

THE
B I B L E
AGAINST
P R O T E S T A N T I S M,
AND FOR
C A T H O L I C I T Y;

E V I N C E D I N A
C O N F E R E N C E B E T W E E N A C A T H O L I C, A P R O T E S T A N T (E P I S C O P A L I A N),
AND A P R E S B Y T E R I A N.

BY THE *James*
R T. R E V. D R. S H E I L,
R O M A N C A T H O L I C B I S H O P.

T O W H I C H I S A N N E X E D
A N A P P E N D I X,

P R O V I N G T H A T
T H E " R E F O R M E D " C H U R C H E S A R E D E S T I T U T E O F
A N Y L A W F U L M I N I S T R Y.

" Many a time have they afflicted me from my youth; yet they have not
prevailed against me. — Ps. cxv. 9.

" But they shall produce no fruit, nor shall they be able to manifest
unto men. — 2d Tim. ii. 14.

Fifth Edition.
REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED.

APPROVED BY THE RT. REV. DR. FENWICK, BISHOP OF BOSTON.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY PATRICK DONAHOE.

502

DEDICATION.

To the Reverend Gentlemen of the "Christian Alliance."

GENTLEMEN :

IF I am rightly informed, you have devised, matured, and commenced a system of operations for the conversion of the Holy Father and his spiritual children to what you denominate the pure doctrines of Christ. You have engaged in an arduous enterprise, and, no doubt, are stimulated by a zeal, if according to knowledge, worthy of high commendation.

But, Gentlemen, it occurs to me that there is a preliminary difficulty in the way of your success, to which you have not paid sufficient attention. It is to be presumed that you have no wish to pervert us Catholics to infidelity, or to reduce us from our present faith to no faith at all; for, since you profess to be Christians, and do by no means deny salvation to be attainable in our Church, you must hold Catholicity to be far preferable to infidelity. You cannot, then, restrict your zeal in our behalf to the negative work of destroying our present faith, but must extend it to

the positive and far more important work of converting us to the truth as it is in Jesus. Your ambition is, no doubt, to convert us from error to truth. But here, Gentlemen, is the difficulty. What is the truth to which you propose to convert us? or, in other words, what do you propose to give us in exchange for what we now have? We beg to be enlightened on this point. We are not willing to leap in the dark. Before we can entertain your proposition to forsake the religion of our fathers, endeared to us by the memory of the many persecutions to which it has been subjected, and hallowed by innumerable saints and martyrs, we must be told distinctly what we are to receive in exchange for it. We cannot forsake it for we know not what — for mere vague assertions and indefinite promises. We must first see what you have to offer, and we must compare that with what we now have, and judge which is preferable.

Now, Reverend Gentlemen, with all due respect, we must say that you do not tell us distinctly what it is to which you propose to convert us. Nay, more, we do not see that you are in a condition to tell us; for — pardon our presumption — you do not seem yourselves either to agree, or to be able to agree, as to what is the truth as revealed by our blessed Lord. You all agree to say that it is *not* Catholicity, but you are far from agreeing to say what it *is*. How, then, are we to know to what we are to be converted?

You represent internally hostile sects and conflicting doctrines. One of you cannot put forth a positive doctrine which another of you will not deny. We cannot join one of your sects without giving umbrage to all the rest. If we become Calvinists, the Arminians will denounce us ; if Episcopalians, we shall be scouted by Presbyterians and Congregationalists ; if Unitarians, we shall be anathematized by all the Trinitarians.

Nor is there any probability of your agreeing among yourselves. You have been trying, for three hundred years, to come to a tolerable understanding of what our Lord requires us to believe ; but you have only multiplied your differences, and, where you have not become indifferent to all faith, you have only become the more irreconcilable one with another. To what, then, would you convert us ? What do you offer us in exchange for our present definite and certain faith ? Nothing but vagueness, uncertainty, contradiction, dispute. Now, Gentlemen, we beg you, before proceeding further, to pause on these facts, and either remove the difficulty they involve, or have the manliness to dissolve your "Alliance ;" lest, instead of converting us, you impress still more strongly on our minds that your covenant is with death, and your "Alliance" with hell. Truth is one — homogeneous in all its parts. So long as you are many-tongued, so long as you teach different and mutually contradictory doc-

trines, we know you have not the truth, and that the God of truth does not, and cannot, approve your "Alliance."

You will pardon me, Reverend Gentlemen, for dedicating this volume to you. I dedicate it to you, because you, of all men, seem most in need of the lesson it is intended to teach, and because it may furnish some hints which may be of use to you in your work of converting Catholics. Permit me to hope that you will take it under your patronage. It is an old book, indeed, and not now for the first time republished in this country; but I presume it will have all the charms of novelty for the most of you.

Very respectfully,

Gentlemen,

I have the honor to be

Your obedient servant,

THE PUBLISHER.

TO THE READER.

IF the doctrine and morals of the first Christians had been such as they were continually represented by their adversaries then in power, no monster had ever been so frightful as the Christian religion. And if the faith and morals of Catholics had really those deformities, under which they are but too often painted, even from the pulpit, and in those very books which are put into the hands of the people as necessary preservatives against Popery, I freely own it were better to be of no religion at all than to be a Papist.

What, then, was commonly said and thought of the first and best Christians that ever were in the world? The most distinguished part of their Christian character was, that they utterly denied the Godhead, as is witnessed by St. Justin, Apol. 1, p. 56. Some accused them of giving divine worship to the cross, as we find it recorded in Minutius, Felix, and Tertullian; others said they gave it to the sun, to an ass's head, and other things not fit to be named.

Next they gave it out that they had no men of sense or learning among them; that they kept the common people in awe with superstitious fears; that their

pretended miracles were only tricks of art or magical enchantment; that they were traitors to the government, and guilty of all the evils that happened to the state; that, in their most *sacred meetings*, they feasted on the flesh of *murdered infants*, made delicious sippets in their *warm and innocent blood*, and closed at length the barbarous solemnity with all sorts of lewd and *incestuous embraces*; in a word, that they were professed enemies to honor and conscience, to God and man. All these things are attested by Origen, Tertullian, St. Justin, &c., and show how true this saying of Tertullian is, viz., that "*the truth and hatred of it began together.*"

This brief and faithful account of the general hatred of the Christian religion, in its very infancy, may serve for a key to many useful discoveries; as, 1st. That a formed design of *misrepresentation* and *slander* is a sure mark that the cause in favor of which they are employed is a very bad one. 2d. That those whose faith and morals lie under the injustice of public censure, may comfort themselves with this reflection, that nothing was ever more contemptible than religion in its greatest purity. 3d. That what our blessed Redeemer said to his followers, (Luke, c. 21, v. 17,) "You shall be hated by all men for my sake," was not confined to the primitive times. For truth always was, and always will be, odious to insincere and prejudiced understandings; and the present age is so overstocked with such unhappy dispositions, that, if they had been as frequent in *primitive times*, few nations

would perhaps have ever embraced the Christian faith. 4th. That the same methods are still pursued against the truths of the gospel, as were at first employed against the *gospel* itself. My meaning is, that the character of the Catholics is as unfairly represented now, as that of the Christians was in primitive ages.

I might appeal, for the truth of this, to an infinite number of Protestant and Presbyterian books and sermons, filled with such false characters, both of our faith and morals, as cannot but create the strongest prejudices against us.

It is, therefore, as well to do away the many ill-founded opinions entertained against the Roman Catholic Church, which induced me to write the following treatise, as also by reason of several conferences that I had with two brothers which I have, who do neither agree among themselves nor with me in that faith *without which* St. Paul affirms it to be *impossible to please God*. Heb. c. 11, v. 6. Yet each of them continually labors in order to persuade me and the other brother to be of his own profession; but all their frivolous reasoning and ill-supported arguments could never convince me to forsake that ancient religion, which only I find to be conformable to the express word of God. And after I had seriously studied what ground each of them had for his particular doctrine, I found out, at last, that not only they, but also the most learned doctors of their religion, do give me, and those of my profession, only their own conjectures and ima-

ginary fancies, for the word of God ; and this in all controverted points, which are between us and both their churches, in matters of religion ; which now I shall clearly show to all those that will be pleased to read and consider their doctrine in this treatise ; which faithfully relates not only their principles and corresponding practices, but also the truth of that religion which I only find to be conformable to the express word of God. And this I design (by the grace of God) to make clear to any discerning understanding ; not by any extraordinary style of language, or superficial eloquence, which is not the object of my heart or studies ; but the bare gaining of those poor souls, who, by false impressions, are led astray from the Church of Christ. “ He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.” Matt. c. 11, v. 15.

A

TREATISE

WHICH CLEARLY SHOWETH

THE ONLY RELIGION,

& c.

SECTION I.

Concerning Man's Free Will.

1. WHEREAS the Scripture says, (Deut. c. 30, v. 15, 19,) "See, I have set before thee, this day, life and good, death and evil; I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing. Therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "that is not left to our choice; for by Adam's fall into the state of sin, we have wholly lost all ability of will to do any spiritual good accompanying salvation," as our confession of faith declares, chap. 9, first agreed upon by the assembly of divines at Westminster, and afterwards approved by the general assembly of the kirk of Scotland, printed at Edinburgh, in the year 1650. Pray, my dear brother, get some of your learned ministers to show you (if they can) by some clear text of Scripture, that it is not in a man's power to do that which is able to advance him towards heaven, when he is helped by God's preventing grace exciting him; for this is what you affirm, and the Catholics do deny it, for they say, that "men's free will is still enabled to do good or to avoid evil, and that

it is in their power also either to omit their duty or to do it, even when preventing grace is given them;” for this is what the council of Trent declares, (sess. 6, c. 5,) and you may perceive how conformable it is to the express word of God, in the aforesaid text.

2. Whereas the Scripture says, (Jos. c. 24, v. 15,) “And if it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom you will serve.” “No, no,” say the Protestant and Presbyterian, “that we cannot choose, for the choice thereof is not left in men’s power since the fall of Adam.” And hence our Mr. Whitgift (in his *Defence against the Reply of Cartwright*, p. 473) accuses the ancient bishops, and writers of the Greek and Latin church, saying, that “they were spotted with that Popish doctrine of free will.” Truly, brother, since your authors are forced to acknowledge that this doctrine of free will was maintained by the holy fathers of the primitive church, I know not any reason which should move you to believe your ministers, when they tell you, that “these holy fathers have been of their own religion;” and moreover you have no reason to say, that “these ancient bishops, and those now of the Roman church, have not the express word of God, to rely upon in their assertion concerning men’s free will.

3. Whereas the Scripture says, (Eccles. c. 15, v. 12, 15, &c.,) “Say not thou, He hath caused me to err; if thou wilt, thou shalt observe the commandments. He hath set water and fire before thee; stretch out thy hand to which thou wilt. Before man is life and death, good and evil; that which he shall choose shall be given him.” “No, no,” say the Protestant and Presbyterian, “we have lost that freedom of our will by Adam’s sin.” And this, therefore, our Whitaker declares, (in *Respons. ad Rat. Campiani*, rat. 1, p. 15,) that “himself would not believe the freedom of man’s will, although Ecclesiasticus would affirm it a hundred times, that before man were life and death.” Since you, brethren, do not much regard what this book declares, surely you will give credit to what these following texts (which you must own to be

canonical) do affirm; viz. "Beheld, I do set before you this day a blessing and a curse; a blessing if you obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day, and a curse if you will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God, but turn aside out of the way, which I command you this day, to go after other gods which ye have not known." Deut. c. 11, v. 26, &c. You see by this text that one might choose either to follow the true or false Gods; and the same is further proved by the following words, which say thus: "The word of the Lord came unto the prophet Gad, David's seer, saying, Go and say unto David, Thus saith the Lord, I offer thee three things; choose thee one of them, that I may do it unto thee." 2 Sam. c. 24, v. 11, 12. Pray, mark how this text expressly declares that "David might choose either of these three things" proposed unto him, and if you be not satisfied by what the Old Testament tells you, be pleased to take notice of what St. Paul tells you in the New Testament, saying thus: "Without thy mind I would do nothing, that thy benefit should not be as it were of necessity, but willingly." Philemon, v. 14. And he also says thus: "He that standeth fast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will." 1 Cor. c. 7, v. 37. Behold how expressly St. Paul affirms that we have power over our own will, to do that which is less perfect, or that which is more perfect: "For he that giveth his virgin (saith he, v. 38) in marriage doth well, but he that giveth her not in marriage doth better." Whereby you plainly see that one hath power to do either of both extremes: may God's grace so enable our power, that hence the evangelists say, "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God." John, c. 1, v. 12.

4. And how free our will comes to lead us to do evil St. James tells us in these words: "Let no man say, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God, for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man, but every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed," but hitherto sin, but when is the sin committed? The

text tells you, saying thus: "Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin." James, c. 1, v. 13, &c. Therefore it is only then sin is hatched, when free will yields itself to concupiscence, so as to give its consent to what is suggested; and it is for giving freely such an evil consent, God spoke to the Jews by the prophet Isaias, saying thus: "When I called, ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear; but did evil before mine eyes, and did choose *that* wherein I delighted not." Is. c. 65, v. 12. Pray, observe how clearly the word of God tells you that the people did choose to do evil, which they might avoid, if they wished; otherwise Pharaoh's obduration would not be ascribed to his free will by the Scripture, saying thus: "But when Pharaoh saw that there was respite, he hardened his heart, and hearkened not unto them." Exod. c. 8, v. 15. And hence the Scripture says, "Why do you harden your hearts, as the Egyptians and Pharaoh did harden their hearts?" 1 Sam. c. 6, v. 6. And so David crieth to us all, saying thus: "Harden not your heart." Psalm 95, v. 8. And the prophet Ezekiel says, "Cast away from you all your transgressions, and make you a new heart and a new spirit, for why will you die, O house of Israel? wherefore turn yourselves and live." Ezekiel, c. 18, v. 31, 32.

Though I have now showed unto you the true and Catholic doctrine to be conformable to the aforesaid unequivocal texts, yet I am afraid that your free will, by them proved, will choose the contrary doctrine taught by your ministers, who were never able to produce as much as one plain text of Scripture, which might prove their assertion therein.

SECTION II.

Concerning Christ's giving sufficient Grace unto all Men.

1. WHEREAS the Scripture says, (Matt. c. 22, v. 14,) "Many are called, but few *are* chosen." "No, no," say the Prot-

estant and the Presbyterian, "every one is chosen that was called, because there was none sufficiently called, but only the predestinate," as our confession of faith affirms, c. 3, 7, and 10. Truly, brother, neither you nor those who have composed your confession of faith can prove this doctrine of yours, by the express word of God; for this clearly affirms the contrary, not only in the aforesaid, but also in the following texts. Our Savior says to the incredulous people of Jerusalem, "O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! how often would I have gathered together thy children, as the hen gathereth together her chickens, and thou wouldst not!" Matt. c. 23, v. 37. Behold how they would not answer to Christ's calling, who therefore says thus to them: "Behold, your houses shall be left desolate." v. 38. And then began to upbraid the cities, wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not: "Woe unto thee, Chorazin; woe unto thee, Bethsaida; for if the mighty works which were done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment than for you." Matt. c. 11, v. 20, &c. Do you perceive, brother, by this text of plain Scripture, that though the Jews did not then repent, yet that Christ labored sufficiently to that end? and hence St. Paul declares, that he said to Israel, "All the day long I have stretched forth my hand unto a disobedient and gainsaying people." Rom. c. 10, v. 21. "I have called, and ye have refused; I have stretched forth my hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all my counsel." Prov. c. 1, v. 24, 25. "What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?" Isa. c. 5, v. 4. Why, then, did they not answer, as your ministers do now-a-days, that he did not call them sufficiently? But this they had not to say, as is evidently proved by the ensuing texts, saying thus: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him." Rev. c. 3, v. 20. "Turn ye, turn ye from your wicked

ways, for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" Ezek. c. 33, v. 11.

2. Behold how he tells them all that they were sufficiently incited; otherwise vainly he had said, "Why will ye die, O house of Israel?" for they might reply, saying, that they could not but die, because thou givest us not the grace to live; but this excuse they could not allege; otherwise St. Paul would not have said the following words: "We beseech *you* that ye receive not the grace of God in vain." 2 Cor. c. 6, v. 1. "Who willeth all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth." 1 Tim. c. 2, v. 4. "Dost thou contemn the riches of his goodness, patience, and longanimity, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? but according to the hardness of thy heart, thou heapest up to thyself wrath against the day of wrath." Rom. c. 2, v. 4, 5. I beseech you to take notice how men are able to contemn the very riches of God's goodness, who still gives sufficient grace to every one, and, with so much patience and longanimity, expects the effect of that grace which is frustrated by the impenitent sinner. Of such a soul it is said, "I gave her space to repent of her fornication, and she repented not; behold, I will cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of their deeds." Rev. c. 2, v. 21, 22. Surely, brother, you would not be so senseless as to blame the cripple for not running, or the blind for not seeing: why, then, would you imagine God to be so cruel and so unmerciful, that he would not only blame, but also condemn poor souls? If he had not offered them sufficient grace wherewith they might repent, if they had pleased, is he that most clement Father whom the Scripture tells you "not to be willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance," (2 Pet. c. 3, v. 9,) by that grace which he daily offers to them? as you have now plainly seen by these twelve direct texts of Scripture, produced in this section.

SECTION III.

Concerning Christ's dying for all Mankind.

1. WHEREAS the Scripture says (Rom. c. 5, v. 6) that "Christ died for the ungodly." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "Christ died for none, but only for the elect, as our confession of faith declares, ch. 3." Indeed, brother, I acknowledge that this is some of your doctrine in that chapter; yet I know that St. Paul was not of your opinion herein, as you may see by what he says in this text; but I believe that your learned ministers did not consult with him, when first they began to teach this strange doctrine of theirs, which you may further know to be false by the texts of Scripture which I have produced in the last section, for that sufficient grace, which God offers to all men, proceeds only from Christ's death, and therefore it necessarily follows that Christ died for all them to whom the grace is offered; for hence God said to Abraham, "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Gen. c. 12, v. 3. "In thy seed shall be blessed all the nations of the earth." Gen. c. 22, v. 18. And St. Paul declares that "the blessing of Abraham comes on the Gentiles." Gal. c. 3, v. 14. There is none therefore excepted from being partaker of this blessing, seeing that all the families and all the nations of the earth do enjoy it; yet it is evident that many among these nations and families are reprobates, for "many are called, but few are chosen." Matt. c. 22, v. 14. Therefore reprobates do enjoy many blessings by Christ's death, which could not happen if Christ had not died for them; the truth hereof is further proved by the ensuing texts: "Despise thou the riches of his goodness, patience, longanimity, that, after thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath?" Rom. c. 2, v. 4, 5. Pray, who does this but the reprobate? And if Christ had not died for him, why would St. John say that "he is the pro-

pitiation for our sins, and not only for ours, but also for the sins of the whole world"? 1 John, c. 2, v. 2. Surely the whole world comprehends more reprobates than elects; he, therefore, who died for the sins of the whole world, died for the sins of the reprobate.

2. And if Christ had died only for the sins of the elect, wherefore should St. Paul warn us not to be the occasion of damnation to those for whom Christ died? "Destroy not him," saith he, "with thy meat, for whom Christ died." Rom. c. 14, v. 15. He, therefore, for whom Christ died may be destroyed, and eternally perish; which St. Paul further proves, saying thus: "Through thy knowledge shall thy weak brother perish, for whom Christ died." 1 Cor. c. 8, v. 11. "There shall be false teachers among you, (*have a care of them, brother,*) who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord (*as you deny his real presence in the blessed sacrament of the Eucharist*) that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." 2 Pet. c. 2, v. 1. Do you not see here, by clear Scripture, how Christ bought, at the price of his precious blood, the sons of perdition? which, by their own false doctrine, do bring swift destruction upon themselves and upon their flock; "For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead." 2 Cor. c. 5, v. 14. St. Paul had not proved by Christ's dying for all, that all were dead; if any man could be found for whom Christ did not die, and lest any would presume to say that such a man could be found, St. Paul's next words are these: "Christ died for all." v. 15. The council of Trent, citing these words of St. Paul, says thus: "But though he died for all, yet all receive not the benefit of his death, but only those to whom the merit of his passion is communicated." Sess. 6, c. 3. Which words are conformable to those of St. Paul, saying thus: "We trust in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, especially those who believe." 1 Tim. c. 4, v. 10. Christ, therefore, is a Savior to all men, by giving what sufficeth to save them, (see sect. 2 and 5, n. 7;) but this suf-

iciency is effectual to salvation only in the truly faithful, whose faith and works are not disagreeable to the word of God; therefore he is said to be chiefly a Savior to such people, though he did not die only for them, but also for all mankind, as St. Paul expressly declares, saying thus: "As by the offence of one, *judgment came* upon all men to condemnation, even so, by the righteousness of one, the *free gift* came upon all men, unto justification of life." Rom. c. 5, v. 18.

SECTION IV.

Concerning the Commandments.

I. WHEREAS the Scripture says, (Ezek. c. 36, v. 27,) "I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my precepts, and keep my judgments, and do them." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "that cannot be true, for our ministers do make us believe, in the Larger Catechism, annexed to the confession of faith, page 184, that no man is able of himself, or by any grace received in this life, perfectly to keep the commandments of God, but doth daily break them in thought, word, and deed." Truly, brother, I cannot but commiserate the great extremity to which you are reduced, by believing this strange doctrine taught by your learned ministers; for, on the one side, I see that they make you to believe that it is impossible for you to keep the commandments, even with all the grace that God can give you in this life; and, on the other side, I see that you are obliged to believe the word of God, which tells you that "you cannot enter into life, unless you will keep the commandments." Matt. c. 19, v. 17. What now can you do, poor dupe? for I see that you are in an imminent danger of despairing of your salvation, and blaspheming God, who requires of you, under pain of eternal damnation, the performance of such laws, which by no means, as you imagine, can be

observed. Truly, the greatest tyrant that ever stood upon earth never arrived to that height of despotism, that he would oblige, under pain of death, his subjects to that which would be wholly impossible for them to do. Why, then, would you believe that God, who is the fountain of all justice, goodness, and mercy, would come to that height of injustice, that he would oblige us, under pain of eternal damnation, to keep the commandments? If this had been wholly impossible for us in our state, even with all the grace that he could give us, truly that would not only encroach upon his goodness and justice, but also upon his wisdom; for as it is certain that God made these laws, so it is no less evident that God useth admonitions and exhortations, propounds rewards, and threatens punishment, in order to induce men to observe them; which would be a great folly and imprudence for him to propose, if he had not thought that it might be possible for us to observe them. Therefore, since his laws, admonitions, and exhortations, cannot be but prudent and reasonable, he supposes the possibility of that which they enjoin, and whereunto they exhort. "For God," saith St. Augustin, (*Ser. 61, de Temp.*) "could not command any thing impossible, because he is just; neither will he condemn a man for that which he could not avoid, because he is merciful." God, therefore, who, of his own infinite mercy, gives sufficient grace to all men, (as you have seen, sec. 2,) gives them also sufficient grace, wherewith they may, if they please, keep all the commandments. And hence St. Leo says that "God justly presseth upon us the doing of that, to the performance of which he offereth us his grace." *Ser. 16, de Passione.* "That the justification of the law might be fulfilled in us." Rom. c. 8, v. 4.

2. Whereas the Scripture says, (*Ezek. c. 37, v. 23, 24,*) "They shall be my people, and I will be their God; and they shall all have one shepherd; they shall also walk in my judgments, and keep my commandments, and do them." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "we shall neither have one shepherd, since we accuse the bishops for admitting

of such a man, nor walk in your judgments, nor keep your commandments, because we are told by our learned ministers, the former to be a usurpation, and the latter to be wholly impossible for us in this life, as our Mr. Willet affirms, in his *Synopsis Baptismi*, p. 564." Indeed, brother, you are not taught to maintain this doctrine of yours by the word of God, which you pretend to be your only rule of faith, and you may also know the truth hereof by the ensuing texts: "Moses called all Israel, and said unto them, Hear, Israel, the statutes which I speak in your ears this day; learn them, and keep them, and do them." Deut. c. 5, v. 1. And after saying these words, he begins to tell them all the ten commandments, (v. 6,) which God would have them to learn and fulfil. David, speaking of the righteous, says thus of him: "The law of God is in his heart; none of his steps shall slide." Psalm 37, v. 31. Surely, brother, this man, who has the law of God in his heart, and whose steps do not slide, keeps all the commandments. The Scripture says that "Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord, and that he was a just and perfect man." Gen. c. 6, v. 8, 9. And we read that Job also "was a perfect and upright man, one that feared God and eschewed evil." Job, c. 1, v. 1. Enoch and Elias were so just and holy, that they are said to have "walked before God, and were translated." Gen. c. 5, v. 22, 24. 2 Kings, c. 2, v. 11.

3. And most clearly is the justice of Abraham exalted by the mouth of God himself, saying thus to Isaac: "I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father, and I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and I will give unto thy seed all these countries, and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." Gen. c. 26, v. 4, &c. Luke also giveth an excellent testimony of Zacharias and Elizabeth, the parents of St. John the Baptist, saying thus of them: "They were both just before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of our Lord blameless." Luke, c. 1, v. 6. And the young man told Christ that "he

had kept all the commandments from his youth." Matt c. 19, v. 20. And because he did thus, St. Mark says that "Jesus, beholding him, loved him" Mark, c. 10, v. 21. Which Christ would not have done, if the young man had been a liar in what he said of himself; and Christ said unto his Father, "I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me; and they have kept thy word." John, c. 17, v. 6. And hence St. John says thus: "Whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things which are pleasing in his sight." 1 John, c. 3, v. 22. And he says thus to the angel of Sardis: "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." Rev. c. 3, v. 4. You have seen now, by positive texts of Scripture, that it is not only possible for men to keep all the commandments by the assistance of God's grace, but that also very many have kept them inviolably; nay, St. Chrysostom affirms more that this, saying that "God commanded nothing impossible, insomuch that many go beyond the very commandments." Hom. 19, in Hebr. But since some Protestants do say that the commandment of loving God with all our soul is the commandment which is impossible to us all in this life, hence I will show you this to be flatly against the express word of God. David says; "I have sought thee in my whole heart, and I have kept thy law." Psalm 119, v. 10, 55. And God himself testifies this to be true, when he gave order to the prophet Ahijah to tell Jeroboam his misbehavior, in these words: "Thou hast not been," saith he, "as my servant David, who kept my commandments, and followed me with his whole heart." 1 Kings, c. 14, v. 8. We read also in Scripture that "Josias had turned unto the Lord, with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might, according to all the law of Moses." 2 Kings, c. 23, v. 25. Pray, what more is commanded, any where in Scripture, than this, which the word of God tells you Josias had performed?

4. Whereas Christ says, (Matt. c. 11, v. 30,) "My yoke is

easy and my burden is light." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "your yoke is uneasy, and your burden is heavy; for there is none of us able, either of himself or by any grace received in this life, to keep your commandments," as our Mr. Willet affirms, in his *Synopsis*, p. 564. I beseech you, dear brother, to look for better authority, and cause your ministers to show you, if they can, whereabouts in Scripture do they find this doctrine of theirs. Have you not seen already in this section several texts of Scripture, declaring the falsity of their assertion herein? And does not St. John affirm that "God's commandments are not grievous"? 1 John, c. 5, v. 3. And does not God himself declare the same, saying, "Love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, for this commandment, which I command thee this day, is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off; it is not in heaven, (*where you say it shall only be fulfilled,*) that thou shouldst say, Who shall go up to that heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it? neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it? but the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayst do it." Deut. c. 30, v. 6, 11, &c. Mark these last words, by which you may plainly see that God gives us sufficient grace, wherewith we may fulfil his commandments; as I have shown you, sec. 2. Take notice also of these following words of St. Chrysostom, speaking of God's commandments: "Hearing," saith he, "my precepts to be a yoke, be not afraid, for it is replenished with rare delight; neither fear ye that I name it a burden, for it is light; how, then, said he before, the gate to be narrow, and the way to be straight through tribulation? O, that is when thou art drowsy or lazy; but when with courage thou doest that work, then the burden shall be light unto thee." Hom. 6, in Matt.

5. Whereas Christ says, (John, c. 14, v. 15,) "If ye love me, keep my commandments." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "but if we love you, we will only have

faith in you, and declare openly that we necessarily must break daily your commandments, in thought, word, and deed." What, brother, do you pretend to know them who love God, better than Christ knows? who further says (v. 21) thus: "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." How, then, can you pretend that you love God? Whereas you profess not to keep his commandments, for "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." 1 John, c. 5, v. 3. Or why do you so foolishly believe that your naked faith will save you? Whereas St. Paul tells you, that "circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." 1 Cor. c. 7, v. 19.

6. Whereas the Scripture says, (1 John, c. 2, v. 3,) "Hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "but hereby we know that we know him, if we keep not his commandments; for our ministers tell us that they and we do know that we know him, yet they make us believe that neither they nor we will ever keep his commandments in this life." Since, then, ye believe that ye can never keep the commandments in this life, why do you presume to say that you know God in this life? Whereas the Scripture says that "He that saith he knoweth God, and keepeth not his commandments, he is a liar." 1 John, c. 2, v. 4. You, brother, may now plainly see how wholly impossible it is for me to reconcile such manifest contradictions as are in this matter, betwixt the express word of God and your doctrine. Therefore I do rather choose to remain still a Roman Catholic, though I be all the days of my life persecuted for it in this world, than to become either a Protestant or a Presbyterian, and thereby forsake the word of God; which you have now seen to be conformable to what the Church of Rome believes concerning this point; for the council of Trent only says thus of it: "If any man say that the commandments of God are impossible to be kept by a man, ever justified and constituted under grace, let him be accursed. Sess. 6, can.

18. And St. Augustin says no less, in the following words :
 "We accurse," saith he, "their blasphemy that affirm that
 God commanded any thing impossible to man, and that God's
 commandments cannot be kept by any man in particular, but
 by all men taken together." *Ser. 19, de Temp.*

SECTION V.

Concerning Faith and Justification.

1. WHEREAS the Scripture says, (James, c. 2, v. 21, &c.,)
 "Was not Abraham, our father, justified by works, when he
 had offered Isaac, his son, upon the altar? Was not also
 Rahab, the harlot, justified by works, when she had received
 the messengers, and had sent them out another way?" "You
 see, then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by
 faith only." v. 24. "No, no," say the Protestant and Presby-
 terian, "we do not see that a man is justified by works, for
 faith resting on Christ and his righteousness is the alone
 instrument of justification, as our confession of faith affirms,
 c. 11." Truly, brother, I acknowledge that St. Paul says
 that a man is justified by faith, but I could never find out
 that text of pure Scripture which affirms that faith is the
 alone instrument of justification; for that word *alone*, or *only*,
 could not be found from the first of Genesis to the last of
 Revelations, until your great apostle, Luther, first added it to
 that of St. Paul, (Rom. c. 3, v. 28,) in his German translation
 of the Bible. And when this high presumption of adding to
 the word of God was objected to him, he answered most
 impertinently, saying, that "the word *alonè* should remain
 in his Bible, although all the Papiſts in the world should go
 mad at it." Tom. 5, Germ. fol. 141. But leaving the cen-
 sure of Luther's presumption and unreasonable expression to
 the authors, I will only here go forward in order to show that
 which I took in hand; and in the mean time it is necessary

that I should let my brother know the nature of justification, that thereby he may the easier come to understand which are the works that are excluded from justification, according to St. Paul, and which are the other works, by which we are justified, according to St. James.

2. It is generally agreed upon that the justification of a sinner is the translation of one from the state of sin into the state of grace, or a changing of one from being an enemy to become a friend to God; but that one might be so altered, there are some preparations and dispositions required to go before, in the soul of a sinner that is come to age, (of which kind only we speak.) For God first, of his own mere mercy, by his preventing grace, does so incite and call a sinner, that he may convert himself to God if he pleases; and hence Christ says, "No man can come to me, except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him." John, c. 6, v. 44. Secondly, a sinner being so awakened by the divine grace, conceiving "faith by hearing," (Rom. c. 10, v. 17,) doth believe all things to be true, which are revealed and promised by God, through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ; "for without faith it is impossible to please him." Heb. c. 11, v. 6. Thirdly, this faith representing God to be a severe punisher of sins, there ariseth, in a sinner thus disposed by faith, a fear of God's judgment, with which the soul is profitably terrified; "for the fear of our Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Prov. c. 1, v. 7. "And whoever is without fear, cannot be justified." Eccles. c. 1, v. 28. Fourthly, the soul of a sinner being thus terrified, it is raised up again to hope by the same faith which represents God to be most merciful in forgiving sins; and hence St. Paul says that "we are saved by hope." Rom. c. 8, v. 24. Fifthly, upon this hope and confidence in the divine mercy there ariseth the love of God in the soul, and also a hatred, and a detestation of the sin, a sorrow and grief for what evil is past, and a firm resolution of a better life for the future.

