;

1. That Bellarmine himself in this place is so modest as not positively to affirm, that where there is a Promise there can be any true Merit. All that he here asserts, is, that he who performs the Work may be said to have merited the thing promised. Now we think it very improper to affirm that any one can be said truly to merit what without a Promise he could never have obtained.

2. Altho in these places a Promise is made to several Performances, yet who ever fulfilled the conditions to which they are made? who ever has kept the Commandments? who ever has been godly? who ever has endured Temptation after that manner, and to that degree, as to dare to affirm the Reward, even upon the account of God's Promise, to be his due? After we have done the best we can, we shall find our Performances to be very weak and imperfect, and that we have reason daily to put up that Petition to God Almighty, *Forgive us our Trespases.* And if so, how kind so ever God may have been in promising us an inestimable Reward, yet since upon the account of our many failings we cannot come

up to the conditions upon which he has promised it, we have but little reason to pretend to merit it, especially since,

3. All our best Actions, altho performed by God's Assistance, bear no proportion to what he has been pleased to promise us. Had God made us no promise of a Reward, we were bound upon the account of our Creation, and those Mercies which we daily receive from him, to have served him according to the best of our power; should then our good Deeds be never so perfect, they would be abundantly recompensed even in this Life. What equality then betwixt the Actions of finite Creatures, and the eternal Kindness of an infinite God in the World to come?

To promise us any thing, destroys the nature of true Merit; but to promise so vast a Reward, and to such who cannot exactly perform the conditions upon which it is promised, sets us at a greater distance from it.

The sixth Argument to prove good Works to be meritorious, is fetched from those Scriptures where mention is made of good Men being worthy of a Reward.

Luke 10. 7. *The Labourer is worthy of his Hire.*

2 Thess. 1. 5. — *That ye may be counted worthy of the Kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer.*

Rev. 3. 4. *Thou hast a few Names, even in Sardis, which have not defiled their Garments, and they shall walk with me in white, for they are worthy.*

In these and the like places, saith Bellarmine, to be worthy of a Reward signifies to merit it.

I answer,

That to be worthy is of a much larger Signification than to merit. For to merit a Reward, signifies (as has been shewn) to do something betwixt which and the

the Reward there may be some equality or proportion. But *to be worthy of it*, may denote no more than the Performance of such Conditions, unto which by the kind Acceptation of the Donor, it is made to belong, although there be no Equality betwixt it, and the Performance of such Conditions. When God is pleased so to assist us with his Grace, as that we perform what is acceptable in his Sight, and what he has thought fit to reward: then may we be said to be worthy of such a Reward, because he has made us to be so. Hence St. Bernard, [*We are worthy by his Dignation, not by our own Dignity.*] But could we have been said truly to have merited it, what we had done, must have been of our own Strength and Power, and we must have done it in that Degree of Perfection, as that without any Promise from God, we might have justly challenged it as our due from him.

Bern. de decl.
Ecccl. ser. 9.
— *Illius dignatione non nostra dignitate.*

The seventh and last Argument mentioned by Bellarmine for the Proof of *Merit* is fetched from such Scriptures where God is said to be a just Judg, and no Acceptor of Persons.

Rev. 2. 11. *There is no respect of Persons with God.*

Gal. 2. 6. *God accepteth no Man's Person.*

1 Pet. 1. 17. *And if ye call on the Father, who without respect of Persons judgeth according to every Man's Work, &c.*

Acts 10. 34. *Then Peter opened his Mouth, and said, Of a truth, I perceive that God is no Respector of Persons.*

For then, saith Bellarmine, there is respect had to Persons when a Judg gives a *Reward* without *Merits*, or a greater *Reward* where there are few *Merits*, and therefore God in the Retribution of *Rewards*, considers Mens *Merits*, and according to the Diversity of their *Merits*, assigns the Mansions of eternal Glory.

I answer,

1. That as to the Distribution of Rewards no Judge can properly be said to be an Acceptor of Persons, who gives any one more than he deserves, unless he were obliged to the contrary, or did another an Injury by defrauding him that had more *Merits* of what was his due, to give to him that had less. Now if in the fore-mentioned Passages, God be considered with Respect to the final Distribution of Rewards according to Mens Works, if he shall bestow a Reward far surpassing all their best Actions, how was he obliged to the contrary?

He would indeed act contrary to his own Truth and Faithfulness, should he not bestow such a Reward because he has promised it. But what can forbid him to distribute his own Gifts as he pleaseth?

And as for his doing another an Injury by bestowing upon any one more than he deserves, this cannot be; because he has an eternal Reward in store for all such (how many soever they be) who perform the Conditions upon which out of meer Grace and Favour he has made it to become due.

2. That in most of the forementioned Passages, if not in all, where God is said to be *no Acceptor of Persons*, respect is had not so much to the final Distribution of Rewards according to Mens Works, as to his calling the *Gentiles* to be made Partakers of the Benefits of the Gospel.

The *Jews* knew themselves to have been God's peculiar People; they believed the Promise of the Messiah to belong only to them, and therefore were wont to despise others who were not of the Stock of *Abraham* as well as themselves. But at our Saviour's coming the partition Wall was broken down, and God declared to be no Acceptor of Persons, in that all Persons of what

Qua-

Quality or Nation soever were alike capable of being made Members of the new Covenant in Christ.

Having thus explained those Texts which are brought by *Bellarmino* and others to prove good Works to be truly meritorious, and shown that they give no Countenance to any such Doctrine, it were as easie to show that they have as much abused *Antiquity* in this matter, as they have the *Scriptures*; but my Business being only to vindicate the Scripture from their false Interpretations, I shall conclude this Discourse with these following Observations.

1. That this Doctrine has so little Foundation in the Scripture, that the Word *Merit* is not so much as to be found there. *Bellarmino* indeed pretends to show us the Word in two places, but he quotes them both according to the Latin Translation which we do not allow of.

Omnis misericordia faciet locum unicuique secundum meritum operum suorum.
Πάντα ἐλεημοσύνη ποιήσει τὸν ἕνα ἕκαστον κατὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ δικησάν.

The first is *Eccles.* 16. 14. The English whereof according to the Latin Translation is, *All Mercy shall make place for every one according to the Merit of his Works.*

But according to the Original it is, *Every Man shall find according to his Works.* Now we have already shown the great Difference betwixt receiving according to the *Merit of our Works*; and receiving according to our Works. The first denotes an Equality betwixt the Reward and good Works, the second only signifies the Reward to be the consequent of them.

Talibus hostiis promeretur Deus.

Τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσιαῖς εὐαρεστήσεται ὁ Θεός.

The other Passage is *Heb.* 13. 16. which according to the Interpretation of bad *Latin*, denotes *God to be delighted by such Sacrifices*; but according to the Interpretation of the *Greek*, no more is meant than that, *with such Sacrifices God is well pleased*; which he may be when there is nothing of *Merit* in the case.

Psal. 38. 4.
March. 6. 12.

1. 12. That there are a great many places of Scripture which do directly contradict this Doctrine of *Merit*.

For

For besides such as set forth our many Sins and Infirmities, and declare the Necessity of God's Forgiveness; such as assert our good Works to be done by the Assistance of God's Grace. That we were obliged to have done them although we had had no Prospect of a Reward; That an eternal Reward is our Inheritance, and that there is no Proportion betwixt it and the best of our Actions. There are other places which expressly affirm *eternal Life* to be the *Gift of God*: other which declare Justification to be of Grace, and consequently Glorification to be so too; *for whom he has justified, those he has glorified* Other which teach us the Necessity of daily praying to God for a Supply of things necessary for our present Subsistence, and consequently that if we do not merit our *daily Bread*, much less can we merit *eternal Life*. Other which bid us; after we have done our best, to own our selves to be *unprofitable Servants*. Other that will not allow even our Sufferings for the sake of Religion *to be worthy to be compared with the Glory which shall be revealed in us*.

Phil. 2. 13.
John 14. 9.
2 Cor. 3. 5.
Luke 17. 10.
Rom. 8. 16,
17, 18.

Rom. 6. 23.

March. 6. 11.

Luke 17. 10.

Rom. 8. 18.

Lastly, There are several other which do in so ample a manner set forth the Merit of our Saviour's undertaking for us, as they do wholly take us off from placing any Trust or Confidence in any of our best Performances.

T H E E N D .

Printed by J. J. for Thomas Baskett at the ...
in the Strand, near St. Dunstons Church.

A T A B L E

OF THE Several TEXTS,

*Which are made use of by the Romanists, for the
proof of their several Doctrines.*

By John Wallington

I.

Concerning the Obscurity of Scripture.

<p>PSAL. 119. 34. 18. 73. 135.</p> <p>Matth. 13. 11. Luke 8. 10. Luke 24. 27. 45.</p>	<p>p. 40.</p> <p>} p. 24.</p> <p>p. 36.</p> <p>p. 38.</p> <p>p. 25.</p> <p>p. 37.</p>	<p>John 5. 35. Acts 8. 31. 1 Cor. 12. 10. 2 Tim. 3. 7. 2 Pet. 3. 16. 1. 20. 1 John 4. 6. Rev. 5. 4.</p>	<p>p. 39. p. 26. p. 37. p. 39. p. 27. p. 35. p. 39. p. 40.</p>
--	---	---	--

II.

Concerning the Insufficiency of Scripture, and the Necessity of Tradition.

<p>1 CHRON. 29. 29. 2 Chron. 9. 29.</p>	<p>p. 55.</p> <p>p. 55.</p> <p>6 E</p> <p style="font-size: small;">c. m. n.</p>	<p>1 Kings 4. 32. Gen. 18. 19.</p>	<p>p. 55. p. 58. Exod.</p>
--	--	--	------------------------------------

A Table of the Texts.

Exod. 13. 8.	p. 60.	1 Cor. 5. 9.	p. 57.
Deut. 32. 7.	p. 60.	2 Theff. 2. 15.	p. 57.
Judges 6. 13.	p. 60.	1 Tim. 6. 20.	p. 70.
Pfal. 44. 1.	p. 60.	2 Tim. 1. 13, 14.	p. 70.
John 16. 12.	p. 63.	2 Tim. 2. 1, 2.	p. 70.
John 21. 25.	p. 66.	2 Ep. John 12.	p. 72.
1 Cor. 11. 2, 16.	p. 64.	3 Ep. John 13. 14.	p. 72.
23. 24.	p. 64.	Col. 4. 16,	p. 57.
1 Cor. 7. 1.	p. 57.		

III.

Concerning the Supremacy of St. Peter.

M Matth. 16. 18, 19.	p. 98.	John 21. 15, 16, 17.	p. 106.
-----------------------------	--------	----------------------	---------

IV.

P A R T 2.

M Matth. 23. 2.	p. 139.	John 22. 15, 16, 17.	p. 105.
Matth. 14. 29.	p. 127.	Gen. 1. 1.	p. 139.
Luke 5. 3, 7, 10.	p. 128.	Deut. 17. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.	p. 134.

V.

Concerning Infallibility.

P Sal. 132. 13, 14.	p. 183.	18. 20.	p. 157.
Cant. 4. 7.	p. 145.	23. 1, 2.	p. 154.
Isaiah 1. 26.	p. 145.	28. 20.	p. 157.
2. 3, 4.	p. 182.	Luke 10. 16.	p. 159.
35. 5.	p. 184.	22. 32.	p. 161.
52. 1.	p. 145.	John 14. 16.	p. 164.
59. 21.	p. 184.	14. 26.	p. 166.
Matth. 16. 18.	p. 146.	16. 18.	p. 168.
18. 17.	p. 150.	Acts 15. 28.	p. 173.

A Table of the Texts.

Ephes. 4. 14.	p. 174.	Heb. 13. 7.	p. 180.
1 Tim. 3. 15.	p. 175.	Revel. 1. 13, 15.	p. 178.
2 Tim. 2. 19.	p. 177.		

VI.

Concerning the Worship of Angels and Saints departed.

P A R T 1.

2 Kings 2. 11.	p. 211.	Matth. 27. 52.	p. 223.
Jerem. 15. 1.	p. 196.	Luke 16. 19, to 31.	p. 207.
Zech. 1. 12.	p. 200.	15. 7, 10.	p. 201.
Pfal. 91. 11.	p. 220.	John 5. 45.	p. 205.
Dan. 10. 13.	p. 220.	Acts 12. 13.	p. 201.
Dan. 10. 20, 21.	}	Hebrews 1. 14.	p. 220.
Deut. 32. 8.		p. 221.	2 Peter 1. 15.
Baruch. 3. 4.	p. 199.	Revel. 2. 26, 27.	p. 224.
2 Maecab. 15. 12, to 15.	p. 199.	3. 12.	p. 227.
Matth. 17. 3.	p. 223.	3. 21.	p. 228.
18. 10.	p. 221.	6. 10.	p. 197.
22. 30.	p. 204.	12. 10.	p. 206.

VII.

P A R T 2.

G E N. 2. 18.	p. 270.	2 Chron. 6. 16.	p. 265.
Gen. 18. 2.	p. 234.	Job 5. 1.	p. 255.
Gen. 19. 1, 19, 20.	p. 235.	Job 19. 21.	p. 255.
Gen 48. 16.	p. 252.	Job 4 ^v . 8.	p. 256.
Exod. 32. 13.	p. 263.	Pfal. 132. 1. 10.	p. 269.
Numb. 22. 31.	p. 236.	Dan. 2. 46.	p. 239.
Josh. 5. 13, 14.	p. 237.	Rom. 15. 30.	p. 256.
1 Sam. 28. 14.	p. 238.	Eph. 6. 18, 19.	p. 256.
1 Sam. 7. 8.	p. 256.	Eph. 3. 16.	p. 257.
1 Kings 15. 4.	p. 263.	Gal. 3. 9.	p. 267.
2 Kings 19. 24.	p. 263.	1 Thess. 2. 25.	p. 257.

A Table of the Texts.

2 Thess. 3: 1.	p. 257.	Rev. 8: 3.	p. 268.
Col. 4: 3.	p. 257.	Rev. 5: 8.	p. 269.
Heb. 13: 8.	p. 257.		

VIII.

Concerning the Worship of Images and Reliques.

E xod. 28. 2.	p. 291.	Pfal. 99. 5.	p. 285.
12. 16.	p. 291.	Isai. 11. 10.	p. 300.
Exod. 3. 15.	p. 289.	Matth. 5. 34, 35.	p. 287.
Exod. 13. 19.	p. 296.	Matth. 24. 30.	p. 292.
Exod. 25. 18.	p. 279.	Matth. 11. 20, 21, 22.	p. 300.
Numb. 21. 8, 9.	p. 282.	Acts 5. 12, 15.	p. 301.
Deut. 34. 6.	p. 297.	Acts 19. 11, 12.	p. 302.
2 Kings 13. 21.	p. 298.	Phil. 2. 10.	p. 293.
2 Kings 23. 16, 17, 18.	p. 299.		