3. Now, all these former dispositions, viz., faith, hope, love, &c., being placed in the soul, the infusion of justifying grace

doth follow; and although faith is the first disposition of the soul to this justification, yet these other virtues are also necessary, "for the house of God," saith St. Augustin, "is founded by faith, raised up by hope, and perfected by charity." *Ser. 22, de Verb. Apost.* And as one may truly say, in this sense, that faith doth justify, viz., as a fundamental and radical disposition to justification, so one may also say, with no less truth, that fear, hope, love, and repentance, do likewise justify, to wit, as secondary dispositions proceeding from faith, because these virtues do also fitly dispose the soul to receive the form of justice; and the Scriptures do ascribe forgiveness of sins, salvation, or justification, to them in this sense, as they do to faith in the other sense. For our Savior told Mary Magdalene that "many sins were forgiven her, because she loved much." Luke, c. 7, v. 47. And St. Paul says thus: "If I should have all faith, (take notice of these words, viz., 'All Faith,') so that I should move mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." I Cor. c. 13, v. 2. And after numbering faith, hope, and charity, he says thus, (v. 13,) that "the greater of these three is charity;" and hence he further says the following words: "But above all things have charity, which is the bond of perfection." Colos. c. 3, v. 14. And he also says that "Christ became the author of eternal salvation to all that obey him." Heb. c. 5, v. 9. You may now perceive, brother, by these texts of Scripture, how the word of God expressly attributes forgiveness of sins and salvation to those other virtues above mentioned; nay, you may see that St. Paul, who, you pretend, favors your own doctrine, doth extol charity above all faith.

4. And, notwithstanding your great calumnies of the Catholic Church, yet she professeth openly that no man, by any faith or works, can merit the grace of justification; for the council of Trent says the following words: "We are said to be freely justified, because none of these things which precede justification, whether faith or works, do merit the grace of justification." Sess. 6, c. 8. All the causes therefore of our justification are these following: the efficient cause is

our merciful God; the meritorious, our Lord Jesus Christ. the final cause is the glory of God and Christ, and life everlasting; and the formal cause is the justice of God, not that by which he himself is just, but that by which he makes us just, and with which we being endowed, are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and are not only reputed, but are truly just; for the grace of justification consisteth in two things, to wit, in remission of sin, and in inward sanctification, as I shall let you see in the sixth paragraph. In the mean time, take notice of that other, which the Catholics do call the second justification, for it is that by which one is not of impious made just, but of just he is made more just, and of being a friend he is made more intimate with God, and so it is acquired by doing works of justice and piety, by which one that is in the state of grace purchased to himself a further augmentation of grace; but observe that the Roman Catholics do affirm that the grace of God must be still aiding and assisting him all the time he doth any meritorious works which deserve this augmentation of grace, as may be seen by the council of Trent. Sess. 6, c. 16. And they add that even to such actions, done in that manner, God, if he had pleased, might have given no reward; but he was pleased to promise, and to give a reward for them out of his own free, gracious goodness, being moved, by the merits and passion of Jesus Christ, to accept, for his sake, all such good works, as rewardable; which doctrine you may know to be true, by the express words of Scripture. This I will produce, sec. 6.

5. You may now easily understand, brother, by what I have said here, in the three last numbers, which by these works that St. Paul excludes from justification, when he says that "a man is justified by faith, without the works of the law." Rom. c. 3, v. 28. For he does not exclude the works which are done by men that are in the state of grace, but only the works of the law of nature done by the Gentiles, who had no true faith, and the works of the written law done by the Jews, who had not faith in Jesus Christ, whom they deny to have been the true Messiah of which the Scriptures spoke;

and that this is St. Paul's meaning you may easily know by what he says in the three preceding texts of his, produced in paragraph No. 4; and also by these other following texts of his; for he says that "Christ dwells by faith in the heart, rooted in charity," (Ephes. c. 3, v. 17;) and that "neither circumcision is any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by charity or love." Gal. c. 5, v. 6. And he further says that "circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God" 1 Cor. c. 7, v. 19. So you may now perceive, by these very texts of St. Paul, that he doth only exclude from justification the former works of the Gentiles, and of the incredulous Jews, and not the works of grace which do follow faith; for they do justify, that is, they dispose the soul unto the first justification, as faith itself doth; and they proceed from faith, as you have seen in paragraph No. 2. And therefore they are not only the works of the law of nature done by the Gentiles, nor the works of the written law done by the incredulous Jews, but the works of grace that follow true faith. And hence St. Augustin reconciles these former texts of St. Paul and St. James, saying thus of them: "The sentences of Paul and James are not contrary to one another, when one affirms that a man is justified by faith without works, and the other saith that faith is in vain without works; for St. Paul speaks of works that go before faith, and St. James speaks of works that follow faith." *Lib. 83, quest. p. 76.*

6. Whereas the Scripture says, (Ezek. c. 36, v. 25,) "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean from all your filthiness." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "you will not clean us from our filthiness, for in our justification we are never cleansed by infusing righteousness into our souls, but only the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, by which our sins, still remaining in our souls, are then only covered; as our confession of faith declares," c. 11. Truly, brother, though that is the doctrine which you are taught to believe by your confession of faith, yet it is not that doctrine which the word of God teacheth you to

believe, as evidently appears by the ensuing texts: St. Paul says that "the love of God is sowed in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us." Rom. c. 5, v. 5. And he also says thus: "that ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, and be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and that you put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Ephes. c. 4, v. 22, &c. And speaking of Christ, he says that "he had by himself purged our sins." Heb. c. 1, v. 3. And St. Peter affirms no less, saying thus: "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." Acts, c. 3, v. 19. Behold how the word of God tells you that the sins are not covered in our souls, but are wholly blotted out, and entirely taken away; and hence St. John says that "Christ is the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world." John, c. 1, v. 29. And he also says the following words: "If we walk in the light, as he is the light, we have fellowship one with another; and the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sins. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." 1 John, c. 1, v. 7, 9. Nay, the prophet says that, at our conversion, "he will cast all our sins into the depth of the sea." Micah, c. 7, v. 19. But this he could not do by only covering them in our souls, as you falsely allege, pretending that the following text favors you therein: "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord doth not impute iniquity, and whose sins are covered, (it followeth) and in whose spirit there is no guile." Psalm 32, v. 1, 2. I see you never produce these last words, viz., "in whose spirit there is no guile," because they do evidently prove that those sins which are covered from God's eyes must not be at all in the soul; and therefore the former sins of the just, being so covered from the eyes of God, cannot be seen in his soul. For the Scripture tells you here, that in this man's spirit there is no guile, which would not be true if the sins had still remained in it; and you may further see the truth hereof by these other words of the same prophet, saying thus: "As far

as the east is distant from the west, so far he has removed our transgressions from us." Psalm 103, v. 12. By which you see that the sins are wholly taken away from the soul of a sinner, at his true repentance and conversion; for that great distance which is between the aforesaid points, viz., east and west, doth clearly evince that then the sin is utterly taken away from the soul of a sinner; for hence David himself says thus: "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean, wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." Psalm 51, v. 7. But if we believe your doctrine, it behoveth him to say, "Purge me, and I shall not be clean, wash me, and I shall still remain as black as pitch, as filthy as the puddle, even with all the washing you can bestow upon me in this world." See sec. 19. No. 6.

7. Whereas the Scripture says, (Exod. c. 32, v. 33,) "Whoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "you cannot blot him out of your book, because justification once obtained can never be lost again, as our confession of faith declares, c. 11." What, brother, do the authors of your confession of faith know this matter better than God knows it? Did they never read what he says by the prophet, in these words? "Therefore, son of man, say unto the children of thy people, The righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him in the day of his transgression; as for the wickedness of the wicked, he shall not fall thereby in the day that he turned from his wickedness, neither shall the righteous be able to live for his righteousness in the day that he sinneth; all his righteousness shall not be remembered; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it." Ezek. c. 33, v. 12, 13. Do you not plainly see here, by the express word of God, that he who was once just, and consequently in favor with God, may afterwards die spiritually, and thereby lose the grace of justification, which he once had when he was just? Nay, Solomon's salvation is much doubted of by the holy fathers; yet God himself said that he was once just. "I will establish," saith he, speaking of Solomon, "his king-

dom forever, if he be constant to do my commandments and judgments, as *at this day*." 1 Chron. c. 28, v. 7. You see that Solomon was at that day pleasing God; but what he did afterwards the Scripture tells you, saying thus of him: "And he had seven hundred wives, princesses, and three hundred concubines; and when he was now old, his wives turned away his heart to other gods; he went after Ashtareth, the goddess of the Zidonians, and Milcom, the idol of the Ammonites; he built a temple to Chemosh, the idol of Moab, and in this manner he did to all his wives, who were strangers: therefore our Lord was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the Lord God of Israel." 1 Kings, c. 11, v. 3, &c. David says that "God hates all workers of iniquity." Psalm 5, v. 5. He did hate, therefore, Solomon for those iniquities which he had committed. I do not dispute, here, whether he repented or no, whether he was saved or no; but without all doubt, he once lost his former justice; and so did Nicholas, (one of the seven deacons,) who was once full of the Holy Ghost, (Acts, 6, v. 3,) yet he lost afterwards his righteousness, by falling into heresy; for from him the Nicholites have borrowed their name. And St. John says that "he hates their deeds," (Revel. c. 2, v. 6,) because these people obstinately held certain points which were against the common belief of the whole universal church; and he also says to the angel, or bishop, of Philadelphia, these following words: "Hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." Revel. c. 3, v. 11. Pray, how could this bishop's crown be taken by another man, if he could not lose the grace of justification? Or, if we could not lose this grace, why would St. John say unto us all, "Look to yourselves, that we lose not these things which we have wrought, but that ye receive a full reward." 2 John, v. 8. I know that the translators of your English Bible have falsely translated this last text, contrary to the Greek text, that hereby they might obscure the meaning of God's words, and cause their flock to err, in giving only credit to what they were pleased to translate unto them; but their dealings

herein avail them nothing in this point, of which I speak now, because it is sufficiently proved by several other texts of Scripture, and Christ himself says this of the matter: "If any man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered." John, c. 15, v. 6. By which kind of expression you may plainly perceive that one might lose the grace of justification. "The foolish Galatians began with the spirit, and ended with the flesh." Gal. c. 3, v. 3. It is therefore St. Paul said the following words to them: "Ye did run well; who did hinder you, that ye should not obey the truth?" Gal. c. 5, v. 7. Behold how these people came not to obey the truth, who before did not only walk well, but also run well. It is for fear of such an unfortunate fall St. Paul said thus to the Corinthians: "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." 1 Cor. c. 10, v. 12. And most clearly are these words of his to the Romans, saying thus: "Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God on them which fell, (*take notice of these words,*) severity towards thee, goodness if thou continue in his goodness; otherwise thou also shalt be cast off." Rom. c. 11, v. 22. But how could one be cut off, if he could not lose the grace of justification? And if this could not be lost, why should St. Paul bid the Philippian "to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling"? Phil. c. 2, v. 12. Or why would he say thus of himself: "I keep under my body, and bring it under subjection, lest, perhaps, while I preach to others, myself may become reprobate, or be cast away"? 1 Cor. c. 9, v. 27. I have shown you now, brother, three-and-thirty evident texts of Scripture, in this section, which declare the contrary of what you are taught to believe concerning the doctrine of justification, though you have not, in the whole Bible, as much as one plain text to support these new notions of yours. Therefore I have reason to suppose that you will not be further seduced by them, in not embracing the true doctrine, so manifestly proved by the word of God, which you pretend to be your only rule of faith.

SECTION VI.

Concerning good Works.

1. WHEREAS Christ said to Mary Magdalene, (Mark, c. 14, v. 6,) "She hath wrought a good work on me." "No, no," say Luther (Tom. 1, Fol. 196) and Calvin, (Lib. 3, Inst. c. 14, sec. 9,) "she hath not done a good work in that action, for we teach that all the best actions even of the greatest saints are mortal sins." Here, brother, is some of your great apostles' and first reformers' doctrine; and you may take notice how clearly it contradicts the former words of Christ, and also these other words of St. Paul, saying thus: "He who giveth his virgin in marriage doth not sin therein." 1 Cor. c. 7, v. 36. But if we believe this strange doctrine of yours, he sinneth mortally, whether he gives her in marriage or no; and if the young man, to whom Christ said, "If you have a mind to be perfect, go and sell all you have, and give it to the poor," (Matt. c. 19, v. 21,) had obeyed Christ, he would also have sinned mortally, and this by the advice of Christ himself. And so, instead of becoming more perfect, he would become a far greater sinner than he was before.

2. Whereas St. Paul says, (Colos. c. 1, v. 24,) "I, who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ, in my flesh, for his body's sake, which is the church." "No, no, Paul," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "Christ did not require of you or of any other man to suffer such bodily afflictions in the flesh; for he did so apply the merits of his own sufferings to all those for whom he hath purchased redemption, that he requires nothing of them now but to lay hold of his passion by the hand of faith, as our confession of faith teacheth, c. 8, 11." Truly, brother, if you would once show me some clear text of Scripture which teaches you to believe this doctrine of your confession of faith, I might be thereby induced to give credit to what you

say herein to be true; but since I am sure that you can never find out such a text in the whole Bible, methinks that I have great reason not to believe what you affirm in this matter, since I find it to be disagreeable to several plain texts which I read in the Scriptures; and if you had taken the pains to read our books, you might clearly see by them that we believe, though your ministers do tell you the contrary, that the passion of Christ in itself is of sufficient worth and value to satisfy for all the sins of the whole world, yea, of millions of worlds, and also for all the pains that is or can be due to these sins; yet we say, and this according to the word of God, that Christ, by his unsearchable wisdom, knew it was fit to order it so, that the full fruit of his passion should not be applied to any but to those who would perform several things, which he requires at their hands for this effect; not that there is need of this to supply any want, or value which might be in his passion, but that there is need to do these things on our parts, by the virtue of the covenant and condition upon which the benefit of Christ's passion is granted unto us; and your own ministers ought to acknowledge this to be true, if they had not a mind to contradict their own principles and practice; for they tell you that you ought to be baptized, that you must lay hold of the passion of Christ by the hand of faith, that you must have true repentance for your sins, and that you must have a will to receive the body and blood of Christ; "for unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall have no life in you." John, c. 6, v. 53. These are four things which commonly your own principles do require to be superadded, that you may enjoy the full fruit of Christ's passion; and we add to them, that we must fulfil the commandments, as you have seen, (sec. 4,) and that consequently Christ requires of us several penal and laborious works, though in themselves they have no sufficient proportion to cancel the pains due to our sins, or to merit either the grace of justification (see sec. 5, No. 4) or the augmentation of grace; yet they have virtue to the first and last effect; but this virtue proceeds from the virtue of Christ's merits and

passion, which is communicated unto us by the performance of these things which he requires; for this was his covenant with us, as I have hinted above, and this doctrine of ours is so far from derogating from our Savior's passion, that it honors it more than your doctrine, which denies that the passion of Christ is sufficient to elevate and raise our poor endeavors of satisfying, to any ability of making real satisfaction. But let us hear how the express word of God confutes you herein.

3. Whereas Daniel (c. 4, v. 27) said to Nebuchadnezzar, "O king, let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, and redeem thy sins with alms, and thy iniquity with mercy to the poor." "No, no, O Daniel," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "the king could not redeem his sins by any such works, and hence our Jacobus Andreas says (*Concione 4, in cap. 21, Lucæ*) that "we have learned to be saved by faith only, and that we cannot satisfy by our fasting, alms, prayers; therefore permit that we may give over these things." Pray, consider yourself how directly your doctrine contradicts here the express word of God, which your brethren have falsely translated, that they might obscure the text, and use some subterfuge in expounding it to the simple people, who do not recur to the original, or to any other true translation of the Bible, (see sec. 24, No. 4;) but their shifts herein cannot bring them off, because this verity is declared by several other texts of Scripture. Tobias says, that "alms do deliver from death, and do purge all sins," (Tob. c. 12, v. 9;) and that "alms do deliver from death, and suffereth not to go into darkness." Tob. c. 4, v. 10. And hence Ecclesiasticus says that "as water quenqueth burning fire, so alms do expiate sin." Eccles. c. 3, v. 33. But since your ministers do pretend that they do know this matter far better than the authors who wrote these two last books, which they do not own to be canonical Scripture, because they find them manifestly affirming that which they themselves deny, hence I will produce the authority of other books, which they acknowledge to be canonical, and shall begin with that of Solomon, which says that

by mercy and truth. sin shall be forgiven, and by the fear of the Lord men depart from evil." Prov. c. 16, v. 6. And Christ himself says thus: "But rather give alms of such things as you have, and behold all things are clean unto you." Luke, c. 11, v. 41. Wherefore he exhorts us to the secret performance of our fasts, alms-deeds, and prayers, and he tells us that "otherwise we will lose our reward, but if we do them in secret, our Father, which seeth in secret, will reward us openly: lay up for yourselves," saith he, "treasure in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal." Matt. c. 6, v. 2, 4, 5, 6, 16, &c. "Whosoever shall give to one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, Amen, I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward." Matt. c. 10, v. 42. "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every one according to his works." Matt. c. 16, v. 27. "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you. For I was hungry, and ye gave me meat, I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink, I was a stranger, and you took me in, naked, and ye clothed me, I was sick, and ye visited me, I was in prison, and ye came unto me." Matt. c. 25, v. 34, &c. Take notice of the word "for," because it is hereby declared that it is for doing such good works Christ will say to them in the day of judgment, "Come, ye blessed, and inherit the kingdom prepared for you," &c. So, on the contrary, he will say to the damned souls, "Get ye away, ye cursed, into fire everlasting For I was hungry, &c, and ye did not feed me," &c. Matt. c. 25, v. 41, &c. Whereby you see that the word "for" signifies the cause of their damnation; and hence Christ says the following words: "But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the weak, the lame, and blind, and thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Luke, c. 14, v. 13, 14. For this reason St. Paul calls alms-deeds the seed of glory, saying thus of it: "But this I say, He who soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly, and he who soweth bountifully shall

reap also bountifully, every man according as he purposeth (*mark these last words*) in his heart; so let him give not grudgingly, or of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver; and God is able to make all grace abound towards you, that you, always having all-sufficiency in all things, may abound in every good work," (2 Cor. c. 9, v. 6, &c.); as it is written, (Psalm 112, v. 9,) "He hath dispersed, he hath given to the poor; his righteousness remaineth forever." He encourages likewise the Philippians to give alms, and to do other good works, that thereby they might merit; for he says thus to them: "In Thessalonica, ye have sent once and again unto my necessity; not because I desire a gift, but I desire fruit that may abound to your account.) I have received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God; but my God shall supply all your need, according to his riches in glory by Jesus Christ." Phil. c. 4, v. 16. And he commanded the Bishop Timothy "to charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate, laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may (*mark these words*) lay hold on eternal life." 1 Tim. c. 6, v. 17, &c.

4. Whereas the Scripture says, (Psalm 19, v. 11,) that "for keeping God's precepts there is great reward." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "there is no reward to be given to us for any work that we can do in this life. And hence our Mr. Whitaker affirms (*in Resp. ad Rati. Camp. rati.* 5, p. 78) that 'St. Cyprian and all the fathers of those times did err grossly in teaching the merits of good works.'" Indeed, brother, if those fathers did err in teaching this doctrine, I know not how either you or your ministers can excuse the Scripture writers from being guilty of that error, which I find to be so often recommended and taught by them; and in further proof hereof, take notice what the following texts declare. David says thus: "The Lord

rewarded me according to my righteousness, according to the cleanness of my hands hath he recompensed me." Psalm 18, v. 20. And hence it is said, that "God is justifying the righteous, to give him according to his righteousness." 1 Kings, c. 8, v. 32. "Be you strong, therefore, and let not your hands be weak, for your work shall be rewarded." 2 Chron. c. 15, v. 7. "They who have done good things shall go forth unto the resurrection of life." John, c. 5, v. 29. "Be glad and rejoice, for great is your reward in heaven." Matt. c. 5, v. 12. And when Peter said thus unto Christ, "Behold, we have forsaken all and followed thee, what shall we have therefore?" (Matt. c. 19, v. 27,) Christ did not then answer, saying, that they would not have, therefore, any reward at all; but he made them a promise, upon that account of following him; that "when he would sit upon the throne of his glory, that they also would sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." v. 28. And hence St. Paul says that "every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labor," (1 Cor. c. 3, v. 8;) and that "our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us an eternal weight of glory." 2 Cor. c. 4, v. 17. "For whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap; 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; and let us not be weary in well doing, (*why so?*) for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not; as we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men." Gal. c. 6, v. 7, &c. Which to confirm, he brings in the example of Moses, "who refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to be afflicted with the people of God, esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt; for he had (*mark these words*) respect unto the recompense of reward." Heb. c. 11, v. 24, &c. And he also says thus of himself: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give at that day, and not to me only.

but also unto all them that love his appearing." 2 Tim. c. 4, v. 7, 8. Behold how St. Paul reckons out the good works that he hath done, by which he had advanced himself in piety and justice, being assisted by the grace of God, and rendered those works of his meritorious; and hence St. Augustin, in his commentary upon this text, says, "He reckons now his good merits, that after them he might obtain the crown, who after evil merits did obtain grace. To whom could the just Judge render the crown, if he had not first, as a merciful Father, given him grace? and how had that been a crown of justice, if grace had not gone before, which justifies the impious? How could that have been rendered as a due, if the first had not been freely bestowed." *Aug. de Gra. et Lib. Arbit.* It is, therefore, God's mercy to promise heaven to our good works; it is his mercy to give us that grace which confers all the meritorious value upon these works; it is his mercy to excite us by actual grace to perform such works, and to accompany and assist us whilst we work; but it is his justice and righteousness to give that reward, which his mercy made these works able to deserve, so that now, as a just Judge, he rewards our good works; and hence St. Paul says thus: "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." Rom. c. 4, v. 4. Christ therefore will say, in the day of judgment, these words of St. John: "My reward is with me, to give every one according as his works shall be." Rev. c. 22, v. 12.

5. Against these former texts of Scripture, being in number thirty-two, and five more, which I will produce, (No. 6,) my brothers have two texts, which they, by misinterpreting, do prefer before all these thirty-seven texts, and several others, which I might produce to the same purpose. The first of these texts, upon which they rely wholly herein, is that of Isaias, saying thus: "We are all as unclean things, and all our righteousness as filthy rags." c. 64, v. 6. To which I answer, that the prophet speaks only of those works done by us, when we are left to ourselves, without being aided by the grace of God; and that this is his meaning you may evidently

know by these other words of the same prophet, saying, (v. 7,) "And there is none that calleth upon thy name, that stirreth up himself to take hold of thee." Pray, brother, is not this the very same doctrine which we teach, as you have seen, sec. 5, No. 2, 3, 4? Did I not tell you there, that we acknowledge that we are as unclean things, and that all our righteousness is unworthy of any spiritual reward, and that we cannot stir up ourselves, by taking hold of God, until we are incited and helped by God's grace? But surely this is not the same as to say, with you, that these good works, which proceed from the grace of justification, are unclean, and not rewardable. Show me this by some clear text of Scripture, and then I will acknowledge that you have some colorable pretence to believe this new doctrine of yours; or show me, if you can, which of the holy fathers, in their commentary upon that text of Isaias, did ever interpret or expound it to your meaning. I suppose no man of sense will blame me for demanding of you either of these two requests, as I show you my own doctrine by clear Scripture, and only desire of you to refer the interpretation of these obscure texts, which you produce in your own defence, to the holy fathers' judgments, in their commentary upon them; for these men, who exceeded us in piety, wit, and learning, are more competent judges in this matter than either you or I can presume to be, since we are parties, between which the dispute is controverted; nay, every one of us alleges that these fathers were of his own religion; recur you therefore with me to their commentaries, if you dare; and if you do this, then you will see how pitifully you are blinded by your ministers' conduct in this matter.

6. Your second text is that of Luke, where Christ, after producing the similitude of the master and servant, says thus: "When ye have done all that ye are commanded, say, We are unprofitable servants." Luke, c. 17, v. 10. To which I answer, that the text only says, that by all we do, or can do even by God's grace, it profiteth nothing to God, for he depends not in the least upon any creature whatsoever; but though we

be unprofitable servants in this sense, yet we are profitable servants to ourselves, for heaping up for us treasures in heaven, and for making "friends to us of the Mammon of unrighteousness, to receive us into everlasting habitations," (Luke, c. 16, v. 9;) which are things very profitable to us, and though we are in that other sense unprofitable servants to God, yet in regard of our services and obedience to him, he says unto us, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I commanded you," (John, c. 15, v. 14,) which is a thing of no small profit and honor to us. Pray, do you think that it is not very profitable to them that "left father and mother, wife and children, and what they had in this world, for the sake of Christ, that they shall receive a hundred fold, and inherit life everlasting"? Matt. c. 19, v. 29. Is it not also profitable to them to do good works in this life, who will say thus: "He hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light"? Colos. c. 1, v. 12. And is it not likewise profitable to them to do good works, to whom God will say the following words: "And they shall walk with me in white, because they (*mark these words*) are worthy"? Rev. c. 3, v. 4. Shall not they profit by overcoming, to whom it is said, "He that shall overcome, and keep my works until the end, I will give him (*in heaven*) power over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron"? Rev. c. 2, v. 26, 27. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne." Rev. c. 3, v. 21.

SECTION VII.

Concerning Works of Supererogation, and Austerity of Life.

1. WHEREAS Christ said to the young man who told him he had kept the commandments from his youth, (Matt. c. 19, v. 20, 21,) "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell the things

thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have a treasure in heaven." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "if he has a mind to be perfect, let him not do so; for our Mr. Willet says, in his *Synopsis*, p. 245, that 'he is an enemy to the glory of God, that changeth his rich estate, wherein he may serve God, for a poor.'" Truly, brother, I cannot give credit to this doctrine of yours, until I see it proved by some direct text of Scripture; for I know it is directly against the express word of God, and against the known commendable examples of many potent kings and princes, who, leaving their worldly crowns and great riches, became poor religious monks and friars, in hopes that, in exchange thereof, Christ would give them a treasure in heaven, as he had promised to the aforesaid young man, if he would renounce his riches, and give them to the poor; and you cannot allege that this renunciation could not be any thing that might be wanting to the young man, to obtain life everlasting; for Christ did only bid him, if he had a mind "to enter into life, to keep the commandments." Matt. c. 19, v. 17. Therefore that renunciation was only wanting to obtain that degree of evangelical perfection, as the very next text expressly declares; and we read that very many of the first believers have followed Christ's advice herein, as you may see by the following text: "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart, and of one soul, neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had all things common, neither was there any among them that lacked; for as many as were possessors of land or houses sold them, and brought the price of those things which were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet, and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need." Acts, c. 4, v. 32, 34, 35. Pray, brother, tell me who commanded these first believers to renounce their riches, and to use that kind of way of living? If they had a command from God for it, how can you excuse all those of your own church from being guilty for not observing that command? And if they had not a command

of it, but that it was only counselled to them, that they might thereby come to be perfect, why deny that there are works of supererogation and counsel, which are not commanded? Do you not know how expressly St. Paul contradicts your doctrine herein, when he says thus, "Concerning virgins, I have no command of the Lord, yet I give my counsel, (*you translate falsely the word "judgment;"*) art thou loosed from a wife, seek not a wife?" 1 Cor. c. 7, v. 25, 27. If this be a command, woe to your learned ministers, who do marry when they were free; and if it be not a command, what can it be but a counsel, which people may follow if they please? You have another example of this in the book of Numbers, where it is said that "if a woman vow any thing, and bind herself with an oath, (*mark these words,*) she that is in her father's house, and yet in maiden's age, if her father knew the vow she promised, and the oath wherewith she bound her soul, and held his peace, she shall be bound to the vow; whatsoever she promised and swore, she shall fulfil indeed; but if, immediately as he hears it, her father doth contradict it, both her vow and her oath shall be void, neither shall she be bound to the promise." The same is said of the vows of a wife, that they should bind her, if her husband would hold his peace at them; but if he had contradicted them, they would be made void. Num. c. 30, v. 3, 4, &c. But who sees not that it could not either be in the power of the father to make his daughter's vows void, or in the husband's power to annul the vows of his wife, if they had vowed things which they were before obliged to perform by a precept from God? For example, if they should vow to fast in the feast of expiation, the maid's father, or the wife's husband, could not make void these vows; for the law did oblige them to this, as appears by the following text: "Every soul that is not afflicted, (*that is, which fasted not,*) that day shall be cut off from among his people." Levit. c. 23, v. 29. So that you may plainly observe, that the word of God speaks, in the aforesaid example, of vows made to do that which they were not otherwise obliged by any precept from God, and

consequently it manifestly appears that there are works of supererogation, which are superadded to what we are commanded; and hence St. Chrysostom says that "God commanded nothing impossible, insomuch that many go beyond the very commandments." Hom. 19, in Hebr. Which is further proved by that of St. Paul, advising those of Jerusalem to supply with their riches the want of their poor brethren, that they might be also supplied by the poor's abundance. "Herein," saith he, "I give my advice, for this is expedient for you, 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." 2 Cor. c. 8, v. 10, 14. St. Paul can speak here of no other abundance that the poor could have, but only of the abundance of these good works that they had done, for which they had no command from God; for if they would be obliged by a precept to fulfil them, these could be no abundance, but were necessary for their own salvation, according to that of Christ, Matt. c. 19, v. 17.

2. Whereas St. Paul says, (Colos. c. 3, v. 5,) "Mortify your members, which are upon earth." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "we will not mortify our members; for our Mr. Willet affirms, in his *Synopsis*, p. 254, that 'cruel and inhuman kind of chastising people's bodies, by fasting and other discipline, to be utterly unlawful.'" Pray, brother, get some of your learned ministers to show you this doctrine by some evident text of Scripture; and if they cannot produce you such a text, which I defy them to do, be you no longer seduced by them, in not believing the contrary doctrine, which you see to be true, not only by the former, but also by the following texts: "And Jeremiah said unto the house of the Rechabites, Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, Because ye have obeyed the commandment of Jonadab, your father, and kept all his precepts, and done according unto all that he commanded you, therefore Jonadab, the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me forever." Jer. c. 35, v. 18, 19. You see

by these words how the austerity of the Rechabites pleased God, and how he had favored them for leading that austere life, for which they had no precept, but only the command of Jonadab, their father, saying thus to them: "Ye shall drink no wine," which was the common drink of that country, "neither ye, nor your sons, forever; neither shall ye build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any; but all your days ye shall dwell in tents." Jer. c. 35, v. 6, 7. Pray, show me, if you can, by some text of Scripture, that this man was commanded by a precept from God to adopt that austere way of living, which also he obliged his children to embrace. If they had a command from God for leading that kind of life, how came all those of your church to be exempted from that command? And if Jonadab had not a command for it, why do you deny that there are any good works, but only those that people are obliged to perform by virtue of a precept? Was Judith commanded to practise that austere mode of living which she led? for she lived sixty-nine years in chastity, in an upper room, retired from all society, in continual fasting, hair-cloth, and prayer; and when she began this course of life, she was both young and beautiful. Judith, c. 8, v. 5, &c., c. 16, v. 11, 28. David tells you of his own austerity, saying, "I am weary with my groaning; all the night make I my bed to swim; I water my couch with my tears." Psalm 6, v. 6. "By reason of the voice of my groaning, my bones have cleaved to my skin; I have eaten ashes like bread, and mingled my drink with weeping." Psalm 102, v. 5, 9. "My knees are weak through *fasting*, and my flesh faileth of fatness." Psalm 109, v. 24. "At midnight I will rise to give thanks to thee; thy law is my meditation all day; seven times a day I praise thee; mine eyes have anticipated the night-watches, that I might meditate in thy word; I have anticipated the dawning of the morning, and cried," &c. Psalm 119, v. 62, 97, 164, 147, 148. Although St. John Baptist was filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb, (Luke, c. 1, v. 15,) yet his austerity was exceeding great, for it was foretold of him that "he shall be great in

the sight of the Lord, and he shall drink neither wine nor strong drink, and he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias; the child grew and waxed in spirit, and was in the desert until the day of his showing to Israel." Luke, c. 1, v. 15, 17, 80. That is, from his childhood until he was thirty years old, during which time St. Mark says of him, "And John was clothed with camel's hair, and a girdle of skin about his loins, and he did eat locusts and wild honey." Mark, c. 1, v. 6. Behold how he abstained from certain meats, and from certain drink; and he did eat so sparingly, that Christ himself said of him, "John came neither eating nor drinking." Matt. c. 11, v. 18. You have another example of this kind of austerity in Timothy; for though he had great weakness of stomach, and frequent infirmities, yet he mortified himself to that degree by drinking water at all his meals, though wine was the common drink of that country, that St. Paul thought it fit to write to him, saying, "Drink not water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thy frequent infirmities." 1 Tim. c. 5, v. 23. By which words you plainly see, that before he did not so much as drink a little wine. But who commanded him that abstinence from wine? or who commanded St. John the Baptist to practise that austere way of living which he led during his life? Truly, I find not in the whole Bible any precept, which obliged these saints to use that particular kind of life which they led; and indeed, if neither of them could obtain no more glory in heaven, for the great mortifications which they undertook willingly, and suffered so patiently, than he who used no austerity at all in this world, they were great fools for their pains; whereas they might obtain the glory of heaven in the highest degree by embracing that easy way of living which Luther and Calvin have now prescribed to all their own disciples. But let us see further what says the word of God of that laudable and ancient way, by which those who were in former times most renowned, both for wisdom and piety, sought to attain unto a

higher degree of perfection in this world, and consequently to a higher degree of glory in heaven.