IX.

Concerning Seven Sacraments, and the Efficacy of them.

PART I.

PART 2.

Of Confirmation.

Of Orders.

L uke 24. 9.	}	p. 312.	Acts 6. 6.	}	p. 335.
John 16. 8.			Acts 13. 3.		
John 15. 26.	}	p. 312.	Acts 14. 23.	}	p. 339.
John 14. 16.			Acts 13. 2.		
Acts 1. 8.		p. 315.	Acts 20. 28.		p. 339.
Acts 8. 17.		p. 318.	Eph. 4. 11.		p. 339.
2 Cor. 1. 21, 22.		p. 320.	1 Tim. 4. 14.	}	p. 335.
Heb. 6. 1.		p. 319.	2 Tim. 1. 6.		
1 John 2. 27.			1 Tim. 4. 14.		p. 337.

Of Penance.

Of Matrimony.

Matth. 4. 17.	}	p. 323.	1 Cor. 77.	p. 344.
Mark 1. 15.			Eph. 5. 32.	p. 342.
John 20. 22, 23.				

A Table of the Texts.

1 Thess. 4. 4.	}	Mark 16. 16.	p. 353.	
1 Tim. 2. 15.		p. 344.	Luke 3. 16.	p. 352.
<i>Of Extreme Unction.</i>		John 1. 26.	p. 352.	
Mark 6. 13.	}	John 3. 5.		
Mark 16. 18.		p. 346.		Acts 2. 38.
James 5. 14, 15.		p. 350.		Acts 22. 15.
<i>Of the Efficacy of the Sacraments.</i>		Eph. 5. 25.		
Matth. 3. 11.	p. 352.	1 Pet. 3. 21.	p. 354.	
Mark 1. 8.	p. 352.	Acts 8. 18.		p. 355.
		1 Cor. 10. 17.		

X

Concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass.

P A R T I.

G EN. 14. 18. 19.	p. 365	Lev. 17. 19, 21.	p. 352.
Exod. 12. 3.	p. 382	Mat. 6. 21. compar'd	}
Exod. 24. 8.	p. 387.	with	
1 Sam. 2. 35.	p. 390	Jer. 33. 18.	p. 394.
Prov. 9. 1.	p. 391	Dan. 8. 11, 12.	

XI.

P A R T 2.

L EV. 1. 9.	p. 429	John 4. 21, 23.	p. 404.
Mal. 1. 11.	p. 397	Acts 13. 2.	p. 419.
1 Sam. 7. 9.	p. 429	1 Cor. 10. 14, — 24.	p. 424.
Matth. 26. 28.	p. 410	1 Cor. 11. 24.	p. 410.
Luke 22. 19. 20.	p. 410		

XII.

XII.

Concerning the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

M	Atth. 26. 26, 27, 28.	p. 455	John 6. 61.	} p. 446
	John 6. 51.	p. 437	John 6. 62.	
	John 6. 52.	p. 440	1 Cor 10. 16.	} p. 453
	John 6. 53.	p. 441		

XIII.

Concerning Auricular Confession.

N	UM. 5. 6, 7.	p. 483	John 11. 44.	p. 485
	Gen. 3.	p. 481	John 20. 23.	p. 460
	Gen. 4.	p. 482	Acts 19. 18.	p. 473
	Lev. 13. 14.	p. 482	2 Cor. 5. 18, 19.	p. 474
	Matth. 3. 5, 6.	p. 484	James 5: 16.	p. 477.
	Matth. 16. 19.	} p. 360	1 John 1. 9.	p. 480

XIV.

Concerning Satisfaction.

P A R T I.

G	EN. 2. 17.	p. 517	Deut. 32. 50.	p. 527
	Exod. 32. 1, &c.	p. 523	2 Sam. 12. 13. to 17.	p. 519
	Numb. 12. 15.	p. 522	2 Sam. 24. 1.	p. 522
	Numb. 14. 2, &c.	p. 525	1 Kings 13. 1.	p. 529
	Numb. 20. 28.	p. 527	1 Cor. 11. 29.	p. 530

A Table of the Texts.

XV.

PART 2

L EV. 4 5, 6.	A 547	Luke 11. 41.	P 542
Plal. 119. 62.	P 562	1 Cor. 11. 31.	P 546
2 Chron. 7. 14.	P 534	2 Cor. 2. 10.	P 563
Jer. 18. 7. 8.	P 533	2 Cor. 7. 11.	P 549
Prov. 16. 6.	P 531	2 Cor. 8. 14.	P 580
Dan. 4. 27.	P 539	1 Col. 24.	P 552
Jonah 3. 4.	P 534	Eph. 5. 1, 2.	P 557
Matth. 3. 8.	P 543	Gal. 6. 2.	P 558

XVI.

Concerning Purgatory.

PART 1.

N umb. 14. 32.	}	P. 583	Mich. 7. 8, 9.	P. 613
ver. 33.			Isaiah 9. 18.	P. 614
Exodus 1. 15.	}	P. 587	Malachi 3. 3.	P. 615
James 2. 25.			Matth. 12. 32.	P. 616
Matth. 8. 22.		P. 588	1 Cor. 3. 15.	P. 629
1 Cor. 15. 29.		P. 597	Matth. 5. 25, 26.	P. 628
1 John 5. 16.		P. 602	1 Pet. 3. 19.	P. 633
Zech. 9. 11.		P. 606	Acts 2. 24.	P. 636
Psalms 66. 12.		P. 608	Luke 32. 42.	P. 637
1 Sam. 3.		P. 610	Phil. 2. 10.	P. 640.
2 Kings 8.		P. 610		

XVIII.

Concerning Prayers in an Unknown Tongue

PART 1st. & 2d.

L EVIT. 16. 1.	}	P. 65,	Matth. 26. 16.
1. 2e. 8			

XIX.

Concerning the Celibacy of Priests.

PART 1, 2.

1 Tim. 3. 2.	p. 745	Luke 1. 23.	p. 761
Titus 1. 8.	p. 754	1 Sam. 21. 40	p. 765
2 Tim. 2. 4.	p. 756	Luke 1. 34.	p. 778
1 Cor. 7. 32, 33.	p. 757	Matth. 19. 12.	p. 780
1 Cor. 7. 5.	p. 761	1 Tim. 5. 11, 12.	p. 782

XX.

Concerning the Visibility of the Church.

Numb. 24. 4.	p. 825	Matth. 16. 18.	p. 826
1 Kings 8. 14.	p. 825	Matth. 18. 17.	p. 829
2 Sam 7. 16.	p. 837	Matth. 28. 20.	p. 845
Pfal. 19. 4.	p. 832	John 14. 16.	p. 846
Pfal. 72. 5.	p. 837	Acts 20. 28.	p. 831
Pfal. 89. 3, 4.	p. 836	15. 3.	p. 831
Isa. 49. 14. to 17.	}	15. 4.	}
Isa. 54. 9. to 12.		18. 22.	
Isa. 60. 15. to 20.		2 Cor. 4. 3.	
Isa. 61. 8, 9.	p. 838	Eph. 4. 11, to 14.	p. 843
Isa. 62. 3. to 12.	}	1 Cor. 15. 9.	}
Isa. 66. 21.		Gal. 1. 13.	
Jerem. 30. 2.	p. 840	Phil. 3. 6.	p. 832
31. 35, to 37.	}	1 Tim. 3. 14, to 16.	}
32. 38, to 41.			
33. 14, to 20.			
Ezek. 34. 22, to 25.		p. 841	
37. 23, to 27.			
48. 35.			

A Table of the Texts.

XXI:

Concerning Merits.

P <i>Salm</i> 62. 12.	p. 865	<i>Gal.</i> 2. 6.	p. 876
<i>Matth.</i> 5. 12.	p. 862	<i>Gal.</i> 6. 8.	p. 866
<i>Matth.</i> 20. 8.	p. 863	2 <i>Theff.</i> 1.	p. 871
16. 27.	p. 865	2 <i>Theff.</i> 1. 5.	p. 875
25. 34. &c.	p. 869	2 <i>Tim.</i> 4. 7, 8.	p. 871
25. 21.	p. 869	1 <i>Tim.</i> 4. 8.	p. 873
19. 17, 29.	p. 873	<i>Hebr.</i> 6. 10.	p. 871
<i>Luke</i> 6. 38.	p. 865	<i>James</i> 1. 12.	p. 873
10. 7.	p. 875	1 <i>Pet.</i> 1. 17.	p. 876
<i>Acts</i> 10. 34.	p. 876	<i>Revel.</i> 3. 4.	p. 875
<i>Rom.</i> 2. 6.	p. 865	2. 81.	p. 876
1 <i>Cor.</i> 3. 8.	p. 865	7. 14, 15.	p. 869
		22. 12.	p. 869

A
T A B L E
 OF THE
Principal Matters
 Contained in this VOLUME.

The INTRODUCTION.

	Page		Page
T HE Faith of the Reformed called by the Church of Rome Bibliſm, and they themſelves Bibliſts,	5	Where the Canon Law and School Divinity obtained, theſe were conſulted more in all caſes of Controverſy and Diſpute than the Bible,	7
The ſincere Chriſtians of all Ages governed themſelves by the Word of God,	ibid.	Pious Tales and Legends injoin- ed to be read by the People, <i>ibid.</i>	
The Hereticks of the firſt Ages appealed from the Bible to Tradition; ſome invented new Goſpels, and others razed ſeveral Places out of the True Goſpel,	6	The Apocryphal Books made a part of the Chriſtian Rule, and the Bible prohibited, by a Synod of Tholouſe in the 13th Century,	ibid.
As the Papacy encreaſed, the uſe of the Scriptures decreaſed,	ibid.	Cajetan applied his Mind to the ſtudy of the Scriptures, and writing Comments upon them, upon the Diſpute he had with Luther,	8

the Principal Matters.

It was dangerous in England for a Lay-man to have a Bible, for some years after the Reformation was begun by Luther, 9

In after-time, when the People had the use of the Bible, and nothing less than the Word of God would content them, the Papiſts then appealed to the Bible for the confirmation of their new Doctrines, Page

This method of theirs improper for these two Reasons :

First, Because they declare, that several Articles of Popery are not contained in the Scripture, but must be taken from Church-Authority, Page

This confessed to be true as to Invocation of Saints, by Cardi-

nal Perron, Card. Bellarmine, Salmeron, Father Coton, 10, 11

Secondly, Because they declare the Scriptures are obscure, even in matters of Faith, so as that the People, without an Infallible Guide, cannot find out the true sense of them, Page

Notwithstanding this the Romanists, where the Person is weak and ignorant, boast of Scripture-Proofs for their Religion, and against ours. Page

Instances of this kind from Bellarmine, Card. Perron, Father Coton, and amongst the English Writers, from the Author of the Touchstone of the Reformed Gospel, and the Catholick Scripturist, Page

I.

Concerning the Obscurity of the holy Scriptures.

T*HE Plainness and Perspicuity of the Scriptures opposed by C. Bellarmin, by Scriptures, by Sayings of the several Fathers, and by answering Objections,* Page

What the Protestants believe touching the Perspicuity of Scripture. Several things herein promised.

I. Protestants are far from

thinking the Scriptures to be throughout plain and easy to be understood, Page

2. That all Persons are not in a capacity of understanding all Scripture, but according to their Educations, Parts, and other Circumstances, they are capable of knowing the true meaning of more or less of it, Page

A TABLE of

<i>Page</i>	<i>Page</i>
<p>3. That some places are so obscure and difficult, that the most Learned cannot be certain of their having attained to the true sense of them, 19</p>	<p>proof of its Obscurity, against the Protestant Doctrine touching its Perspicuity, considered and examined, 24</p>
<p>4. That a great part of Scripture is now very easy, which was once difficult, and that many things are now extremely difficult, which Time will make as easy, <i>ibid.</i></p>	<p>Psal. 119. 73, 18, 135. Luke 24. 7. Examined, 25</p>
<p>5. That all things necessary to be rightly understood in order to Salvation, are in the Holy Scriptures delivered with great Perspicuity, 20</p>	<p>Acts 8. 31. considered and answered, 26</p>
<p>The Objection answered, <i>viz.</i> That it is not plain in Scripture, what Points are necessary, and what not, 21</p>	<p>2 Pet. 3. 16. five things returned in answer to the Cardinal's Interpretation of this Place, 27, to 32</p>
<p>6. That those Matters, the knowing of which is only profitable, and of use to our greater growth in Virtue, &c. most of them are very plainly delivered in Scripture, <i>ibid.</i></p>	<p>Several Citations of Scripture considered, that are made use of upon this Argument by the Author of the Touchstones of the Reformed Gospel. 32</p>
<p>7. That the Scriptures, though so plain in the most necessary Points, may yet by bad Men be misunderstood and perverted to an ill Sense, 22</p>	<p>Rev. 2. 5. } both these places } } misquod } Luk. 2. 50. } by this Author } 32</p>
<p>8. That when we affirm all things necessary to Salvation, to be perspicuously contained in Scripture, we mean all such things, of which the Spirit is designed to be the Instrument of Conveyance to our understandings, 23</p>	<p>Rev. 5. 4. answered in four Particulars. 35</p>
<p>Several places of Scripture alleged by the Cardinal for the</p>	<p>Four Reasons laid down to vindicate 2 Pet. 1. 20. from their false Interpretation, 35</p>
	<p>Luk. 24. 45. This place can't be understood of the Scriptures in general, but only of the Prophecies concerning Christ in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophecies and Psalms, 37</p>
	<p>1 Cor. 12. 10. doth no ways prove the Obscurity of the Scriptures; but that for the sake of which our Adversaries are so zealous to have them obscure, <i>ib.</i></p>
	<p>Luke 8. 10. only proves our Saviour made choice of a Parabolic way of Speech for some time</p>

the Principal Matters.

Page	Page
<p>to his Hearers; considering how they watch'd all Advantages from his Discourses to do him a Mischiefs, 38</p> <p>The Doctrine of the Obscurity of the Scriptures in matters necessary is as great an Imposition upon Experience, as is that of Transubstantiation upon our Senses, 41</p> <p>Several places of Scripture proposed to the Romanists, which more clearly assert the Perspicuity of the Scriptures, than theirs do its Obscurity; such as these,</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Deut. 30. 11. 42</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">2 Cor. 4. 2, 3, 4. 44</p> <p>Card. Bellarmine's Exposition of these two Places examined, ib.</p> <p>Whether a Writing be obscure or plain is not a Question to be de-</p>	<p>cided by Testimony, but Experience, 46</p> <p>The Cardinal's Instances for a Specimen of the Obscurity of the Scripture, examined, 47</p> <p>No Scripture obscure, excepting those particular Texts, wherein the Mysteries of our Religion are contained, 48</p> <p>The Obscurity of the Mysteries may make them incomprehensible, but not unintelligible, ibid.</p> <p>Those Instances of Card. Bellarmine to prove the obscure manner of expressing things in Scripture, have nothing in them, that a Man, who hath but one good Commentator, will call Obscurity, 49</p> <p>This Argument concluded with the Words of Mr. Chillingworth on this Subject, 50</p>

II.

Concerning the Insufficiency of Scripture, and Necessity of Tradition.

Page	Page
<p>Three things here examined, which are held by the Church of Rome, and endeavoured by them to be proved from Scripture.</p> <p>I. That the Scripture doth not contain all things necessary to Salvation, or is not a Rule sufficient to guide us therein. This answered, 54</p> <p>The loss of many Books menti-</p>	<p>oned in Scripture, doth not make it an insufficient Rule to us; This proved by four Reasons;</p> <p>1. Every thing wrote by inspired Persons was not Canonical, or indeed of Divine Inspiration, 55</p> <p>This Inspiration was not a power at all times resident in all those Persons, ibid.</p> <p>2. Those</p>

	Page
2. Those Books that are not now extant, mentioned in Scripture, were not Canonical, because they are lost,	56
3. Though some part of the Scripture is lost, yet it follows not that what was lost did contain things necessary to Salvation, and that what remains is not now a sufficient Rule,	ibid.
4. That which was once written, and is now no where extant, hath not been preserved to us by Tradition,	ibid.
Whether St. Paul writ an Epistle to the Laodiceans, considered,	57
II. What is to be understood by Tradition in a Theological sense, and whether a necessity of such a Tradition can be proved from Scripture,	58
Card Bellarmine's Proof from Scripture (Gen. 18. 19.) for the necessity of Tradition examined and answered in four Particulars,	59
Exod. 13. 8. considered and answered in five particulars,	60, 61
III. Whether there be any necessity of a Tradition, where there is a written Word? or whether there be indeed any such Tradition? This examined as to those places of Scripture alledged by the Cardinal for it,	62
John 21. 25. four Reasons assigned why this place of the Evangelist can make nothing for that	
end it is produced by him,	62, 63
John 16. 20. The Cardinal's Observation from it, and an Answer returned in three particulars,	64
1 Cor. 11. 2. no necessity of interpreting this of any other Tradition, than of what is contained in Scripture, viz. the great Doctrines and Rules of it, which the Apostle delivered to them when present, and which he wrote to them when absent,	ibid.
1 Cor. 11. 23. this makes directly contrary to the Doctrine of Tradition,	65
Three things alledged in answer to C. Bellarmine's Inference from the 34th Verse of the forementioned Chapter,	66
2 Thess. 2. 15. examined in four particulars,	67, 68
C. Bellarmine's Reply to it considered and answered,	69
Bellarmino proceeds to prove this point of Tradition the same way, and from the same places of Scripture, with some Hereticks in the time of Tertullian, viz.	
1 Tim. 6. 20. 2 Tim. 1. 13, 14. Chap. 2. 1, 2.	70
These places considered in two particulars,	71, 72
2 John 12. } cited to little purpose by the Card.	
3 Joh. 13. 14. } in this Argument	
Several Texts brought by the Authors of the Touchstone of the	73

the Principal Matters.

Page	Page
<i>the Reformed, &c. and of the Catholick Scripturist, to prove,</i>	
1. <i>That the World was for some time without a written Word, and had nothing but Tradition and verbal Teaching,</i>	73
	2. <i>That what was spoken by inspired Persons was of as good Authority, and equally received, as what was written by such,</i>
	74
	<i>Both these Particulars briefly considered and answered.</i>

III.

Concerning the Supremacy of St. Peter and of the Pope over the whole Church.

P A R T I.

Page	Page
T <i>Three ways made use of by the Cardinal to prove the Supremacy;</i>	<i>This the plain sense of St. Austin,</i>
First, <i>By some places of Scripture. Secondly, By many Priviledges and Prerogatives of St. Peter. Thirdly, By Testimonies. The first of these only concerned in this Design,</i>	80
Mat. 16. 18, 19. <i>largely considered and examined,</i>	81
I. <i>Two things implied in the former part of this Promise;</i>	<i>The Christian Church was not built by St. Peter's Hands alone, but by them all, and especially by St. Paul; which shews this Promise to have a respect to all, who had the Office of Apostles,</i>
First, <i>That there is no certainty that St. Peter is meant by the Rock, upon which Christ saith, he will build his Church,</i>	82
By Rock, <i>according to the best sense of the antient Interpreters, is understood the Faith concerning Christ, which St. Peter had newly confessed,</i>	<i>Jesus Christ the only Foundation that can be laid, and therefore St. Peter cannot be the Foundation, but only as a Minister of Jesus Christ, who helped to lay the Foundation, which is Christ himself and his Faith,</i>
	83
	<i>The distinction of a First and Secondary Foundation overthrown by that place of St. Paul, Rom. 15. 20.</i>
	ibid.
	<i>Faith</i>

A TABLE of

Page	Page
<p><i>Faith in Christ may be called a Foundation [Col. 1. 23.] and the Apostles (as Preachers of this Faith) are called a Foundation, Eph. 2. 20.</i> ibid.</p>	<p><i>Patristical Authority remained in Peter's Successors alone, examined,</i> 87</p>
<p><i>The Apostles understood no such Preheminence from these Words, nor did St. Peter himself so interpret them, when the Holy Ghost came upon them to lead them into all Truth,</i> 83, 84</p>	<p><i>The Popes Priviledg of Infallibility as well as supreme Dominion, asserted by the Cardinal from this place of Scripture, considered,</i> 83, 89</p>
<p><i>Secondly, There is nothing in the word Rock, which implies any Superiority of Power and Authority over the rest of his Brethren and the whole Church, (if we should suppose this Promise made to him alone) but only hath a respect to the support and stability of that Structure that is laid upon it,</i> 84</p>	<p>II. <i>The latter part of this Promise considered, And I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, &c.</i> 90</p>
<p><i>Card. Bellarmine's Explanation of this Word very improper, if not downright nonsense,</i> 85</p>	<p><i>What is here meant by the Kingdom of Heaven, by binding and loosing?</i> 91</p>
<p><i>C. Bellarmine's Reply to this, viz. the Apostles were all Foundations as well as St. Peter, examined and answered,</i> ibid.</p>	<p><i>The same with the Power of the Keys, which was not here promised to him alone, but equally to them all,</i> ibid.</p>
<p><i>Impossible for the Popes of Rome to make out their Claim to which they pretend from him, that they succeed him in this Authority,</i> 86</p>	<p><i>Thus the Antients interpreted this place, St. Austin particularly, a remarkable Quotation of whom is at large considered,</i> 92, 93</p>
<p><i>No Evidence that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, but only that he founded that Church, and settled a Bishop there,</i> ibid.</p>	<p><i>This justified by three other passages in the holy Gospels, viz. Matth. 18. 18. & 19. 28. John 20. 21, 22, 23. all of which do demonstrate that the Keys were not given to him alone,</i> 94, 95</p>
<p><i>Bellarmino's Assertion, that the Apostles being dead, the Apo-</i></p>	<p><i>The Opinion of those confused who affirm that Christ gave the Power of remitting and retaining Sins to all the Apostles, but the Power of the Keys to St. Peter alone,</i> 96</p>
	<p><i>As the Keys were not promised to St. Peter alone, so not to him more than any other Apostle, but only the use of them first, before any other Apostle,</i> 97, 98</p>

the Principal Matters.

	Page		Page
<i>Consult,</i>	98	to destroy,	100
<i>A recapitulation of the whole of this Argument in eight particulars,</i>	98, 99	<i>The word [Bind] imports not a power to impose Laws, but only to tie Men to those Laws which are already made,</i>	101
<i>Mat. 23, 8, 9, 10. overturns the Pretensions of Superiority in St. Peter and his Successors,</i>	99	<i>A Citation out of St. Hierom, alledged by the Romanists for the proving a Supremacy of Peter in St. Peter over the rest of the Apostles, considered,</i>	102
<i>That St. Peter had no power to make, but only to declare the Laws of our Saviour Jesus Christ, is evident from those words, One Shepherd, one Lord, one Lawgiver, who is able to save and</i>		<i>This Discourse concluded with the Observation of Dr. Hammond on this Argument,</i>	103, 104

IV.

To prove the Supremacy of St. Peter and of the Pope over the whole Church.

P A R T 2.

	Page		Page
<i>St. John ch. 2 r. v. 15, 16, 17. alledged by the Romanists to prove somewhat granted to St. Peter, which was conferred on none of the Apostles, that of a Pastor of the whole Church, with a supreme power over it,</i>	104	<i>This appears plainly from St. Peter himself, 1 Pet. 5. 2 from St. Paul, Acts 15. 22 from the Example of the Church of Jerusalem at the beginning of the Christian Church, and from the Example of the Church of Alexandria at the beginning of the Christian Church,</i>	105
<i>Two Answers returned to this;</i>			
1. <i>That these words contain only a plain Charge or Command to do his Office,</i>	107	<i>The words, I have given thee the keys, are not to be taken literally, but as a figure of speech, and signify that St. Peter was made the chief of the Church, and that he was to have the power of binding and loosing on earth, which should be ratified in Heaven,</i>	108
2. <i>That this Duty, upon that Precept, belongs not to him alone, but to every one of them as much as him,</i>	108	<i>The words, I have given thee the keys, are not to be taken literally, but as a figure of speech, and signify that St. Peter was made the chief of the Church, and that he was to have the power of binding and loosing on earth, which should be ratified in Heaven,</i>	108

A TABLE of

Page	Page
<p><i>threefold Confession he might obliterate his threefold Denial of our Saviour,</i> 110</p> <p><i>This is St. Cyril of Alexandria (with others) Interpretation,</i> 111, 112</p> <p>I. By the word Feed, the Church of Rome understands the highest Power to be committed to St. Peter, 113</p> <p><i>This word imports nothing of Ruling or Governing, but only refers to feeding the Flock by Word and Doctrine,</i> 114</p> <p><i>These words made use of by Bellarmine to assert the power of the Bishop of Rome, which extends to five Things.</i></p> <p>1. He is hereby made the Supreme Judg in Controversies of Faith, 115</p> <p>2. That He is an infallible Judg, <i>ibid.</i></p> <p>3. That He hath a power to make Laws for the whole Church, 116</p> <p>4. That He is absolutely above the whole Church, even above a General Council, <i>ibid.</i></p> <p>5. That He hath a Temporal power over Princes, <i>ibid.</i></p> <p><i>These Inferences confuted, even by their own Writers,</i> 117</p> <p>II. The Cardinal's Observations from the word MY Sheep, for establishing St. Peter's universal Pastorsnip considered and refuted, 118</p> <p>III. The Ramish Interpretation</p>	<p><i>of the words [Lambs and Sheep] confuted by the whole History of the Gospel, and by all Antiquity,</i> 119</p> <p>Bellarmino's threefold Mystery in these Words examined, 120, 121</p> <p><i>And disowned by the greater Writers of that Church,</i> 122</p> <p><i>All the Apostles of Christ had the same power of Feeding the Sheep given to them as St. Peter, who were to take the same care of all Christ's Flock that he did, <i>ib.</i></i></p> <p><i>They were to teach All indefinitely, so that among them none should be neglected, but instructed by some or other of them,</i> 123</p> <p><i>Their Objection, that though Feeding must be allowed to the other Apostles, yet St. Peter alone was to feed by Authority and Power over all, whereby he was to prescribe what was to be taught and believed: this answered,</i> 123, 124</p> <p>Pope Boniface the VIIIth Extravagant asserting from these words the same Authority that St. Peter had, to be inherent to the See of Rome, looks rather like a Pasquil, than an Interpretation of the holy Scriptures, 125</p> <p><i>The whole of this Discourse concluded with three Observations:</i></p> <p>1. That the Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome is built barely on three metaphorical Speeches of our Saviour</p>

Severer unto St. Peter, without one word or syllable concerning the Bishop of Rome, or any other Sac- cessor,	Page 121
The Rhemish Annotation on Mat. 14. 29. examined,	127
As likewise that upon Luke 5. 3.	127, 128
2. If the danger of wresting the Scriptures to a false opinion why the common People should not read them, then no body at all should look upon them, for their most learned Preachers teach them more than the common Ex- ample,	131
3. The great disagreement of the Church about the Interpre- tation of these three places of Scrip- ture, which have been the subject	132

of this Discourse,	Page 134
This no great Argument of their Unity, they fit most best of us of the certainest and best sense in the most best of this Verse.	134
The sense of Scripture used by the Catholics themselves I am limited to the Interpretation of Sect. 2. in Appendix. The same sense proof of the Canonical Testi- mony as well as Historical, as by the Churches testimony, and the same testimony also, as by the same sense, from Sect. 2. in Appendix.	135
The Conclusion	136

V.

Concerning the proof of their Doctrine of *Infalibility*.

I nfallibility in the Notion of the present Church of Rome is the Principle into which she ul- timately resolves her Faith, and the very Foundation of the Papal Superstructure,	Page 141
What the Romanists under- stand by it,	142
This Doctrine as it is stated by them, vacates the Usefulness	142

and Necessity of any Scripture of written Word,	Page 143
That it is a notorious begging of the Question in them, to prove their Infalibility from the Scrip- tures,	144
That it is a preposterous Me- thod for Men, ultimately to re- solve their Faith into that, rather than into the Scripture which they	144

A TABLE of.