3. Whereas Daniel shows the way by which he sought to come to a greater degree of perfection, saying thus, (Dan. c. 9, v. 3,) "And I set my face unto the Lord, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes." "No, no, O Daniel," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "that is not the right way of seeking the Lord, but this other contrary way of ours, which shows us to go to heaven, and to obtain there as much glory as you, without undergoing any austerity at all in this world; for our Mr. Willet says, (p. 243,) that 'God is not better worshipped by fasting than he is by eating and drinking.'" Truly, I know not how to reconcile this doctrine to the word of God, which, as you may now perceive, expressly declares the contrary, as plainly appears, not only by the former, but also by the following texts. God said by the prophet, "Turn ye to me, with all your hearts, and with fasting, with weeping, and with mourning." Joel, c. 2, v. 12. And this they have done, as appears by that of Nehemiah, saying, "The children of Israel came together in fasting, and sackcloths, and earth upon them." Nehem. c. 9, v. 1. But if God be not better worshipped by fasting than he is by eating, why did he bid these people to fast in this manner? Or why did the Niniyites please him rather by fasting, and using austerity, than they did before in not fasting, and in not using austerity? Jon. c. 3, v. 5, &c. Or why doth not the Scripture promise reward as well to eating and drinking as it doth to fasting? Matt. c. 6, 17, 18. Or why did our Savior affirm "devils to be cast out by prayer and fasting" (Matt. c. 17, v. 21) rather than by prayer and eating? How came St. John Baptist to teach his own disciples to fast, (Matt. c. 9, v. 14,) if they derived no benefit thereby? Or why did Christ himself say to his own disciples, that "the day would come, when the bridegroom should be taken from them, and that then they should fast?" Matt. c. 9, v. 15. We read of holy Anna, the proph-

etess, that "she was of a great age, and lived with a husband seven years from her virginity, and that she was a widow about fourscore and four years, during which time she departed not from the temple, but served God (*note these words*) with fastings and prayers, night and day." Luke, c. 2, v. 36,

37 You have seen now, by manifest scriptural evidence, that exercise by which God is served in this world; and hence St. Paul says, "Behold, now is the acceptable time, behold, now is the day of salvation, giving no offence in any thing, that our ministry be not blamed, but in all things approving ourselves, as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distress, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labors, in watchings, in fastings." 2 Cor. c. 6, v. 2, &c. "Always bearing about in our body the mortification of Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our bodies." 2 Cor. c. 4, v. 10. And hence he says thus of himself: "I keep under my body, and bring it under subjection, lest perhaps, when I have preached to others, myself become reprobate, or be a castaway." 1 Cor. c. 9, v. 27. And indeed, if St. Paul was, in this particular, right, your ministers are now much in the wrong for teaching the contrary of what he had practised in his own person, and left us an example thereof. And as for your part, brother, I leave it to your own discreet consideration to judge, whether it be safer for you, in conscience, to believe the doctrine of those who have these five-and-twenty clear texts of Scripture, produced here and in the last number, to ground themselves upon, than the contrary doctrine taught by your ministers, who have not as much as one plain text of Scripture in the whole Bible which can prove their doctrine therein, but are forced to rely in this matter upon their own false conjectures and imaginary interpretation, which they make you believe to be God's true word.

SECTION VIII.

The Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper

1. THE order of doctrine requires that the definition of a sacrament in general should be known, before we treat of it in particular. Therefore, to prevent mistakes, I say that a sacrament is an outward sign, instituted by Christ, signifying the inward grace which it confers, when it is duly received. Whence it follows, that if there be seven such outward different signs, consequently there must be seven different sacraments. But before I speak of those five which the Protestants and Presbyterians call *bastard sacraments*, invented by the *Papists*, I will treat of baptism and the Lord's supper, which they acknowledge to be true sacraments.

2. Whereas Ananias said to Paul, (Acts, c. 22, v. 16,) "Arise and be ~~baptized, and wash away thy sins.~~" "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "but arise and be baptized, and wash not away your sins;" for our Luther says, in his first Article, (condemned by Leo X.,) 'that to deny sin to be remaining in a child after baptism, is to tread both Paul and Christ under foot.' And hence our confession of faith affirms (c. 6) that 'by original sin we are wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body, and that this corruption of nature, during this life, doth remain in those that are regenerated, and that it and all its motions are truly and properly sin.' Pray, show me, if you can, this doctrine, by some clear text of Scripture, which will be more convincing than either the former or following texts, which expressly declare the contrary to what you affirm. St. Peter said thus to the Jews: "Be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Acts, c. 2, v. 38. And St. Paul, speaking of Christ, says, that "we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of

life; knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin (*note these words*) might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." Rom. c. 6, v. 4, 6. And speaking of the duty of the husband to his wife, he says thus: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it (*take notice of these words*) with the washing of water by word." Ephes. c. 5, v. 25, 26. And he also addresses the following words to the Corinthians: "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." 1 Cor. c. 6, v. 11. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Colos. c. 1, v. 14. "According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Titus, c. 3, v. 5. You see by these texts of St. Paul, how he was not of your opinion in this matter; for if we rise from original sin by baptism, as Christ arose from the dead, how can that same sin remain in us? If the body of sin be destroyed by baptism, how can that very body still infect our souls? If baptism washeth away our sins, and sanctify our souls, how can we be defiled in all the faculties and parts of our soul and body? If we be cleansed from sin, how can the filthiness of sin remain in us? If we be born anew by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, how can the old man, or the death of sin, abide in us? "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness, and what communication hath light with darkness, and what concord hath Christ with Belial?" 2 Cor. c. 6, v. 14, 15. And how can it be truly said, that "Christ is the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world." John, c. 1, v. 29. Whereas, according to your doctrine, (here, and sec. 5, No. 6,) he never took away either original or actual sin, which are all the sins that ever the world had committed. St. Augustin, whom some of you allege to have been a Protestant, speaks thus of the matter: "By carnal generation, original sin is only contracted, but by the regenerating spirit, remission is

granted, not only of original, but also of the voluntary sins " *Lib. 1, de Peccat. mer. et remis. c. 5.* And "we teach that baptism gives remission of all sins, and takes away the crimes." *Lib. 1, cont. duas Epist. Pelag. c. 13.* By these words of St. Augustin, you may plainly perceive that your doctrine was not that which the primitive church believed, but is rather of the Manichean heresy, as you may see by what St. Augustine says in the aforesaid chapter.

3. Whereas Christ says, (John, c. 3, v. 5,) "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water, and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "that cannot be true, since our learned ministers do declare that the children who were never baptized can enter into the kingdom of heaven, and our confession of faith says, (c. 28,) that grace and salvation are not so necessarily annexed unto baptism, that no person can be saved or regenerated without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated." "What, brother, do you imagine that either your ministers or the authority of your confession of faith ought to be preferred or believed before the express words of Christ himself, plainly declaring the contrary? Are you not now ashamed for telling to me, heretofore, that you believed nothing of these controverted points, which are between you and me, but only that which the word of God tells you in your Bible? whereas you may perceive that your whole study is to contradict God's word, and to believe no scripture which you find to be contrary to your minister's practice and imaginary fancies; and this is the reason which occasions you to connive now at your Presbyterian ministers, who permit your poor children to die without the benefit of baptism; for they persuade you that it is not only unnecessary, but also unlawful, to baptize them, unless it be conferred publicly. Do not these people know that St. Paul was baptized privately by Ananias? Acts, c. 9, v. 18. And the eunuch by Philip? Acts, c. 8, v. 38. But they who teach you to believe that God's commandments are wholly impossible to be kept, and make daily profession

to break them, may also by the same rule let this pass along with the rest of their errors, and cause thereby your unbaptized children never to enjoy the glory of heaven. "Let not," saith St. Augustin, "according to our fancy, eternal salvation be promised to infants dying without the baptism of Christ, which the divine Scriptures do not promise." *Lib. de Peccat. mer. et remis. c. 32.* "Whosoever saith that such children shall have life in Christ who depart this life without the participation of the sacrament of baptism, that man certainly contradicts the preaching of the apostles, and condemneth the whole church, where such haste is made to run with children, because it is believed, without doubt, that otherwise they cannot be quickened in Christ." *Epist. ad Hero.* "Do not believe, do not say, do not teach, that children prevented by death, before they receive baptism, can attain remission of their original sin, if you desire to be catholic." *Aug. Lib. de Orig. Animæ.* But since you, brother William, do not desire to be a Catholic, but to remain still an obstinate Presbyterian, you may therefore say and teach whatever your fancy imagines, and never scruple much to see your fancies contradicted by the express words of your own Bible.

4. Whereas Christ said to his disciples, (John, c. 6, v. 51,) "And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." "No, no, Christ," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "for the bread which you gave to your disciples was not really your own flesh, but only a figure or token of your flesh, as our ministers and confession of faith teach, r. 29." "Nay, brother, show me, if you can, the answer of yours, by some express text of Scripture; and until you show me that, I will believe that Scripture which tells me the contrary, and would not disbelieve it for the whole world; nay, if an angel, and even your ministers, had told me otherwise, I would not give him credit; for I know certainly that which Christ affirmed to be infallibly true; and I do firmly believe that it was not terrestrial bread, or the figure of Christ's flesh, that was given

for the life of the world, but his true and real flesh, which suffered upon the cross; and I hear Christ himself, who is the teacher of truth, positively affirming that he would give his disciples the very same flesh which he gave for the life of the world. And though the Jews that were then present suspected the truth, as you do now, of what he said, and murmured against him for affirming so, yet I see, by clear Scripture, (v. 53, &c.) that our Savior, with many asseverations, affirmed it repeatedly to them; yea, and suffered them and some of his own disciples then to depart from him, because they would not believe this divine mystery. But do you imagine that Christ would suffer them to depart in that ignorance without telling them, as your ministers now tell you, that his only meaning was, that he would give his disciples only bread and only wine taken in remembrance of his passion? or do you believe that Christ is a mocker and deceiver of men? to speak one thing, and to aver it with asseverations, which are equal to oaths, and to intend the contrary? or do you think that St. Mark, (c. 14, v. 22, &c.,) St. Luke, (c. 22, v. 19, &c.,) and St. Paul, (1 Cor. c. 11, v. 23, &c.,) would belie Christ in this matter, and deceive us, by saying that "Christ gave his own body and blood to his disciples at his last supper"? If he had not then given it, as you falsely believe, and though you know your own impossibility of producing any text of Scripture whereby your doctrine can be proved, yet you rather rely herein upon your ministers' sinister interpretation; than believe the word of God, which expressly declares the contrary in four different places.

5. As for these words which you produce in your own defence, viz., "Do this in remembrance of me," (1 Cor. c. 11, v. 24,) they were spoken by Christ after he had consecrated the bread, and after he told his disciples that it was his body which he then gave them, as is evident by the 24th verse of that chapter. Wherefore it is manifest that Christ's intention, by these words, was to oblige us to remember that death which he suffered for our salvation, when we eat his flesh and

drink his blood, and hence St. Paul concludes, (v. 26,) from these words, that we declare the death of our Savior as often as we make use of that sacrament; so that we are so far from having reason to say that this solemn commemoration excludes the real presence of Christ's body in this mystery, that, on the contrary, we see, by this remembrance, that then his very flesh ought to be really taken, seeing it is not possible for us to forget that it was for us he gave his body in sacrifice, when we see that he gives us daily the same body to eat; whence it follows that we ought not to consider that Christ does not command us only to remember him, but to remember him as he died for us, when we eat his flesh and drink his blood, even as the Jews, in eating the peace-offerings, remember that they had been immolated for their sins. Observe the connection and force of his words in this text, and you will perceive that he does not say simply that the bread and wine of the eucharist should be to us a memorial of his body and blood; but he advertises us that in doing that which he then described, that is, in receiving his body and blood, we should remember him as he died bloodily for us. And his real presence in the sacrament makes this remembrance no less; for Christ does not here die again, but this unbloody sacrifice is offered now in remembrance of his bloody sacrifice upon the cross; and that the aforesaid text ought to be understood in this sense, you may further see, if you please to read the holy fathers' commentaries upon the former words of St. Paul.

Besides this powerful authority of Scripture, let us have recourse to good common sense, and I will prove to you that the words of Christ import a real and substantial presence. 1st. Because all propositions like these, *This is bread, This is a man, &c.*, (unless you speak of pictures, or resemblances, which is not the present case,) are in all common discourse as currently understood of the *reality* and *substance* of the things specified, as if the words *really* and *substantially* were added. Nay, a man would be laughed at for a formal cautious coxcomb, if, pointing to a loaf of bread, he should say, *This is*

bread *really* and *substantially*; or, coming from court, (for example,) he should tell me he had seen the king *really* and *substantially*; because there is no difference between a *thing* and its *reality* and *substance*. In like manner, therefore, when *Christ* said, *This is my body*, he declared as effectually that it was the *reality* or *substance* of his *body*, as if he had expressed it in the most formal terms. This is the common language of mankind. All wise men speak so, and all wise men understand it so. And if any man should pretend to mean otherwise, he would deservedly pass for a notorious *equivocator*, that says one thing and means another.

I prove it *2dly*. If *Christ* gave not his *real body*, but a morsel of bread, to his *apostles*, when he said, *Take and eat, this is my body*, then it follows that he called a morsel of bread his *body*; which cannot be maintained without making *Christ* guilty of a downright *absurdity*. For nothing can be more absurd than to hold a morsel of *common bread* in a man's hands, and, pointing to it, say, *This is the living body of a man*; it being contrary to the common practice of mankind, and the common laws of speech, to call one thing by the name of another, with which it has no manner of *resemblance* or *connection*; and that, too, without giving the persons to whom it is spoken the least intimation to serve as a key to let them into the true meaning of such an extraordinary and unheard-of manner of speech.

I prove it *3dly*. A sober man would be ashamed in any serious occasion to use a *deceitful* way of speaking, so as to call a thing by a name it was never known by before; as for example, to take up a piece of *brick*, and say, *This is a diamond*. It is therefore incredible that *Christ*, who could say nothing unbecoming himself, should use this *deceitful* way of speaking in the most solemn action of his life; when he was fulfilling the *types* and *figures* of the *old law*, declaring his last *will* and *testament*, and bequeathing a sacred legacy to his church forever.

Lastly. I prove it from the doctrine of the *Church of England*, as it is delivered in her own *Church Catechism*, which is

printed in all books of *common prayer*, and has the whole authority of that church to recommend it. Now, in this *Catechism*, to the question, *What is the inward part or thing signified?* it is answered, *The body and blood of Christ, which is VERILY and INDEED taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper.*

This, then, is the doctrine of the *Church of England*, which expresses the *real and substantial* presence of *Christ's body and blood* in the *sacrament* as fully as any *Papist* can do; for if *VERILY* and *INDEED* be not the same as *REALLY* and *TRULY*, and of full force to exclude a mere *figurative presence*, I confess I am yet wholly ignorant of the signification even of the most ordinary words, and it will be impossible to know what men mean, even when they speak in the plainest terms; so that it must either be owned that the words of *Christ's institution* import a *real and substantial* presence of his *body and blood*, even according to *Protestant* doctrine, or we must suppose the *Church of England* guilty of a most *scandalous equivocation* in so serious a matter, and say, she only makes use of the words *VERILY* and *INDEED* to impose upon ignorant people, and make plain *bread* and *wine* go down the better.

Now, to come to the principal point in question, I leave it to common sense to decide whether there must not be a *change of the bread and wine*, if the words of *Christ's institution* import a *real and substantial* presence of his *body and blood*. For if this be granted, they ~~either must be changed,~~ or they must remain together ~~with his body and blood,~~ as *Lutherans* hold; but this is certainly inconsistent with the obvious meaning of the words of *Christ*. [I prove it thus: If *Christ*, taking the *bread* into his hands, had said, *HERE is my body*, I own it would not be inconsistent with the obvious meaning of his words to say, that the *bread* and *body of Christ* are joined together in the *sacrament*. But *Christ* did not say, *HERE is my body*, but, *THIS is my body*, which nothing but a *substantial change* of the *bread* into his *body* can make really and literally true; because the word *this* points precisely at what the apostles saw; which if it continued broad

after, as it was before the words of consecration, the proposition was absolutely false, because the sense of it then was, that the *bread* he gave to his apostles was his *body*, which implies a contradiction, and is as impossible as that any two substances remaining different should be the same.

But let us now see, my dear brother, what your Protestant doctrine is on this head. You say, 1st. *That Christ blessed the bread and wine, therefore did not destroy it.* What trifling stuff is this! What if *Christ* blessed the water at *Cana in Galilee*, and with his blessing changed it into wine. Does it follow from thence that the *water* still remained?

2. You would have us believe *there is nothing in the sacrament but bread and wine.* I answer, This may be *Zwinglian Protestantism*, but it is not the *Protestantism* of the *Church of England*, whose *Catechism* (which surely is a *Protestant* one) teaches positively that *the body and blood of Christ are VERILY and INDEED taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper.*

3. That *the apostle himself does no less than thrice call it bread and wine after the consecration.* 1 Cor. 11, v. 26, 27, 28. To which I answer, that nothing is more common, even in familiar discourse, than to call a thing by the name of that out of which it is *made*, or from which it is *changed*. Thus it was said to *Adam*, (Gen. c. 3, v. 19,) *Dust thou art*; because, though then a living man, he had been made of *dust*. In like manner the *serpent*, that was made by a substantial change from *Aaron's rod*, is still called a *rod* in Scripture, because changed from it: *They cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents; but AARON'S ROD swallowed up their rods.* Exod. c. 7, v. 12. Again, nothing is more familiar than to name things from the *appearance* which they have to our senses. The Scripture itself says, *Behold, there stood A MAN over against him.* Jos. 5, v. 13. Yet in the same place we are told he was not really A MAN, but the *captain of the Lord's host*, that is, an *angel*. So *St. Mark* assures us, that the women entering into the sepulchre saw a YOUNG MAN. c. 16, v. 5. But he had only the name because he

appeared so. For he was not really a *young man*, but an *angel*. Matt. 28, v. 5. Thus also it is the common way of speaking to say, I saw a *dead man* exposed, though it be not then a *man*, but a mere *carcass*. In like manner, therefore, the *body of Christ* in the *sacrament* is by a proper and familiar *figure* called *bread* by St. Paul, because it is *changed* from *bread*, has to our senses the *likeness* of *bread*, and nourishes the *soul*, as bread nourishes the *body*. If you ask what this consecrated *bread* is, our Savior tells you, (John, 6, v. 51,) THE BREAD that I will give IS MY FLESH. St. Paul tells you (1 Cor. c. 10, v. 16) it is THE COMMUNION OF THE BODY OF CHRIST. Nay, we ourselves call it the HOLY BREAD of eternal life in the *mass* after consecration. Yet I hope nobody will infer from thence that we do not believe *transubstantiation*.

Objections answered.

Your opinion of transubstantiation, say the Protestant and Presbyterian, seems to be tolerably well founded; but to us it appears to destroy the great evidence of the first witnesses of Christianity. That is, if it be not *true bread* and *wine*, but the *body* and *blood* of *Christ*, which we receive in the *sacrament*, it follows that our *senses* are deceived; and by consequence the *apostles* could not be sure they saw *Christ* work any *miracles*, which takes away the great *evidence* of Christianity.

Answer. This *objection*, so highly magnified by some of our adversaries, must either *suppose* that we must never trust our eyes or any of our senses, unless we may *always* trust them; or that our senses must always be trusted, when they give us *jointly* the *best information* they are capable of. The first of these *suppositions* is contrary both to reason and religion, nay, even to experience, and to our senses themselves. For all these correct the *errors* of sense, if I may be allowed that way of speaking. The *sun* appears to our eyes scarce bigger than a span, and the fixed *stars* a great deal less.

But *reason* tells us they may be greater than the *earth*. A straight stick, if you put the end of it under water, will appear crooked. But take it out, and your eyes will discover their own *mistake*. The two disciples going to *Emmaus* had *Jesus* in their company; they both *heard* him and *saw* him; yet took him for another, because **THEIR EYES WERE HOLDEN**, *that they should not know him*. Luke, 24, v. 16. At length even by *their senses* they found they had been misinformed; for soon after *their eyes were opened*, and they *knew him*. v. 31. But because their sight had deceived them on this occasion, were they never to trust to it any more? Were they not to believe that they had seen any *miracles* of Christ? *St. Mary Magdalen* was deceived in the same manner: *she saw Jesus, yet knew not that it was he, and supposed him to be the gardener*. John, 20, v. 14, 15. But was she not to believe her eyes when she fell *at his feet*? (Matt. 28, v. 9;) when she *told the disciples, that she had seen the Lord*? (John, 20, v. 18;) when she saw him nailed to the cross, (Matt. 27, v. 55,) and laid in the tomb? v. 61.

The second *supposition*, to wit, that our senses must always be trusted, is equally false. For, first, the two disciples going to *Emmaus* had the *joint information* both of their eyes and ears. Yet I hope they might be sure and faithful *witnesses of Christ's miracles*.

2dly. *Josue's eyes* deceived him when he said to the angel, *Art thou for us, or for our adversaries?* Jos. 5, v. 13. And all his *senses* might then have been under the same *mistake*. But was he not to trust his eyes, when he saw the sun stand still, the walls of *Jerico* tumble down, the waters of *Jordan* rise up in heaps, and so many other *miracles* done both by *Moses* and himself?

3dly. When *St. Peter* was rescued out of prison, he *knew for certain that God had sent his angel, and had delivered him out of the hands of Herod*. Acts, 12, v. 11. Here, then, is a *fact*, in which he both *believed* and *disbelieved* the *information* of his senses. Had he believed them as to the *person of his guide*, (whom he *saw, heard, and felt*, when

he struck him on the side,) he must have judged him to be a man, not an *angel*. In this, then, he found his *senses* were *mistaken*. Yet he still believed his *eyes*, and had nothing but his eyes to trust to that he *saw two miracles wrought in his favor*, viz., the *falling of his chains*, and the *iron gate's opening of its own accord*.

4thly. If God had said to the holy women as they went to the sepulchre, *You shall meet one there, who, to all your senses, will appear to be a man, and yet is none*; or to the apostles before the last supper, *You shall eat and drink that which will seem to be bread and wine, but in reality is not so*; would it follow that if they had believed him they must have renounced the use of their *senses* forever? To say that God is not to be believed, is *blasphemy*, and to say that if they believe him in this, they must renounce their senses in all other matters, is *madness*.

It is therefore false, that, without believing our *senses* in *every thing*, when they give us the best informations they can, we must believe them in *nothing*. It is false to say, that, if we do not judge of *bread* and *wine*, in the *sacrament*, by the information of our *senses*, the apostles could not be sure they ever saw *Christ* work any *miracles*, or that the *sensible grounds* of Christianity are shaken. For God having given us *senses* to direct our judgment, we ought to rely on their *information*, unless either our *senses* themselves, or *reason*, or *faith*, correct their mistake. And if *reason* may ever be allowed to overrule their misinformation, we cannot surely refuse to pay the same deference to the *revelation* of God, when it tells us that such or such a thing is not what it appears to be to our *senses*. In fine, since we have so many instances of this in the *Scripture*, as it is ridiculous to say, we must believe our *senses* in *nothing*, so it is impious to say we must believe them in *every thing*.

6. Whereas Christ says, (John, c. 6, v. 51,) "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "he shall not live forever, un-

less he takes of the cup, which is unlawfully taken away from the laity by the Popish priest, as our ministers allege.' Indeed, brother, if you accuse the priests of unlawfulness for administering this sacrament to the laity only under the form of bread, you may also presume to accuse Christ himself, for administering it under the same form to those two disciples that were going to Emmaus. Luke, c. 24, v. 30. And you may, by that same arrogance, presume likewise to accuse those first believers, who are said to have "continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship in breaking of bread and prayers." Acts, c. 2, v. 42, 46. But if you do not presume to accuse either Christ or those first believers for administering the sacrament only under the form of bread, why do you presume to accuse those Popish priests, since they do nothing herein, but only that of which Christ and his disciples had left them an example? You might know by what I have showed you here, (No. 1,) that he who receives it under one kind, receives it as a complete and perfect sacrament, viz., "a visible sign, signifying an invisible grace," &c. And hence Christ says that "he who eats that heavenly bread shall never die, but shall live forever." John, c. 6, v. 51. What need you more than to never die, and to live forever? Surely this is as full an effect of this sacrament as is promised any where in Scripture to them that take it under both kinds; and the reason of this is, that whatever is contained under both kinds, the very same is contained in one kind; for Christ is there definitive, which property requires that he should be still whole and entire; and hence it follows that wherever Christ's flesh is, his blood also must be in the very same place; and consequently, when you receive his body, you receive likewise his blood, and when you drink his blood you eat his flesh; and it is therefore St. Paul says, "Whosoever shall eat this bread, or (*your Bible has the word "and," contrary to the Greek text*) drink this chalice of our Lord unworthily, he is guilty of the body and blood of our Lord." 1 Cor. c. 11, v. 27. For he declares, by the word "or," that one is guilty of both the body and blood of Christ, if he un-

worthily receives him under one kind; but this could not happen if both the body and blood of Christ had not been contained in each kind.

7. As to what you allege, that all people are obliged to take the cup, because it is said, "Drink ye all of this," I answer, that Christ spoke then to the apostles, and to their successors, the priests, to whom also he said, "Do this." And as these words, viz., "Do this," are not to be so understood, that they oblige the laity to consecrate the bread and wine, so likewise these other words, "Drink ye all of this," are not to be so generally understood, that they oblige the laity to take the cup; and what some of your sect infer from these words, viz., "The flesh profiteth nothing," (John, c. 6, v. 63,) is blasphemous; for Christ himself says there, (v. 51,) that "his flesh is the life of the world." The sense therefore of these words is, that Christ's flesh profiteth nothing to them who would believe that it is the flesh of one, that is, only a man, not having the divine nature of God united to him; and hence, Christ knowing that this was the opinion of Judas and some of the Jews, because they believed not that he was the true Son of God, he therefore expressed the former words, and, after them, the following: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and life," (v. 63;) that is, they ought to raise you up in spirit to believe that this flesh, which I give you, is joined with the divine nature of God, who is able to give this same flesh to be eaten by men, that by really feeding upon it, they may be nourished to eternal life. You may further see the truth of this in the holy fathers' commentaries upon the sixth chapter of St. John. Now you have seen, brother, by what I have shown you in this section, how your learned ministers have seemingly destroyed the natures of these two sacraments, which they pretend to have left you; for they deny, contrary to the express word of Christ, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, and profess to give you nothing but mere bread and wine, having no more divinity in them, than a piece of clean paper has written characters; and

your Presbyterian ministers deny both the virtue and necessity of the sacrament of baptism, notwithstanding they find the word of God in opposition to them.

Objections answered.

We have paid the greatest attention, dear brother, to the arguments you have made in defence of your religion; but how can you account for these three following texts, which plainly contradict your doctrine, and prove the necessity of communion in both kinds? "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Matt. 26, v. 28. "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you." Luke 22, v. 20. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" 1 Cor. 10, v. 16. These three texts, I say, are wholly wide from the purpose, and only prove (and indeed they prove it effectually) that Christ consecrated the cup into his blood as well as the bread into his body, which I wish you believed as heartily as I do. But then I must desire you to remember, that Christ neither consecrated the cup into dead and inanimate blood, nor the bread into a dead carcass. Whence I have concluded, that whoever receives his body receives likewise his sacred blood; for a living body cannot be without blood; nor can we receive one half of Christ without the other.

The other two texts have some shadow of difficulty; but it will soon vanish. St. Matthew (26, v. 27) says, "He took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it." And St. Mark (14, v. 23) says, "They all drank of it." Whence, I presume, you would have us conclude, that all are here commanded to drink of the cup. But the *all* mentioned by St. Mark explains the *all* that were commanded to drink, according to St. Matthew. And who were those *all*? They could be no others than the apostles, who were the only persons with our Savior at his last supper. For surely if the apostles were the *all* that drank, they were likewise the same

all that were bid to drink — a strange argument to prove that the *laity* are all bound to drink of the cup.

But is it not remarkable that Christ should, in distributing the bread, say no more than "Take and eat;" yet in giving the cup should say expressly, "Drink ye all of it," to prevent, as it were, the taking away of the cup? This is Mr. Lesly's observation. I answer, that St. Luke has given a reason for it, which utterly spoils the force of this observation. For he tells us that Christ himself divided the bread, and gave to each apostle the morsel he was to eat. Luke 22, v. 19. So that all were not to eat of the same piece of consecrated bread, but all were to drink of the same consecrated cup; which therefore (according to St. Luke's relation) he gave them, and bade them divide it among themselves. v. 17. And this explains our Savior's saying, "Drink ye all of it;" which was only said to caution them, that they were all to have their share of the cup he gave them; whereas the caution was unnecessary as to the consecrated bread, which he distributed with his own hands.

The last text, on which you lay the greatest stress, is as follows: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." John 6, v. 54. This, you say, implies a positive precept of communion in both kinds, as a means necessary to attain to life everlasting. I grant it implies a positive precept of receiving the body and blood of Christ, but not of communion in both kinds; which I prove first from the practice of the primitive church, who were surely as clear-sighted as the pretended reformers, yet never could discover a positive precept of communion in both kinds in that text; for, had they seen it, they would not have acted contrary to it by administering the communion in one kind only, as they did on many occasions.

But I prove it, 2dly, from no less than four texts in the same chapter of St. John, where Christ promises eternal life to eating alone; as, first, "This is the bread which came down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die." v. 50. 2dly, "If a man eateth of this bread, he shall live

forever ; and the bread that I will give is my flesh." v. 51. 3dly. " He that eateth me shall live by me." v. 57. And 4thly. " He that eateth this bread shall live forever." v. 58. Since, therefore, life everlasting is here promised no less than four times to eating the bread, without any mention of the cup, the true meaning of the above-mentioned texts, wherein both eating and drinking are mentioned, can be no other than this, viz., " Except we become partakers both of the body and blood of Christ, for the nourishment of our souls, we shall have no life in us ;" which no Roman Catholic ever denied. But since it is impossible to receive the living body of Christ without receiving his blood by the very action of eating his body, it is an undeniable consequence, that communion in one kind is an entire fulfilling of the precept implied in the above-mentioned text, as it fully answers the end for which the sacrament was instituted ; to wit, the obtaining life everlasting, according to Christ's promise, so often repeated in the same chapter.

Nay, nothing can be more rational than this interpretation of the fore-mentioned texts ; because the only drift of our Savior's discourse was to convince the disbelieving Capharnaits that unless their souls were nourished with the real flesh and blood of the Son of man, they should not have life everlasting ; and that they, who were made partakers of his body and blood, should have life everlasting. So that provided the real body and blood of Christ be but received, whether it be by the action of eating, or of drinking only, or by both together, it is manifest that all worthy communicants, as they receive whole Christ, who is the fountain of grace and eternal life, so they fully satisfy the end of Christ's institution, and perform all that is obligatory in the precept of communion.

This, I think, suffices to satisfy any man, who will be content with a reasonable satisfaction ; and to convince him, at the same time, that your loud clamors against us on account of communion in one kind, are wholly unjustifiable, and appear to be the fruits of a violent party spleen rather

than a sincere zeal for the truth. I shall, however, offer one consideration more, to make good the principal point I have maintained, to wit, that there is no positive command to oblige all to receive the sacrament in both kinds. For surely if there were any such command, I may confidently say it is wholly improbable the universal church, in any age whatsoever, could be so blind as not to see it; and if they saw it, I ask, what motive could her bishops and pastors have to combine together in resolution to commit a damnable sin, by forbidding what Christ has commanded, when there was neither honor, nor interest, nor pleasure, to induce them to it? And yet it is an incontestable fact, that two general councils (and general councils have always been regarded as the representatives of the universal church) decreed that the sacrament should not be administered to the laity in both kinds. It is therefore plain that, when they made this law, they were convinced in their hearts of two things: first, that the people were not injured by receiving it in one kind; and, secondly, that there was no command to oblige them so to receive it in both. And if neither they nor the great lights of the primitive church could ever discover any such command, it looks rather like a chimera than a probability, that a set of obscure factious persons, without mission or authority from any lawful superior, should be more intelligent and clear-sighted in divine matters than they, and see things wholly unseen before.

SECTION IX.

Of the Sacrament of Confirmation.