	Page
<i>themselves are forced to fetch from the pretended Testimony of Scripture,</i>	ibid.
<i>The Testimonies alledged by them for the Proof of this Doctrine of theirs considered, and first those out of the Old Testament,</i>	145
Isai. 1. 26. ch. 52. 1. Cant. 4. 7. <i>instanced in by them for the Confirmation of it,</i>	145
<i>Out of the New Testament, Matth. 16. 18. considered,</i>	146
[<i>In answer to this 6 things offered to their Consideration</i>]	147,
	148, 149, 150.
Matth. 18. 17. <i>examined,</i>	150
<i>This place refers only to the Discipline and not the Doctrine which is to be observed, in particular Churches, and that only as to private Injuries and Offences, and not to any Error or Heresy amongst Christians,</i>	ibid.
<i>Their Interpretation of Matth. 18. 20. considered, and refused in two Particulars.</i>	152
<i>The Misrepresenters Arguments from Matth. 23. 1, 2. examined,</i>	154
<i>Three Things offered in Reply to it,</i>	155
1. <i>Words of an Universal Extent are to be limited and bound up, according to the Nature and Subject matter to which they relate,</i>	ibid.
2. <i>Their own and other Writers, whose Expositions they are obliged to receive, have accordingly interpreted them,</i>	ibid.
3. <i>This justified from our Saviours own reasoning against the Jewish Doctors.</i>	156
<i>A brief Answer returned to their Exposition of Matth. 28. 16. upon this Argument.</i>	157
<i>The Words only are a Promise of general Assistance to the Apostles under the Difficulties and Dangers they were to struggle with in the Discharge of their Ministerial Office,</i>	158
St. Luke 10. 16. <i>answered in four Particulars,</i>	159
Chap. 22. 32. <i>The former and latter parts of the Words thoroughly considered and answered,</i>	161
John 14. 16. <i>The Occasion and Coherence of the Words considered,</i>	164
<i>The Promise here made relates not to the Truth of Doctrine, but to the Holy Spirit's being a Comforter or Advocate, one who should strengthen and support them in their Afflictions, &c.</i>	165
St. Peter's Successors <i>no way interested in this Promise exclusively to the Successors of any of the other Apostles, to whom it was jointly and equally made with St. Peter,</i>	ibid

the Principal Matters.

Page	Page
<p><i>That John 14. 26. respects only those to whom it was address'd, doth appear. (1.) from the Occasion and meaning of the Words,</i> 166</p> <p><i>(2.) From the reason of the thing,</i> 167</p> <p><i>John 16. 13. examined, and an Answer returned to the Inferences from it of the Author of the Guide of Controversy,</i> 168</p> <p><i>2 Pet. 3. 16. no ways serviceable to the Purpose, as alleged by that Author; this largely proved in five Particulars,</i> 170. to 173</p> <p><i>The Papists infer from Acts 15. 28. a like Presidency of the Holy Spirit in all their general Councils,</i> 173</p> <p><i>The Variety of this Assertion laid open,</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>The Anathematizing Humour of their Councils, plainly shew that they are act'd by a quite contrary Spirit to that which inspired the Apostolick Synod,</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>Eph. 4. 14. Misinterpreted by</i></p>	<p><i>the Guide of Controversies, and three Considerations returned to it,</i> 174</p> <p><i>1 Tim. 3. 15. Examined and freed from their corrupt Exposition and Interpretation of it,</i> 175</p> <p><i>2 Tim. 2. 19. Relates only to the prime Fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith, and not to any Stability peculiar and appropriate to the Church of Rome, as the Guide, &c. would have it,</i> 178</p> <p><i>Heb. 13. 7. Falsly urged by the Guide, for a blind and an unliking Conformity to the Doctrines of the Roman Church,</i> 180</p> <p><i>Several Places of Scripture proving the Infallibility of the Church, and that the Roman Church is this Infallible Church, taken out of the Catholick Scripturist, and the Touchstone, &c. briefly consider'd and answer'd,</i> 181, 187.</p>

VI.

Concerning the Worship of Angels, and Saints departed.

P A R T. I.

AS there are three sorts of Excellencies, so there is a three-fold Worship due to them, 189

The two first of these the Reformed own and confess as, but deny the last, as having no four-

A TABLE of

Page	Page
<i>dation in Scripture or true Anti-</i> <i>quity,</i> 190	<i>What to be understood by the</i> <i>Dead Israelites, and by the</i> <i>Prayers of the dead Israelites in</i> <i>Baruch 3. 4.</i> ibid.
<i>The whole of this Argument</i> <i>reduced to five Heads, and the</i> <i>several places of Scripture exam-</i> <i>ined under them,</i> 193	<i>Zech. 1. 12. examined,</i> 200
I. <i>Though we deny that Angels</i> <i>and Saints departed, pray for the</i> <i>Church on Earth, yet many of</i> <i>the Texts they cite for it do not</i> <i>prove it,</i> 194	<i>What to be understood by the</i> <i>Communion of Saints,</i> ibid.
<i>That Angels and Saints have a</i> <i>tender Compassion for the Church</i> <i>on Earth, and intercede with God</i> <i>by earnest Prayers for its Prospe-</i> <i>riety,</i> ibid.	<i>The Communion of Saints</i> <i>may be preserved between the</i> <i>Church Triumphant and Church</i> <i>Militant, without our praying to</i> <i>them, or their meriting for us,</i> ib.
<i>It may be probable that holy Bi-</i> <i>shops and Pastors, when they are</i> <i>gone to Heaven, have in their</i> <i>Prayers a particular regard to</i> <i>that part of Christ's Church over</i> <i>which they presided, &c.</i> 195	[<i>We own a Communion with</i> <i>the Saints in Heaven, but we are</i> <i>not on any account to worship them</i>] ibid.
<i>Some have asserted that God</i> <i>may on some particular occasions,</i> <i>and in some Circumstances, depute</i> <i>an Angel or Saint to have the</i> <i>charge of such a particular Per-</i> <i>son, Country, or City, but this extra-</i> <i>ordinary and out of course,</i> ibid.	II. <i>There is no proof from Scri-</i> <i>pture that Angels and Saints have</i> <i>an universal knowledge of Men</i> <i>and their Conditions,</i> 201
<i>Jer. 15. 1. impertinently urged</i> <i>by Romanists to prove that the</i> <i>Saints in Heaven pray for Men</i> <i>on Earth,</i> 196	<i>Luk. 15. 7, 10. explained, and</i> <i>two ways assigned how Angels pos-</i> <i>sibly may know when a Sinner re-</i> <i>pent,</i> 202
<i>Their Inference from Rev. 6.</i> <i>10. refused,</i> 197	<i>Saints departed ignorant of</i> <i>Men, whilst the Angels by virtue</i> <i>of their Ministry on Earth may</i> <i>possibly know many things concer-</i> <i>ning them,</i> 203
<i>Their corrupt reading of 2 Pet.</i> <i>1. 15. unservicable to their pur-</i> <i>pose on this Argument,</i> 198	<i>Mat. 22. 30. considered and</i> <i>proved to speak as to the Saints</i> <i>in Heaven, only of an Equality</i> <i>in State and Priviledg, and not</i> <i>in Knowledge and Perfection of</i> <i>Nature,</i> 204
<i>Their Interpretation of 2 Mac-</i> <i>cab. 15. 12, 13, 14. answered,</i> 199	<i>John 5. 45. explained, and</i> <i>therein shewed that by Moses (e-</i> <i>ven in the Interpretation of their</i> <i>own Writers) must be understood</i> ib.

the Principal Matters.

Page	Page
<p><i>the Writings or Books of Moses,</i> 205</p> <p>Two things returned in answer to their Inference from Rev. 12. 10. 206</p> <p><i>The Parable of Dives and Lazarus (Luke 16. 19 to 31.) impertinently urged by the Cardinal on this Argument,</i> 207</p> <p>If taken for a real History, it proves too much upon them, more than they would have it, and so nothing at all. This shewed in five particulars, 208</p> <p>2 Kings 2. 11. (which the Cath. Scripturist calls a Reserve) considered and examined, 211</p> <p>Four Ways asserted by the Romanists to shew the Saints may come to the knowledge of Men and their Conditions :</p> <p>1. By Information from the Angels. Four things returned in answer to this, 214</p> <p>2. By a kind of unconceivable swiftness of motion, wherewith Angels may be endowed, and glorified Saints also, they being made equal to them. Two Answers returned to this, 215</p> <p>3. By the Glass of the Deity, wherein all things are represented to their view that are in God. This answered, 216</p> <p>4. By Revelation from God. This answered likewise, <i>ibid.</i></p> <p>As God no where hath told us that he doth make known to Blessed Spirits the Hearts and Requests of Men, so he hath in effect</p>	<p>told us that he doth not, 218</p> <p>III. There is no proof from Scripture that Angels and Saints departed are entrusted with the Care and Government of the World under God, 219</p> <p>Heb. 1. 14. & Psal. 91. 11. only shew us that the Angels in general do by the Command and Direction of God minister to good Men in times of Danger and Distress, 220</p> <p>IV. Answers returned to those Texts the Cardinal makes use of to prove there are Guardian Angels over particular Persons, 221</p> <p>A Reply to those places of Scripture urged to prove that God sets particular Angels over particular Countries and Princes to govern and defend them, 222</p> <p>Those Texts they alledg to shew Saints departed have afterwards appeared on the Earth, considered and answered, 223</p> <p>Somewhat offered in Answer to those Texts, from whence they infer the Glory and Happiness of the Apostles and other eminent Saints at the Day of Judgment, 224</p> <p>Bellarmino's Interpretation of the Iron Rods in Rev. 2. 26, 27. and in Psal. 2. 9. examined and refuted, 225</p> <p>An Explication of Rev. 3. 12, 21. and Matth. 24. 45, 46, 47. Matth. 25. 14. Luke 19. 12. 227, 228, 229</p> <p style="text-align: right;">From</p>

Page	Page
<i>From all which places it is evident, that as God makes use of Angels not as governing Spirits, but as Ministers of his Will, and</i>	<i>Instrument of his Providence, so he makes not use of Saints departed at all,</i> 230

VII.

Concerning the Worship of Angels, and Saints departed.

PART 2.

Page	Page
IV. T hat there is no Proof from Scripture for the Religious Adoration of Angels and Saints departed, 233	perceiv'd to him (Josh. 5. 13.) was paid to the Son of God, the second Person of the Trinity, as is apparent from the 14th verse, and other places of Scriptures, 237
Their Instance from Gen. 18. 2. was only a civil Respect or Reverence in Abraham, that was customarily paid by that Country from Man to Man, he looking upon them to be no more than Men, 234	The case of Saul's worshipping of Samuel, rais'd by the Witch of Endor, considered 1 Sam. 28. 14. 238
Tho' some Interpreters have thought one of these three Angels to be the Son of God, <i>ibid.</i>	An account given of Nebuchadnezzar's worshipping Daniel, (Dan. 2. 46.) contrary to the Curd. Interpretation, in two Particulars, 239
The same Answer serves for the other Proof of Lot's worshipping the two Angels, and supplicating them in the behalf of Zoar, from Gen. 19. 1, 19, 20. 235	Several places of Scripture largely considered, which expressly forbid and condemn this Practice in the Church of Rome, 241 to 249
Three Reasons alledged in Answer to their Instance of Balaam's worshipping the Angel, (Numb. 22. 31.) 236	V. There is no Proof from Scripture for the solemn Invocation of Angels and Saints departed. Of this there are three Branches, viz.
The Religious Worship, which Joshua paid to the Angel that ap-	First,

the Principal Matters.

	Page
First, <i>There is no Proof from Scripture for praying to them to bestow, or pray to God for Blessings for us,</i>	250
<i>No Instance of any express Command in the Old Testament, neither in the New Testament, according to the Opinion of many learned Writers of their Church,</i>	251
<i>That place out of Gen. 48.16. alledged by them for the Invocation of Angels, answered,</i>	252
<i>Job 5.1. no Precept to pray to Angels, nor implying any Custom of that Age, to implore the Aid and Protection of Angels,</i>	255
<i>Their chief Proof for Invocation of Saints, are from such Texts of Scripture, wherein good Men on Earth are commanded to pray for one another, and from Examples of that kind,</i>	256
<i>But from hence no Argument can be drawn for it,</i>	
1. <i>Because Christians on Earth are empowered only by them to desire others to pray for them, [but Romanists pray to Saints and Angels, not only to pray for them, but to bestow Blessings upon them, &c. which supposes a certain Power in them to help them, and so terminate the Worship on them,</i>	257
2. <i>When we desire our fellow-Christians to pray for us, the desire is not a Prayer to them</i>	
<i>but a friendly request, [but the Church of Rome enjoins to call upon the Saints departed, in a most devout manner, after the manner of Supplicants.]</i>	258
3. <i>These Texts require us to desire our fellow-Christians to be only mere Petitioners for us, as they do for themselves: but the Church of Rome teaches us to pray to them as Advocates and Mediators in Heaven with God,</i>	ibid.
4. <i>They require us to desire the Prayers of good Men on Earth, who hear us and know our Condition: but the Church of Rome require Men to pray to Saints in Heaven, who cannot hear us, and for ought we know are ignorant of our State,</i>	259
5. <i>When we desire our fellow-Christians to pray for us, it is a vocal Desire, but the Romanists with mental and vocal Prayers apply themselves to Saints departed,</i>	260
<i>Several places of Scripture, by way of Conclusion to this Argument, produced to prove that God is the only Object of Prayer, as well as of the other parts of Religious Worship,</i>	260
Secondly, <i>There is no Proof from Scripture that we may pray to God to be heard for the sake of the Saints, in favour of them and their Merits,</i>	262
<i>The Texts made use of, to defend this, considered,</i>	263

A TABLE of

<i>Page</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Thirdly, There is no Proof from Scripture for praying to Saints and Angels, as Intercessors and Mediators in the Presence of God,</i> 266	<i>8. 3. who is there said to offer up the Prayers of the Saints to God,</i> 268
<i>Gal. 3. 9. explained, and shew'd wherein Moses was a Mediator, as he was an Interuncio, a Person that went between God and the People, relating the Covenants and Agreements made betwixt them,</i> 267	<i>Rev. 5. 8. cited by the Romanists to no purpose,</i> 269
<i>Our blessed Saviour generally understood by the Angel in Rev.</i>	<i>The Office of a Mediator is every where appropriated in Scripture to our Lord Christ; this prov'd by many places of Scripture,</i> 270
	<i>Their Distinction of a Mediator of Redemption, and a Mediator of Intercession, examined in five Particulars,</i> 271
	<i>The Conclusion of the whole.</i>

VIII.

Concerning the Worship of Images and Reliques.

<i>Page</i>	<i>Page</i>
T HE Testimonies alledged from Scripture by the Romanists in defence of their present Practice of worshipping of Images, reduced under three Heads. 278	<i>essarily adored by those that adored the Ark, answered, ibid.</i>
1. Those which speak expressly of Images; two instances in and answered:	<i>The Assertion of Dr. Parker, late Bishop of Oxon (in his Reasons for abrogating the Test) that an outward Worship was given to the Cherubims; considered and answered,</i> 281
1. Exod. 25. 18. which doth not forbid the making of Images for the purposes mentioned there, this being no part of the Controversy, nor doth it in the least enjoin the worshipping of them, 279	2. Numb. 23. 8, 9. which are command or mention in the least, that the Children of Israel were to pay any Worship to the Brazen Serpent, though erected for such great Blessings to them. 282
<i>Card. Bellarmin's Interpretation, that the Cherubims are ne-</i>	<i>The weakness of the Cardinal's Inference from hence shewn, viz. that the Brazen Serpent must needs</i>

the Principal Matters.

needs to be worshipped by the Israelites, because God had ordered it to be placed aloft, and it gave Relief to those that looked upon it,

Page
283

The Author of the Touchstone of the Reformed Gospel his Interpretation of this place examined,

284

This Passage of the Brazen Serpent no ground in the least for Image worship,

ibid.