1. WHEREAS the Scripture says, (Acts, c. 8, v. 14, &c.,) "And when the apostles who were in Jerusalem had heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who, when they were come, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost, for he was

not yet come upon any of them, but they were only baptized in the name of our Lord Jesus; then they impose hands (*behold the outward sign*) upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost." (*Behold the inward grace given in this sacrament of confirmation.*) "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "that confirmation is no sacrament at all, but a kind of ceremony used by the apostles." Indeed, brother, it hath the definition of a sacrament, as you may see, sec. 8, No. 1. And if the imposition of hands after this manner had been only a ceremony, why did not Philip the deacon, who converted and baptized the Samaritans, use that ceremony? Where could there be any necessity for sending these two bishops, viz., Peter and John, to the Samaritans, if this had not been a venerable sacrament, which ordinarily ought to be conferred by a bishop? And though Protestants deny it to be a sacrament, yet I see that the Church of England reserves this confirmation to their pretended bishops, and would not suffer their common curates to confer it, as Sir Richard Baker relates, p. 421. And the same is evident from their Common Prayer Book, wherein their bishops have a prescribed form of ceremonies and prayers, which they use when they confer their confirmation. As for the Presbyterians, I cannot but admire how impudently they allege, in their Catechism, against Popery, printed at Glasgow, the year 1683, p. 68, that "the Papists have no ground in the word of God for confirmation." Whereas the aforesaid text doth clearly enforce the truth of our doctrine; and it is further proved by that other text of the Acts, which declares that St. Paul had baptized, and afterwards confirmed, about twelve of St. John's disciples. "Hearing these things," saith the Scripture, "they were baptized in the name of our Lord Jesus; and when Paul had imposed hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came upon them." Acts, c. 19, v. 5, 6. And to prevent the subterfuge of those who would offer to misinterpret the aforesaid text, saying that they only prove that the gift of the Holy Ghost is given by the imposition of hands, in order to speak several languages, I will therefore produce

the following words of St. Augustin, which sufficiently confute that pretence of denying the truth. "Is there any man, saith he, "of so perverse a heart as to deny these children on whom we impose hands to have received the Holy Ghost, because they speak not with tongues?" *St. Augustin, Trac. 6, in Epist. in Joan.* And he further observes, "The sacrament of chrism, like visible seals, is sacred and holy, even as baptism itself." *Aug. Lib. 2, cont. lit. Pet. c. 104.* And St. Jerom gives also a further proof of this sacrament in the following words: "Dost thou not know also that this is the custom of the churches, that hands should be imposed on such as have been baptized, and so the Holy Ghost be invoked? Dost thou inquire where it is written? In the Acts of the Apostles. And though there were no authority of Scripture for it, yet the consent of the whole world (*note these words*) in this respect would be equal to a precept; for many other things also which are observed in the church by tradition, claim the authority of a written law." *Epist. cont. Lucifer*

SECTION X.

Of the Sacrament of Penance.

1. WHEREAS Christ says, (John, c. 20, v. 22, 23,) "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "that power of loosing and binding sins was only given to those apostles who were present; and so Christ did not oblige himself to ratify the sentences and judgments of pastors, which are very often rash, and contrary to justice and charity, as our Catechism against Popery affirms, p. 66." Pray, brother, show me, if you can, by what text of Scripture your learned ministers prove that St. Thomas, one of the twelve, who was not present when Christ spoke these words, as

appears by the aforesaid chapter, (v. 24,) had not that power of forgiving and retaining sins? Or how can they prove that St. Paul (who had not been converted to the Christian religion until two years after Christ had conferred that power upon his apostles) had not the same power? Do they foolishly believe that this power was then granted to those that were then present, merely for their own sake, in order to increase their authority, and not for the sake of those members of the Church of Christ, of which the far greater number lived after the time of the apostles? Or do they imagine that it is a dishonor to God that men should have the power to forgive sins? And if this be their pretence, let them take notice of the following words of St. Ambrose, writing against the Novatian heretics. "Why do you baptize," saith he, "if sins cannot be remitted by a man; for in baptism there is the remission of all sins, nor is it material whether priests challenge to themselves this power by penance or by baptism." *Ambrose, Lib. de Pcnit. c. 7.* Therefore I would advise you to learn from your ministers, why should it be a greater dishonor to God, that men should now forgive sins by penance, than that they should forgive them by baptism, seeing it is the Holy Ghost that forgives them in both cases, by the ministry of a man? for when the priest baptizes a child, he says, "I do baptize thee," that is, I wash away thy sins, "by the power given to me, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And when he absolves the penitent, he likewise says, "I absolve thee from thy sins," that is, I wash them away, "by the authority of Jesus Christ, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Whereby you may clearly understand that you have no sufficient reason to deny that sins should be forgiven by the ministry of a man in the sacrament of penance, whereas you admit that sins are forgiven by the ministry of a man in the sacrament of baptism; and if you believe the word of God, it tells you the one as expressly as it tells you the other. And St. Chrysostom speaks thus on the subject: "Christ has given that power to priests,

which would not be given either to angels or to archangels. Earthly princes have also power to bind only the bodies, but the bond of priests toucheth the very soul itself, and reacheth to heaven. What power, I beseech you, can be greater than this?" *Chryst. lib. 3, de Sacerd.*

2. Whereas the Scripture says, (James, c. 5, v. 16,) "Confess therefore your sins to one another, and pray for one another, that ye may be saved." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "we will not confess our sins to any man who knows them not before, and we are taught to do so by our learned Mr. Whitaker, who says, (*Cont. Rat. Camp. rat.* 5, p. 78,) that "not only Cyprian, but also almost all the fathers of that time, were infected with the error of confessing private sins to priests." Truly, brother, this error, of which Whitaker presumes to accuse the holy fathers, shows that you contradict your own doctrine elsewhere; for almost all Protestants acknowledge that the Roman Church was pure and without blemish in St. Cyprian's time, that is, about the year of Christ 250; and yet, on the other hand, you reject now the doctrine of confessing men's private sins to priests, which was then generally practised by all the believers of that pure and true Church, as your own authors are forced to acknowledge. But what need I reflect upon this contradiction, whereas it is common to all our dissenting brethren to deny, at one time, what they admit at another, not knowing what they do? The word of God expressly tells them how they ought to conduct themselves in this particular; yet they will not believe it, though they say that it is their only rule of faith. But omitting such censures, I would be glad to know from your ministers, how could that power, which Christ gave to absolve people from sin, be exercised, unless sinners, who, you see, are commanded by the Scripture to confess their sins, were obliged to confess their sins to those who have this power? Where do they read in Scripture that public sinners only are comprehended under that precept which commands people to confess their sins? And where do they read in Scripture that those who came to St. Paul, "confessing and

declaring their sins," (Acts, c. 19, v. 18,) only confessed their public sins? Let them show me either of these three things, by some plain text of Scripture, and then I will be more ready to embrace your doctrine concerning this point. In the mean time, I think myself obliged in conscience to believe these former texts, and also this other of St. John, which says, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." 1 John, c. 1, v. 9.

SECTION XI.

Of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.

1. WHEREAS the Scripture says, (James, c. 5, v. 14, 15,) "Is any man sick among you, let him bring in the priests," (your ministers have translated the word "elders," improperly, from the Greek word "Presbuterous," of the church,) "and let them pray over them, anointing them with oil, in the name of the Lord, and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "we will not make use of that unprofitable Popish ceremony; for our Catechism against Popery (p. 71) says, that we ought not to practise it in the church, because it doth not now heal corporal diseases." Pray, brother, oblige your ministers to show you this doctrine by some text of clear Scripture, if there be any such text to be had in their Bible, or else urge them to confess that they are quite unable to produce such a text. Oblige them also to produce you another plain text of Scripture, which may prove that this extreme unction was purposely instituted in order to cure corporal diseases. Indeed, we acknowledge that God gives it this virtue, when he thinks it expedient, and we see, by daily examples, that innumerable infirm people are restored to their former health immediately after receiving this sacrament; yet we say that this is not

the principal end for which it was instituted by God, but rather for the remission of sins and augmentation of grace, which you may perceive is true, by these express words of Scripture, saying, "And if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him." v. 15. Hence you may know how greatly you are injured by those learned ministers, who are the occasion of depriving you of this great benefit, which you might obtain by receiving this sacrament before you depart out of this world.

SECTION XII.

The Sacrament of Holy Order.

1. WHEREAS St. Paul says to the bishop Timothy, (1 Tim. c. 4, v. 14,) "Neglect not the grace that is in thee, (*take notice of these words,*) which was given thee by prophecy, with the imposition of the hands of the priesthood." Behold the outward sign, and consequently the sacrament of holy orders contained in Scripture. "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "we will not acknowledge that to be a sacrament at all, for we are taught by our Mr. Whitaker, (*Cont-Duræum, lib. 9, p. 821,*) and Mr. Fulke, (in his Retentive, p. 67,) that 'we should with all our hearts abhor, detest, and spit at your stinking, greasy, antichristian order.'" Pray, brother, observe how irreverently your great divines exclaim here against that holy sacrament, which they find to be expressly contained in the word of God, and thus not only in the aforesaid, but also in the following text, which says, "I admonish thee, that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee (*here you have the inward grace which was then given*) by the imposition of thy hands." 2 Tim. c. 1, v. 6. And these other words show you the outward sign by which that grace was given, by the ministry of a bishop. But, notwithstanding you see this by clear Scripture, yet your Presbyterian ministers abhor to hear and practise it, and I believe that their

chief reason for doing so is, that at the beginning of their pretended reformation, they could not show that they themselves were either lawfully ordained or lawfully sent by God to teach their new notions; and hence they made the simple people, who then embraced their doctrine, believe that they had an extraordinary commission from God to preach and teach these notions, and so by that means they deceived the poor ignorant people, who neither then nor now make use of the sound doctrine of St. Paul, saying, "Though an angel from heaven preach another gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed." Gal. c. 1, v. 8. But, notwithstanding this pretence of extraordinary calling, yet I see that the Church of England endeavored, in Queen Elizabeth's time, to force the Catholic bishops then in prison to impose their hands on the queen's new pretended bishops, which they refused, and preferred rather to die in prison than ordain them, as Sanders (*De Schismate Anglorum*) and Chamney (*De Vocatione Ministrorum*) assert. Hence it appears how disorderly your Protestant and Presbyterian ministers have proceeded in the beginning of their deformation, and they have caused thereby their own churches to live in the same confusion ever since, pretending, forsooth, to more authority than St. Paul himself. For though this great apostle was called in an extraordinary manner by a voice from heaven, and received the true spirit of God, yet we see by Scripture, that he was ordained by the imposition of hands, as appears from the Acts of the Apostles, c. 13, v. 3.

2. Whereas St. Paul says to the bishop Titus, (Tit. c. 1, v. 5,) "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain priests in every city, as I also appointed thee." "No, no, Paul," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "it was not for that end you left him in Crete, that he might ordain priests in every city." Otherwise our learned ministers would not cause several acts of parliament to be made against all sorts of priests, who are therefore now liable to the penal laws, if they be discovered or taken in any city, town, or village, of all these king-

doms, in which our Protestant or Presbyterian religion flourishes.

3. Whereas St. Paul says, (1 Tim. c. 3, v. 1,) "This is a faithful saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work." "No, no," says the Presbyterian, "that is rather a false saying, because he who desires the office of a bishop, desires only an antichristian work; and therefore it is, our Presbyterian government hath often rooted all kinds of bishops, and their devilish ways of governing, out of the kingdom of Scotland; and it hath now of late, since King James was banished, displaced all those Episcopal ministers who would not by oath renounce Episcopacy."

SECTION XIII.

The Sacrament of Matrimony.

1. WHEREAS Christ says, (Mark, c. 10, v. 11, 12,) "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her; and if the wife shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "neither of them committeth adultery in that case; for our confession of faith says, (c. 24,) that in case of adultery after marriage, it is lawful for the innocent party to sue out a divorce, and after the divorce to marry another, as if the offending party had been dead." Truly, brother, your learned ministers are not taught to believe or practise this doctrine by the word of God, which only tells them that adultery is a just cause of separation of bed, as appears by that of St. Matthew, c. 5, v. 32, and c. 19, v. 9. But surely this is not the same as to say that adultery dissolves the bond of marriage; for Christ says, in these very texts of Matthew, that "whosoever marieth her that is put away, that he committeth adultery." But this could not be true, if her first marriage had been dis-

solved by committing adultery, as St. Augustin clearly showeth, *Lib. 1, de Adulterinis Conjugis, c. 22*, and St. Jerom, in his commentary on the aforesaid texts. And you may further discover the truth of this by the following texts, which say, "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery." Luke, c. 16, v. 18. "The woman that hath a husband is bound by the laws to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband; so then, if while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress." Rom. c. 7, v. 2, 3. "The wife is bound by the law, as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will." 1 Cor. c. 7, v. 39. But these other words of St. Paul are decisive, saying, (in this chapter, v. 10, 11,) "Let not the wife depart from her husband; but if she depart let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband." Now, brother, since I have shown you the truth of the Catholic doctrine, concerning this point, by all these former texts of Scripture, I hope you will not blame me for requiring of you to show me one plain text of Scripture which affirms that it is lawful either for the husband or wife to marry another in case of adultery.



SECTION XIV.

Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

1. WHEREAS St. Paul says, (Heb. c. 5, v. 1,) "Every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifice for sins." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "there are no such priests now ordained whose office might be to offer sacrifice for men's sins; therefore we will

have no Popish mass brought in, under that false pretence of offering sacrifice for people's sins, because Christ offered himself once as a sacrifice for us all, which is enough forever." Pray, brother, how can either you or your ministers pretend to know this matter better than St. Paul knew it? or St. Peter, who was present at our Savior's bloody sacrifice, and after his resurrection had often conversed with him, during the forty days before his ascension to heaven? and yet this apostle speaks the following words concerning the priests and sacrifice: "Ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, by Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. c. 2, v. 5. You see by these words of clear Scripture, that this holy sacrifice of the mass, which is offered to God by the priests, is acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Why, then, do you deny the lawfulness thereof, since the word of God contradicts you herein? Nay, St. Paul further speaks thus on the subject: "We have," saith he, "an altar whereof they have no power to eat, who serve the tabernacle." Heb. c. 13, v. 10. By these words he tells the Jews that they cannot partake of the sacrifice of our altar, if they adhere to their old sacrifices; and if you remark well his discourse, (1 Cor. c. 10,) you will see how plainly he concludes against the Jews and heathens, that all those who wish to be made partakers of their sacrifices, cannot be made partakers of the Christian sacrifice of the body and blood of our Savior. Therefore he bids them (v. 14) fly from serving idols, by their sacrificing to them, or eating of that which hath been offered to them. If they would do this, he tells them of a far better sacrifice, of which they might be made partakers at our altars. "For," saith he, (v. 16,) "the chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? and the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?" And having thus taught them that, by the virtue of the priest's benediction, or consecration, the true body and blood of Christ are made communicable upon our altars, under the appearance of bread

and wine, he then tells them that they could not be made partakers of this sacrifice, if they continued still to partake either of the Jewish or heathenish sacrifices, of which they made themselves partakers, by eating of that which was sacrificed to them. "For, behold, Israel," saith he, (v. 18,) "they that eat of the sacrifices are not partakers of the altar;" for by doing so, they communicated with those who offered these sacrifices. And having spoken thus of the Jewish, he afterwards speaks of the Gentile sacrifices. "But the things," saith he, (v. 20,) "which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God; and I would not that you should be made partakers with devils." "For," saith he, (v. 21,) "ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils." You see, brother, by this discourse of St. Paul, how he disapproves the sacrifice of the Jews and Gentiles, and tells them what great difference there is between their sacrifices and that noble sacrifice which the Christians then offered to God. "For," saith he, (v. 17,) "we are all partakers of that one bread, which is the bread of life, that came down from heaven," as you have seen, sec. 8, No. 6.

2. Now, as to what you allege in the beginning of the last number, "that it is enough that Christ was once offered as a sacrifice for our sins," I answer, we do acknowledge that Christ has so offered himself for the salvation of mankind, and that therefore we do not pretend by the sacrifice of the mass to make a new propitiation to appease God, as if he had not been fully satisfied by the sacrifice of the cross. Neither do we by this holy sacrifice pretend to make any addition to the price of our salvation, as if it had been imperfect; for this is not our doctrine, but some of your minister's calumnies against us, and they make the poor ignorant people really believe that it is our doctrine, which you may plainly see is false, by the following words of the council of Trent: "The sacrifice of the mass is instituted only to represent the bloody sacrifice which was once accomplished upon the cross, to perpetuate the memory of it to the end of the world, and to apply to us the saving virtue of it, for the remission of those

sins which we commit every day." Sess. 22, c. 1. You may perceive by these words that the Roman Catholics do acknowledge that all the merits of our redemption depend upon the death and passion of Christ. When the priest therefore says to God, in the celebration of this divine mystery, "We offer unto thee this Holy Host," they pretend not by this oblation to make or present to God a new payment of the price of our salvation, but to offer up to him, in our behalf, the merits of our blessed Jesus Christ, there present, and the infinite price which he once paid for us; and Christ being so present upon the altar, under the figure of death, we believe that then he intercedes for us, and represents continually to his Father that death and passion which he has suffered for his church; and it is in this sense we say that Jesus Christ offers up himself to his Father for us, in the blessed eucharist; and it is after this same manner we conceive that this oblation renders God more propitious to us; and therefore we call it a propitiatory sacrifice, because that which is offered for us, and for the remission of our sins, is a propitiatory offering, which applies plentifully the satisfaction of Christ's passion to us, not derogating from his bloody sacrifice, but delivering the fruits of it to us, as I observed before, sect. 6, No. 2.

Whereas the prophet foretold the sacrifice which would be offered in the law of grace, saying, (Malac. c. 1, v. 11,) "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and even in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a pure offering." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "that cannot be true; for we will not suffer that either incense or sacrifice shall be offered to yourself, or to your name, for that would be mere idolatry, of which all the Papists are damnably guilty, by adoring the eucharist and giving incense thereto, in their unlawful sacrifice of the mass." Truly, brother, though you believe firmly this doctrine to be true, yet your learned ministers were never able to produce so much as one clear text of Scripture whereby

its truth could be proved. As for the holy fathers' authorities, they need not pretend to produce them, because they are decidedly against them in this point, as you may see in the answer to Mr. Jennings's Challenge.

For a further proof of it, these words of the Psalmist, "Thou art a priest *forever according to the order of Melchisedech*," (Psalm 110, v. 4,) are urged by St. Cyprian in the third age, St. Jerom, St. Epiphanius, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustin, in the fourth, and St. Isidore, St. Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret, in the fifth. For, as they argue, priests of the order of Aaron sacrificed beasts; but Melchisedech's sacrifice was bread and wine, (Gen. 14, v. 18,) a figure of the holy eucharist, by the daily offering whereof, and the fruits of his passion, Christ is a *priest forever*.

St. Cyprian calls the holy eucharist a "true and full sacrifice," (Epist. 63;) St. Augustin, a "true and sovereign sacrifice," (l. 10, de Civ. Dei, c. 20;) Eusebius, "an expiation for all the world," (l. 1, Dem. Ev. c. 10;) St. Cyril of Jerusalem, a "spiritual sacrifice, an unbloody worship, a propitiatory victim," (Cat. Myst. 5.)

But there needs no other proof than what the Church of England herself teaches. For if the body and blood of Christ be *verily* and *indeed* taken and received by the faithful, and consecrated by the priest, it must of necessity follow that the priest offers them up *verily* and *indeed* upon the altar, and that they are an oblation of mercy. For how can Jesus Christ be unacceptable to his Father? Or how can the fruits of his passion be applied more effectually than by his own dear self?

Nor is the very name of mass an invention of latter ages. For thus the holy sacrifice of the altar was called above *thirteen hundred* years ago. Witness first, St. Ambrose, who writes thus: "I continued the office, I began to *say mass*," &c. l. 2, Epist. 14. And secondly, St. Leo, whose words are remarkable: "When the multitude (says he) is so great that the church cannot hold them all, let there be no difficulty made to *offer the sacrifice* oftener than once. For some part

of the people must of necessity be deprived of their devotions, if, following the custom of *saying mass* but once, none can *offer up the sacrifice* but they who come early in the morning." St. Leo, Epist. 11, (olim 81,) ad Dioscorum.

Here we have the sacrifice of the eucharist plainly spoken of, and called by the very name of mass, first by St. Ambrose, a father of the fourth age, and secondly by St. Leo, who lived in the fifth; and I never heard they were the first who gave it that name. But let that be as it will, can our adversaries reflect, without some uneasiness of thought, that it is but about a hundred and fifty years ago, when, by the sole authority of a secular tribunal, it was made high treason in Ireland for Christians to perform that very devotion, which was the most solemn worship of God in those ages, (when the Church's faith was uncorrupted, according to your own concession,) and which they had received from the apostles themselves.

I add, moreover, that the Church of England is one of the first churches since the creation, that pretended to true priests and altars without any external sacrifice, this being in reality nothing less than a solecism in religion; because a priest is properly one whose office is to *offer sacrifice*, and the altar is the place on which it is offered.

Objections answered.

Let us now see what you have to say against it. You say it is a vain and idolatrous thing. Why? Because by Christ's sacrifice God is sufficiently satisfied, and the repenting sinner fully secured; for which see the following text: "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for us forever, sat down at the right hand of God." Heb. c. 10, v. 12. I answer that, if this argument proves any thing, it proves likewise that both Christ's mediation for us in heaven, and the sacraments he has provided for us on earth, are also useless; because God is sufficiently satisfied, and our ransom is fully paid by Christ's sacrifice offered on the cross. Nay, prayer, alms, fasting, self-denials, keeping the commandments, and repent-

ance itself, may all be thrown into the list of vain and idle things. But if all these be both profitable and necessary, because they are ordained by God as means to apply to us the fruits of that bloody sacrifice, by which alone we are redeemed and the divine justice is fully satisfied, then surely Christ's offering himself daily on the altar for the self-same end, cannot, without blasphemy, be called vain or idolatrous. Indeed, we must live in a very Christian age wherein worshipping of Christ is called idolatry.

It is true he offered himself but once a bloody sacrifice for us, since he can but once pay the ransom which God demanded; and it is of this sacrifice of redemption St. Paul speaks in the whole chapter quoted by you. Because he is our "High Priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech," he offers himself daily for us in an unbloody manner; not to redeem us again, but to apply by this, as by other means appointed by him, the price of our redemption.

But you say, if "Christ sits forever at the right hand of God," how can he be truly present upon our altars? I answer, in the very same manner as his body and blood are *verily* and *indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper. But let St. Chrysostom teach you your lesson. "We always offer (says he) the *same Christ*. Therefore the sacrifice is the same. Are there many Christs because he is offered in many places? No. Christ is every where the same. He is entire here, and entire there, and has but one body. As therefore his body is the same, though offered up in different places, so the sacrifice is the same. He is our High Priest, who offered that victim which cleanses us. We now offer the same, which was offered then, and which cannot be consumed." Hom. 17, in Epist. ad Heb.

But how do you pretend to understand that the same body can be in different places at once? and if not, your religion must be a very blind one. I answer, first, when you have explained the six following questions, you shall have full satisfaction. The first query is, How two bodies could be at once in the very same place by penetration, when Christ came to

his disciples, the doors being shut. John, 20, v. 19. The second is, How his body and blood can be present verily and indeed to one thousand faithful Christians receiving them at the same time in different places. The third is, How the same person can be both God and man. The fourth is, How there can be three divine persons, and only one God. The fifth is, How God could make all times and places, before there was either time or place to make them in. The sixth is, Whether a man's soul be at the same time in distant parts and distant places, as in the right hand and in the left, and whether the soul meets itself, and is separated from itself, when a man joins and parts his hands, &c. Again, whether part of the soul be not bit off and eaten, if a furious dog should snap a man's hand off and eat it? When, I say, you have given a clear and satisfactory answer to these few questions, there will be no difficulty in answering both the questions now proposed, and some other very curious ones proposed by you.

I answer, 2dly, if it be blindness to believe what we do not fully understand, we must necessarily renounce the best part of the Creed. But there is a large difference between understanding the mysteries we believe, and knowing the reasons why we believe them. To believe without reason is blindness; but to believe things that are above our understanding, is the very nature and essence of Christian faith.

SECTION XV.

Of the Ceremonies of the Church.

1. WHEREAS St. Paul says, (1 Cor. c. 14, v. 40,) "Let all things be done decently and according to order." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "but let all things be done undecently, without order and Popish ceremonies, lest we should be guilty of superstition, as these people are, for using such ceremonies which are not prescribed in the

word of God. And hence our Mr. Calfchill affirms, (cited by Mr. Fulke, in his Rejoinder to Martial's Reply, pp. 131 and 132,) that the very fathers deviated all from the simplicity of the gospel, in using such ceremonies." Pray, brother, let me know, if you can, where do you read in Scripture that we ought not to use ceremonies? Do you not know that Christ himself had used some ceremonies in curing the deaf? Mark, c. 7, v. 32, &c. He first took him aside from the multitude; secondly, he put his finger into his ears; thirdly, spitting, he touched his tongue; fourthly, he looked up to heaven; fifthly, he groaned; sixthly, he used a word deserving special interpretation, saying, "*Eppheta*," that is, *Be opened*. Did he not also use ceremonies, by breathing upon the apostles? John, c. 20, v. 22. And in pardoning the adulteress, he twice bowed himself, and wrote something on the earth, John, c. 8, v. 6. And, in curing the blind man, "he spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and then spread the clay upon his eyes, and said unto him, Go wash in the pool of Siloe." John, c. 9, v. 6, 7. How do you know that Christ did not use purposely these ceremonies, that thereby he might leave his Church an example of using some other ceremonies in such mysterious actions, as are ordained to cure our spiritual deafness, spiritual dumbness, and spiritual blindness? Truly, brother, I know no reason nor Scripture which could prohibit the Church of Christ to institute some ceremonies, both in imitation of these ceremonies used by Christ, and also that she might do all things decently and according to order, as St. Paul commanded us; for by decency the people are stirred up to a higher degree of reverence and veneration, at the administration and receiving of the holy sacraments; and if Jacob, a private man, used a new ceremony, by erecting a stone, and by pouring oil on it, and giving it the name or title of Bethel, (Gen. c. 28, v. 18,) which God himself had approved, (Gen. c. 31, v. 13,) and if the synagogue of the Jews had lawfully instituted a new feast by the advice of a private man, Mordecai, (Esther, c. 9, v. 20, &c.) I know no reason why the Church could not as

lawfully institute solemn feasts, and also some decent ceremonies, which might communicate a greater degree of respect and solemnity at the administration of the sacraments, as leaves are ornaments to trees; for I know that Christ has not prescribed the particular form by which these sacraments should be administered, when he first instituted them, but left their institution to the wisdom of the apostles and the Church, to whom he said, "He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me." Luke, c. 10, v. 16. But since you, brother John, presume to censure the precepts of the Church, and profess that you will believe nothing but that only which the word of God prescribes in the Bible, I therefore request you to show me by Scripture, that your own Episcopal ministers ought to make use of their white surplices; that you ought to have godfathers and godmothers at the administration of the sacrament of baptism; that you ought to receive the communion fasting; and that you ought to kneel before your bishop when he confirms you. Truly, brother, you act very unfair with us in this matter, for you employ what ceremonies you please, without having any Scripture authority; and you accuse us of superstition, for using other decent ceremonies, (which are nowhere prohibited by Scripture,) because we have not Scripture for them particularly, but the institution of that Church which the Scripture commands us to hear and obey. Matt. c. 18, v. 17. Heb. c. 13, v. 17.

SECTION XVI.

Of the Single Life of Priests, and such as have vowed Perpetual Chastity.

1. WHEREAS St. Paul says, (1 Cor. c. 7, v. 1,) that "it is good for a man not to touch a woman." "No, no, Paul," says Martin Luther, (*Tom. 5, Wittember. Ser. de Matrim. fol. 119,*) "it is not good for a man not to touch a woman; for

as it is not in my power not to be a man, so it is not in my choice to be without a woman; it is not in our power that it should be repressed or omitted, but it is as necessary as to eat, drink, purge, clean the nose, &c." I beseech you, brother, to consider what a great door to libertinism this doctrine of your first reformer opens to young men and women, to the husband and wife, when either of them is absent or infirm; for they are all taught, by this doctrine of Luther, not to strive against that which he tells them is impossible to be observed; and your own authors cannot but believe him, because, in their writings, they style him thus: "Holy Luther, a man sent of God to enlighten the world, the conductor of Eliseus, and the chariot of Israel, to be revered next after Christ and Paul; greater than whom lived none since the apostles' time, the angel, the last trumpet of God, whose calling was immediate and extraordinary," &c.

2. Whereas St. Paul says, (1 Cor. c. 7, v. 7, 8,) "I would that all men were even as myself; but every one hath his proper gift from God, one after this manner, and another after that. I say, therefore, to the unmarried, and widows, it is good for them if they so continue, even as I." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "indeed, Paul, it is far better for them not to continue so, but to marry, seeing this is the practice of our reformation, of which our apostle, Luther, has left us an example. Truly, brother, I acknowledge that this man has left you such an example, for though he was an Augustinian friar, and vowed perpetual chastity, yet he cast off his religious habit, in the year 1524, and unlawfully married the nun, Catharine Bore, who also had before vowed perpetual chastity; and though your Mr. Parkins, in his Reformed Catalogue, p. 161, seemingly excuses this unlawful copulation, saying, "The vow of continence is not in the power of him that voweth," yet I know not how either you or any other can justify that action of your first apostle, Luther, who was bound to fulfil his vow of chastity; for the word of God requires from all people to perform what they lawfully vow, as you may see by the following text of Scripture:

“When thou hast made a vow to the Lord thy God, thou shalt not delay to pay it, because the Lord thy God will require it: if thou wilt not promise, thou shalt be without sin, but that which is once gone out of thy lips, thou shalt observe, and thou shalt do as thou hast promised to the Lord thy God, and hast spoken with thy own will and thy own mouth.” Deut. c. 23, v. 21, &c. “Offer unto God thanksgiving, and pay thy vows unto the Most High.” Psalm 59, v. 14. “Vow, and pay unto the Lord your God.” Psalm 76, v. 11. “They shall vow a vow unto the Lord, and perform it.” Isa. c. 19, v. 21. “Pay that which thou hast vowed.” Eccles. c. 5, v. 4. But it seems that Luther thought it a safer way not to pay that which he had vowed of his own accord. As for what Mr. Parkins alleges, that it is needless for people to vow continence, because “the performance thereof is not in their own power,” I answer, that by this doctrine he may also presume to hinder you from renouncing the devil and all his works, at your baptism; because the performance thereof is not in your own power, unless you be assisted with the grace of God. But you, who deny that even this grace is capable of making you keep God’s commandments, may also, by the very same rule, believe that even the grace of God is not able to make you lead a chaste life, and so your bachelors and young ministers, who are not married, must confess themselves to be all ———.

3. Whereas St. Paul says, (1 Cor. c. 7, v. 25, 38,) “Now, concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord, but I give my counsel, (*or judgment, according to your Bible.*) He that giveth his virgin in marriage doth well; and he that giveth her not doth better.” “No, no,” say the Protestant and Presbyterian, “for he who giveth his virgin in marriage doth far better than he who gives not his virgin in marriage; and hence our Luther says (*Tom. 5, Wittemb. in Assert. art. ad cap. 7, 1 Cor.*) that ‘matrimony is much more excellent than virginity, and that Christ and his apostles dissuaded Christians from virginity.’” You may find this doctrine of Luther acknowledged and seemingly defended by your own

Whitaker, *Cont. Camp. rat.* 8, p. 151. But I see that St. Paul was not of their opinion, for he further says in this chapter, (v. 40,) "But more blessed shall she be, if she so remain, according to my counsel; and I think that I also have the Spirit of God." But it seems you believe that it was not St. Paul that had the Spirit of God, but your own Luther, who teaches you to believe the contrary; and this makes you prefer Luther's new notion to the sound doctrine of St. Paul, expressly declaring the contrary to what Luther affirms concerning virginity; but if you believe Christ's own words, you shall see that he was not of Luther's opinion; for he speaks thus of the matter: "There are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that can receive it, let him receive it." Matt. c. 19, v. 12. But if you believe Luther's words, (related here, No. 1,) there is none at all able to receive it; but it is evident that Christ was not of his opinion; otherwise he would not have said either the former or following words: "Verily, I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive much more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting." Luke, c. 18, v. 29, 30. You see by these words the possibility of leading a chaste life, and also a reward promised for leaving a wife; and show me, if you can, a reward promised in Scripture for marrying a wife.