II. *Those which show that some Creatures are to be religiously honoured for their bare relation to God,*

285

Psal. 95. 4. examined, and therein shown that by Footstool was not meant the Ark, but Mount Zion, the holy Hill, on which the Temple stood,

286

That no Adoration was paid to the Footstool, evident from the Original Hebrew, from the Vulgar Translation, and from the Chaldeæ Paraphrast,

ibid.

Mat. 5. 34, 35. considered, and the Cardinal's wild Conclusion from it refuted,

287

III. *Those which show some Creatures are called sacred or holy, because of their relation to holy Things,*

289

Exod. 3. 5. very impudently urged by the Cardinal and the Author of the Touchstone of the Reformed Gospel, to prove and defend the worshipping of Images,

290

Page

The Feast of the Passover, Exod. 12. 16. the Priests Garments Exod. 28. 2. Christ's Sepulchre, Isa. 57. 10. and the Scriptures, 2 Tim. 3. 15. most unreasonably urged by Bellarmine for the proof of Image worship,

291

The Cardinal's Interpretation of the Sign of the Son of Man, (Mat. 24. 30.) urged by him for so prove the Worship of it from Scripture, considered and refuted,

292

The Name of Jesus in the Opinion of the Catholick Scripturist, is a kind of Representation of Christ, at which we are commanded to bow the Knee — This nothing to the purpose,

293

We are commanded [Phil. 2. 9, 10.] to bow At the Name of Jesus, but not To it,

294

Worshipping of Reliques.

By Reliques the Church of Rome understands not only the Bodies of the Saints, but any of those Things which did belong to them; and were blessed so far as to touch their sanctified, and (which is more) sanctifying Bodies, such as St. Francis's Girdle, &c.

295

No Foundation for this Practice in the holy Scriptures, though established by the Council of Trent

ibid.

Joseph's Injunction to the Children of Israel (Exod. 13. 19.)

A TABLE of

Page	Page
<p>cerning the removal of his Bones, no ways serviceable to their purpose, 296</p> <p>Deut. 34. 6. is so far from countenancing this practice of the Church of Rome, that it is favourable to Us against Relique-Worship, 297</p> <p>The Miracle that was wrought by Eliha's Bones (contrary to Bellarmin's Interpretation from 2 Kings 13. 21.) doth not prove that God either gives or intends such Honour to the dead Bodies of other of his Saints, 298</p> <p>The Cardinal's Quotation from 2 Kings 23. 16, 17, 18. infers a contrary Practice to that of the Roman Church, 299</p>	<p>What to be understood by Christ's Sepulchre being glorious (according to the vulgar Translation) in Isa. 11. 10. This proves no more the Worship of Reliques, than it doth for the worshipping of Images, 300</p> <p>The weakness of the Cardinal's proof for this Doctrine of Theirs from Mat. 11. 20, 21, 22. displayed, ibid.</p> <p>Acts 5. 12, 15. alleged by them, bath nothing to do with Relique-Worship, 301</p> <p>Acts 19. 11, 12. is so far from defending or proving the worship of Reliques, that it doth not so much as prove that there are any such things as Reliques, 302</p> <p>The Conclusion.</p>

IX.

Concerning Seven Sacraments, and the Efficacy of them,

P A R T I.

Page	Page
<p>Christ only instituted Two Sacraments, as only necessary for his Church, 305</p> <p>We reject the five other additional Sacraments, because they are not Christ's Sacraments, but the Church of Rome's Sacraments, which did appoint them, and ad-</p>	<p>vance them into the dignity of Sacraments, 306</p> <p>The number of the Sacraments set down, and the Nature of a Christian Sacrament stated, 307</p> <p>The number of Seven Sacraments was a long time in raising, in the ninth Century there was but three,</p>

the Principal Matters.

Page	Page
<p>three, but in the twelfth the number was grown up to the full, <i>ibid.</i></p> <p>Two Definitions of a Sacrament, according to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, 308</p> <p>Three Qualifications of a true and proper Sacrament, 309</p> <p>The Sacrament of Baptism instanced in as to all these Requisites, 310</p> <p>The Sacrament of Confirmation brought to the Test, <i>ibid.</i></p> <p>The Nature of it, according to the Roman Catechism, and Pope Eugenius's Instruction for the Armenians in the Council of Florence, 311</p> <p>Chrism (which is a Compound of Oil of Olives and Balsam) the defined the visible Sign or Matter of this Sacrament by the Council of Trent their Catechism, and Pope Eugenius's Instructions, yet the Cardinal makes Imposition of Hands with Prayer to be the matter of it, 312</p> <p>That this Sacrament hath a Promise of Grace vainly proved by the Cardinal from those places of Scripture, which speak of Christ's Promise to his Disciples of his sending the holy Spirit to be their Comforter, their Guide, their Assistant and Supporter, 312</p> <p>No foundation from Acts 8. 17. for this Sacrament of Confirmation, 315</p> <p>What meant by the Laying on of hands, and by the Holy Ghost</p>	<p>in this Text, 316</p> <p>Tho the ordinary Gift of Sanctifying Grace should be supposed to be conferred by the Apostles. Laying on of Hands, yet this doth not prove such Imposition of Hands to be a Sacrament, 317</p> <p>Before Confirmation can be allowed to be a Sacrament, it is necessary for them to prove that it was instituted by Christ, that it hath an outward visible Sign set apart for it, and that it hath a power of conferring sanctifying Grace to the Person confirmed, 318</p> <p>No foundation for the outward Ceremony of Anointing in Confirmation from 2 Cor. 1. 21, 22. 319</p> <p>What meant by Unction in 1. John 2. 27. <i>ibid.</i></p> <p>Heb. 6. 1. no proof of Confirmation, it being doubtful to what custom or practice the Laying on of hands in this place doth belong, 320</p> <p>What we are to understand by Penance, 322</p> <p>What things they are in which we are agreed as to Repentance, and what things they are about which our Controversy at present is with the Church of Rome, 322</p> <p>The Qualification and Requisites to a true Sacrament, such as the Institution, the matter or visible Sign, the form of this Sacrament of Penance is not so far found in Scripture, 323</p>

A TABLE of

Page	Page
<p><i>The Council of Trent hath defined, that Penance was no Sacrament before our Lord's Resurrection; and assigned the Institution of it from John 20. 22, 23.</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">324</p> <p><i>Bellarmin's Interpretation and Inference from this place examined,</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">ibid.</p> <p><i>The Institution of sacramental Signs ought to be certain and determined, not left to the fancies and humours of every particular Person, as it is in this case of Penance,</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">325</p> <p><i>It is not sufficient to make a thing a Sacrament, because it hath some sort of a sign with a Promise annexed to it,</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">ibid.</p> <p><i>The matter of Sacraments was not left by Christ to the Discretion of Men, to establish what they should think good therein, but were determined and appointed by God himself,</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">326</p>	<p><i>The great Difference among the Romish Writers, both as to the Nature and the Form of this Sacrament of Penance, ibid.</i></p> <p><i>The Council of Trent hath defined Contrition, Confession and Satisfaction, to be the Element or Sacramental Sign of it,</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">ibid.</p> <p><i>None of these can be accounted Signs of this Sacrament,</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">327</p> <p><i>The Cardinals Assertions examined, that before our Lord's Resurrection, his Ministers had not the Power of giving Absolution,</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">328</p> <p><i>The true sense and meaning given of St. John 20. 22, 23.</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">330</p> <p><i>Penance so far from deserving the Honour of being a Sacrament, that it is merely and properly a Qualification for our worthy partaking of the Sacrament of Baptism,</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">330</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>The Conclusion.</i></p>

X.

Concerning Seven Sacraments and the Efficacy of them.

PART 2.

Of the Sacrament of Orders.

THE Nature of this Sacrament, as to the matter and

Page

form of it according to the Definition of the Council of Florence,

334

the Principal Matters.

	Page		Page
<p><i>Imposition of Hands made the outward visible matter in this Sacrament of Orders, and by the Cardinal, proved from Act. 6. 6. & 13.3. & 14.23. 1 Tim. 4.14. 2 Tim. 1. 6.</i></p>	335	<p>larmine would have it,</p>	338
<p><i>That Imposition of Hands was used with Prayers in Ordination is not doubted, but that it was instituted and appointed by Christ to be the outward visible sign of a Sacrament of Orders, doth not appear from these places of Scripture,</i></p>	336	<p>Bellar. <i>Proof from Acts 13. 2. that this Sacrament was instituted of God, refused,</i></p>	339
<p><i>The Determination of the Council of Florence about the matter of this pretended Sacrament, contrary to that of the Cardinal's,</i></p>	ibid.	<p>Acts 20. 28. <i>only proves that there are Orders, and that there ought to be a regular Ordination, but it no way proves that Orders is a Sacrament,</i></p>	339
<p><i>The Delivery of the Chalice and Paten to the Person ordained, is made the matter of this Sacrament by the one, and Imposition of Hands by the other,</i></p>	ibid.	<p>Card. Bellarm. <i>trifling with Scripture animadverted on,</i></p>	340
<p><i>Though Imposition of Hands be granted to be part of the matter of this Sacrament of Orders, yet this is not proved to be so from Scripture by the Cardinal,</i></p>	337	<p><i>One single Text insisted on by him to prove Matrimony a Sacrament, as to its Institution, Sign and Grace,</i></p>	341
<p><i>Two Texts brought by the Cardinal to prove there is a Promise of sanctifying Grace annexed to this Sacrament, examined,</i></p>	ibid.	<p>Eph. 5. 32. <i>The place of Scripture urged by the Cardinal, examined,</i></p>	342
<p><i>By the Gift of God in 2 Tim. 1. 6. is only meant Timothy's Authority and Ability for the Work of the Gospel, so which had been ordained, not a sanctifying Grace of God, as Bel-</i></p>	337	<p><i>The great Mystery mentioned there doth no way relate to the Conjunction of Man and Wife,</i></p>	343
<p></p>		<p><i>No sanctifying Grace consequent upon it, as is alleged from this Scripture by Bellarm. ibid.</i></p>	ibid.
<p></p>		<p><i>Not from 1 Tim. 2. 15. the true meaning of which place is assigned,</i></p>	344.
<p></p>		<p><i>His two Texts from 1 Cor. 7. 7. and 1 Thess. 4. 4. answered,</i></p>	345.
<p></p>		<p><i>Bellarmino mentions nothing on this Argument from Scripture, about the Divine Institution or the outward sign of this Sacrament,</i></p>	ibid.
<p></p>		<p><i>Durando and the Canonists for this reason have concluded it no Sacrament,</i></p>	ibid.

A TABLE of

	Page		Page
<i>What Extreme Unction is, according to the Decree of the Council of Trent,</i>	346	<i>Mark 16. 18. alledged by the Author of the Touchstone of the reformed Gospel, no ways relates to their Sacramental Unction,</i>	350
<i>The different Interpretation of the Roman Writers of Mark 6. 13. this Anointing referring only to a Ceremony of a miraculous Cure of D. seases,</i>	347	<i>How far we agree with the Church of Rome as to the Efficacy of the Sacraments, and wherein we differ from them, considered.</i>	351
<i>Two Differences alledged betwixt Anointing in St. James, (chap. 5. and 14, 15.) and the Popish pretended Sacrament of Extreme Unction,</i>	ibid.	<i>That the Sacraments work their Effect by Virtue of an inherent Quality fixed in them, as the Papists determine, is contrary to the great Design of Christianity,</i>	352
<i>This unointing in St. James, in the sense of some of the Papists themselves, did primarily respect (as well as that of St. Mark) bodily Cures, as is evident from the passage it self,</i>	348	<i>Several Texts of Scripture alledged by Bellarmine on this occasion, examined and answered.</i>	353
<i>This Interpretation confirmed from the ancient Offices in the Church for anointing the Sick,</i>	349	<i>As the Sacraments are Covenants, so there are several Qualifications required, without which the Sacraments will be of no Efficacy to the Person receiving them,</i>	355
<i>An Objection answered from the latter part of verse 15. and if he have committed Sins, they shall be forgiven him, answered,</i>	ibid.	<i>The Conclusion.</i>	

XI.

Concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass.

P A R T I.

	Page		Page
T <i>HE Question first raised between the Church of Rome and Us,</i>	357	<i>What meant by Mass and what by Sacrifice,</i>	358

the Principal Matters.

Page

What the Church of England grants and allows, and what she denies on this Argument, 360

The Reason why our Church rejects this Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass is on the many Inconsistencies and Absurdities that are found in it, 361

It is directly contrary to the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, 363

Two Observations alledged from Heb. 9. 12, 25, 26. and from chap. 10. 14.

1. *That Christ cannot be offered without Suffering, and therefore if he be offered in the Mass, he must suffer there.* *ibid.*

2. *That the same Consideration is to be had of the time from the Beginning of the World, to the Death of Christ, as of the time from his Death to the End of it,* 365

Gen. 14. 18, 19. commonly urged by the Church of Rome, as a strong Argument to prove the Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass. *ibid.*

The Cardinals reasonings considered and examined from this place, 365

Two Differences assigned by the Card. between the two Priesthoods that of Melchisedec, and that of Aaron, and two Arguments drawn from thence for the Support of his Cause, 366

An Answer returned to this in three Particulars;

Page

I. *There is no sufficient ground to believe that Melchisedec did offer an unbloody Sacrifice of Bread and Wine,* 367

This confirmed from the Hebrew, LXXII. Interpreters, the Targim of Onkelos, the Syriac Version, and the ancient Latin Version, and from the concurring Judgment of Josephus, Philo the Jew, Cardinal Cajetan and Casander, 368

Judg. 6. 18, 19. no ways serviceable to them on this Argument, 369

Two Things in answer to what the Cardinal urges to prove a Sacrifice from those words, he brought forth Bread and Wine; 370

Two Answers to his Argument from these words, For he was the Priest, 371

Four Reasons alledged to invalidate the Cardinal's Argument from the Soph Pasuck of the forementioned Verses, 372

Whether the Benediction of Melchisedec was a Sacerdotal Action, considered. 374

Whether his offering Bread and Wine was the form of Sacrifice peculiar to that Priesthood; this examined in four Particulars, 375

II. *Tho Melchisedec had offered such a Sacrifice, it doth not follow that the Priesthood of Melchisedec consisted in this, and was thereby distinguished from that of Aaron,* 376

A TABLE of

Page	Page
<p><i>Under the Aaronical Priesthood Bread and Wine was sacrificed, as well as under that of Melchisedec.</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>Three Differences assigned by Bellarmine between the Melchisedecian and Aaronical Priesthood herein. This answered in four Particulars,</i> 377</p> <p><i>How Christ is said to be a Priest for ever,</i> 379</p> <p>III. <i>The it should be granted, that Melchisedec did offer such a Sacrifice, and that his Priesthood was thereby distinguished from that of Aaron, it doth not follow that Christ ought to institute in his Church an unbloody Sacrifice under the Species of Bread and Wine.</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>A great difference between the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Sacrifice of Melchisedec,</i> 380</p> <p><i>Georgius di Ataide, a Portuguese Divine in the Council of Trent, Salmeron, Mariana, deny the Sacrifice of the Mass to be proved from Scriptures,</i> 381</p> <p><i>The Paschal Lamb (Exod. 12. 3.) another pretence fetched</i></p>	<p><i>from Scriptures for the Sacrifice of the Mass,</i> 382</p> <p><i>Whether the Paschal Lamb was a Type of the Eucharist, examined,</i> 383</p> <p><i>Four Instances alledged by the Cardinal to prove it a figure of the Eucharist,</i> 384</p> <p><i>To each of which an Answer is returned,</i> 385</p> <p><i>Exod. 24. 8. where the Confirmation of the Covenant of God with the Israelites, was by a solemn Sacrifice, and the Sprinkling of Blood, no proof of the Sacrifice of the Mass,</i> 387</p> <p><i>1 Sam. 2. 35. cannot be expanded of the Priesthood and Sacrifices of Christians succeeding the Aaronical, and which would remain to the end of the World,</i> 390</p> <p><i>Prov. 9. 1. No Proof at all of the Sacrifice of the Mass; the Passage being purely parabolical, like that of St. Matth. 22.</i> 391</p> <p><i>Neither can it with any show of Reason be inferred from Isa. 19. 19, 21. nor from Isa. 66. 21. with that of Jer. 35. 18. nor from Dan. 8. 11, 12.</i> 392 to 394</p>

XI

Concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass.

PART I.

Page

W Herber Mal. i. 11. do not be understood if the Sacrifice of the Mass, as the Pasch-bread of, or of other spiritual Sacrifices, such as Prayer and Praise &c. considered,

397

Incense and a pure Offering, in this place not to be understood literally and properly,

398

The word Incense taken improperly in the judgment of the Ancient Apologists for the Christian Religion,

ibid.

The word Offering doth often signify not a Sacrifice, but a Gift or Present. And a pure Offering imports no more (according to St. Peter, 1 Ep. 2. 5.) than that this Service or Offering is pure, and without mixture, or as he call it there, a spiritual Sacrifice,

399

The spiritual Sacrifices of Christians are in the Properly described in terms that were conformable to what was used and practised in that time in the Temple of the Jews,

401

The Christian Services are expressed by the Prophet under the

Page

character of Incense and a pure Offering, if we observe Malachi Incense was a Type or Figure,

John 4. 20. a good Intercession of this place in Malachi,

ibid.

These spiritual Services called Sacrifices both in the Old and New Testaments,

402

The ancient Christians (Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Eusebius, Theodoret) understood these words in Malachi of a spiritual Sacrifice,

403

This Sacrifice is not a sacrifice of the Incense of the Mass,

404

The Church of Rome holds that the Sacrifice of the Mass is a sacrifice of the Incense of the Mass,

405

The Church of Rome holds that the Sacrifice of the Mass is a sacrifice of the Incense of the Mass,

406

The Church of Rome holds that the Sacrifice of the Mass is a sacrifice of the Incense of the Mass,

407

A TABLE of

Page	Page
<p><i>Our Saviour's words many times are to be interpreted in a different sense from the Question put to him, and the occasion of his words, ibid.</i></p>	<p>3. <i>The Death of Christ immediately following upon his Supper, wholly removes the difficulty,</i></p>
<p><i>The Argument of the Cardinal from this place, if admitted, will prove too much upon him,</i> 406</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">412</p> <p><i>The Cardinal's Argument to prove that Christ in his last Supper offered himself a Sacrifice, is from the true Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in that Supper, which are received as the Flesh and Blood of a Victim offered for us. This examined,</i></p>
<p><i>The Cardinal's Interpretation of the 23d verse of that Chapter very absurd and groundless,</i></p>	<p style="text-align: right;">413</p> <p><i>An Answer returned to his Charge against the Lutherans and Calvinists,</i> ibid.</p>
<p><i>Our Saviour in this place doth not speak of the Quality of the Sacrifice, but of the Disposition of the Worshippers,</i> 408</p>	<p><i>The Institution of the Lord's Supper, as delivered to us in the Evangelists and St. Paul, is so far from proving the Romish Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, that it overthrows it. This largely shown,</i> 414 to 419</p>
<p><i>The Cardinal's Discourse on these words, The Hour cometh, and now is, very inconsequent,</i> ibid.</p>	<p>Acts 13. 2. <i>made use of by the Cardinal to prove the Sacrifice of the Mass,</i> 419</p>
<p><i>Bellarmin's proof of the Sacrifice of the Mass from the Institution and first Celebration of the Sacrament, examined,</i> 409</p>	<p><i>The Rhemish Annotation of this Place examined,</i> 420</p>
<p><i>Three Answers returned to his Argument concerning the Present Tense in the words of Institution, is given, is broken, is shed,</i> 419</p>	<p><i>The Cardinal's Inference from this place is, that the Ministry or Service exhibited to the Lord here, doth not seem possible to be any thing else than a Sacrifice, and the Sacrifice of the Mass,</i> 421</p>
<p>1. <i>Nothing more common in Scripture, than to put the present Tense for the future, especially where the Thing spoken of is certainly and suddenly to come to pass,</i> ibid.</p>	<p><i>Two things premised, before the Answer to it, which consists of four Particulars,</i> 421 to 424</p>
<p>2. <i>The Vulgar Latin, and their Canon of the Mass read the Words in the future Tense, which takes off the whole force of his Argument,</i> 411</p>	

the Principal Matters.

	Page
Three Arguments for the Sacrifice of the Mass collected from 1 Cor. 10. 14 to 21.	425
The Answers to these are,	
1. St. Paul doth not compare the Lord's Table with the Altars, but with the Tables of the Jews, and of the Heathens, where they did eat the remainder of the Sacrifices, which were offered at the Altar,	426
2. The comparison between the Eucharist, with the Sacrifices of the Jews and Gentiles, doth no ways serve the Cardinal's Purpose,	426
3. Allowing St. Paul to compare the Communion we have with Christ by the Eucharist, with the Communion the Heathens had with Devils by eating the Idolothyta, it doth not follow that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice in that sense, which the Romanists contend for,	427

	Page
These forementioned Words of St. Paul afford rather three good Arguments against the Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass,	
Three sorts of Sacrifices among the Jews:	
1. Some were of the kind that were offered at the Altar of the Lord, and were called the Peace-offering.	
2. Some were of the kind that were offered at the Altar of the Lord, and were called the Sin-offering.	
3. Some were of the kind that were offered at the Altar of the Lord, and were called the Burnt-offering.	
Each of these applied to the present Argument, and to the favouring the Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass,	

XIII.

Concerning the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

	Page
What Transubstantiation is, as defined by the Council of Trent,	433
From hence Bellarmine undertakes to prove these two things;	

	Page
1. That the Eucharist is not natural Bread and Wine, but is the very Body and Blood of Christ really and substantially, under the form of Bread and Wine.	

A TABLE of

Page

II. *That there is a Transubstantiation or Conversion of the Substance of the Bread and Wine into Christ's very Body and Blood. Both these Particulars inquired into,* 434

I. *The Cardinal proves that the Eucharist is the very natural Body and Blood of Christ by four sorts of Arguments,* *ibid.*

First, *From the Figures of it in Scripture; this answered,* 435

Secondly, *From what Bellarmine calls a Promise contained in John 6. 51. The Bread that I will give is my Flesh; this answered,* 437

The Eucharist not the proper subject of this Discourse; but the Flesh and Blood of Christ is here to be understood the same as the Bread in ver. 35, 48, 51. and by both Christ himself, who was to die for the World, *ibid.*

By eating his Flesh, and drinking his Blood in this place, are the same with coming to him, or believing in him, ver. 35, 45, 47, 51. 438

Bellarmino's first Argument from the above-cited Verses examined, and an Answer returned in three Particulars, 438, 450

His second Argument to prove this Discourse in St. John belongs to the Eucharist is from the words of the last Supper, which bears a more fundamental truth: This answered, 450

Page

His third Argument examined, and answered in several Particulars, 440

His fourth Argument from the Distinction, ver. 53. of that Chapter, between Eating and Drinking, betwixt Flesh and Blood, considered and answered, 442

His fifth Argument from ver. 49. answered, 443

His sixth Argument from the words [eating the Flesh of Christ] answered, *ibid.*

His seventh Argument from John 3. 3. answered, 445

His double Exposition from ver. 61, 62. considered and answered, 446

Thirdly, *His third Argument is taken from the very words of the Institution [This is my Body] and here the Cardinal alleges two Arguments for proving that the very Body and Blood of Christ are substantially in the Eucharist,* 448

1. *That it is not probable our Lord should speak figuratively, whether we consider the Matter, a Sacrament; the Persons to whom he spake, the Apostles; or the Place and Time: This answered,* *ibid.*

2. *That it is evident from the very words themselves, This is my Body: This examined upon each word in this Expression, and distinct Answers return'd to each,* 449

Fourthly, His fourth Argument to prove the Truth of Christ's Body to be truly in the Eucharist, is taken from the Use of it: and here he argues from the Fraction, Consecration, the-Communication, and the Guilt by unworthy Participation. An Answer returned to each of these Particulars, 453

Page
 II. Transubstantiation, or the Conversion of the Bread and Wine into the proper substance of Christ's Body and Blood, very weakly proved from the Scripture by the Cardinal, 459
 The only Place insisted on by him is from Mat. 26. 26. & his Answered, 460

XIV.

Concerning Auricular Confession.

Page
TO prevent Mistakes in explaining this Doctrine by Scripture, it is shown wherein the Church of England agrees with the Church of Rome in it, and wherein it disagrees, 453

1. We agree that all ought to confess their Sins to Almighty God, 454

This Confession which is made to God is either in the Publick Offices of the Church, or in private, 455

2. We agree that in case of Publick Sins, given to the Church by any criminal Crime, a publick Confession ought to be made to the Church, 456

3. We agree that private Confession of Sin may be made to all sorts of People, whether of the same or of the contrary Sex, and that not

Page
 only when any Injury hath been done to another, or in case of any Doubt or Scruple, but in all Cases whatsoever, 457

4. We agree that Confession of Sin ought more especially to be made to the Priest, and that in all cases whatsoever, 458

The two things wherein the Church of England disagrees with the Church of Rome are,

1. That secret Confession is of Divine Institution; and

2. That in Confession it is necessary to name

together with

of what kind

This is

and by some

The

A TABLE of

	Page
<p><i>Such as</i> John 20. 23. Matth. 16. 19. Chap. 18. 18. <i>ibid.</i> Matth. 18. 18. <i>is by some made to have respect not only to the Priest, but to every particular Christian,</i> <i>ibid.</i> This place, and Matth 16. 19. may be interpreted of that general Power and Authority, which was given by our Saviour to the Apostles of determining in all matters concerning the Christian Religion, and of declaring what was right and fit to be done, and what was otherwise, 461 What to be understood by the Kingdom of Heaven, by the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, by binding and loosing, 462 By Remission of Sins in John 20. 23. may be understood, 1. The Declaration of God's Will concerning Remission of Sins made manifest to us by the Ministers of the Gospel, in the preaching God's Word, in Prayer, and in the due Administration of the Sacraments, 464 2. Those good Effects which are by a right Application of those means, produced in Mens Minds, 467 If Remission of Sins have a respect to the formal Absolution pronounced by the Priest upon the Confession of Sins, yet this doth not establish the Doctrine of Auricular Confession. <i>ibid.</i></p>	<p><i>Because such a Remission or Absolution may have respect to the Publick Censures of the Church duly inflicted on notorious Sinners,</i> 468 These Words, though it should be granted to have respect not only to such Sins as deserve publick Censure, but to such Sins likewise as are secretly confessed to the Priest, yet they do not determine any such Confession to be absolutely necessary to be performed by every one who desires Forgiveness of Sins, 469 Though it should be supposed necessary to make Application to Priests for the Forgiveness of Sins, yet there is no Obligation to the particular Enumeration of all Sins together with the Circumstances which the Church of Rome ridiculously insists upon, 471 Acts 19. 18. explained in four Particulars, 473 By the Ministry of Reconciliation (2 Cor. 5. 18, 19.) may be understood, 1. The preaching of the Gospel, the Care of which was committed to the Apostles upon our Saviour's leaving of the World, 475 Or, 2. That Authority delegated by Christ to his Apostles, of giving the Assurance of Forgiveness of Sins to all such who confess their Faults, and are truly penitent, 476</p>

*

the Principal Matters.

Page
The Practice of the Church of Rome as to the requiring a particular Confession of all Sins, different as to those who are within the Bosom of the Church, and who are without, and only are about to be admitted into it, 476

S. James 5. 16. examined; and by Faults may be understood,

1. *Those Injuries Men do to one another,* 477

2. *Not only Injuries, but any Crimes whatsoever, which God in the Beginning of the Church punished with Sickness,* *ibid.*

What to be understood by being healed in this place, and praying for one another, *ibid.*

A great Difference betwixt publicly confessing some particular Faults, upon such occasion as this was, when there was a power of healing in the Church, and the being constantly obliged to confess in private to a Priest all Sins whatsoever, 478

If the Words in St. James be considered as a general Proposition deducible from what the Apostle had discovered in ver. 14, 15, &c. there will be still less Foundation in this Passage for Auricular Confession, 479

Page
Confession as it is in 1 John 1. 9. (according to the Interpretation of the Papists themselves) is to be made to God alone, and does denote not a particular Recital of all Sins whatsoever, but an humble Acknowledgment of having offended God, &c. 480

The several Figures of Auricular Confession in Scripture examined and answered, 481

God requiring a Confession first of Adam, Gen. 3: then of Cain, Gen. 4: by an Angel, the Representative of a Priest under the Gospel, this answered, *ibid.*

The Lepers coming to the Priest, (Lev. 13. 14.) to receive his Judgment, whether he were clean or no, is supposed to prefigure the Sinners coming to Confession to the Priest under the Gospel; this answered, 482

The Figure taken from Numb. 5. 6, 7, 8. answered, 483

The fourth Figure mentioned by Bellarmine, and taken from Mat. 3. 5, 6. answered, 484

That Figure taken from Lazarus his coming out of the Grave, answered, 485

This whole Argument concluded, with four Observations, 486

Concerning the Doctrine of *Satisfactions*.