4. I know that you object against us these words of St. Paul, that "it is the doctrine of devils to forbid marriage, and to command to abstain from meats." 1 Tim. 4, v. 3, &c. To which I answer, that St. Paul speaks here only of the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, and other heretics, who taught that "the use of marriage came from the devil, and also that the devil had created certain meats," and therefore they would neither marry nor eat of those kinds of meats at any time; and this occasioned St. Paul to declare then, (v. 3,) that "God created those meats," from which they always abstained. But surely, brother, you will not allege that this is our doctrine, whereas you know that we eat on other days

those kinds of meats from which we abstain on Fridays and Saturdays, and in Lent. As for marriage, we honor it more than yourselves, for we believe it to be a sacrament, which you do not, and we never give a divorce to those that were once lawfully married, as you do, either by the consent of your ministers, or an act of parliament, as appears by the divorce which the parliament granted to the duke of Norfolk. This is quite contrary to our practice, whereby you may perceive what great reverence we have for marriage, so that we cannot be numbered among those former heretics against whom St. Paul speaks, who taught the use of it to proceed from the devil; and therefore they absolutely forbid ever to marry at all. As for us, we only declare marriage to be unlawful and forbidden to those persons only, who knowingly and willingly had either vowed perpetual virginity, when they might have married if they pleased, or who knowingly and willingly consented to receive holy orders, when they might as freely have married, to which state they knew none to be admitted, but such as would voluntarily and freely profess perpetual virginity; therefore we cannot be said to forbid marriage, unless you say, that St. Paul forbade it, when he condemned the widows that consecrated themselves to the service of the Church, and would fain afterwards marry, of whom he says, "having damnation because they have made void their first faith," (1 Tim. c. 5, v. 12,) the vow of perpetual widowhood, which they took, when they might marry if they pleased; it is therefore in this very same sense we declare marriage to be unlawful to all those who received holy orders, and vowed perpetual virginity; for we know, by the word of God, that such people are obliged to perform what they had before promised to God, which you may also know to be true by the texts of Scripture produced in the second paragraph of this section.

Objections answered.

But pray, brother, how do you account for these following texts of Scripture, which are in direct opposition to your doc-

trine of celibacy or single life of priests? First, we read in Matt. 19, v. 11, that "all men cannot receive this saying, save those to whom it is given." I answer, this text is wrong translated; * for it ought to be translated thus: "All men do not receive this saying." Now there is a large difference between not doing a thing and not being able to do it.

The second is, "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife." 1 Cor. c. 7, v. 2. Well, what then? Will you infer from thence, that marriage is the only means to avoid fornication? If you do, St. Paul, who had no wife, yet was no fornicator, will rise in judgment against you for abusing the sense of his sacred words. Nay, you will draw upon yourself the just indignation of numberless widows and widowers, maids and bachelors, in this country, who will tell you they can live free from fornication without engaging themselves in the bonds of wedlock. If, therefore, God's grace be not wanting to thousands among the laity, who live single to their very deaths, we cannot doubt but it flows more plentifully on those who embrace the single state out of a pure zeal to devote themselves entirely to his service. Whence it is plain St. Paul's words imply no general precept, but only an advice to those, who, being under no engagements, are at full liberty to marry if they please, and find, perhaps, by experience, that marriage is the best security against their natural weakness.

But does not St. Paul say it is better to marry than to burn? He does so. But he does not say that marriage is the only remedy against burning. Let us suppose a married man so unhappy as to hate his own wife, and at the same time burn for the wife of his neighbor, (I fear the case is not impossible:) must he marry her? No, surely. What, then, must he do? I believe St. Paul would advise him to have recourse

* If any one doubts the truth of what the author asserts here, and in many other places throughout this work, respecting the mistranslation of the Bible by Protestants, let him read *Ward's Errata of the Protestant Bible*, and he will at once be convinced that the charge is well founded. — *Editor Boston edition.*

to the remedies himself made use of against the buffets of Satan; that is, to prayer and mortification. It is therefore plain that there are other remedies, besides that of marriage, provided by Almighty God against the burnings of concupiscence; and these are the remedies which persons engaged in holy orders and religious vows make use of when they find themselves assaulted by unlawful desires; so that we may reasonably hope matters are not so bad as you represent them, when you tell us that forbidding to marry leads to much lewdness and villany, as fornication, adultery, incest, &c. Nay, if it does, St. Paul was highly to blame when he debarred widows devoted to God the liberty of it.

You say, thirdly, "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?" 1 Cor. c. 9, v. 5. Here, again, the sacred word of God is put to the torture to force it to speak the language of flesh and blood. For, 1. How could St. Paul, who had no wife, have the power to lead one about? 2. How is it probable the apostles should lead their wives about, since St. Jerom assures us positively that they who were married lived separated from the use of wedlock? But 3dly, the whole context shows that St. Paul speaks not of a wife, but of a woman, or *diaconissa*, to attend him in his travels, and provide necessaries for him, probably out of her own substance.

This, I say, is proved from the context. For the whole drift of the chapter whenæ it is taken (as appears from the title prefixed to it in the Protestant Bible) is to show that ministers of the gospel must live by the gospel. "Am I not (says St. Paul) an apostle? Are not you my work in the Lord?" v. 1. "Have we not power to eat and drink?" v. 4. Then follows the text in question, which, truly translated, is this: Have we not power to lead about a sister, a *woman*, as well as the other apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? v. 5. And he goes on thus: "Who goeth to warfare any time at his own charges? Who planteth a vineyard,

and eateth not of the fruit? Or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock?" v. 6, &c.

But must not the apostles have stood in need of more than was necessary for their own subsistence, if St. Paul spoke of the wives of his fellow-apostles, who were in no condition to maintain their husbands, but rather to be maintained by them? So that their company would have been an additional charge to them, instead of a help; especially if they lived together as husbands and wives, and an increase of children were continually coming upon them. It is therefore plain the Protestant translators have used violence to the aforesaid text, and made St. Paul speak things he never thought of, to render him favorable to the first reformers, and encourage others to follow their religious example.

The 4th and 5th texts quoted by you have the same tendency, and are as follows: "A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife, (1 Tim. c. 3, v. 2,) having faithful children." Tit. c. 1, v. 6. I doubt not but you think this a clear text against us. And so it will be if you can infer from it that a bishop must be a married man, according to St. Paul's rule. But if that be his meaning, why did he not follow his own rule? For it is very certain St. Paul was a bishop, and it is no less certain he never was married. The true meaning therefore of his words is, that a man was not fit to be promoted to episcopacy, who had been married oftener than once; so that the force of St. Paul's rule is not in the word *wife*, but in the word *ONE*.

But does it not follow, at least, that St. Paul allowed bishops to marry once? I answer, it follows that a man who was or had been once married might be made a bishop. But it does not follow that bishops were allowed to marry after their consecration. And the reason of St. Paul's rule in the choice of persons to be promoted to holy orders was, because in his time virginity was so rare, both among Jews and Gentiles, that if neither married men nor widowers had been chosen, the Church would have been destitute of necessary pastors

Yet even then he would not have those taken to the altar who had been married twice, and thereby appeared to have stronger ties to earth than was suitable to so holy an employment.

Your 6th text is, "Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled." Heb. c. 13, v. 4. I answer, marriage is honorable in all; but sacrilege and adultery are not very honorable things. The pretended marriage of Theodore, the monk, appeared not at all honorable to St. Chrysostom, who told him it was worse than adultery. Nor was the marriage of widows, that "began to wax wanton against Christ," honorable in the judgment of St. Paul. And Luther's marriage with a nun was scandalous to the highest degree, even in the judgment of Melancthon, who was much scandalized at it.

But do I then infer that the Protestant clergy live in continual adultery? No. For I am as fully persuaded that their marriage is valid, as that their ordination is null.

However, I cannot have the same opinion of the marriage of the first reformers; for many of them had been validly ordained in the Catholic Church, and by their orders were tied to her laws and discipline. Some of them had, over and above, made solemn vows of perpetual chastity; and I presume vows made to God are not cobwebs, to be broken through at pleasure. I am not, however, surprised that Protestants, though now free from such engagements, should still stand up for the marriage both of religious and priests, by reason of the signal service it did to their church in its infancy. For the reformation was clinched by it, and the price of its full establishment were thousands of sacrileges and broken vows.

Priests and nuns, whose example was like to have an influence on many of both sexes, were too considerable a part of the Church to be neglected or overlooked in a general reform; and liberty was not only the most proper bait to be set before them, but the best reason in the world to convince them that a reformation was necessary. But lest time and age, and the

troublesome after-qualms of conscience, should suggest dangerous thoughts of returning to their ancient Mother Church, the best expedient to keep them stanch to the cause was to hamper them fast in the noose of wedlock. Here, then, the pulpits were employed to preach down the obligation of religious vows. Scriptural texts were taught to speak a language agreeable to the desires of flesh and blood, nunneries were set open, and priests allowed to exchange their breviaries for more diverting company. Nay, to their great comfort and edification, Martin Luther, with his religious bride, Kate Boren, had already set the example; and it was too charming not to be followed by many, who would have thought a mere change of religion a very dull and insipid thing to be damned for, if there had been nothing to be got by it in this world.

Thus fallen priests and nuns became the nursing fathers and mothers of the reformed churches, and the new gospel was propagated, like mankind after the fall of Adam, not by a spiritual, but carnal generation. Not that all flocked in to become votaries to Venus; for great numbers abhorred the thing, and chose to be beggars abroad, and to fly for sanctity to foreign monasteries, rather than defile their souls, and dishonor their sacred character, with practices unheard of before, though then varnished over with the plausible name of marriage. But let that be as it will, it is plain the reformation was built upon the ruins of broken vows, and would have gone on but very slowly, if that untoward block of celibacy had not been removed out of its way.

SECTION XVII.

Of Antichrist.

I. WHEREAS the Scripture affirms that Antichrist shall be but one particular man, saying thus of him, (2 Thess. c. 2, v. 3,) "The man of sin, the son of perdition." "No, no,"

say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "Antichrist is no particular man; and though the fathers were of that opinion, as our Mr. Whitaker confesses, (*lib. de Antichristo*, p. 21,) yet they have erred; wherefore Antichrist is a series of distinct popes, successively living, one after another." Truly, brother, if this doctrine had been true, it would prove that we have had already many hundred Antichrists, because there have been many hundred popes since the time of Christ; yet I could never read, in any ancient or modern history, that any of those popes have been received by the Jews for the true Messiah; yet I see in Scripture that Christ foretold the contrary of the man Antichrist, saying, "I am come in my Father's name, and you receive me not. If another shall come in his own name, him you will receive." John, c. 5, v. 43.

2. Whereas the Scripture says of Antichrist's presumption, (2 Thess. c. 2, v. 4,) that "he is lifted up above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "it cannot be true that Antichrist would lift himself above all that is called God; because none of the popes, whom we affirm to be Antichrist, have ever assumed the arrogance that they would have themselves worshipped above all that is called God."

3. Whereas the Scripture says of Antichrist, (Rev. c. 13, v. 13,) "And he doth great signs, so that he maketh even fire to come down from heaven upon the earth, in the sight of men." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "such signs ought not to happen in the days of Antichrist, because we cannot prove that any of the popes have ever wrought them."

4. Whereas the Scripture says, that Antichrist will cause (Rev. c. 13, v. 17) "that in his days no man shall buy or sell, but he that hath the mark or name of the beast, or the number of his name." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "Antichrist will not impose that upon the people in his own days, because the Roman Antichrist never hindered any body to buy or sell lawfully, neither did he re-

quire of those that bought and sold in his time, that they should have his mark, or the number of his name."

5. Whereas the Scripture says (Rev. c. 11, v. 7, 8, &c.) that "in the streets of Jerusalem Antichrist shall kill the two witnesses which the Lord will send to prophesy against him." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "that cannot be verified of Antichrist; because we cannot prove that ever the Roman Antichrist has killed those two prophets, either in Jerusalem or elsewhere."

6. Whereas Christ says (Mark, c. 13, v. 24, 25, &c.) that "in those days, after the tribulation (of Antichrist,) the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars of heaven shall fall." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "such alterations were not to happen after the tribulation of Antichrist, for after all the excommunications and thunderbolts, which were fulminated against us by the Roman Antichrist, in his cursed council of Trent; yet we manifestly see that the sun, moon, and stars, shine now as bright as ever they did before."

7. Whereas Christ says (Matt. c. 24, v. 22) that "for the sake of the elect, Antichrist's days shall be shortened." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "indeed his days are rather prolonged, for we see they are very numerous already, and we are now much afraid that they will continue longer than we expected in the beginning of our reformation; for we thought then that we would immediately break down the walls of Rome; and pull Antichrist by the beard from his Papal throne."

8. Whereas three several texts of Scripture affirm that the man Antichrist shall continue but three years and a half; "and he shall speak words against the Most High, and he shall think himself able to change times and laws, and they shall be delivered into his hand, until a time, and times, and half a time." Dan. c. 7, v. 25. "And from the time when the continual sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination unto desolation set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days." Dan. c. 12, v. 11. "And there

was given to it a mouth, speaking great things, and blasphemies, and power was given to it to act forty-two months." Rev. c. 13, v. 5. "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "Antichrist must act longer than three years and a half, since our learned ministers affirm that the pope of Rome is Antichrist; for our Mr. Napper (*On the Rev.* pp. 43, 68) says that "Pope Sylvester is the man, who reigned twenty-one years and four days." And Melancthon (*in locis postremo editis*) says, that "it is Pope Zozimus, who reigned three years, four months, and seven days." Beza (*Confess. General.* c. 7, sect. 12) affirms that it was "Pope Leo, who reigned twenty years, one month, and thirteen days." Mr. Foulk, (in his *Answer to a Counterfeit Catholic*, p. 36,) Dunham, (in his *Treatise of Antichrist*, lib. 1, c. 4,) Mr. Willet, (in his *Synop.* p. 160,) Mr. Parkins, (in his *Exposition of the Creed*, p. 307,) and Danæus, (*contra Bellar. part 1*, p. 131,) affirm that "Pope Boniface the Third (who reigned twenty-one years, eight months, and twenty-three days) was the first Antichrist, and began to reign about the year 607." And Bullinger says (*On the Apocalip.* c. 13, ser. 61, fol. 198) that "Antichrist ought first to appear in the year 763;" and Junius, (*On the Rev.* c. 20, p. 257,) that "Hildebrand was the man, (who reigned twelve years, one month, and three days,) about the year of Christ 1074." And Mr. Fox affirms (*in Apocalip.* p. 98) that "Antichrist ought to come in the year 1300."

9. You may now, brother, see, by these various opinions, the doctrine of your learned ministers, who in this respect are not unlike Samson's foxes, "whose tails were tied together, but their heads went different ways, in order to burn and destroy the Philistines' corn." Judges, c. 15, v. 4, &c. And precisely so your ministers proceed in this matter; for they all agree in one opinion, alleging that "the pope of Rome is that Antichrist, who is so much spoken of and detested in Scripture;" but their different opinions prove no more than that they all agree in order to deceive the poor ignorant people, whom they persuade that their own foolish

fancies are conformable to the word of God; and if you reflect seriously on the several answers which I gave to the aforesaid texts of Scripture, you will plainly see that they are truly deduced from your own principles; and consequently you will perceive that the pope of Rome is not the Antichrist of which the Scripture makes mention.

SECTION XVIII.

Of the Chief Pastor of the Church.

I. WHEREAS Christ said to Peter, (Matt. c. 16, v. 19,) "And I will give up to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed in heaven." "No, no, Christ," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "you gave no such keys or particular power to Peter, any more than you gave to the rest of the apostles; for if you had given him such a particular power, our Mr. Fulke would not have said, (in his *Confutation of the Papist's Quarrels*, p. 4,) that 'many of the ancient fathers were deceived, to think more of Peter's prerogative, and the pope of Rome's dignity, than by the word of God was given to either of them.'" Indeed, brother, it clearly appears by these words of Mr. Fulke, that the holy fathers of the primitive Church have not been of your religion, which affirms the contrary of what they openly professed and taught concerning St. Peter and the pope of Rome's supremacy; and I think that it is safer for me in conscience to prefer these holy fathers' judgments herein, to your ministers' new notions, which are warranted by no Scripture or antiquity. As for their evasion or subterfuge, alleging that the rest of the apostles had as much power as St. Peter, I answer that we acknowledge the power of loosing and binding sins was given to all the apostles, after Christ had spoken

the former words to St. Peter, as is evident, John, c. 20, v. 23. But we say that "the keys of the kingdom of heaven were never said in Scripture to be given to any of the apostles, except to St. Peter only, and as we lawfully infer that he is the commander-in-chief of the army to whom the keys of the city are delivered at his entrance into the town, and that he is the chief officer of a castle or family, to whom the master commits the keys," even so we may as lawfully infer that Christ, by telling St. Peter that "he would give him the keys of the kingdom of heaven," meant to confer on him a superior degree of dignity, which would not be common to all the rest of the apostles; and you may plainly discover the truth of this by these other words of Christ: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father, who is in heaven; and I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church," &c. Matt. c. 16, v. 17, 18. That is, "I will build my church upon your firm and true faith, not only for your own sake, but also for the perpetual good of the church;" and lest people should imagine that this building of the church on St. Peter's faith should be overthrown at Peter's death, hence Christ declares that himself had prayed to his heavenly Father, that "his faith should not fail." Luke, c. 22, v. 32. And as that faith was then to continue in the true Church of Christ, in all future ages, even so St. Peter's supremacy was to be transmitted to his lawful successors in all future ages; for as the chair of Moses was always filled by the successors of Moses till the coming of Christ, even so the chair of Peter was to be so furnished with such successors until the coming of Christ, at the day of judgment; for Peter succeeded Christ upon earth, even as Aaron succeeded Moses. Levit. c. 8. And Linus succeeded Peter, even as Eleazar succeeded Aaron, &c.; so that, as God had provided his church successively in the old law with high priests, who, for the personal wickedness of any of them, did not cease to govern his church by them, even so he hath provided his Church, in the law of grace, with such high priests as should have (by his bounty)

many advantages above the high priests of the old law ; and it cannot be truly said, that this derogates from Christ's honor or priesthood ; for though Christ himself is said to be the foundation and chief corner-stone, yet we see, from Scripture, that he did not think it unfit to communicate the title of foundation to others, as is evident by the following words of St. Paul : " We are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." Ephes. c. 2, v. 20. As it does not therefore derogate from Christ's honor that he communicated the aforesaid title of foundation to others, so it does not derogate from his honor (inasmuch as he is said to be the Chief Priest) that he communicated the title of being chief priest to others ; and as it does not derogate from Christ's honor, inasmuch as he is said to be the King and supreme Lord of the universe, that he has given the title of king to others of subordinate power, whom God thought necessary for the proper government of his own people, and therefore obliged his people to obey them. 1 Pet. c. 2, v. 13. And even so it does not derogate from Christ's honor (inasmuch as he is said to be the Supreme Head of the Church) that he has given the title of being his own vicar-general, and supreme head of the Church upon earth, in spiritual affairs, to St. Peter, and to his lawful successors, whom he thought necessary, for the proper government of his Church ; and therefore he obliged us to obey them, " not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake." Rom. c. 13, v. 5. You see, brother, by these examples, how falsely your ministers infer that the true Church of Christ ought not to have a supreme pastor upon earth, because Christ himself is said to be her Chief Priest and chief Corner-stone.

2. Whereas the Scripture says (John, c. 21, v. 15, &c.) that " Christ gave in charge to Peter, to feed his lambs and sheep." " No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, " Christ gave Peter no more charge to feed his lambs and sheep than he gave to every one of the rest of the apostles, as our ministers affirm." Pray, brother, show me this doctrine, by

some text of clear Scripture, or else acknowledge ingeniously that you are totally unable to produce such a text, but that you only give credit to this doctrine upon your ministers' word. In the mean time, I shall advert to what Christ says here of Peter: "Lovest thou me more than these?" (v. 15;) for it is a sign that he then intended to give him, for that greater love, some exalted dignity which would not be common to the rest of the apostles, whom then he excluded, by speaking thrice in the same terms to Peter in the singular number; and after Peter gave him an affirmative answer at each time, then Christ spoke, and gave him the charge of feeding both his lambs and sheep, which charge still remains; because the office of a pastor is an ordinary and perpetual office, and as long as there are lambs and sheep to be fed, so long there must be a pastor to feed and govern them; which because Peter could not perform in person these many hundred years past, there must needs be some other lawful successor, to execute this office in his place; for this high pastorage upon earth was chiefly instituted by Christ, through the paternal care and love he had for his church, which he intended should stand forever, according to this manner of government.



SECTION XIX.

Of Prayer for the Dead, Purgatory, and Indulgences.

1. WHEREAS the Scripture says (Mach. c. 42, v. 43) that "Judas Machabeus sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem, for sacrifice to be offered for the sin of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection; for if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "it is neither holy

nor lawful to pray for the dead, and we deny that book to be canonical which affirms it. And this occasioned our Mr. Fulke (in his *Confutation of Purgatory*, p. 362,) to say that ‘Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustin, Jerom, Chrysostom, and a great many more of the fathers, have erred in believing that sacrifice for the dead was an apostolic tradition.’” * Truly, brother, it plainly appears, by these former words of your own Mr. Fulke, that these holy fathers were neither Protestants nor Presbyterians; for if they had been either the one or the other, they would not think it would be lawful to offer sacrifice for the souls of those that were dead. And it also appears by Mr. Fulke’s accusation of the holy fathers, that the doctrine of purgatory is no new invention of the pope, though your ministers tell you the contrary.

2. As for their denying that the book of Machabees is canonical, I answer, that the Church, which is all the testimony we have to prove that the Bible is the word of God, (see sect. 24,) tells us also that this book is canonical, and the third council of Carthage (held in the year 397) has asserted it (*con.* 47) in the canon, which the fathers of that council

* Let these illustrious fathers of the Church speak for themselves. St. Chrysostom says, “*It is not in vain that oblations are made for the dead; it is the ordinance of the Holy Ghost, who designs that we should help one another.*” St. Augustine also says, “*Oblations, prayers, and alms in abundance, are the true comfort we can procure to those who are dead.*” To show still further the antiquity of the custom of praying for the dead, I will add another proof from St. Augustine, who lived in the end of the fourth century. It is taken from the 13th chapter of the 9th book of his *Confessions*. “*I therefore, O thou God of my heart, become a petitioner to thee for the sins of this my mother, &c. O Lord, my God, do thou inspire thy servants, my brethren, thy children, my masters, whom I serve both with my heart, and my voice, and my pen, that as many of them as shall read these things may remember, at thine altar, Monica, thy hand maid, and Patricius, her husband.*” Thus speaks the luminary of the fourth century, which is more than sufficient to convince the most incredulous that the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church of the present day, in relation to this subject, is the same as that held in the days of St. Augustine. — *Ed.*

would not have done, if it had not then been generally believed by the Catholic Church that this book was canonical. But lest I should be too tedious in proving the truth of it, I will therefore only advance a proof which seems to be indisputably granted by your own ministers; that is, that this book is written by a true and faithful writer of the ancient church history; or else why do they place it in some of your Bibles? And without doubt also this book was written before our Savior's time; so that by the most grave testimony of such an ancient writer of ecclesiastical history, you must allow, first, that Judas Machabeus (who was then high priest, and also the chief commander of the Jews, God's only true servants in those times) held prayer for the dead to be lawful. Secondly, you must acknowledge that all the Jewish soldiers (being godly men, who had devoted their lives for the defence of the true faith) concurred in this act of piety; for the text says, that the twelve thousand drachms of silver had been a contribution made by the troops, that it might be offered as a sacrifice for the sins of their fellow-soldiers, who were slain in battle. Thirdly, you must also confess that this was not a private opinion in those times, but a thing done conformably to the custom of the Jewish church; which to this very day employs prayer for the dead, as is evident from the books written by the Jewish rabbies, who lived before and after the birth of Christ; and in proof I shall produce the following authors, who declare this truth: Rabbi Simeon (in *lib. 20, Ar. in Cap. 18 Gen.*), Menachim Siam, (in *Comment. ad Levit. c. 16.*) Rabbi Hisim Alphes, (*Scholiastes, ad cap. Roch.*), Rabbi Kimchi David, (in *Psalms 32.*) and Rabbi Moses, (in his *Symbolum Fidei Judæorum.*) printed in the year 1569, fol. 26, 27, and 32, where you may see the Jewish prescribed form of prayer for the dead; nay, your own Whitaker's words are a sufficient testimony; for he acknowledges (*cont. Duræum, lib. 1, p. 85*) that "prayer for the dead is some of the Jewish doctrine;" so you may now perceive that what I have alluded to above is true, viz., that what Judas Machabeus had done, concerning prayers for the dead, was not the

private opinion of him alone, but the common custom of the Jewish church; and if it had been then a novelty, the priests of Jerusalem (who knew full well their own custom of offering sacrifices) would not receive that money on such an account, lest they should be damnably guilty for conniving at the offering of an unlawful sacrifice; but you see they were so far from suspecting its unlawfulness, that, on the contrary, it was their own common doctrine; and though it was so publicly recorded, not fully two hundred years before Christ, and was generally believed and practised even in his and in the apostles' time, yet we can never discover that any person was then reprehended by them for maintaining it; even Calvin himself, in his Institutes, (l. 3, c. 5, sect. 10,) *admits that it was a received custom in the church to pray for the dead, above thirteen hundred years before his time.*

3. Nay, we see that it was so believed by the very apostles themselves; and hence St. Paul says, "What shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not again? Why are they then baptized for them?" 1 Cor. c. 15, v. 29. To what purpose do men undergo penance for the dead, if there be no resurrection, and if the soul do not still survive, expecting to be reunited to the body? St. Paul can speak here of no other baptism, that can profit the dead, but the baptism of penance; for so St. Mark, (c. 1,) and so St. Luke, (Acts, c. 2,) speak; and it is most certain that St. Paul takes his argument from that which can be performed for the dead with profit to them. We, therefore, who do well in baptizing with water young children that are not able to assist themselves, do also well to baptize the dead, by taking on ourselves this painful baptism of penance and prayer in their behalf, whom we know to be then wholly unable to help themselves, or ease their pains; and as God's infinite goodness is so merciful as to give effect to the baptism of children performed by us, even so he is merciful in giving effect to that other baptism of penance, which we perform for those poor souls who departed out of this life with some small sins, viz., an idle word, or a jocose lie, &c., for which his great

goodness doth not require eternal punishment; but because "nothing defiled can enter into heaven." Rev. c. 21, v. 27. Therefore he urges them to suffer in that temporal purging fire of purgatory, until they are sufficiently cleansed from those spots of small sins; and when they are thus purified, then he admits them to the enjoyment of his heavenly glory, as the following text doth clearly evince: "I will wait for God my Savior; my God will hear me: rejoice not, thou my enemy, over me, because I am fallen: I shall arise when I sit in darkness: the Lord is my light. I will bear the wrath of the Lord because I have sinned against him, until he judge my cause, and execute judgment for me: (behold what follows:) he will bring me forth into the light; I shall behold his justice." Micha, c. 7, v. 7, &c. Pray, brother, tell me from whence will God bring him to that light. Surely you will not say, that it is out of the hell of the damned spirits, for out of this there is no redemption; therefore it must be out of some other place, in which the soul suffers only for a time, and not perpetually.

4. You have an additional proof from these words of St. Paul: "If any man's work (that is, small sins, which he calls *works*) burn, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." 1 Cor. c. 3, v. 15. You see therefore by clear Scripture, how the soul may suffer, after this life, the temporal punishment of a purging fire; and also, by the following text, that we shall be accountable "for every idle word that we speak." Matt. c. 12, v. 36. But a lesser account will be required for them than for great sins, which Christ calls *beams*, and these only *motes*. Matt. c. 7, v. 3. Yet, because this stain of small sins must be purged before the soul goes to heaven, we are therefore liable to some punishment for them, but not eternal; for as we would think him a tyrant, who would punish every offence, both great and small, with a cruel death, so we would have too hard an opinion of God's justice if we should believe that for a small lie, or an idle word, he would punish the delinquent with the endless and unspeakable torment of hell fire, if the person die with-

out repentance, as thousands must needs do, who die suddenly, or out of their senses, or in their sleep. And lest we should entertain this unjust opinion of God's justice, Christ himself gives us a very clear proof of the contrary: "The servant who knew the will of his Lord, and does not according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew it not, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes." Luke, c. 12, v. 47, &c. When, therefore, it happens that people die, having only these small sins, for which they are to give an account, they must be beaten only with these few stripes, and not with many, which would happen if these stripes were to be inflicted in hell for all eternity.

5. Whereas the Scripture says, speaking of Christ, (Zacharias, c. 9, v. 11,) "Thou also, by the blood of thy testament, hast sent forth the prisoners out of the pit, wherein there is no water." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "he never sent such prisoners out of any pit at all. And so our Catechism against Popery says (p. 54) that 'it would be a great rashness to think that God takes pleasure in punishing his children for sins already pardoned.'" Pray, brother, content not yourself with this foolish doctrine, but oblige your ministers to show you, by some clear text of Scripture, (if they can,) that there is no such pit, wherein souls could be kept for a certain time, and not perpetually; and though I have shown you already (by the word of God) that there is such a prison, yet, for further proof, observe what Christ himself tells you concerning it, saying, "Make an agreement with thy adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him, lest perhaps thy adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison; amen, amen, I say to thee, Thou shalt not go from thence till thou pay the last farthing." Matt. c. 5, v. 25, 26. St. Jerom, in his commentary upon these words, says, "That is what the text declares, Thou shalt not go out of prison until thou pay even thy little sins." You see therefore by plain Scripture, and by St. Jerom's commentary upon it, that, after atoning for our little sins there is a

release for the soul, and consequently forgiveness of some sins in the world to come; and if there had been then no forgiveness of sins, Christ would not express the following words: "It shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor the world to come." Matt. c. 12, v. 32. For he supposes, by this expression, that there are some sins that are forgiven in the world to come, from which he excludes the sin against the Holy Ghost, of which he speaks in this passage.

6. Now, as to what your Catechism says, viz., that "it would be a great rashness to think that God takes pleasure in punishing his children for sins already forgiven," it is manifestly against the express word of God, as it is evident by what we read in the book of Numbers, that when the people had grievously offended God, by murmuring and sinning against him, yet when Moses prayed for them, the Lord said thus: "I have forgiven, according to thy word; but yet all the men that have seen the signs that I have done in Egypt, and in the wilderness, shall not see the land for which I swore to their fathers, Your carcasses shall lie in the wilderness, your children shall wander in the desert forty years, and shall bear your fornication, until the carcasses of their fathers be consumed in the desert." Num. c. 14, v. 20, 22, 23, 32, 33. You see, therefore, by Scripture, that God had forgiven those people their sins, and for those very same sins which he forgave, these sinners died in the wilderness, and their children suffered, for the space of forty years, all the troubles and fatigues of wandering in a wilderness. Can, then, any man of common sense wonder if they who had received pardon on these terms (and then were slain the very next day by their enemies) should for a time, yea, perhaps forty years, suffer some punishment after death? Eternal punishment (the former sin being forgiven) they could not suffer, if they did not commit other sins; yet manifestly some punishment after death could not but be due to them, seeing that so great a punishment was so justly laid on their children for that whole space of forty years. We read also in the second book of Samuel, that, upon David's repentance for

his sin of murder and adultery, God spoke to him by the prophet Nathan, as follows: "The Lord hath taken away thy sin; nevertheless, because thou hast given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, for this thing the child that is born to thee shall surely die: and it came to pass on the seventh day, that the child died." 2 Sam. c. 12, v. 13, 14, 18. Behold the sin taken away, and yet a punishment still remains due, even for that very sin, which was then forgiven; and I might point out to you several other examples of this from the Scripture; but the aforesaid will suffice, because by them it is made evident that, upon the true repentance of a sinner, though the pain of eternal punishment be then forgiven, yet the delinquent remains liable to the temporal punishment, which, when he suffers it not in this world before his death, he must suffer in the world to come, but not in the hell of the damned, because the sin is forgiven: therefore it must be in the prison of purgatory, out of which the soul cannot go "until he pay the last farthing." Matt. c. 5, v. 26.

7. Whereas the Scripture says, (1 Pet. c. 3, v. 18, &c.,) "Because Christ also indeed suffered for our sins, being put to death, died once in the flesh, but by the spirit brought to life, in which he also came and preached to those spirits that were in prison, who in the days of Noah had been incredulous when the ark was building." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "Christ's soul never preached to such spirits that were in prison, neither did it descend into hell, or into your Popish '*Limbus Patrum*,' but into the grave, as our learned ministers affirm; and hence our Carlisle wrote an entire whole book against that Papistical error which alleges the contrary." Pray, brother, do not think to stop my mouth or pen by such silly answers, for I always insist upon one point, which obliges you to show me your principles by the express word of God, or by some text of Scripture as it is expounded by the holy fathers of the primitive church, in their commentaries; show me, therefore, by such a text of Scripture, which prison that is, and who those spirits to

which Christ then preached after being put to death. Surely that prison cannot be the hell of the damned, for those souls could derive no benefit by Christ's preaching to them; because for all eternity there is no redemption for them. Therefore it must be some other prison, out of which there was a hope of release; and if you search your whole Bible from the first of Genesis to the last verse of the Revelations, I defy you to find out any such prison, except that which we call *Limbus Patrum*, or *Purgatory*.

8. This is that place to which the Scriptures sometimes attribute the name *hell*, as you may see by the following text: "Christ being slain, God raised him up; having loosed the sorrows of hell." Acts, c. 2, v. 24. Your good ministers have corrupted this text by putting in the word *death*, instead of the word *hell*, that thereby they might obscure the meaning and force of the text; yet I see they have truly translated with us that prophecy of David—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; nor wilt thou give thy Holy One to see corruption." Psalm 16, v. 10. St. Peter applies these words to Christ's soul, and not to David's. "For," saith he, "David being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn to him, with an oath, that of the fruits of his loins one should sit upon his throne, seeing he spoke of the resurrection of Christ; for neither was he left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption." Acts, c. 2, v. 30, 31. What more proof of Christ's soul descending into hell can reasonably be required by a Christian, who pretends not to be an infidel? And if you believe St. Augustin, he tells you the same truth: "That our Lord, being mortified in the flesh, went into hell, is very certain; for that prophecy which saith, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell,' cannot be contradicted, which lest any man should presume to understand otherwise, (as your ministers do now-a-days,) St. Peter doth expound it in the Acts of the Apostles, &c.;" and then he concludes with the following words: "Who, then, except an infidel, will deny Christ to have been in hell?" *St. Augustin, Epist. ad Evod.* 99. And speaking on these words of Christ to the good thief, (Luke,

c. 23, v. 43,) "This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise," he also says, "It is not to be thought by these words that paradise is heaven, for the man Christ Jesus was not to be in heaven on that day, but in hell according to his soul, and in the grave according to his flesh: the Scripture clearly shows that he was in hell according to his soul." *St. Augustin, Epist. 57, ad Dardan.* But, as the same holy father shows, (on the 87th Psalm,) he was so in hell, that he was free from suffering any torments in his soul; but he began there his triumph over the infernal powers, freeing the souls of the just from their captivity, and carrying them most gloriously with him to heaven, according to this passage of St. Paul: "Ascending on high, he led captivity captive, he gave gifts to men; that he ascended, what is it, but because he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?" *Ephes. c. 4, v. 8, 9.* Upon these words St. Jerom speaks thus in his commentary: "Our Lord and Savior descended into hell, that, being victorious, he might lead with him the souls of those who were kept there enclosed; whence it came to pass that, after his resurrection, many bodies of the saints were seen in the holy city."

9. You see now, brother, how we have all the former texts of Scripture (to which I might add many more) in proof of that place which we call *purgatory*; yet they are so little regarded by you, that you rather give credit to your ministers' ridiculous contradictions and foolish evasions, than believe what God tells you here, both in the New and Old Testament. Your ministers make use of so many tricks in expounding the fifth article of the Apostles' Creed, (which says "that Christ descended into hell,") that it would be too tedious for me to relate the pitiful shifts to which the defence of their bad cause drives them. The most part of these men will have you to say that Christ descended only into the grave, and so by this they retrench the whole article, and persuade you that you ought to say, "was crucified, dead, and buried, he descended into *the grave.*" But your Bishop Usher would have you substitute in place of "descended

into hell," "he ascended into heaven;" and so for *descended* you have *ascended*, and for the word *hell* you have the word *heaven*. But your Presbyterian ministers, finding that these subterfuges are altogether insufficient, thought it the easiest way for themselves to deny that the creed itself was apostolic, which they have done, (as may be seen by their Shorter Catechism, p. 258,) that thereby they might render the people regardless of what it contains, when all its authority is taken away. Indeed, I confess that this Presbyterian shift might, in some manner, serve their turn concerning this point, if the truth of purgatory were not as expressly contained in the Scriptures as it is in the Apostles' Creed; and let them who believe the creed to be apostolic, observe what St. Cyril and the fathers of the Alexandrian council declare to Nestorius the heretic, who pretended to believe the Nicene Creed, and yet denied the blessed virgin Mary to be the mother of God; wherefore these fathers wrote him the following words: (Epist. 10.) "It is not sufficient that you profess with us the symbol of faith; for you do not understand nor expound it rightly, but rather perversely, although you confess its words with your tongue." I say the same to those who confess the creed to be apostolic; for the light of reason might show them, that it is not sufficient for salvation to confess the words of the creed with the tongue, but that it is also necessary to understand and believe it in that true sense and meaning in which the apostles understood it, when they left it to believers, as a summary comprehending the chief articles of the Christian faith.

Objections answered.

• But, brother, notwithstanding all you have said on the subject, we shall prove from the following texts of clear Scripture that there is no such place as purgatory. 1st. "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord; from henceforth, says the spirit, that they may rest from their labor." Rev.

14, v. 13. I answer, that death puts an end to all laboring or working for salvation, according to these words of our Savior: "The night cometh, when no man can work." John, c. 9, v. 4. But it does not put an end to all suffering, except it be in relation to such pious souls as are perfectly innocent or purified by their sufferings in this life.

2dly. The doctrine of purgatory is dangerous and groundless from five reasons. First, because there is no ground for it in Scripture. Secondly, because they that belong to God can be nowhere afflicted but he is afflicted with them. The first, brother, is answered already, and I promise to answer the second as soon as I have capacity enough to understand that it is any thing to the purpose.

3dly. Because it denies the fulness of Christ's satisfaction. I answer, that if suffering for our sins in the life to come be injurious to Christ's satisfaction, then suffering for them in this life, carrying our cross, and bearing worthy fruits of repentance, to which the gospel exhorts us, must likewise be injurious to it.

The 4th reason is, because the doctrine of purgatory lessens the horrid nature of sin. I answer, if purgatory could expiate the guilt of mortal sin; or if men were naturally fond of suffering bitterly even for lesser offences, I should be of your opinion. But it is above my comprehension that punishments and sufferings should lessen the horror of sin.

The last reason against purgatory is, that the desire St. Paul had of being dissolved was, that he might be with Christ. Phil. c. 1, v. 23. Very right; and it is the desire of all pious souls. But they leave it to God to judge, whether at their dissolution they shall be worthy to be immediately admitted to his blessed sight; and resign themselves entirely to his holy will and pleasure.

As to what you say, that the doctrine of purgatory impairs the confidence and comforts of the saints, I can easily guess what sort of saints you mean. But if the fear of purgatory lessens any man's confidence in God, surely the fear of hell

will lessen it much more; and yet we are all exhorted in the gospel to fear Him who can cast both soul and body into hell. Matt. c. 10, v. 28.

10. Whereas Christ says, (Matt. c. 16, v. 19,) "And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven." "No, no, Christ," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "you did not give that power of loosing to the Church, in order to grant any indulgences, as the Papists pretend to grant, who often give indulgences of many hundred years to people, and do also hereby forgive them those sins which they did not *yet* commit." I beseech you, brother, to show me (if you can) by clear Scripture, that it is not in the power of the Church to grant indulgences; and if you offer to produce such a text, (which I defy you to do,) you will consequently condemn the daily practice of your own ministers, who upon certain considerations, and at the serious repentance of their public penitents, often remit them some of that penance, which they first oblige them to perform; and truly this is the same method which the Catholic Church practises, when she gives indulgences, which she declares to be no more than a relaxation or remission of some part (or the whole) of those penitential works, to which a sinner is liable by the ancient canons of the Church, which enjoined, for certain sins, certain periods of time to do penance; and this according to the nature and gravity of the sin committed; for example: to fast so many months on bread and water for such a sin, to fast so many years for another greater sin, and so forth; so that a great sinner, by blasphemies, perjuries, or the like, might in one week, or in one month, run in debt to those canons, above a hundred, or perhaps a thousand, years' penance; which penalties the clemency of church discipline changes into a milder and less severe satisfaction; and this she does not for the sake of receiving money, or bribes, as some of your sect falsely allege; for several general councils and popes' decrees have expressly prohibited to

give or receive any sort of gift, either directly or indirectly, for indulgences, or for any other spiritual function, so that when indulgences are given, they are granted gratis, and before any one can derive benefit from them, we teach that they must sincerely repent of their former sins, and also perform those pious works, which he that grants the indulgence appoints, and the performance of these good works is a practice of excellent virtues; for example, prayers, almsdeeds, and the like; so that indulgence, in effect, is but a commutation to a less severe satisfaction, instead of the great and rigorous penance enjoined by the canons; and this is the meaning of the indulgences which are often granted for a hundred or a thousand years; and not that they signify a forgiveness of sins not yet committed, (as you often told me heretofore;) for this was never the intention of the Catholic Church in granting indulgences; but when the sins which any one has already committed are so great that they deserve a hundred or a thousand years' penance, according to the canons, the same Church that framed these canons, being now moved by some just cause, and seeing the contrition of the penitent, is mercifully pleased to commute that long penance into a shorter; and I appeal to the serious and unbiased reader, if the belief of this principle, according to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, gives any latitude to sin; whereas we teach that there is no benefit to be expected by indulgences, till first the sinner reconciles himself to God by penance, and not, as Dr. Stillingfleet, either maliciously or ignorantly, insinuates. But, let him say what he pleases, the power of the Church, in granting indulgences, is evident to any who rightly believe both the former and following texts: Matt. c. 18, v. 18. John, c. 20, v. 22, 23. And, brother, if you have not a mind to be accounted as a heathen or publican, (Matt. c. 18, v. 17,) you ought to hear and observe what the Church universally teaches concerning this and all the other points of her doctrine

Objections answered.

You talk largely, brother, concerning the authority of your church; but we build our authority upon the Scriptures, which plainly contradict your doctrine of indulgences in the following texts of clear Scripture. The first is, "There is no pardon of sin, but by the mercy of God through the blood of Christ." Rom. c. 5, v. 10, and Eph. c. 1, v. 7. I answer, all this is very orthodox, but nothing to the purpose; because indulgences are not a pardon of sins, but a release of temporal punishments due to them. And even this is not granted but by the power given to the Church by Jesus Christ, and through his sacred blood and the mercies of God.

The second proof is, because there is no such thing in Scripture, that the merits of one saint should be able to make satisfaction for the sins of another. But, brother, I hope it is plain in Scripture that the merits of Jesus Christ are able to make satisfaction for the sins of even all mankind. And all indulgences have their validity from his infinite merits. However, I answer, it is very plain in Scripture that the prayers of saints have often appeased God's wrath, and stopped his hand from punishing the sins of others so severely as they had deserved; and it cannot be doubted but it was the faith and virtuous behavior of those saints that rendered their prayers so available in the sight of God. Thus God Almighty sent Eliphaz to his servant Job, to be prayed for by him with this assurance: "For him will I accept, lest I deal with you after your folly." Job, c. 42, v. 8. Thus likewise was God grievously offended at the mutiny of the Israelites against Moses, and had resolved to send a plague amongst them to destroy them. He was appeased upon the earnest solicitation of Moses, and answered him, "I have pardoned them, according to thy word," (Num. c. 14, v. 20,) to wit, the temporal punishment he had designed to inflict upon them.

The third and last proof is, because "Christ needeth not

any merits of saints to be added to his satisfaction." This is most certainly true, because the satisfaction Christ has made for us is of infinite value; and whatever is infinite cannot need any thing to be added to it. But will you infer from thence that therefore we need not do penance for our sins, nor receive the sufferings God sends us in the spirit of penance? If you do, you ~~give the~~ lie to the word of God in a thousand places. Nay, there is not a truth more certain than that we are bound to punish our sins, and do penance for them, notwithstanding the infinite satisfaction made by Christ.

But why are we bound to do this, if Christ has fully satisfied the divine justice, and stands in no need of having our satisfaction joined to his? The reason is, because Christ having purchased an absolute dominion over us with the infinite price of his blood, it cannot be disputed he may lay what terms or conditions he pleases upon us as means, without which the price he has paid down shall not be applied unto us. And therefore, though it be certainly true, that having satisfied superabundantly for us, he might have applied that satisfaction to us without subjecting us to any penal works or temporal sufferings, after the guilt of sin, together with its eternal punishment, was remitted, yet it pleased his infinite wisdom, both for our greater good and the manifestation of his justice as well as mercy, to establish things upon another foot, by changing the eternal punishment into a temporal one, and obliging us to purchase the fruits and application of his infinite satisfaction by doing worthy fruits of penance, and submitting humbly and patiently to the sufferings he shall see fit to lay upon us. And it is this we call satisfaction; which (to express myself in the very words of the celebrated Bossuet, p. 68) is in effect but an application of the infinite satisfaction made by Jesus Christ, whether to ourselves or others.

Whence it follows, that, though Christ needs not our sufferings or penal works to be added to his satisfaction, he requires them of us. And unless we submit to the laws he

has thought fit to impose upon us, we render ourselves unworthy of becoming partakers of the happiness he has purchased for us.



SECTION XX.

not divine worship

Of the Worship and Invocation of Angels and Saints.

1. WHEREAS the Scripture says (Joshua, c. 5. v. 14) that "Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and worshipped the angel." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "people ought not to be seduced by that example of Joshua, for our ministers affirm, in their confession of faith, (c. 21,) that 'we ought not, by any means, to give religious worship either to angels or to saints.'" Truly, brother, I am greatly surprised that your ministers can have the impudence to assert this doctrine; whereas the angel was not then only willing to permit this honor given him by Joshua, but also commanded him to reverence the ground that was sanctified by the angel's presence. "Loose," said he, "thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy." (v. 15.) Surely you cannot pretend to say that this kind of worship (paid by such a holy man as Joshua, and permitted by the angel) is *latria* or divine, seeing the angel, when he first appeared, told Joshua that he was but a prince of the host of the Lord; and if you reply that we may adore angels, with religious worship, as Joshua did, but not saints, behold how the word of God testifies that this kind of worship is given to those who are eminent for sanctity in this world; for Abdias, governor of the house of Achab, king of Israel, meeting with poor Elias the prophet, "when he knew him, he fell on his face, and said, Art thou my lord Elias?" 1 Kings, c. 18, v. 7. And the children of the prophets, seeing Eliseus, said, The spirit of Elias hath rested upon Eliseus; and coming to meet him, they worshipped him, falling to the ground, or, as your ministers translate, "they bowed themselves to the ground before him"

2 Kings, c. 2, v. 15. You see, therefore, by clear Scripture that it was not through any worldly respect, but merely on account of spiritual excellence, that those people worshipped the aforesaid holy men; and consequently you ought to confess that this kind of worship is not that of civil honor, which is due to men of human dignity; neither can you say that it was a divine worship, because the kind of worship which we call *latria* requires that the act of the understanding (wherewith we apprehend the excellency of the object) should be immediately referred to an infinite excellence which happens in the worship of God alone, but could not then happen; for the Scripture says, in the last example, that they bowed to Eliseus, "because the spirit of Elias had rested upon him." Therefore that worship must be only religious that is given on account of his spiritual excellence; but this spiritual excellence is incomparably more eminent in those who are now made co-heirs with Christ himself in participating in all heavenly gifts and glory; to them therefore religious bowing or worship is due, and we are commanded by St. Paul "to render to all their due, to whom honor, honor; owe to no man any thing." Rom. c. 13, v. 7, 8. Behold a precept, for which you often ask, when you desire me to show you a command, which bids us to honor angels or saints.

2. I know you will say that the angel "desired St. John not to worship himself, but to worship God." Rev. c. 19, v. 10, c. 22, v. 8, 9. To which I answer, that St. John then twice worshipped the angel, (as you may see by these texts, which, as you pretend, favor false opinions;) but if the first adoration had been of its own nature idolatrous and sinful, surely St. John would never the second time have committed that idolatrous, damnable, and sinful act, both knowingly and willingly; and this so very soon after he had been warned by the angel not to do it. It was not therefore by reason of any unlawfulness in the action, that the angel willed him not to worship himself, but the angel refused, at both times, this honor, through his singular respect for St. John, whom he knew to have been at the last supper, per-

mitted to recline on our Savior's breast. St. John, c. 21, v. 20. And so he would not permit him to lie now prostrate at his own feet, whom he knew also to be highly favored by God with so many admirable heavenly visions; moreover to be a virgin, a priest, an apostle, a prophet, an evangelist, and that very disciple whom Christ so singularly loved. John, c. 21, v. 20. Therefore he would not admit of such a profound respect at his hands, but humbly said unto him, "I am thy fellow-servant." Behold how the angel respected him; yet St. John's humility working still upon himself more, by seeing an angel so humble, and knowing what Christ had said before, viz., that "even the least in the kingdom of heaven was greater than the great John Baptist," (Matt. c. 11, v. 11,) — to wit, according to the present state, — he therefore conceived meanly of himself; not only the first but also the second time showed to the angel that honor which he knew to be due to him. The truth of what I say here may be confirmed by the example of Joshua, who, after worshipping the angel, was bid to honor him more, by reverencing the place whereon he stood. But why need I go so far to show you an example? Whereas it is said to the angel of Philadelphia, "Behold, I will make them come and adore before thy feet." Rev. c. 3, v. 9. Do you think, brother, that God would cause those people to worship this angel, if that kind of worship had been in itself both sinful and idolatrous, as you imagine? And if you say that by this angel the bishop of Philadelphia is understood, then you must confess that it is lawful for us to worship before the feet of the chief bishop of the Church; and consequently you must acknowledge your own error in censuring us for practising this; but if you confess that by these words the angel is understood, then you ought consequently to acknowledge what I told you here to be true.

3. I answer, that other text, which you pretend favors your false doctrine, and do say that St. John understood the meaning of St. Paul's words (Colos. c. 2, v. 18) far better, or, at least, full as well as your ministers; yet we see by

Scripture, that long after St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Colossians, St. John wrote his Revelation in the Island of Patmos, and it was then he twice worshipped the angel; we, therefore, are no more guilty of sin in worshipping angels, than St. John was; and in whatever sense St. Paul is to be understood, he cannot be rightly understood in a sense forbidding any thing contrary to that which St. John did, and which we with him may lawfully practise. But that you may hereafter fully know the true sense of St. Paul's words in the aforesaid text, you must first know the doctrine that was taught in those times by the enemies of Christ's church; and hence I say, that one Simon Magus taught then that sacrifice ought to be offered to all angels, as well to evil as to good, as Epiphanius relates, *Heres. c. 25*, and St. Chrysostom, *Hom. 7*. On that same text of St. Paul, and some of the new converted Jews did also then teach (as Tertullian writes, *lib. 5, cont. Marcionem*) that Christians ought to retain the old judicial law, through respect to the angel, by whose ministry it was first delivered to them. *Acts, c. 7, v. 3*. Nay, to persevere in that error, some of them gave out that "they had received this as a heavenly verity revealed to them by angels, in dreams and visions;" but the revealers could only be angels of darkness; and hence St. Paul calls their doctrine "*doctrines of devils.*" *Tim. c. 4, v. 1, &c.* St. Paul, therefore, seeing that the church of Christ was thus attacked on the one side by Simon Magus's error, and on the other by the false pretence of those foolish Jews, had great reason to write to the Colossians, desiring them not to be beguiled in worshipping angels, by any persuasion of either of those heretics; so that you may hereby perceive that we teach nothing contrary to that text of St. Paul; nay, we are so far from that temerity, that we have long since condemned the old dregs of Simon Magus's heresy in the council of Laodicea. *c. 35*. Having now answered your chief objections against this doctrine of the Catholic Church, I shall only beg of you this request, viz., that you would be pleased to urge your ministers to show you authentically which of the

holy fathers ever interpreted any of the former texts of St. John and St. Paul, in that sense in which they interpret them now-a-days. Truly, all the diligence they can employ in searching out that will never be able to give you a proper solution to this request. Hence it follows, that you are blindly guided by their conduct in this matter.

4. Whereas Christ says (Luke, c. 15, v. 7, 10) that "there shall be joy in heaven before the angels of God, upon one sinner doing penance." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "there can be no joy in heaven for the sinner's conversion, because we are told by our learned ministers that the angels and saints departed are at such a great distance now from us in this life, that they know not what we do here." Indeed, brother, your doctrine is quite contrary to the word of God, as you may see not only by the former but also by the following text: "And an angel of God called to Agar from heaven, (behold the long distance,) saying, What art thou doing, Agar? Fear not, for God hath heard the voice of the boy." Gen. c. 21, v. 17. "And an angel of the Lord from heaven called to him, (behold again the long distance,) saying, Abraham, Abraham, lay not thy hand upon the boy," &c. Gen. c. 22, v. 11, 12. "The angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and the cities of Juda, with which thou hast been angry? This is now the seventieth year." Zacharias, c. 1, v. 12. "When thou didst pray with tears, and didst bury the dead by night, I offered thy prayer to the Lord," saith the angel Raphael to Tobias. Tob. c. 12, v. 12. If you say that this last text is not canonical Scripture, I give you that answer which I gave, sect. 19, No. 2; for surely you will not deny the book of Tobias to be an ancient ecclesiastical history, which relates the very same doctrine that is affirmed by several clear texts of canonical Scripture.

5. Your only and chief text is that of Isaias, saying, "Abraham hath not known us, and Israel hath been ignorant of us: thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer." Isa. c. 63, v. 16. To which I answer, first, I desire you to

mention which of the holy fathers, in their commentaries on this text, ever interpreted it in the same sense in which your ministers interpret it now-a-days. Secondly, I say that this text proves nothing against our doctrine; and you may know the truth of this, if you attentively consider what the prophet tells you here from the ninth to the sixteenth verse, (he declares how enormously the Jews had swerved from the life, example, and instruction of their predecessors,) whereby you may perceive that he had great reason to fear that Abraham and Jacob would not then look upon them as their children, (as the word *know* signifies,) but would say to them, "We know you not," as Christ will say on the day of judgment to the reprobate. The prophet, therefore, fearing that he would get this repulse at their hands, hence he immediately recurred to the fountain of all goodness, whose mercy he knew to be greater than that of the greatest saints, and told him, with great submission, that Abraham and Jacob had seemed to cease from interceding for them any longer, because they degenerated so much from their lives and documents; hence you see that this kind of expression (which is conformable to the holy fathers' interpretations upon the aforesaid text) doth not affirm that Abraham and Jacob knew not after their death what had passed among the Jews. Pray consider how well Abraham could tell the rich man that "his five brothers had Moses and the prophets." Luke, c. 16, v. 29. Did not Moses and the prophets live many years after Abraham was dead? And yet you see (by Scripture) that Abraham knew that there were men who left such books to the Jews, and he knew that those books were then extant, and that their writings were of no less efficacy to convert the rich man's five brothers, than the preaching of a man risen from the dead would have been. If you say that this is a parable, I answer, that in parables the interlocutors must be made to speak sense, and not nonsense; and if you give no credit to what a parable says, why do you give credit to your ministers, who do pretend to prove against us, (in your confession of faith, p. 62, and in your Catechism against Popery, p. 33.)

that there is no purgatory, by this very same parable. But since the falsehood of their assertion is sufficiently confuted by what I have proved to you in the last section, hence I will now proceed in order to show you the truth of the Catholic doctrine concerning the present point, which might be sufficiently proved by what we read in the second book of Chronicles, (c. 21, v. 12,) where it is said that Elias had sent a letter to Joram, telling him of many particular wicked actions which he had committed after Elias was translated. Elias, therefore, being departed, knew what passed in the world, and showed his great care to assist his brethren in this life. His own departure happened the eighteenth year of King Josaphat's reign, (2 Kings, c. 2, v. 11,) and Josaphat reigned five-and-twenty years, as it is manifest, 2 Chronicles, c. 20, v. 31. So that seven years of Josaphat's reign elapsed after the departure of Elias; then this Joram's son reigned after Josaphat, (2 Chron. c. 21, v. 1,) and it was to him that this letter came from Elias.

6. You may also see, by several examples taken from Scripture, how saints living even in this world could know and tell many things which were secretly done by others; for Samuel said thus to Saul: "I will tell thee all that is in thy heart," (1 Samuel, c. 9, v. 19;) and Eliseus told Giezi what he had committed privately. 2 Kings, c. 5, v. 26. The same Eliseus knew also what was said in the king of Syria's private chamber, (2 Kings, c. 6, v. 12,) and St. Peter knew the deceitful heart of Ananias, and said unto him, "Why hast thou conceived this thing in thy heart?" (Acts, c. 5, v. 4;) by which you see that some saints even in this world, and other saints after their departure from it, most certainly knew their brethren's actions. Why, then, do you deny this knowledge to the same saints now present with God, and enlightened with the light of beatific glory, which elevates and corroborates the understanding to a wonderful perfection in knowledge? Do you think that the saints, raised by God to such a degree of sublimity, have not now a more perfect knowledge of what we do in this world than they had before they

were so elevated to that glory and perfection? Indeed, if God had deprived them in heaven of such knowledge, he would not have said, "He that shall overcome and keep my works unto the end, to him I will give power over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron, and as the vessel of a potter, they (who slight them) shall be broken." Rev. c. 2, v. 26, &c. Is he not a blind ruler over nations, who knows not what passes in the spiritual affairs of nations, which are the affairs that belong to his ruling power? Is it not said of the devil, that "he accuseth our brethren day and night?" (Rev. c. 12, v. 10;) which he cannot do unless he first knows in what to accuse us. Is it not, then, a great shame for you to deny, in opposition to the word of God, such knowledge to the angels and saints, now in heavenly glory? whereas you grant that the very devils in hell, and the damned souls in eternal flames, possess it. Luke, c. 16, v. 23.

7. Whereas the Scripture says (Hos. c. 12, v. 4) that "Jacob wept, and made supplication to the angel." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "Jacob made then no supplication to the angel, but to God, as our Catechism against Popery declares, p. 29." Truly, brother, that is not what the text here declares, but quite the contrary, saying, that "Jacob made supplication to the angel, and that he had prevailed against him in wrestling;" and we read in Genesis (c. 48, v. 15, &c.) that "he first called upon God, and afterwards upon his good angel, in order to help and bless the children of Joseph; and he declares that this angel delivered him from several evils. I have shown, in paragraph No. 4, another example from Zacharias, which affirms that the angel made supplication to the Lord, beseeching him to have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the cities of Juda; and the prophet says in that chapter, (v. 13,) that "the Lord answered the angel with good and comfortable words." Daniel tells you what assistance Michael the angel had given to himself. "None," saith he, "is my helper in these things, but Michael, your prince." Dan. c. 10, v. 21. And he also says thus: "At that time shall Michael rise up, the great

prince, who standeth for the children of thy people." Dan. c. 12, v. 1. Pray, brother, inquire of your learned ministers, to what purpose does Michael stand up for God's people, if he does not as much as pray for them, or offer their prayers to God, according to that of St. John, "I saw the angels standing in the presence of God, and to them were given seven trumpets; and another angel came and stood before the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given to him much incense, that he should offer the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar, which is before the throne of God; and the smoke of the incense from the hand of the angel is the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God." Rev. c. 8, v. 2, &c. You see, by these words of clear Scripture, that the angel, who stood before the throne of God, had such long ears (at which you often laugh) that he could hear the prayers of the saints on earth, and not only heard them, but also "offered them up before the throne of God in a golden censer." And do you not think that the prayers of those saints became more acceptable to God by being thus jointly offered to him from the hands of the angel? For you see, by the text, that the smoke of the incense ascended with them from the hand of the angel, by which they must have been rendered more acceptable to God.

8. Whereas the Scripture says (Exod. c. 32, v. 12, 13) that "Moses spoke to the Lord, saying, Let thy anger cease, and be appeased upon the wickedness of thy people. Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants." "No, no, Moses," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "you ought not to beg pardon of God on account of the merits of those saints that were dead; for our ministers tell us that we can receive no benefit now by the intercession of any saint that left this world." And hence our Mr. Fulke says, (in his *Rejoinder to Bristow*, p. 5,) that "Ambrose, Augustin, and Jerom, erred in holding the invocation of saints to be lawful." Indeed, brother, it plainly appears, by this accusation of your own Mr. Fulke, that those holy fathers of the primitive church were neither Protestants nor Presbyterians, but

Roman Catholics. As for what you allege against the present text, its falsity is sufficiently proved by the next verse, which says, that "the Lord appeased from the evil which he had spoken against his people." Whereby you see that, by the merits of those who were dead, God was pleased to pardon their friends in this world; and of this you have several other examples in Scripture. Would not Solomon's kingdom be given to his own servants, if it had not been for the sake of David, then dead? 1 Kings, c. 11, v. 11, 12. Was it not also on account of David's merit, then dead, Abias obtained that his son Asa reigned in Jerusalem? as you may see in the same book, c. 15, v. 4. And would not the city of Jerusalem have been destroyed by the Assyrians, were it not on account of David's good works? 2 Kings, c. 19, v. 32, &c., c. 20, v. 6. Where did you ever read in Scripture, that there was any promise made to David, before he left this world, of protecting that city on his account? If there had been any such promise made to him, surely the city would not be ruined in the captivity; you see, therefore, by clear Scripture, that it is a great happiness for one in this world to have a faithful friend and patron, in great favor and credit with God, by whose merit and intercession he may obtain several benefits which otherwise would not be granted him, as the former examples do plainly show; and this is further illustrated by the following text, which says, "Then said the Lord to me, If Moses and Samuel shall stand before me, my soul is not towards this people." Jer. c. 15, v. 1. It evidently appears by this expression, that Moses and Samuel (then dead) were accustomed, after their death, to intercede for these people, and that their intercession was most powerful and acceptable before God. You have such another text in Ezekiel, c. 14, v. 17, &c. And Eliphaz, seeing holy Job's great affliction, said thus to him: "Call now, if there be any that will answer thee, and turn to some of the saints." Job, c. 5, v. 1. Does not this mode of expression clearly show that Job used to ask the assistance of saints that were dead?

9. Judas Machabeus (2 Mach. c. 15, v. 12, 13, &c.) tells

us that he saw (in an admirable vision) Onias the high priest and Jeremiah the prophet (long after their death) earnestly interceding to God for the people of Israel; and if you say that this book is not canonical, I refer you to what I told you, sect. 19, No. 2. And the truth thereof is evident, by a similar vision which St. John saw, of which he gives this testimony, saying, "And when he had opened the book, the four living creatures and the four-and-twenty ancients fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints." Rev. c. 5, v. 8. You see, then, by canonical Scripture, how these saints in heaven knew and heard the prayers of the saints on earth, which they, with that great solemnity, presented "to the Lamb, in golden vials." It is most certain that God knoweth all our prayers before the saints or angels offer them; but he knows that they ascend with less efficacy when they are not seconded by the intercession of the angels or saints. So God knew beforehand that all the people answered Moses, saying to him, "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." Exod. c. 19, v. 8. And the very next words are, that "Moses told the words of the people to the Lord," which words were well known to God before Moses had mentioned them; yet, by mentioning them, he made (by his joint mediation) this cheerful offer of the people more pleasing to God; and because he did this to their great advantage, Moses tells them again, "I stood between the Lord and you at that time." Deut. c. 5, v. 5. You may see another example of this kind of mediation in the book of Job, where God spoke thus to Job's three friends: "My wrath is kindled against thee; take therefore unto you seven oxen, and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer for yourselves a holocaust, and my servant Job shall pray for you; his face I will accept." Job, c. 42, v. 7, &c. You may understand by these words, that Christ is a more powerful mediator than Moses, Job, or any other creature can be, because Christ is a mediator by his own personal merits, who fully satisfied God's anger, and is therefore susceptible of no repulse; and

it is in this sense St. Paul calls him "the Mediator of God and men." 1 Tim. c. 2, v. 5. But the name of a mediator, in that sense wherein Moses, Job, and other saints and angels are called mediators, implies no more than that such a mediator should stand between God and him for whom he intercedes or mediates.

10. Whence it follows that there are two ways of approaching our Savior Jesus Christ: the first is immediately, by ourselves approaching reverently in prayers to him; the second is when we, humbly acknowledging our own unworthiness, procure the intercession of Christ's greatest friends, to accompany with their joint mediation our humble petitions to him, which manner of proceeding is no dishonor, but rather an honor to Christ; for by this we show that his merits are so great, that by them the saints are advanced to such great favor with God in heaven, that their prayers and intercessions become as effectual there as they were even in this world, in which some of them obtained several requests and pardons for their brethren. Neither do we, by humble way of praying, act against that precept of Christ, saying, "Come to me, all ye," (Matt. c. 11, v. 28,) any more than St. Paul acted against it; for after Christ spoke these words, he desired the Thessalonians to mediate for him with God, in these words: "Brethren, pray for us." 1 Thess. c. 5, v. 25. He bids also the Hebrews "to pray for him," (Heb. c. 13, v. 18,) and says thus to the Romans: "I beseech you, brethren, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the charity of the Holy Ghost, that you assist me in your prayers for me to God." Rom. c. 15, v. 30. If this way of praying, which was practised by St. Paul, be not injurious to Christ, or against his precept, I know not by what reason or authority your ministers can allege that we do any thing, in this matter, for which we have not the authority of God's word; whereas they were never able to produce any one clear text of Scripture, whereby their allegation herein could be proved; so that all the ground upon which they rely, in this matter, is only their own fancies, which sometimes cause them to

inquire of us, where have we a command for this doctrine But I ask of them, where is there any text in Scripture which prohibits it? For their greatest pretence of just separation from us is, that they were forced thereto from such errors as they could manifestly by Scripture clearly demonstrate to be damnable; but in searching out these points, wherein they differ from us, I find the matter to be quite contrary; for I find that they have forsaken the Scripture, inasmuch as they have forsaken our communion.