PART I.

Page	Page
T HE whole of this Argument managed under five Particulars, 490	lation of Christ Jesus for the Sins of the whole World, 499
1. What the Doctrine of Satisfaction is as asserted in the Roman Church, 491	(3.) It depreciates the Value of Christ's Satisfaction, when it is not allowed to extend to the whole Demerit of our Sins, but we must atone for our part of it our selves, 500
Their different Notions and Definitions concerning the temporal and Eternal Punishment of Sin, <i>ibid.</i>	Several Absurdities contained in this Doctrine, 502
Three things supposed in this Doctrine of their Church, <i>viz.</i>	2. This Doctrine supposes we can supererogate with God, i. e. arrive at a state of Virtue above the Precept, or perform under Works, and suffer more than the Demerit of our former Sins, 504
1. That Sin is not wholly pardoned altogether as to both Guilt and Punishment; but some part of the Penalty due thereto, still remains after the Pardon or Remission of it, 492	This quite impossible both in respect of Action and Sufferings, 505
Three Answers returned to this, 494	Several places of Scripture explained upon this Argument, 506
(1.) This is contrary to the Gospel-Covenant in the Sacrifice of our Saviour, <i>ibid.</i>	to 509
This apparent from several places of Scripture, 495	3. Whether Afflictions may be said to be Satisfaction to God's Justice, or a Revenge upon Sin as to certain Remains of Punishment, still left undischarged in the Sufferings of our Saviour, 511
(2.) This is contrary to the Divine Justice to demand a Debt twice over, that in our own Act and Performance which was already satisfied for, by the Obla-	

the Principal Matters.

	Page	Page
<i>The Intention and Design of God in them, asserted in four Particulars,</i>	512	<i>vid's Child (2 Sam. 12. 13.) occasioned,</i> 519
<i>The Nature of those Penances that were usually inflicted in the Discipline of the Church upon notorious Sinners, considered, together with the several Ends and Purposes of them,</i>	514	<i>That of numbering the People, 2 Sam. 24. making to the Cardinal's Purpose,</i> 522
<i>Bellarmino's Influence of the Case of Adam (Gen. 2. 17.) considered,</i>	517	<i>The Influence of Miriam, (Numb. 12.) and of the Golden Calf, (Exod. 32.) of the Murders in the Wilderness, (Numb. 24.) of the Death of Moses and Aaron in the Wilderness, considered, and Answers returned to each of them,</i> 523
<i>Death as Punishment to good Men, but of great Advantage to them,</i>	518	530
<i>The Case of the Death of Da-</i>		<i>The Conclusion.</i>

XVI:

Concerning the Doctrine of Satisfaction.

PART 2.

	Page	Page
IV. THE <i>Case of the Nini- vites considered, (Jon. 3. 4.)</i>	534	<i>Satisfaction, or a Performance of more than is required upon their Account, as is asserted in the Church of Rome,</i>
<i>Several Texts of Scripture out of the Old and New Testaments, as brought by the Romanists for their Satisfactions examined, and Answers returned to the Interpretations of them,</i>	535 to 550	<i>These passages of Scripture considered, which the Church hath influence in, for their founding this Practice of the Church, (as they call it) and which they account themselves, especially the Pope, hath the Power to apply, as they please,</i>

A TABLE of

Page	Page
<p>(<i>Two sorts of Sufferings</i>) expressed in Scripture, one Personal, which he submitted to on the Cross for the Redemption of his Church, and which was there completed: others which he still sustains in his faithful Members, whence he hath a Sympathy and fellow-feeling with, and which he shall always be concerned with to the end of the World, 554</p> <p>This account of the two sorts of Sufferings of Christ explains Col. 1. 24. which plainly refers to the latter of them, <i>ibid.</i></p> <p>Eph. 5. 1, 2. explained, and the Impertinency of their Interpretations of it, shewn, 557</p> <p>Gal. 5. 1, 2. doth not prove any thing for their vicarious Satisfaction, 558</p> <p>The Article of the Communion of Saints no ways proves that the Effect of any ones Sufferings can redound to others, <i>ibid.</i></p> <p>2 Cor. 8. 14. alleged by the Romanists upon this Head of the Communion of Saints, and an Answer returned to their Insistence from it, 560</p> <p>The Originals of these Satisfaction shewn, how they began, and were established in the Church, 569</p> <p>It was the ancient Discipline of the Church, that those who were guilty of any notorious Offences, were always removed from the Communion of it, and were</p>	<p>to undergo a long Exclusion and State of Penance, before they were admitted into it again, <i>ibid.</i></p> <p>St. Basil in his Canons of Ecclesiastical Censures prescribes a Penance of fifteen Years to the Sin of Adultery, before they were to be admitted into the Communion of faithful People, as to all the Advantages of it, Prayer and the Holy Eucharist, 565</p> <p>These Penances in the Primitive Church consisted of several Steps and gradual Advances above one another, <i>viz.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Station of Weeping, what this was, and in what part of the Church to be performed, 566 2. The place of Hearing, to whom this belonged, <i>ibid.</i> 3. The Place of Subjection or Substration, to which were appropriated the Penitentiary Acts, 567 4. The Station wherein the Penitents joined with the Assembly of the Faithful, and were employed with them, <i>ibid.</i> <p>Two Canons of St. Basil the 75th Epist. ad Amphiliam, and the 81 Can. at large recited 568</p> <p>The Penances both as to the measure or continuance of them were generally relaxed by the Bishop, or by some Presbyter authorized by him, upon the Evi-</p>

the Principal Matters.

dence of the true Repentance of the Person, The Usefulness and Advan-	Page 570	Page of such Church-Discipline, 571	The Conclusion of the whole.
---	-------------	--	------------------------------

XVII.

Concerning Purgatory.

PART I.

	Page	Page
T HE ancient Writers had a general Notion of a purging Fire, but this was widely different from the Papistical Purgatory,	578	582
The Council of Trent gives no Description of it, but leaves it to her Prelates, and Priests, to sell what it is, and in what extent to be believed,	579	(1.) His first Principle examined, viz. that there are Scriptures, which teach that after the Sin it self is forgiven, there remains some Pains still due to that Sin, and therefore consequently infer a Purgatory, because that Man to whom the Sin is forgiven may be obliged to have such kind of Pains in this Life.
Not a Text in the Old or New Testament, where we meet the Word Fire, but what may have Fetch or other their Arguments apply to, and extracts of such Purgatory,		
What the Popish Article in this point is.		
The Doctrine of the Council of England, as to this point.		
The Catholic's Sentiments particularly examined on this Argument under two Heads.		
1. The Impugnments of an pretended Scripture of Scripture, necessary to support this Doctrine.		

A TABLE of

<p><i>The Grounds the Ancients</i> <i>rest upon in their Prayers for</i> <i>those deceased, were altogether in-</i> <i>consistent with the present Cir-</i> <i>cumstances of the Popish Purga-</i> <i>tory,</i> 594</p> <p><i>Their Liturgies and Offices</i> <i>for the Dead have no Appearance</i> <i>in them of a Nation of Purgato-</i> <i>ry,</i> <i>ibid.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page</p>	<p><i>Epiphanius his Reasons for</i> <i>praying for the Dead, considered,</i> 595</p> <p><i>1 Cor. 15. 29. largely ex-</i> <i>amined,</i> 597</p> <p><i>What to be understood probably</i> <i>by baptizing for the Dead,</i> 600</p> <p><i>1 John 5. 16. considered, and</i> <i>their Interpretation refuted,</i> 602</p>

XVIII.

Concerning Purgatory.

PART 2.

<p>Purgatory pleaded for by the Romanists out of the Old Law, 606</p> <p><i>Zech. 9. 11. alledged by the</i> <i>Cardinal for a Proof of Purga-</i> <i>tory,</i> 607</p> <p><i>The true Interpretation of this</i> <i>place,</i> 608</p> <p><i>Psal. 66. 12. considered and</i> <i>found no Proof for this Doctrine,</i> <i>even in the Judgment of some of</i> <i>their own Writers,</i> 609</p> <p><i>The Cardinal's trifling Argu-</i> <i>ments from 1 Sam. 3. 2, 3. ex-</i> <i>posed and answered,</i> 610</p> <p><i>Mich. 7. 8, 9. explained and ex-</i> <i>amined as to this Doctrine,</i> 613</p> <p><i>What to be understood by de-</i> <i>vouring the Thorns and the</i></p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page</p>	<p><i>Bryars in Isa. 9. 18.</i> 614</p> <p><i>Mal. 3. 3. considered,</i> 615</p> <p><i>What to be understood by the</i> <i>World to come in Matth. 12.</i> <i>32.</i> 626</p> <p><i>1 Cor. 3. 15. largely consid-</i> <i>ered,</i> 623</p> <p><i>Matth. 5. 25, 26. examined,</i> 629</p> <p><i>Their own Writers do not ge-</i> <i>nerally interpret this place of Pur-</i> <i>gatory,</i> 630</p> <p><i>The Reasons upon which the</i> <i>Cardinal grounds the Strength of</i> <i>his Arguments from this Text,</i> 631</p> <p><i>These answered,</i> 632</p> <p><i>What to be understood by the</i> <i>Spirits in Prison,</i> <i>1 Pet. 3. 19.</i> 633</p>

the Principal Matters:

<p>This plate no ways serviceth the Doctrine of Purgatory, 636 Three other places of Scrip-</p>	<p>Page was examined, The Conclusion of the whole, 639</p>	<p>Page ibid. 639</p>
---	--	-------------------------------

XIX.

Concerning Prayers in an Unknown Tongue.

PART I.

FOUR Things oppos'd in man-
aging this Argument.

I. An Examination of the more
general Proofs from Scriptures,
which the Church of Rome ur-
ges for their Practice herein, 642

II. From the Practice of the
Jewish Church from the time of
the Babylonish Captivity to the
Coming of Christ, 643

Four things offer'd in Answer
to this, VIZ.

(1.) That long before this Cap-
tivity God deliver'd the Scrip-
tures, and the publick Offices of
Prayer contain'd in them, to the
Jews in their native and vulgar
Language, 643

(2.) That it doth not as all
appear that in this Captivity the
Old Hebrew was so universally
lost as is pretended, but rather
the contrary, 648

(3.) Supposing that after this
Captivity the Jews did not under-

stand Hebrew, yet the reason why
they translated not their Scrip-
tures, wherein their Publick Ser-
vice was contain'd, into their new
vulgar, was peculiar to them-
selves, and such as is by no means
justifiable upon Christian Princi-
ples, 647

One Reason why they were so
sly of translating their Scriptures,
was because they look'd upon all
other Languages as too profane
to express their sacred Oracles,
648

Another Reason was, they look-
ed upon the Scriptures as their
own proper Treasure, and so could
not endure to think of communi-
cating them to the Heathen, whom
they despis'd and abhorr'd, 649

(4.) Supposing that after this
Captivity the Jews did not un-
derstand the Hebrew, yet when-
ever their Scriptures and Divine
Offices were read to them in He-
brew,

A TABLE of

Page	Page
<p><i>them, they had them always interpreted to them into their vulgar Language,</i> 661</p> <p>II. <i>A particular Examination of those places of Scripture which they urge in Defence of their Latin Service.</i> 663</p> <p>Levit. 16. 17. and Luke 1. 8. <i>urged impertinently by the Romanists, as appears by these four particulars;</i></p> <p>1. <i>It doth not appear from these places, that in the Performance of this sacred Office, there was any vocal Prayer used, either by the High Priest on the great Day of Expiation, or by the Priest in the Morning and Evening-Incense,</i> 664</p> <p>2. <i>That the Symbolical Prayer expressed by this sacred Action of the Priest was peculiar to him-</i></p>	<p><i>self, and the People had no part in it,</i> 668</p> <p>3. <i>The Reason why in this sacred Action the High Priest and Priests withdraw from the sight of the People was wholly mysterious and typical, and as such is not to be urged in Vindication of the Christians Praying in an Unknown Tongue,</i> 669</p> <p>4. <i>That during the time of this sacred Action, the People had their proscribed Prayers for themselves in a Language which they understood,</i> 671</p> <p>Matth. 21. 16. <i>examined,</i> 675</p> <p><i>The Author of the Touchstone his two Illustrations on this Argument considered and refused,</i> 676</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The Conclusion.</i></p>

XX.

Concerning Prayers in an Unknown Tongue.

P A R T 2.

Page	Page
<p>III. A <i>N Examination of those Scripture - Arguments which are made against Publick Prayers in an Unknown Tongue,</i> 685</p> <p>1st. <i>The Scripture makes it necessary for our Understanding, so far as it is capable, to concur with</i></p>	<p><i>our Wills and Affections in all that Worship we render to God, which it is impossible for it to do when we worship him in an Unknown Tongue,</i> 686</p> <p>2dly. <i>The Scripture makes Praying in an Unknown</i></p>

the Principal Matters.