Objections answered.

But pray, brother, how can you know that those are real saints to whom you pray? for we know that the pope has canonized many wicked men. As to your first question, we may have a moral certainty or a prudent conviction of it, which suffices. To your second I give this short answer: That it must be a very bad cause which cannot be supported without slander.

To pray to saints is idolatrous; therefore you are daily guilty of idolatry. I answer, 1. Then all those great and holy men of the primitive ages, just now reckoned up by Mr. Thorndike, were idolaters; which is strange news indeed, but it wants confirmation. I answer, 2. If desiring a part in the prayers of saints in heaven be idolatrous, then surely desiring the prayers of sinful men upon earth is still a worse sort of idolatry. And so all members of the Church of England, who recommend themselves to one another's prayers, are guilty of a grosser idolatry than what Papists are accused of. *

It has no warrant from the word of God, but is forbidden, which we prove from the following text. "Him only shalt thou serve." Matt. c. 4, v. 10. Here, poor gentlemen, you are so hard put to it for a text, that I am really in pain for you. For is not this a most admirable consequence, "Christ said to Satan, Him only shalt thou serve;" therefore the Scripture forbids us to desire the prayers of saints and angels? I shall

make bold to infer another consequence full as good, viz., therefore the Scripture forbids us to desire the prayers of one another. But a man must have very bad eyes, who can see no difference between begging a share in a man's prayers and paying divine worship to him.

As to what you say, that we have no warrant from the word of God for it, I have already showed the contrary. However, I should be glad to know what warrant the Church of England has from the word of God for keeping one holy day for all the saints in general, and another for St. Michael and all the angels.

You tell us, 4thly, that the angels refuse to be prayed to; and for this you quote Rev. c. 22, v. 9. But this text has no more relation to the subject in question than to the building of the tower of Babel.

The saints cannot hear our prayers; which we prove from Isa. c. 63, v. 16: "Abraham is ignorant of us." How this text is put upon the rack to make it speak in favor of a blunder! For in the days of Isaiah there were no saints in heaven, because mankind was not yet redeemed. I answer, therefore, that the true meaning of Isaiah (according to St. Jerom) is, that Abraham will not own wicked Israelites to be his children, (Jer. in c. 63, Isa.) in which sense our Savior will say to the reprobate, "Verily I know you not." Matt. c. 25, v. 12.

I answer again, that it is blasphemy to say that God cannot make our prayers known to the saints; so is it a groundless and precarious guess to say he does not do it. For why should the saints be kept in ignorance of what passes in this world any more than the angels, of whom it is said that "they rejoice over a sinner that repenteth"? (Luke, c. 15, v. 7;) which therefore they must certainly know.

Lastly, it is injurious to the mediation of Christ; which we prove from 1 Tim. c. 2, v. 5: "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ." And again, "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous." 1 John, c. 2, v. 1. But

do you not see that, if desiring the prayers of saints be injurious to the mediatorship of Christ, then St. Paul was injurious to it, when he desired so often the prayers of his friends? Every one, therefore, that is but well instructed in his Catechism, knows that, though there be but one Mediator of redemption, (of which St. Paul speaks in the text quoted,) yet all that pray for us, may improperly be called mediators of prayer or intercession. I say improperly, because there is only one (to wit, Jesus Christ) who can have immediate access to God for us. And all others that pray for us, whether saints in heaven or men upon earth, must use the mediation of Christ, when they offer their prayers to God; which fully answers the text from St. John.

Hence Bishop Montague made no difficulty to write thus: "I do not deny (says he) but the saints are mediators, as they call them, of prayer and intercession. They interpose with God by their supplications, and mediate by their prayers;" in Antid. p. 20. And again in his treatise of In-voc. p. 118, he writes thus: I own Christ is not wronged in his mediation: it is no impiety to say, (as Papists do,) Holy Mary, pray for us.

But if any one asks what need there is to desire the saints to pray for us, since Christ's mediation is all-sufficient, I answer, it may as well be asked what need there is to pray for ourselves, or for one another. But as the satisfaction of Christ, though all-sufficient, must be applied to us by prayer and good works, so likewise his mediation. In effect, whatever we beg of God, or others beg for us, we only hope to obtain it through the mediation of Jesus Christ; and the true reason that moves us to desire the saints to pray for us is the very same that moved St. Paul to desire the prayers of his absent friends, viz., that God may have the honor, and we the profit, of more prayers than our own.

In a word, it is impossible to give a solid reason why desiring the prayers of the saints in heaven is more injurious to Christ's mediatorship than the prayers of men upon earth. And I insist upon it, as a thing manifest to common sense,

that either both are lawful or both unlawful. If both be unlawful, then Protestants are as guilty as Papists. But if both be lawful, then they who seduce the people by persuading them that our invocation of saints is both idolatrous and injurious to Christ's mediatorship, are guilty of a most grievous injustice, which they never can answer, either to God or man.

I will end this subject with an objection, which I should really blush to answer seriously, were it not that I have found by experience that the generality of women and children are wonderfully affected with it. The objection is grounded upon these words of Christ: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Matt. c. 11, v. 28. Whence they conclude, that, since Christ commands all to come to him, it is unlawful to have recourse to the prayers of saints and angels. This is the wretched argument with which so many are misled.

I answer, therefore, that the heart of a Christian, in all its prayers, speaks to God, and expects no blessings from him but through Jesus Christ. Nay, the very essence of prayer is a raising up of the heart and mind to God. We are then so far from violating the command of Christ by desiring to have the prayers of his saints joined with ours, that we may not only come to God ourselves, but wish that many more may do the same with us.

Besides, if desiring the saints to pray for us be contrary to the command of Christ, desiring the faithful to pray for us is no less contrary to it. And therefore, as it would be absurd to charge Protestants with a breach of Christ's command for desiring their friends to pray for them, so it is no less absurd to charge us with a breach of Christ's command for desiring the saints to pray for us.

[Forasmuch as I believe that our friends of the Protestant Episcopal Church have not gone so far on the road to Calvinism as to reject all veneration for the writings of the primitive fathers of the church, I beg leave to insert here, for their edification, a passage from St. Augustine, who, they admit, was a learned doctor of the church, and well versed in the

belief and practice both of his own and of the preceding ages. It is taken out of his 20th book, cap. 21, *contra Faustum Manichæum*, who seemed to reproach the Christians much after the same manner as the Protestants are pleased to reproach the Roman Catholics, telling them they took away the idols indeed, but substituted the martyrs in their places; to which this holy father returns an answer in these words: *For as to the calumny cast on us by Faustus, because we honor the memory of the martyrs, saying, we have changed the idols into martyrs, I am not so much concerned to answer it as I am to show that Faustus himself has, out of a desire of calumniating, exceeded the follies of Manichæus. The Christian people, indred, do celebrate the memory of the martyrs with a religious solemnity, both to excite themselves to an imitation of the martyrs, to have a share in their merits, (mark these words,) AND BE ASSISTED BY THEIR PRAYERS. We worship the martyrs with that worship of love and fellowship wherewith the holy men of God are worshipped in this life, whose hearts we perceive to be prepared to suffer the like passion for the truth of the gospel. But the martyrs we worship so much the more devoutly, by how much we may do it with more security after their victory; and by how much we may, with a more confident praise, extol them as victors in a happy life, than those as yet fighting in this. But with that worship which in Greek is called Latreia, but in Latin cannot be expressed in one word, since it is a certain service properly due to the Divinity, we neither worship nor teach to be worshipped but one God. And wheræas unto this worship appertains the oblation of a sacrifice, whence idolatry is said to be committed by those who exhibit it to idols, we do by no means offer any such, or command to be offered, either to any martyr, or to any holy soul, or to any angel; and whoever falls into this error, he is checked by wholesome doctrine, in order to be corrected or to be avoided.* Now, I beg leave to ask the candid reader, whether St. Augustine doth not justify our practice, with respect to the worship we exhibit to martyrs and saints, in order to obtain for us assistance from God in our necessi-

ties; and whether St. Augustine was not a competent witness of the practice of the whole Catholic Church of his time; or whether he himself would not rather condemn such a practice, if he had not believed it to have been lawful, and the sense of the whole Catholic Church. And if it was good and orthodox when he lived, now over fourteen hundred years ago, why not so in our days?]

SECTION XXI.

Of Images.

1. WHEREAS the Scripture says, (Numb. c. 21, v. 8,) "The Lord said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it up, and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "neither make nor regard such figures or images at all, or else you will be guilty of damnable idolatry, as all the Papists are." Truly, brother, your rash and uncharitable censure accuseth Moses to have been as much guilty of idolatry as the Papists are in this matter; and you may see the truth hereof, by what the ninth verse of the aforesaid chapter declares, saying thus: "And Moses made a serpent of brass, and set it up, and it came to pass that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass he recovered." You see then, by Scripture, what Moses had done; and yet he was so far from being an idolater, that he did it in obedience to the command of God, who would not encourage any person to an act whereby he would commit idolatry. Nay, we see in the New Testament, (John, c. 3, v. 14,) that Christ himself approves of the making and exalting of this serpent, and owns it to have been a type and figure of himself exalted upon the cross; since therefore Moses and the Jews neither sinned nor committed idolatry

then, in making, exalting, and venerating, this serpent of brass, prefiguring Christ's crucifixion, why should we now be called idolaters, by you, for making and venerating such images as may put us in remembrance that this same Christ (there prefigured by that serpent) was crucified for our sins? Truly, I see no disparity in the matter, but only that what they did was a sign of a thing which then was to come to pass, and that this which we do now is a sign of that very same thing which already came to pass; but all this difference makes not our veneration to be more sinful or idolatrous than their veneration, (which was expressly commanded by God,) for all the honor which we show before the picture resteth not in the picture itself, but passeth through it to the person which it represents, as may be seen by what the council of Trent declares, which says, "Due honor and veneration is to be given to the images of Christ, of the mother of God, and of the saints, not that there is believed to be in them any divinity or virtue, (mark well these words,) for which they are to be worshipped, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or that any confidence is to be placed in the images, (observe what follows,) as anciently was done by the Gentiles, who did put their hope in idols, (Psalm 115, v. 4, &c.,) but because the honor which is given to the images is referred to the persons represented by the images; so that by, or through, the images we kiss, and before which we uncover our heads, or lie prostrate, we adore Christ and reverence the saints, whom these images represent." Sect. 25.

2. You may now perceive, brother, by these words of the council, how unjustly your ministers do accuse us, and make you believe that the Papists are idolaters, by giving a divine honor to images, whereas we are as far from giving them such honor as they are; for all the honor which we give them is only a relative veneration; that is, that we have a respect for them, as they are apt instruments for moving us to think and consider of Christ's sufferings, and of the good life of those saints whose images we use to respect; so that we have no more honor or respect for the image in itself (pretending

from the relation) than we have for a lump of clay, or as much more of the same stuff of which the image is made; and if your ministers will tell you that we ought not to give such a relative veneration before insensible creatures, let them know that the word of God relates with what great respect the ark was honored, though it was insensible, by reason of the relation which it had to God, in regard that from thence he gave his oracle to the priests; and hence it is said that "Michal saw David dancing before the Lord," (2 Sam. c. 6, v. 16,) because she saw him dancing before the ark; so that in this sense, when David kneeled or adored before the ark, he might be said to have kneeled or adored before our Lord, and thus because the ark had the afore-mentioned relation to the Lord; even so, when we kneel before any image of our blessed Lady, or other saint, we may be likewise said to have kneeled before our blessed Lady, or before such a saint, for this manner of speaking, which you account to be ridiculous and superstitious, is, as you see, the very phrase of Scripture in like occasion. Yea, adoration itself was used before the ark; for David says thus: "Worship at his footstool; for he is holy." Psalm 99, v. 5. By this footstool the ark is understood, as is evident from the first book of Chronicles, (c. 28, v. 2;) and observe that the reason why this worship ought to be made at the ark, is the relation which it had to him whose footstool it was; and hence the Scripture says thus, "For he is holy;" that is, for it is the ark of Him who deserves that worship should be done even at his footstool. You have such another example in the New Testament, where we read that St. John Baptist said thus of Christ: "He who cometh after me is preferred before me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose." John, c. 1, v. 27. Pray tell me, why had St. John Baptist this great respect for Christ's shoes? Was it for any sanctity that was in them? Truly no, but precisely by reason of the relation which they had to Christ, because they were his shoes; even so it is with us; for when we honor images, we honor them not for any sanctity that we believe to be in themselves, but precisely for the

relation which they have to those whose images they are, and do deserve that honor which we testify by those exterior actions of bowing, kneeling, &c.

3. And if we commit idolatry by having this relative veneration for images, I know not how your ministers can excuse themselves and their flocks from committing idolatry; for on the one hand they believe the sacrament of the Lord's supper to be only a sign or figure of Christ's body, and on the other they uncover their heads, and sometimes kneel before the sacrament, at the receiving of it. If, therefore, such uncovering of heads, and kneeling before such insensible signs and figures, be no idolatry in you or in your ministers, I know no reason why the like actions should be accounted idolatry in us; for the very same thing which excuses you from being idolaters, excuses us also; because all the excuse you can allege in your own defence is, that you do not give that reverence to those bare signs in themselves, but to the person or thing which they represent; and we likewise protest and declare, in the presence of God, that we give no more honor than that to the image of Christ; and yet you proclaim that we are idolaters in doing so; nay, that which presses most is what St. Paul declares, "Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." 1 Cor. c. II, v. 27. Now, of being thus guilty of Christ's body and blood, it is impossible for you to give any other reason, but that the abusing of the sign or figure of Christ's body is a high abuse given to the body itself, by reason of the relation which these signs bear to it: you see, therefore, by this, how much you stand in your own light, and how uncharitably and falsely your ministers accuse us in this matter.

4. Whereas the Scripture says that the Lord spoke unto Moses, saying, (Exod. c. 25, v. 18, &c.) "Thou shalt make two churubims of gold, of beaten work; thou shalt make them in the two ends of the mercy-seat, and make one cherubim on the one end, and the other cherubim on the other end; and the cherubims shall stretch forth their wings on high, cov-

ering the mercy-seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another; towards the mercy-seat shall the faces of the cherubims be." "No, no, Moses," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "you ought not to put up such images in the holy house at all; and hence we have burnt and broken in pieces all the images that we got in those polluted churches which we took from the Papists at the beginning of our reformation; and we shall put up no more images in them, lest we should be guilty of idolatry, as the Papists are." Indeed, brother, though those of your religion were guilty of this temerity in the beginning of their *deformation*, yet they had neither command nor example for it in the word of God; nay, we find there several examples to the contrary, for the command that Moses received from God in the aforesaid text was fully executed by him, as may be seen in the same book, c. 37, v. 8, &c. And hence St. Paul says thus: "There was a tabernacle—— and over it were the cherubims of glory, shadowing the mercy-seat." Heb. c. 9, v. 2, &c. And when this tabernacle was placed in the temple of God, the temple itself had cherubims graven on the walls, as is evident from the second book of Chronicles, c. 3, v. 7, &c., where it is said that "in the holy house he made two cherubims of image work, and overlaid them with gold, and their faces were toward the house; he made the veil of blue and purple crimson, and wrought in cherubims. And all the people kneeled immediately before these pictures, and adored towards them, when they prayed in the temple." "Whereby you may perceive how impiously and disorderly you went to work in the beginning of your deformation, by throwing all the images out of the churches; whereas you now see, by clear Scripture, that God himself gave a command for making and placing them in his holy temple, notwithstanding he knew that the Jews were most prone to idolatry; but it seems, by your conduct, that you pretend to know now what ought to be done in this matter better than God himself, because what he had then commanded to be set up in churches, you have now ordered the same to be thrown down, and cast out of churches. The infer-

ence I leave to the consideration of any impartial and conscientious judge.

5. Whereas the prophet (Hosea, c. 3, v. 4) laments the desolation of the temple, saying, "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without theraphim, and without images." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "the prophet was much in the wrong for bewailing the absence of these things, since our learned ministers rejoice and glory for beheading and banishing our lawful kings and princes, and expelling sacrifices and images out of all our churches." Truly, brother, if those of your church were right in doing these things, I acknowledge that the prophet was much in the wrong for lamenting the want of them; but if the prophet was in the right, it plainly follows that you were much in the wrong; and if the putting up of the angels' pictures in churches was not contrary to the decalogue in the law of Moses, I see neither reason nor Scripture to prove their unlawfulness, or that they are contrary to the decalogue in the law of grace; why, then, do you now attempt to hinder us to make use of images? for you ought to know that their presence restrains our wandering thoughts; they may reflect on Christ's passion, and the extraordinary virtues and lives of the saints: you know the Scripture teacheth that our weakness and dulness are much excited to piety by looking on these external signs; hence it says that "the Lord spoke unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and bid them that they make them fringes in the borders of their garments — and it shall be to you for a fringe, that ye may look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the Lord." Num. c. 15, v. 37, &c. These fringes are the phylacteries mentioned by St. Matthew, c. 23, v. 5. You see, therefore, by clear Scripture, that the people of God had received command in the old law, in order to assist their memory, and oblige them to keep the commandments, which also they were commanded to write on the posts of their houses, and on the gates Deut. c. 6, v. 9. Why, then,

should you attempt to hinder us to assist our memories by the view of these other external signs, which were designed purposely for that end? Do you not hear how St. Paul tells us that "God hath given him a name which is above all names; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow"? Philip. c. 2, v. 9, &c. If, therefore, every knee ought to bow at hearing the name of Jesus, because it is a sign which represents Christ to our ears, why should not also every knee kneel at seeing the crucifix, which is a sign that represents in a more lively manner the very same Christ crucified to our eyes? for as the honor given to the name Jesus redounds to the person of Christ, so likewise the honor given to the crucifix redounds to the very same person of Christ, as I observed before, No. 1, 2, 3.

6. But you will say that the use of images is contrary to this commandment: "Thou shalt not make to thee a graven thing, (you translate *image*,) nor any similitude," (Exod. c. 20, v. 4;) to which I answer, that the text speaks of idols, which are worshipped as Gods, as you may see from the very next verse, which speaks thus of the things that are here prohibited: "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them." We pay no such worship to images, which we hold to be wholly incapable of being served by us in the manner the idols were served by the Gentiles, and some Jews in former times, as I told you in the beginning of this section; and indeed, if God had forbidden, by this text, the use of images, he would not immediately after, in the same book, (c. 25, v. 18, &c.,) command Moses to make the images of the cherubims, in order to be placed in the ark, before whose presence idols could not stand, as we see by Dagon (1 Sam. c. 5, v. 3, &c.) so often cast down before it; neither would Solomon place images round about the walls of God's temple. 2 Chron. c. 3, v. 7. So that it manifestly appears how falsely your ministers apply what is spoken in Scripture against idols to the images of angels, Christ, and the saints. They also falsely translated this text; and this purposely, that they might make the ignorant sort of people believe that we

are idolaters. The truth of this is also evident; for the Septuagint, which they pretend to follow, hath the word *Eidolon*, that is, *idols*, and the Hebrew text hath the word *Pesel*, which word only signifies a *graven thing*; yet they deceitfully translate this word as if it had really signified a graven image.

7. Your other chief objection is, that we commit idolatry in worshipping, through the image, the person it represents; as the Israelites committed idolatry, (in worshipping the God of Israel, as you say, through the molten calf;) to which objection I answer, that the Israelites did not then worship the true God through the calf; and you may clearly perceive the truth of this from the chapter you produce against us; for you see there how the people desired "Aaron to make them gods, which should go before them," (Exod. c. 32, v. 1, &c. ;) and Aaron knowing that they meant such gods as they had seen worshipped by the Egyptians, he therefore made them a golden calf, which was the god of Egypt, called Apis, or Serapis, and to this they offered sacrifice and worshipped it, as God himself declares, saying thus to Moses, (in that chapter, v. 8 :) "They have made them a molten calf, and have worshipped it, and sacrificed thereunto, and said, These be thy gods, O Israel, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." Take notice how God himself declares, by these former words, that they sacrificed to the very calf, and attributed their delivery out of Egypt to the Egyptian gods, and hence said, that "they had turned aside quickly out of the way which he had commanded them," and that you see with what grounds, I answer thus: observe yourself what Moses says, speaking of this same act of idolatry: they provoked (saith he) "him to jealousy with strange gods." Deut. c. 32, v. 16. The God of Israel could not be to them a strange God; and the next words are, (v. 17,) they sacrificed unto devils, not to God; and yet you have the rashness to say, that then they sacrificed to the true God through that calf; which is also contrary to the following words: "They sacrificed to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came newly up. v. 17. Surely these gods could not be the God of Israel;

why, then, do you so foolishly pretend to prove from Scripture, that the Israelites sacrificed then to the true God, through the molten calf? whereas you see the word of God expressly declares the contrary; as you may further know by the following text: "They made a calf in Horeb, and worshipped the molten image: thus they changed their glory unto the similitude of an ox, that eateth grass; they forgot God their Savior, which had done great things in Egypt, works in the land of Ham, and terrible things by the Red Sea." Psalm 136, v. 19, &c. Truly this was a strange thing, that they forgot so soon all these great wonders, which God showed them in their distress; so that Moses had great reason to wonder how Aaron could be induced to be guilty of this people's damnable sin; but all the excuse he alleged in his own defence was, that he was forced to it by reason of the violence offered to him by this people, who were always inclined to mischief. Exod. c. 32, v. 22, 23.

8. I answer also what you produce from the prophet Osee, (c. 2,) concerning Jeroboam's renewing this idolatry; and I say, that he likewise worshipped false and strange gods, as it is evident by what God himself declared by the prophet Ahias, saying thus to Jeroboam: "Thou hast gone and made thee other gods, and hast cast me behind thy back," (1 Kings, c. 14, v. 9;) by which words it evidently appears that Jeroboam did not honor the God of Israel through those calves, which he caused to be made, but cast him off, and gave them the honor which was due to him; and hence the Scripture says, that he sacrificed to those calves, which he had made, (1 Kings, c. 12, v. 32,) and gave to them the name Baal, even as the Israelites gave the holy name Jehovah to the calf which they had made, when they left Egypt. But pray what is all this stuff to our present purpose? When did we ever give the honor due to God, or offer sacrifice to any of these images which we venerate? Why, then, do your ministers bring in such impertinent examples against our principles, which principles they certainly know are as far from idolatry as truth is from falsehood; notwithstanding they make it their

business to persuade the poor ignorant people that we are idolaters, that thereby they may render our principles odious to them.

9. Whereas the prophet foretold what great benedictions would descend on the world after the coming of Christ, (Ezek. c. 36, v. 25 :) "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "you did not cleanse the Papists from their idols, but suffer these people to set up now many thousand idols, for one that was before the coming of Christ; and hence our Danæus says, (in his book against Bellarmin, p. 781,) that 'the Jesuits, who glory in having converted certain islands of the East and West Indies to the Christian faith, have brought them to worse idolatry than they had before.'" Truly, brother, that is not the comfort which God had promised to those who would be converted from worshipping false gods; for he further says thus of them: "Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions." Ezek. c. 37, v. 23. But, if those that have been converted to Christianity were to defile themselves no more "with idols or detestable things," how can these Indians or the Roman Catholics of Europe, who were converted from paganism to Christianity, be defiled with idols or detestable things?

10. Whereas the prophet foretold thus of the Gentiles, (Micah, c. 5, v. 13 :) "The graven images also I will cut off, and thy standing images out of the midst of thee, and thou shalt no more worship the work of thy hand." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "you did not cut off these graven images at all, for we see them daily worshipped by the Papists." I beseech you, brother, to consider seriously how plainly you contradict here the express word of God, which further says thus of the matter: "And the idols he shall utterly abolish." Isa. c. 2, v. 18. "In that day he shall be a fountain laying open to the house of David — and it shall come

to pass in that day, saith the Lord of hosts, that I will cut off the names of the idols out of the land, and they shall be no more remembered." Zechar. c. 13, v. 1, 2. O, how pitifully these idols would be cut out of the land, if now the Christian church were a thousand times more infected by idols than ever the world was before the coming of Christ! I see, then, that you must confess that these five last texts of clear Scripture (which speak of us Christians) are altogether false, or else you must acknowledge that the images of which we make use, are not the images or idols which are prohibited by the Scripture, and consequently that we are not guilty of idolatry in worshipping or honoring those images which we make use of.

SECTION XXII.

Of the Relics of Saints, and Pilgrimages to Holy Places.

1. WHEREAS the Scripture says, (2 Kings, c. 13, v. 21,) "And it came to pass as they were burying a man — and they cast him into the sepulchre of Eliseus, and when the man was let down, and touched the bones of Eliseus, he revived and stood upon his feet." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "we will give no credit now to such romances, for they are invented by the Papists, that thereby they might deceive the poor ignorant people, and cause them to commit idolatry by worshipping their pretended saints' relics, which doctrine St. Hierom foolishly taught,* as our Osiander re-

* The doctrine here called foolish was also believed and taught by the following fathers of the church — *Eusebius, St. Gregory Nyssenus, St. Augustine, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, etc.* It is surprising to perceive how much more *enlightened* the reformed saints of our day are than were those immediate successors of the apostles. Eusebius Cæsariensis (lib. 4, cap. 15, *Histor. Eccles.*) gives

lates, in *Epit. centur.* 4, p. 506." Truly, brother, you are not taught to answer after this manner by the word of God, which you pretend to be your only rule of faith; for you see by the former texts, how God honored the bones of Eliseus by so miraculous an accident; and (c. 2, v. 13, 14, &c.) how miraculously he honored the mantle of Elias, upon which Eliseus passed over the River Jordan. What wonder is it, then, to you, that the bones and garments of other saints should be likewise dignified with such miracles? The devout woman said, "If I but touch his garment I shall be whole; and Jesus, turning about, and seeing her, said, Thy faith hath made thee whole." *Matt.* c. 9, v. 21, 22. Behold how the cure was wrought by the exterior touch, accompanied with interior faith. Surely this touch could not be superstitious; for if it were, the cure would not follow it; and the whole multitude would be guilty of superstition; for of them the evangelist says, "The whole multitude sought to touch him, for virtue

an account of the martyrdom of *St. Polycarp*, a disciple of the apostles, which account *Eusebius* took out of a letter which the church of *Smyrna* wrote to the church of *Pontus*, relating the whole trial and execution of the holy martyr, and which he says was extant in his days, and seen by himself. In this letter *Eusebius* affirms that, when *Polycarp* was burned, the Christians gathered his bones with more earnestness than if they were precious stones. The words of the letter are translated from the Greek as follows: *So did we afterward gather out of the ashes and carry away his bones, more precious than jewels, and more pure than gold, and laid them up in a proper place.* Here is an extraordinary veneration for bones, and a value set upon them beyond jewels or precious stones, by the church of *Smyrna*. And whom did the church of *Smyrna* learn this doctrine from, but from *St. Polycarp* himself? And whom could he learn it from but from his masters, the apostles of Jesus Christ, and particularly from *St. John the Evangelist*, with whom he long conversed, and from whose breast (as I may say) he sucked all his spiritual wisdom?

St. Gregory Nyssenus, in his funeral oration upon *Theodorus* the martyr, speaks thus of his soul and body: *The soul, indeed, (says he,) since it went on high, is at rest in its own place, and, being dissolved from the body, lives together with those of its own likeness. But the venerable and immaculate body, its instrument, being dressed and*

came out of him, and cured all." Luke, c. 6, v. 19. We indeed touch the relics with faith and reverence; but the virtue, by which any favor is then granted to us, comes only instrumentally from the saint whose relics we touch, God giving him power to assist us for our devout recourse to him. You have a manifest example of this in the Acts of the Apostles, where it is said that "God wrought special miracles by the hand of Paul, so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs *and aprons*, and the diseases departed from them, and the wicked spirits went out of them." Acts, c. 19, v. 11, 12. If, therefore, you have not a mind to condemn the first and best Christians for so touching, with that great veneration, St. Paul's body, and for bringing those handkerchiefs which had touched him to the sick, why do you censure us for hoping to obtain some blessing by touching and carrying about us relics of saints, which commonly bear a far greater relation to them than the handkerchiefs

adorned, is, with much honor and veneration, deposited in a magnificent and sacred place.

St. Augustine (Epist. ad Quintianum) writes thus to him concerning the relics of St. Stephen, which he sent him by the bearers of his letter: *They carry indeed the relics of the most blessed and most glorious martyr Stephen, which your holiness is not ignorant how conveniently you ought to honor, as we have done.*

St. Gregory Nazianzen, in his oration upon St. Cyprian, says, *The dust of Cyprian can with faith do all things, as they know who have experienced it, and have transmitted the miracles unto us.*

St. Chrysostom, (lib. contra Gentil.,) speaking of the relics of St. Babyla: *The miracles which are daily wrought by the martyrs abundantly confirm our opinion.*

St. Jerome (lib. adversus Vigilantium) says, *Vigilantius is sorry the relics of the martyrs should be covered with a precious veil, and not rather bundled together, in rags or sackcloth, or cast on the dunghill, that Vigilantius, alone drunk and sleepy, might be adored.*

I could fill numberless tomes with the sayings of the fathers and ecclesiastical writers on this subject; but the foregoing extracts are amply sufficient to convince the most skeptical, that the doctrine and practice of the Roman Catholic Church of the present day are in strict conformity with those of the church at the earliest period of its existence. *Nary's Reply to the archbishop of Tuam.* — ED.

more to St. Paul? and yet the Scripture declares that God endowed them with the power of healing infirmities and expelling wicked spirits from the people. Pray, what hath a less relation to a man than his shadow? And yet we read in Scripture that the primitive Christians had a great veneration even for St. Peter's shadow; and God-confirmed their devotion by many miracles, as is evident from the Acts of the Apostles, where it is said that "they brought forth the sick into the streets, and laid them in beds and couches, that at least the shadow of Peter, passing by, might overshadow some of them: there came also a multitude out of the cities round about unto Jerusalem, bringing sick folks, and them which were vexed with unclean spirits, and they were healed every one." Acts, c. 5, v. 15, 16.

Since, then, you see, by clear Scripture, that very many came from other cities to Jerusalem, in order to receive some blessing from St. Peter, and to reverence his very shadow, why do you blame us now for believing that we can receive some blessings by touching and reverencing St. Peter's body, which we certainly know to be still preserved in the city of Rome, together with the bodies of several other saints? Or why are you so much surprised that these bodies, and several other relics, could be preserved for so many hundred years? Whereas you know that the manna, the rod of Aaron, and the table of the covenant, were preserved near two thousand years uncorrupted; for the tabernacle, and all things pertaining to it, were finished about the year of the world two thousand four hundred and eighty-five; and they were only lost when Jerusalem was destroyed by Titus and Vespasian, about forty years after our Savior's death. St. Paul gives you an account of these things, (Heb. c. 9, v. 1, &c.,) and how honorably they were gilt and covered with gold, when they were preserved in the ark; and you may see, in the second book of Chronicles, (c. 5, v. 2, &c.,) with what great pomp and procession both these things and the ark were carried from Sion to Jerusalem: why, then, do you now ridicule professions that are made in the translation of the relics of

saints? Or why do you deceive your poor ignorant flock, by telling them that the word of God is against our belief and practice concerning this matter? Whereas we have the perpetual tradition of the church and the former seven texts of clear Scripture (to which I might add more) in proof of our doctrine; but you were never able to produce either antiquity, or one text of plain Scripture, which could prove its unlawfulness.