Page	Page
<p>Tongue inconsistent with the Edification of the Church, 686</p> <p>3dly. The Scripture condemns performing Religious Offices in an Unknown Tongue, as directly contrary to the natural End of Speech, 692</p> <p>4thly. The Scripture expressly declares Praying in an Unknown Tongue to be contrary to the Design and Nature of Religious Worship, 695</p> <p>5thly. The Scripture makes Praying, &c. utterly inconsistent with that joint concurrence of Devotion, that is required in Publick Worship, 697</p> <p>6thly. The Scriptures represent Prayer in an unknown Tongue, as a great Indecency in Publick Worship, 699</p> <p>7thly. Scripture declares an Unknown Tongue in Divine Service to be of no other Use, but only to give Evidence to the Truth of the Christian, which use it serves not, as it is acquired by natural means, 701</p> <p>-IV. Those Objections considered and answered, by which the Romanists endeavour to invalidate the force of these Arguments, 702</p> <p>1st. That 1 Cor. 14. Whence we deduce the main of our Arguments, treats not of the stated Liturgy or Worship of their Publick Assemblies, but of certain extemporary Exercises of preach-</p>	<p>ing, and Prayer performed by them, by the immediate Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, <i>ibid.</i></p> <p>Two Answers returned to this Objection, 703</p> <p>The Disparities between using an Unknown Tongue in an inspired Prayer and a stated Liturgy, proposed and answered, 705</p> <p>First, The first Disparity is, that those inspired Prayers were intended for the Edification of the People, but so are not stated Liturgies; and therefore there is not the same Necessity why the latter should be in a known Tongue as the former, 705</p> <p>This answered,</p> <p>1. That stated Liturgies ought to be designed for the Edification of the People, as well as those inspired Prayers were, <i>ibid.</i></p> <p>2. That there are sundry parts of the Roman Liturgy, which can serve no end at all, unless it be the Peoples Edification, such are the Lessons, Creeds, &c. 708</p> <p>Secondly, Another Disparity they make between stated Liturgies and those Religious Exercises St. Paul treats of, is that in the latter the People were obliged to join, but not in the former, 715</p> <p>Four Answers returned to this, <i>viz.</i></p>

A TABLE of

Page	Page.
<p>1. That though the People were not obliged to join in the stated Offices of Publick Prayer, yet there is the same reason why they should understand the Language of them, as why they should understand any thing at all appertaining to them, 716</p> <p>2. That there is no part of Publick Worship in which the Duty of the People is not as well concerned as of the Priests, 719</p> <p>3. That the Publick Prayers of the Church have been always looked upon as Prayers that were common to the People with the Priests, 723</p> <p>4. The Church of Rome it self must be forced to own that the People are obliged to join in her Publick Prayers with the Priests, or to confess her self guilty of the highest Absurdity, 726</p> <p>Thirdly, Another Disparity, they make between these two sorts of Prayers, is in respect of</p>	<p>the Languages wherein they were expressed.</p> <p>Four Answers to this returned, viz.</p> <p>(1.) That this pretended Disparity perfectly contradicts the two former, 729</p> <p>(2.) That if this Objection signify any thing, it allows it to be very needful for Men of Learning and Education to understand the Prayers, but not for the Unlearned, which is notoriously false, 731</p> <p>(3.) That St. Paul condemns the use of an Unknown Tongue in Prayer, not because it is barbarous, but because it is unknown, 736</p> <p>(4.) That supposing the People did understand Latin when they hear it, yet this will not at all excuse their muttering their Latin Prayers in so low a Voice, that the People cannot hear them, 738</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Conclusion</p>

XXI

Concerning the Celibacy of Priests and Vows of Continnence.

P A R T I.

Nothing more specious in the Church of Rome, as it carries a great shew of more than ordinary Piety and Self-denial than this Doctrine of the Celibacy of Priests and others, &c. 741

the Principal Matters.

Page

The Hereticks of the first Ages made use of this Method to propagate their bad Opinions; as the Gnosticks, the Ebionites, and Encratites, and Aquarii, Marcion, Montanus, Menichæus, and others, 742

The false Teachers in the Apostles times first set up such Severities and Abstinences, especially from Meats and Marriages, as appears from Col. 2. 21. 743

The Priests of the Old Testament were all married, and their Marriage necessary to the very Being of that Church, 744

Under the New Testament our blessed Saviour and Apostles made no alteration in this matter, ibid.

1 Tim. 3. 2. brought by Romanists to prove the single Life of Priests, 745

This Place asserted for the Denial of Priests against their Interpretation and Inferences, 746

The Jesuit Mumford's Objection from hence answered, 748

Heb. 13. 4. asserted in vindication of the married Clergy, 750

*What to be understood by *idolatriam coniugii* in 1 Cor. 9. 5.* 751

Titus 1. 8. explained, 754

1 Cor. 7. 32, 33. largely explained, and cleared from the false Interpretation of the Cardinal and Father Mumford, 757

Page

Those places considered and answered, which are urged by them to shew a sort of Impurity and Indecency in the Act of Marriage, which renders it unfit and unsuitable to the performing such sacred Offices, as Priests are daily to be employed in, 759

His Instance of Abimelech's (1 Sam. 21. 4.) refusing to give the Holy Bread to David and his Servants, unless they had kept themselves from Women, considered and answered, 765

His other case from Exod. 19. 9. examined and answered, 766

Pope Siricius the first who prohibited Marriage to the Clergy, and the Reasons for it are assigned in his Epistle to the Bishops of Africa, 769

Pope Innocent after him issued out a Decree against the Marriage of the Clergy, *ibid.*

This Decree was carried on with great Fury and Violence by Pope Gregory the 7th. *ibid.*

Fornication more lawful for a Clergy-man than Marriage, is the avowed Doctrine of Cardinal Bellarmine, Costerus, Pighius, Card. Hofius, Card. Campeggius, 770

The Conclusion concerning the Excellency of both the Married and Virgin state compared together.

A TABLE of

XXII.

Concerning the Celibacy of Priests, and Vows of
Continence.

PART 2.

Page	Page
T HE Instance of the Blessed Virgins Answer to the Angel in Luke 1. 34. considered and answered, 778	standing any Vow or Church-Law to the contrary, 797
The Answer implies no Vow of perpetual Continency in it, <i>ibid.</i>	An Answer returned to their Clamours concerning those Persons who in the Beginning of the Reformation, married after they had been in Orders in the Roman Church, and so taken this Vow of Continence upon them, 798
The forged and spurious Gospel of St. James the Foundation of this imagined Vow in the Virgin, 779	There are no such things as Vows to be found in the New Testament, they seeming for some particular Reasons to be peculiar to a former more imperfect Dispensation, 799
What to be understood by these Words of our Saviour in Matth. 19. 12. There be Eunuchs, that have made themselves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven, 780	However it may be lawful under the Gospel in some Cases to make Vows, 800
Whom we are to understand by Church-Widows in 1 Tim. 5. 11, 12, 782	Bellarmino's three Assertions, in Opposition to the Scriptural Directions in this Argument, examined and confuted, 801
Two Things particularly enquired into, <i>viz.</i>	1. That in none of those places of Scripture, those are called to Marriage, who are tempted by the Sting of the Flesh, but only those who live incontinently, so as to pollute themselves with Lewdness: this answered, 802
1. Whether the Gift of Continence may be had by all, as is asserted by the Church of Rome, 787	2. That those who do live incontinently, are not called to Marriage by an absolute Command; but
This Doctrine largely shown to be plainly and expressly contrary to Scripture, 788 to 797	
2. Whether it be not lawful for those to marry, who have not this Gift of Continency, notwith-	

the Principal Matters.

	Page
<i>but only an easy Remedy is shewn them, into which they may betake themselves, and that it is still free to them to aspire to greater things: this answered,</i>	803
<i>3. That this Counsel or Permission or Remedy is not given by the Apostle to those who have vowed Continence, but only to those who are loose and free: this answered,</i>	805
<i>The Church of Rome after all doth not impose any such Vow of Continence upon its Priests or Clergy,</i>	807
<i>No mention of this Vow in their Ritual or Ordinal, nor any such thing put to the Clergy, or made by them in any of their Forms of Ordination,</i>	ibid.
<i>They made this Vow only implied and interpretative at their Ordination, and suppose it to be annexed to Orders by Divine Right; though several among them annex it only by an Ecclesiastical Law,</i>	808
<i>This Law not a Law of the whole Church, but only of their own,</i>	810
<i>The Conclusion.</i>	

XXIII.

Concerning the Visibility of the Church.

	Page
A LL Proofs of Scripture that are brought to argue the Diffusiveness and most glorious Figure the Church hath made in the World, are impertinent to the Purpose, as to its Visibility,	814
<i>The Church, as to the general Notion of it, is Invisible,</i>	815
<i>That part of the Church, which we express by the Name militant, is only concerned in this Controversy,</i>	ibid.
<i>In what sense the Church may be allowed to be visible by Protestants,</i>	817
<i>The Question concerning the Visibility of the Church truly stated betwixt us and the Church of Rome,</i>	819
<i>Bellarmino's Definition of the Church examined as to this Argument,</i>	820
<i>Two things proposed hereupon, viz.</i>	
<i>1. That it is not the stile or usual manner of the Scriptures, especially the Books of the New Testament, in describing the Church, to insist much upon Numbers, or outward Pomp and Splendor of the Church, but rather to the contrary,</i>	821
<i>2. That none of those places of Scripture which are cited by the Cardinal and other Papists,</i>	do.

A TABLE of

		Page
do prove any thing of the Visib- ility of the Church, as it is de- fined by Bellarmine,	824	Interpretation of it, 832
Numb. 20. 4. very imperi- ously cited by the Cardinal in this Argument,	825	An Examination of several places of Scripture out of the Old Testament, misinterpreted and misapplied by the Catholick Scripturist, for the Continuance of this visible Church from one Age to another, under the Go- vernment of one great Pastor and Vicar of Christ the Bishop of Rome, 834 to 842
Matth. 16. 18. alledged to this purpose, explained and vindica- ted from serving of this Cause,	826	His Quotations out of the New Testament for this perpetual Visibilty of the Church under lawful Pastors, examined, 842
Matth. 18. 17. examined and found only to be a Rule that re- spectis the Church, whom she is in that Condition, as makes her ca- pable of awing of Criminals by the Inflictions of such Punish- ments as are necessary therunto,	830	The Catholick Scripturist's blasphemous Suggestion, as if the Pope of Rome was intimated by the Paraclete or Holy Spirit of God, which Christ promised shall come and abide in his Church, 846
This Rule contains nothing in it from whence can be pick'd out such a visible Church as the Car- dinal defines,	831	The Conclusion.
Psal. 18. 19. examined, and three Answers returned to their		

XXIV.

Concerning the Doctrine of Merits.

		Page
T HE Case stated between the Church of Rome and us concerning this Argument; and shown wherein we agree with them, and disagree from them,	830	been pleased to promise to bestow it, ibid.
1. We agree with them in this, that an Eternal Reward becomes due upon the Performance of such Conditions, for which God hath		2. We agree that good Works are the Condition, without which an Eternal Reward can never be obtained, ibid.
		3. We agree God's Grace to be necessary to enable us to do any good Work, 851
		4. We are ready to affirm it to be be

Page
 be agreeable to God's Wisdom and
 Goodness, to bestow a Reward
 upon good Works, although he had
 never promised it, 852

5. We allow that the word
 Merit may be used in an improper
 sense, so as to signify, to procure
 or obtain, without ever consider-
 ing the Worth of the Person, or
 the Work it self, *ibid.*

Thus far we agree with them,
 but then that which hath occasion-
 ed the Dispute betwixt Us and
 them of the Church of Rome,
 is that,

6. Merit in the more proper
 Signification imports Action or
 Actions; to which there is a Re-
 ward in Justice due, viz. when
 it doth not flow merely from the
 kindness of the Giver, but from
 respect to the Worthiness of the
 Action, so as that the Doer hath
 reason to complain of Injustice
 done him, if it be not bestowed
 upon him, 853

There hath been at all times in
 that Church such as have wish
 Us disclaim'd all kind of Merit
 in this last sense, such as Pope
 Gregory the Great, Urban IV.
 and Adrian VI. *ibid.*

There have been others, who
 though they seem to make a Re-
 ward to depend wholly upon God's
 Promise in Christ, yet at the same
 time will needs have it, that good
 Works may be truly said to be me-
 ritorious of it, 854

Others among them go further,
 and assert that God's Promise is

Page
 indeed annexed to the Works of
 just Men, but yet that belongs no
 way to the Reason of the Merit,
 but cometh rather to the Works,
 which are already not worthy only,
 but also meritorious, 855

This Doctrine found Fault with
 by Protestants for these following
 Reasons:

1. Because we are bound to pay
 all manner of Obedience, although
 we were not sure of any Reward
 hereafter, 856

2. Because though many of our
 Works are good, yet many of them
 are evil too, and if God should
 deal strictly with us, instead of re-
 warding our good Deeds, he might
 if he pleased, punish our evil ones,
ibid.

3. Because even our best Acti-
 ons are imperfect, and stand in
 need of God's Forgiveness to cover
 their Defects, *ibid.*

4. Because what ever is Praise-
 worthy in us, is not performed by
 our own Power and Skill, but by
 the Assistance of Gods Grace, 856

5. Because there is no Equality
 or Proportion betwixt the best Ac-
 tions of us finite and imperfect
 Creatures and the eternal Favour
 of God, 857

The Council of Trent, if it hath
 not taught this Doctrine of Merit
 in exprefs terms, yet there is great
 reason to believe that it did at
 least intend to give Countenance
 to it, *ibid.*

This made good even from the
 Judgment of several Divines of
 the

	Page
<i>the Church of Rome, from the Index Expurgatorius, and from the Rhemish Annotations, and from several of their Writers of late Years, when they gave us the Sense of the Council about this matter,</i>	858, &c.
<i>An Answer in five Particulars given to the Bishop of Condom's Defence of the Council in this point,</i>	860
<i>The several Texts produced by the Cardinal ranked under several Heads;</i>	
1. <i>Such as mention eternal Life to be a Reward or Wage,</i> Matth. 5. 12. Matth. 20. 8. <i>These examined,</i>	862
2. <i>Such wherein the Heavenly Reward is said to be given to Men according to the measure and Proportion of their Works and Labour, viz. Psal. 62. 12. Matth. 16. 27. Rom. 2. 6. 1 Cor. 3. 8. Rev. 22. 12. These considered, and three Answers returned to the Cardinal's Inference from them,</i>	865
3. <i>Such Scriptures as do declare an eternal Reward to be so bestowed upon good Works, that they place the very reason why eternal Life is bestowed in the good Works themselves, Matth. 25. 34, &c. Rev. 7. 14. four Answers returned to these,</i>	869
4. <i>Such Scriptures as do declare that a Reward in Justice ought to be given to Mens good Deeds, 2 Thess. 1. 4, &c.</i>	
2 Tim. 4. 7. Heb. 6. 10. <i>Two Answers returned to this,</i>	871
5. <i>Such Scriptures wherein eternal Life is promised to good Works, Matth. 19. 17, &c. 1 Tim. 4. 8. James 1. 12. Three Answers returned to the Cardinal's Inference from these places,</i>	873
6. <i>Such wherein mention is made of good Men being worthy of a Reward, Luke 10. 7. 2 Thess. 1. 5. Rev. 3. 4. The Cardinal's Inference from hence examined and answered,</i>	875
7. <i>Such Scriptures where God is said to be a just Judge and no Acceptor of Persons, Rev. 2. 11. Gal. 2. 6. 1 Pet. 1. 17. Acts 10. 34. Two Answers returned to this,</i>	876
<i>The whole of this Argument concluded with three Observations,</i>	
1. <i>That this Doctrine hath so little Foundation in the Scripture, that the word Merit is not so much as to be found there,</i>	878
2. <i>That there are a great many places of Scripture which do directly contradict this Doctrine of Merit,</i>	ibid.
3. <i>That there are several others which do in so ample a manner set forth the Merits of our Saviour's undertaking for us, as they do wholly take us off from placing any Trust or Confidence in any of our best Performances,</i>	879
<i>The Conclusion.</i>	