2. Whereas the Scripture says (Gen. c. 46, v. 1) that "Israel took his journey, with all that he had, and came to Beersheba, and offered sacrifice to the God of his father Isaac." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "Israel had little to do, when he went thither to offer his sacrifice, because God is not more accessible in one place than he is in another, as our Catechism against Popery affirms." p. 39. What, brother, do you imagine that people of sense or learning will prefer this imaginary notion to that which the word of God most clearly declares? Or do you think that your own ministers are more holy or wise in this respect than the patriarch Jacob, who, the Scripture tells you, practised the contrary of what they make you believe? Truly, you might have some manner of pretence to give credit to them, if their assertion had been confirmed by some heavenly vision, as Jacob's devotion was at the aforesaid well, as may be seen by the second verse of this chapter: nay, we read (Gen. c. 26, v. 23, &c.) that his father, Isaac, was also honored with a heavenly vision, while performing his devotion at the same well, of which you may read more, Gen. c. 21. And if God be no more accessible in one place than he is in another, why doth the Scripture say, "Ye shall not do so unto the Lord, but unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of your tribes, to put his name there; even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither shall ye come; thither shall ye bring your burnt-offerings and sacrifices. Deut. c. 12, v. 4, &c. And hence it is said of God that "thine eyes may be open upon this house, night and day upon this place whereof thou hast said that thou wouldst put thy name,

to hearken to the prayer which thy servant prayeth towards this place; hearken, therefore, unto the supplication of thy servant and of thy people made towards this place." 2 Chron. c. 6, v. 20, &c. And in the ensuing verses there are many blessings solicited for those who would pray in that holy place; wherefore people undertook to go thither in pilgrimage, though they were obliged by the law to go there thrice every year, as the word of God declares, saying, "Three times in the year all thy males shall appear before the Lord," (Ex. c. 23, v. 17;) and because Daniel (in his captivity) could not go to perform his devotion there, the windows of his chamber being towards Jerusalem, "he kneeled upon his knees thrice a day, and prayed, and gave thanks to his God, as he did aforetime." Dan. c. 6, v. 10. You may take notice also of what the angel told Moses, (Acts, c. 7, v. 23,) and to Joshua, (c. 5, v. 15;) for he told them "that the places whereupon they stood were holy ground;" but if the transitory preference of those angels so sanctified the ground upon which they stood for a short time, how can you deny that the permanent abode of the bodies of the saints doth not likewise sanctify the places wherein they are preserved, and in which they shed their blood, by suffering martyrdom for Jesus Christ? for I am sure that you have neither Scripture nor reason which can prove the contrary. Do you not see, by Scripture, (2 Kings, c. 5, v. 14,) that Naaman, the Assyrian, was cleansed from his leprosy by washing himself seven times in the River Jordan, and that, after his cure, he besought Eliseus (v. 17) to permit him to carry with him two mules' burden of earth from the Holy Land, that hereafter he might offer sacrifice to God upon that earth in his own country, because he could not (by reason of the great journey) come to Jerusalem to perform his devotion. You see, also, by Scripture, that there were "certain Greeks who came to Jerusalem to worship at the feast." John, c. 12, v. 20. Yet those people were not obliged to the observance of the Jewish laws; and, notwithstanding this, their devotion prompted them to undergo the hardships of that pilgrimage; and it happened

very fortunately to the eunuch who came from Ethiopia to perform his devotion there, for, at his returning home, the angel of the Lord came to Philip, and desired him to meet this eunuch, which he did, and hereby the eunuch believed in Christ, and was immediately baptized by him. Acts, c. 8, v. 26, &c. You see, likewise, in Scripture, that memorable passage of St. John, which says, "There is in Jerusalem, by the sheep-market, a pool having five porches, and in these were a great multitude of persons, blind, lame, withered, expecting the stirring of the water; and an angel of the Lord descended at a certain time into the pond, and the water was stirred, and he that had gone down first in the pond, after the stirring of the water, was made whole of what infirmity soever." John, c. 5, v. 2, &c. Pray how came this water to possess so great a virtue, and that angel of God was deputed to set it in motion? Truly, you can give no reason why it should possess that virtue more than any other water, but that God was pleased to have it so, because the carcasses of the sheep, which were sacrificed in the temple, were washed in this pond; or else because the blood of the sheep ran into it; yet I see you will not grant that God now sanctifies any place wherein the blood of martyrs has been shed; though those martyrs willingly sacrificed their lives for the faith of Jesus Christ, yet you will not give credit to any of these miracles that are wrought at such places, or at the shrines of the saints, but you must ask, forsooth, now, Where are these miracles recorded in the word of God? as if there had been, ever since the apostles' times, Scripture writers, who might record, and testify all the particulars, which have since occurred, concerning such matters; and indeed, if there had been such Scripture writers, I am sure that they would not only testify these things, but also publicly condemn the novel opinions which you hold against the authority of the universal Church, and against these clear texts of Scripture, which are already committed to writing.

SECTION XXIII.

*Of the Lord's Prayer, and Glory be to the Father,
to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.*

1. WHEREAS Christ says to his disciples, after he had reproved the hypocritical prayers of the Pharisees, (Matt. c. 6, v. 5, &c.) "Thus, therefore, shall ye pray: Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven," &c. "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "I will not pray after that manner, nor make use of that Papistical charm, which is both unprofitable and unlawful to say; but I will use some extemporary prayer made by myself, for this is now the common practice of the reformed Presbyterian religion in the kingdom of Scotland."* I beseech you, brother William, to oblige your learned Presbyterian ministers to show you (if they can) in what part of Scripture they read that it is better for you to employ these extemporary prayers of your own making, than that set form of prayers which Christ had composed, and commanded his own disciples to practise. Truly, brother, it seems that these people judge themselves to be now wiser than Christ was when he made this form of prayers; and it also evidently appears by their practice, that they have a mind to become the disciples of another master, as they vilify that form of prayer which Christ had commanded his own disciples to use.

2. Whereas the Scripture says, (1 Tim. c. 1, v. 17,) "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the wise God, be honor and glory, forever and ever, amen." "No, no," says the Presbyterian, "no more glory to the Father, no more glory to

* It is also the practice of the Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, and the other multitudinous discordant sects with which this country abounds, who, in many other things as well as in this, have *greatly improved* (?) the Papistical doctrine and usages of the Savior. — Ed.

the Son, no more glory to the Holy Ghost; for our learned ministers have wholly banished that out of our church, and they will not suffer us to add it as a conclusion to any of the psalms hereafter." Truly, brother William, your ministers are not taught to do so by the word of God, which they pretend to be their only rule of faith; and though this hymn be not word for word in one place of the Scripture, (as the Lord's prayer is,) yet the sense and similar words, if not the same, are to be found in it, as you may evidently perceive both by the former and following text: St. Peter speaks thus on the subject: "Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; to him be glory, both now and forever, amen." 2 Pet. c. 3, v. 18. "To the only wise God our Savior be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and forever, amen." Jude, v. 25. "To God be glory in the church, by Christ Jesus, throughout all generations, world without end, amen." Ephes. c. 3, v. 21. And St. John tells us that himself had heard every creature in heaven, and upon earth, saying, "To him who sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb, blessing, benediction, and honor, and glory, and power, forever and ever." Rev. c. 5, v. 13. You see now, brother, by all these texts of Scripture, how directly your Presbyterian ministers contradict here the word of God; and if you give credit to St. Basil's authority, he tells you (*ad Ampiloch.*) that this hymn of glorification was used in the Church from the very time of the apostles; and he says that it is an apostolic tradition; but it was sung more frequently in honor of the blessed Trinity after the Arians began to corrupt it; for they blasphemously said that the Son was made by the Father in time, and that there was a time in which he was not; and hence the council of Nice added as an appendix to the hymn (against them) the following words, viz.: "As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end, amen." For the fathers of this council thought hereby to stop the mouths of those heretics, who were not satisfied with changing this hymn, but also the form of baptism; for they administered it as follows: "I baptize

thee in the name of the Father, by the Son, in the Holy Ghost;" and they likewise sung the hymn, saying, "Glory be to the Father, by the Son, in the Holy Ghost;" whereby you see that the Arians (who denied the mystery of the Holy Trinity) but changed this hymn, and yet that your Presbyterian ministers (who pretend to acknowledge this mystery) are not satisfied with changing it, but have altogether abolished it; which is more than the Arians ever offered to do in this matter.

SECTION XXIV.

Of Tradition, and the Judge of Controversy.

1. WHEREAS St. Paul says, (2 Thess. c. 2, v. 15,) "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the *traditions* which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle." "No, no, Paul," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "we will neither hold nor believe that doctrine which was only taught by word of mouth; for our confession of faith says (c. 1) that the whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequences may be deduced from Scripture." Truly, brother, if those who composed your confession of faith had been either good philosophers or sound divines, they would not teach you this doctrine; for they must certainly know that the form of arguing, of which virtue the consequences are inferred, is but human, and consequently they must know that the conclusion which depends on a human joint cause cannot be formally infallible, or the object of divine faith, unless it be otherwise revealed to be God's true word; and it is evident, by the very definition of a syllogism, that the truth of the consequence is a distinct truth from that of the premises; and hence it follows that the truth of these consequences, which your min-

isters infer, must of necessity be a distinct truth from that of the premises; nay, I would fain know, from these new divines, which of the holy fathers of the primitive church ever taught that people ought to believe for divine truth these conclusions, which are only by syllogistic form, seemingly inferred either from one or two premises revealed in Scripture: truly, with all their exertions, they will never be able to show me this doctrine in any of the writings of the holy fathers; for those men have followed more strictly St. Paul's command, which says, "Beware lest any man should deceive you by philosophy and vain deceit." Colos. c. 2, v. 8. And if you have not a mind to be deceived, believe not your ministers' consequences, which are always either fallible, or ill deduced from the premises; therefore oblige them to show you these consequences to be clear Scripture; or else the holy fathers' express words, (in their commentaries on the texts from which these consequences are seemingly inferred,) legally assembled in some general council; and if they can produce you neither of the two, it is evident that their doctrine is both false and pernicious to poor souls, and consequently that those texts, so perversely expounded according to their private interpretation, ought not to be received as the undoubted word of God; for before you believe it is so, you ought first to know that interpretation to be true, and wholly the intention of the Holy Ghost, which to know is a thing quite impossible without a revelation, or some express text of Scripture, which commands us to prefer the judgment of such ministers to the universal decree of a whole general council, lawfully assembled; and in case there had been such a text, (as there is not,) who could now certify to us that it would be the pure word of God, and that this would be its interpretation? This you ought to prove by some other text, which might be likewise questioned, and so without an end.

2. You cannot elude this argument by saying, with your confession of faith, (c. 1,) that "the canonical books of Scripture are worthy to be believed to be the word of God, for the efficacy of their doctrine and for the majesty of their

style." For find me (if you can) in the book of Mischeas, which you hold to be canonical, any one text which contains more efficacious doctrine, or majesty of style, than appear in the book of Baruch, which you believe to be apocryphal. Take the book of Tobias, and the book of Judith, which you reject as apocryphal, and compare each of them to the book of Numbers, which you hold to be canonical, and see if it be possible for you to point out any one chapter, or verse, in the book of Numbers, which conveys more efficacy, majesty, or style, than appear in these other mentioned books; and if you cannot show me this, (which I defy you to do,) you only show, by the doctrine of your confession of faith, that you vent your own fancies for the grounds of your belief. I wonder how could it happen that the greatest doctors, that God ever raised up in his church for its edification, have, upon some occasion or other, never professed their belief that such or such a book was the true word of God, because by its perusal they discover that such efficacy, majesty, and style, appeared in it. Were all these doctors devoid of the spirit of God, even in the foundation of all true belief? Had none of them either sense or reason, wit or learning, for the space of fifteen hundred and odd years; during which time none could find out these evident lights, to show that such and such books only were the true word of God, and all the rest apocryphal? Or how came it that, in the beginning of your deformation, you did not find out that evident light? for in all Queen Elizabeth's reign, you read thus in the 105th Psalm, (v. 28,) "They were not obedient;" contrary to what you read now, saying, "They rebelled not against his word:" that and two hundred other corruptions, you sung them daily in your Psalms, and Queen Elizabeth caused your clergy to subscribe that these corruptions were God's true word; for in the twenty-sixth year of her reign, she commanded Whitgift, her archbishop of Canterbury, to set forth three new articles to be subscribed by all her clergy, and the second of these articles was, that the Book of Common Prayer contained nothing contrary to the word of God, as your own Sir Richard Baker relates, in

his Chronicle, p. 398. But some of her ministers (in a treatise of her excellent majesty) told her, after the rest subscribed to those articles, the following words: "Our Book of Common Prayer does in addition, subtraction, and alteration, differ from the Hebrew in two hundred places, at least." And your own Carlisle (in his book of Christ's Descent into Hell, p. 116) speaks also thus of the English Bible, (translated by Bishop Tindal, in King Henry the Eighth's time:) "The translators thereof have deprived the sense, or obscured the truth, and deceived the ignorant in many places; they alienate the Scripture from the right sense; and finally they show themselves to love darkness more than light, falsehood more than truth." If, therefore, your church was beguiled in this manner (as your own authors confess) at her first appearance to these three kingdoms, why may she not now also be beguiled? seeing ye have now no infallible guide, any more than you had in those times; and hence you may truly say that you are not certain that you have divine faith, because your learned ministers tell you that your Bibles are corrupted, that their own interpretation is not infallible, and consequently they cannot say that they have divine faith.

3. You may also tell them that they know not for certain which books are of canonical Scripture, unless they recur to the tradition of the Church, yea, to the tradition of the present Church, for the church of former ages could not assure them that the Scripture would be free from corruption in this age. Is it not, then, a great contradiction for you to say (as you must do) that you know, by the tradition of the present Church, the Scripture to be the word of God; if the same word of God bids you not to believe the tradition of this Church, which if you will not believe, you can never certainly know that these books you admit to be canonical are the true word of God, or that the copies of these books, you have now, are incorrupted in those languages in which the Scripture was written; and indeed, if it cannot be known for certain whether the originals be faithfully copied or not, all the translations of these originals cannot be known to be without cor-

ruption; for you have no Scripture which assures you of this, because you have no Scripture which tells you that the copies you make use of at present are conformable to the true copies, which were first written by the sacred writers; and you, who reject the tradition and testimony of the Church, cannot possibly make it appear that the Hebrew copies are not grossly corrupted since the time of the apostles; for many great alterations might have been made in them since by the rabbins, when they add points to the texts under pretence of preventing such mistakes as might easily happen to those that were not skilled in reading the Hebrew language, which to that time had no points to express the vowels; for the original was written only with consonants, and the vowels were left to be added by the well-instructed reader, for whose help, in reading the Scripture right, the Jewish rabbins first began to add certain points; and hence I ask, what certainty have you that these rabbins, being Christ's enemies, have added the right vowels to every syllable of the whole Hebrew Bible? for the insertion of vowels, whether right or wrong, depended not only upon the assuredness of their skill, but also upon their honest and sincere dealing, which you cannot, in true prudence, much expect from such sworn enemies to all Christianity; nay, we know for certain how they have endeavored to deceive us already, by altering a whole sentence, which your own English Bible testifies, in the 22d Psalm, v. 16, where you read, with us, "they pierced my hands and feet;" which clear prophecy of our Savior's crucifixion is quite perverted by them to another sense, in the present Hebrew copies, where those malicious Jews would have us to read, "as a lion my hands and feet."

4. Now, as for the Greek copies translated, three hundred years before the New Testament was written, by the seventy interpreters, you reject it in several places of great consequence, of which I shall produce the following examples: the first is that of the 118th Psalm, v. 112, where David says, "I have inclined my heart to perform thy justification for reward," which words plainly testify that David acknowledged he per-

formed good works for the sake of the reward which he hoped to derive from them; but your ministers, to avoid this translation of the Septuagint, recur to the Hebrew copies of a doubtful sense, the one agreeing with the Septuagint, and the other serving their purpose; and so they have translated it after their own way, and cause you to believe for certain that you ought to read it thus: "I have inclined my heart to perform thy statutes always, even to the end." The second is that of Daniel, (c. 4, v. 27,) where the prophet spoke to the King Nabuchodonosor, saying thus to him: "Redeem thy sins with alms to the poor;" which words are literally translated from the Septuagint; but because they prove manifestly Popish satisfaction, as you term it, your ministers did fly to the present Hebrew copy, which hath both the sense of the Septuagint, and another sense that help them to shift off satisfactory works; therefore they make you read it, as they thought convenient for their own ends, by saying, "Break off your sins by righteousness." But what need have I to go further in pointing out such examples? whereas your own Mr. Broughton, a man as skilful in Greek and Hebrew as any that lived in his time in all England, gave the following censure, in his advertisement of corruptions, to your bishops: "*Your public translation of Scripture in English is such, as it perverteth the text of the Old Testament, in eight hundred and forty-eight places; and it causes millions of millions to reject the New Testament, and to run to eternal flames.*" As for the New Testament, which almost all, except St. Matthew's Gospel, was written by the apostles themselves in Greek, your own Beza, upon the Acts, (c. 17, v. 16,) enumerates a whole catalogue of corruptions in the Greek copies; which corruptions, and different readings in several manuscripts procured by your Bishop Usher, hindered him not to publish a New Testament, with various lections and annotations, as Mr. Cressy relates, (Emol. c. 8, n. 3;) and in the preface to the introduction of your great English Bible, published in London, the translators declare, "*that, among the numberless translations which are extant this day in Europe, that*

there is none of them all which is of divine and infallible authority." You see, therefore, by your own authors, how both your Old and New Testament are full of corruptions and errors; and yet you stand so far in your own light, that you do not consider how unjustly your ministers would have you stand precisely to the judgment of their corrupted Bibles, which, they persuade you to believe, is the only judge of controversy.

5. If you answer, saying, that "your judge and guide is not the translated copy as you have it now, but the original in Greek and Hebrew," I ask you, what will your poor ignorant flock do, who neither hear what their rule of faith would have them to practise, nor see what it alleges? for if "*there be not one infallible translation in Europe at this day,*" it is obvious to every one that you are deluded this day; because ye are taught, on the one hand, by your ministers, to judge for yourselves; and on the other you are told, by your chiefest doctors and translators, that you have not in all Europe a true translation, whereby you can rule your judgments. Truly, brother, it seems, by your doctrine, that God has not given sufficient means of knowing the truth to all those of your religion here in Europe, but suffers them to seek the truth in false translations, which he knows to be liars; and though divine faith be grounded on the veracity of God, who says that such a thing is so or so, yet, if the translators of your Bible either willingly or ignorantly tell you a quite different thing, you are left entirely destitute of divine faith, which is requisite for salvation. I thought, brother, that your faith was founded on the written word of God; but I see now, by your own principles, that you cannot assuredly show his written word in any translation, from the original copy which you have at this day, in all Europe. If you answer, that "the illumination of the Spirit tells you God's true word, without the mediation of any uncertain and undoubted means, conveying it to you," then you must be a prophet, and I believe one of those prophets whom St. Paul bids us to shun. Acts, c. 20, v. 29, &c. Truly, I know not

how you can, without great presumption, arrogate to your private spirit so secure an assistance from the Holy Ghost to preserve assuredly your judgment from all errors in divine matters; whereas you deny such an assistance to a whole general council. Can you prudently believe that you have a greater gift from the Holy Ghost than a whole general council lawfully assembled? or any of the holiest doctors that ever flourished in the Catholic Church before Luther's appearance? Pray tell me, where does the word of God certify that you have this assistance from the Holy Ghost, in expounding all texts of Scripture according to your modern whims, which were unknown to the whole world for the space of fifteen hundred and odd years after the birth of Christ? and if you cannot show me this text, I will not believe your doctrine; because you have often told me, heretofore, that people ought not to believe any thing as infallibly true, but only that which is written in the word of God.

6. Indeed, I see you conclude with a small crumb of consolation, for you have no text of Scripture that assures you that the illuminating Spirit, which you imagine is the Spirit of God, and not the spirit of Satan; neither have you any text of Scripture which assures you that you have divine faith at all; for you know not by Scripture, which God commands you to hold on his own authority, from what your translator gives you to hold upon his own; and if you say that "the translations are sufficient means to divine faith, when they contain all things necessary to salvation without any error against faith, or sound morals," I shall only then beseech you to consider how impossible it is for you to know that your translation contains these necessary points; unless you are first certain, by plain Scripture, which of them you are obliged to know, under pain of eternal damnation. (If you be at age, or in your senses,) I would fain know which of your learned ministers could assure me, for certain, that no point necessary for salvation is contained in any of the ten books you deny to be the true word of God, or in any of the books which were transmitted, but are wholly lost, and are men-

tioned in Scripture: for example, the book of Numbers says, "It is said in the book of the wars of the Lord," (Numb. c. 21, v. 14:) this book is not extant: and Solomon spoke three thousand proverbs, and his canticles were a thousand and five, (1 Kings, c. 4, v. 32:) of these a great part are lost: and the first book of Chronicles says, "Now the acts of David the king, first and last, behold, are they not written in the book of Samuel the Seer, and in the book of Nathan the Prophet, and in the book of Gad the Seer?" 1 Chron. c. 29, v. 29. And the second of Chronicles says also thus: "Now the rest of the acts of Solomon, the first and last, are they not written in the book of Nathan the Prophet, and in the Prophecy of Ahijah, and in the visions of Addo the Seer?" (2 Chron. c. 9, v. 29;) and it says also, (c. 20, v. 34,) "Now the rest of the acts of Jehosaphat, first and last, behold, they are written in the book of Jehu, the son of Hanani." The aforesaid books are likewise lost. We see by Scripture that what is said in them is said by prophets; and St. Peter says that "the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but that the holy men spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Pet. c. 1, v. 21. Standing, therefore, to what is known by Scripture, these books, which are lost, delivered what was spoken by the Holy Ghost, and consequently contained the true word of God; hence we may lawfully infer that we have not now the whole word of God entirely written in those books of Scripture which were transmitted to us. This is further proved by the ensuing texts of the New Testament. St. Paul says, (1 Cor. c. 5, v. 9,) "I wrote unto you in an epistle." Note here that he says these words in his first epistle to the Corinthians; where is, then, that epistle which he wrote to them, before this other epistle, which we now call his first epistle? And he bids the Colossians to read in their churches his epistle from Laodicea. Coloss. c. 4, v. 16. Pray where is this other epistle of St. Paul to be had now? Who knows but this, or that other of his to the Corinthians, expressly might have contained several points controverted between us? Perhaps the word *transubstantiation*, and the

word *purgatory*, are written in them. St. Matthew (c. 27, v. 9) quotes some words spoken by the prophet Jeremi, which are not to be found in all his book, as you have it now; wherefore part of this prophet's book is quite lost; and St. Matthew says, also, that "it was spoken by the prophets, that Christ should be called a Nazarene." Matt. c. 2, v. 23. The books of those prophets who foretold it are also lost, for we find not that Christ is called a Nazarene in any of the prophetic books that are extant; and hence the want of those books of the Old Testament occasioned St. Justin (writing against Tryphon) to affirm that the Jews destroyed many books of the Old Testament, that the New might not seem to agree with it as it should. Who can now doubt but that many things, as necessary as others that are in those books which we now have, were written in those books which we have not? Where is it written, in your present Bible, that all things necessary to be believed are written in these books which we have now? Quote me but one text of clear Scripture which declares this, and then I will believe your doctrine; or else give all those books now mentioned, that I may know the points which are necessary to be believed; for you teach that all the books of Scripture are required to show those points which are necessary for salvation; but I shall mention now several points, and the knowledge of some of them is necessary for salvation; yet you cannot find any of them expressly contained, from the first of Genesis to the last verse of the Revelations.

7. First, the present Scripture does not mention which books are the true word of God, and which are not. Secondly, the Scripture does not mention which are the true, incorrupted copies of those true books, or which copies are false and corrupted, or in what places they are corrupted. Thirdly, you stand in need of some infallible guide to tell you which is the undoubted sense of those true copies, and which is not. But you, who will not hear the Church, are not taught by Scripture which guide you are to follow in this matter. Fourthly, you hold it is damnable to marry within certain degrees of

kindred; you hold also that a man ought not to have two wives at once; yet neither of those points is plainly forbidden in Scripture: nay, if we are to practise what the Old Testament relates, a man may have at once two wives, against which practice you have not one clear text in all the New Testament. Fifthly, the Creed of St. Athanasius (of which you make use in your Book of Common Prayer) contains several points for which you cannot show plain Scripture; as that "God the Father is not begotten; that God the Son is not made, but begotten by the Father only; that the Holy Ghost is neither made nor begotten, but doth proceed from the Father and the Son; and that he who will be saved must believe this, for this is an article of that catholic faith, which if a man hold not entirely, and inviolably, without all doubt he shall eternally perish." You also believe another Creed, (that is contained in your Book of Common Prayer,) which affirms that "Christ is of one substance with the Father, and that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son." And to those two I add the Apostles' Creed, for which also you have not Scripture. Sixthly, you have no plain Scripture for the lawfulness of working on Saturday, or for the unlawfulness of working on Sunday. Seventhly, since, according to St. Paul, (Ephes. c. 4, v. 11, 12,) the Church is to be provided with lawful pastors, and that with perpetual succession, it is necessary to know whether the power of choosing these pastors belongs to other ecclesiastical persons, or must they be appointed only by the authority of mere laymen; and if so, whether this secular authority be lawfully obtained, or unlawfully usurped. The knowledge of this is necessary, for we are commanded by the Scripture (John, c. 10) not to hear those pastors who enter not by the door. Eighthly, it is necessary to know what power these lawful pastors have over secular men, be they emperors, kings, magistrates, or common people, and what laws any of these particular pastors can make, and how strictly these laws oblige the people. Show me also from Scripture what public service these pastors ought to perform in the churches, and how often, and in

what manner, this public service ought to be done. Show me likewise from Scripture what a sacrament is; or what is required for the lawful administration of a true sacrament; by whom is every sacrament to be administered; and whether the ministers of all sacraments ought, of necessity, to have received any orders; and what orders must they receive; by whom, in what manner, or form, must these orders be conferred; and whether are we bound to receive the sacraments only once in our life, or as often as we please.

Notwithstanding the aforesaid points are not expressly contained in the Scripture, yet I see that Protestants and Presbyterians do believe them, by the tradition of that Church from which they revolted; and hence I inquire, why do they not also believe other traditions that are not contrary to the word of God, but proposed as divine truths by the same Church? Truly I know no convincing reason or authority which can move them to believe the tradition of the Church with regard to some particular points, and to misbelieve the tradition of the same Church concerning others equally important, which could never be proved to be either directly or indirectly contrary to the word of God. Do not they know that the Scripture commands them, under pain of being accounted as publicans and heathens, to hear the church? Matt. c. 18, v. 17. Do not they know that "she is the pillar and ground of truth, (1 Tim. c. 3, v. 15,) and that she hath the spirit of truth, suggesting unto her all things"? (John, c. 14, v. 26;) and that she hath such pastors and teachers as may still secure her from all circumvention of error? (Ephes. c. 4, v. 11, 12, &c. ;) and that God's covenant with her is perpetual? "My spirit, saith he, that is in thee, and my word that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of thy seed's seed, from this present and forever." Isa. c. 59, v. 21. You see, therefore, by clear Scripture, that the Church cannot err in proposing false tradition as divine truth; and hence St. Irenæus says, "*What if the apostles had left us no Scripture? Ought not we to follow the order of tradition, which they delivered to them to whom*

they committed the churches? to which ordinance many nations of those barbarous people, who have believed in Christ, do consent, without letter or ink, having salvation (that is, soul-saving doctrine) written in their hearts." Iren. lib. 3, c. 4. Nay, brother, when the whole canon of Scripture was fully completed, there was no mention made even of the least care taken by the apostles to divulge it in other languages, wherein it might be read to the nations then converted; which is a manifest sign that they thought all Christians were sufficiently provided for, only by what they heard by word of mouth, and by the tradition of the Church; and do you think that your ministers' private judgments ought to be preferred to that of the apostles', and the following words of St. Paul, "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the *tradition* which they received of us" ? 2 Thess. c. 3, v. 6. Was it not for keeping this tradition, and the form of doctrine taught to the Romans by word of mouth, that St. Paul praises them, saying, "Ye have obeyed from your heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you?" Rom. c. 6, v. 17. Surely this could not be that form of doctrine which is contained in the whole canon of Scripture; for the whole canon of Scripture was not then written when St. Paul wrote this epistle to the Romans; neither did he then prescribe to them any form of doctrine in writing, before he wrote this epistle; neither did he then speak of that form of doctrine which they were to receive many years after; therefore he only meant that form of doctrine which was then taught to several countries by word of mouth; and it is for keeping this kind of doctrine, so taught, he speaks thus to the Corinthians: "Now I praise you, brethren, that you keep the traditions, (your ministers make you read the word *ordinances*,) as I delivered them to you." 1 Cor. c. 11, v. 2. And he recommends most earnestly to Timothy to keep these traditions, as you may see by the following texts: 1 Tim. c. 6, v. 20. 2 Tim. c. 1, v. 13, c. 2, v. 2, c. 3, v. 14. But since you reject this apostolic tradition, I beseech you, show me some text of Scripture which de-

clares that Christ commanded his apostles, before his ascension, to write the New Testament, that it might be hereafter as a rule of faith to true believers; or show me some of his own writings, delivered to them who then believed in him. Truly all the diligence you can employ will never be sufficient to show either of these things; but I can show you by clear Scripture that the gospel was taught before a word of the New Testament was written, as these following texts do testify: Matt. c. 4, v. 23, c. 9, v. 35. Mark, c. 1, v. 14.

9. Now, brother, I would fain know what fundamental reason you can give me for denying that the doctrine of the gospel, so taught by the mouth of Christ and his apostles, could be faithfully delivered to us by our ancestors, even as they received it from their predecessors, and so upwards to the very apostles. Surely the Church of Christ could be as faithful a messenger, for all preceding ages, in delivering this doctrine, as she was in delivering the fore-mentioned points, (No. 7;) and as faithful as she was in delivering the Scripture without corrupting it; and as faithful a messenger as the Church was, in the law of nature, in delivering not only certain points, but all her doctrine, only by tradition; for from the creation of the world to Moses' days, being two thousand four hundred and odd years, there was no Scripture at all; and during that long time, the unwritten word of God was all the rule of faith that true believers had; and by this tradition they knew that "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." Gen. c. 2, v. 3. So all of them held, and believed themselves to be obliged to keep the Sabbath: by this tradition, they knew all the distinction of beasts, "clean and unclean." Gen. c. 7, v. 2. And by this tradition they knew they were obliged not to eat the flesh with the blood. Gen. c. 9, v. 4. They knew, by the same tradition, that tithes were to be paid to the priests. Gen. c. 14, v. 20. By tradition alone they knew the fall of Adam; their future redemption by the coming of the Messiah; they knew also by tradition the reward of good works, and the punishment of evil; and from the time of Abraham until the written law, being four hundred and odd years, they knew by tradition only the precept

of circumcision, (Gen. c. 17, v. 10,) and observed it most strictly: nay, even after the law of Moses was written, though the Gentiles had it not, yet many of them retained the true faith, as appears by the book of Job; and even among the Jews, after they received the law written, they knew several necessary points only by tradition, viz., the remedy for original sin for male children that died before the eighth day, and for female children at all times: it was also by tradition they knew that all the virtue that sacrifice had to take away sin was from the blood of the Redeemer to come. Seeing, therefore, that neither of those churches, in the law of nature, or in the written law, was fallible, in proposing true tradition, nor so much as liable to propose false doctrine by that tradition, why may not now the Church of Christ have that prerogative in the law of grace? and as the observance of some particular traditions in the law of Moses was not an unlawful addition thereunto, why now should the observance of some particular traditions (which are not against the word of God) be called by you an unlawful addition to the law of grace? seeing the same law commands the people to make use of tradition; and “if you reply, saying that we are admonished, by the law of grace, not to be deceived by a new and false doctrine, and that therefore we ought not to add any manner of discipline, or to believe any thing which is not contained in the word of God,” I answer, that those of the law of Moses were likewise admonished, as appears, Deut. c. 4, v. 2, Isa. c. 29, v. 13. Yet this hindered them not from believing by tradition the aforesaid points; nay, it hindered them not from adding more precepts which were not prescribed to them by the law; for after the “children of Israel had kept, according to the law, the solemnity of Azymes seven days, the whole multitude took counsel to keep other seven days; then the priest and Levites arose, and blessed the people, and their voice was heard, and their prayers came up to his holy dwelling-place, even unto heaven.” 2 Chron. c. 30, v. 21, 23, 27. You see, by these last words, that this addition pleased God, and you have such another example in the book

of Esther, (c. 9, v. 20, &c.,) where we read that the Jews, by the advice of Mordecai, obliged themselves and their successors to keep two holy days yearly. Behold here both an addition to the Jewish law and a tradition; and so was the dedication of the altar which was observed eight days every year, as may be seen in the first book of Machabees, c. 4, v. 56. Yet it was not displeasing to God; for if it had been, Christ would not have kept it. John, c. 10, v. 22. You have seen now, brother, how lawfully the Jewish church instituted the aforesaid solemnities, which were not observed by their predecessors; and yet you do not consider how unjustly you accuse the Catholic Church for instituting holy days for the service of Almighty God.

10. It manifestly appears how blindly you are led by the persuasion of your ministers, "who do bid you follow their own directions, and that they will show you, with your own eyes, the word of God favoring all their doctrine, and that you may thereby judge for yourself, and not to take your religion upon trust, as the Papists do;" for it evidently appears that all these fair promises of theirs are but stuff and entirely false, because they are not able to produce as much as one single text of clear and uncorrupted Scripture, to prove their new notions in any of these points which I have handled hitherto; so that you may hereby plainly perceive that it is yourselves that take your religion upon trust; for you receive your English Bible for the true original word of God, upon the authority of your translators, who "declare unto you that they have no translation here in all Europe, which is of divine and infallible authority," (as you have seen in the 4th paragraph of this section.) You receive also that interpretation for true which your ministers tell you, though they acknowledge that themselves are fallible in this interpretation, as well as in all other matters. You see, therefore, by this, that it is yourselves that take your religion upon trust, which is subject to errors and mistakes, as your own chief ringleaders confess. As for us, we rely upon the authority of the Catholic Church, which is infallible, (as I will show hereafter, sec. 25, 26, 27;)

and hence we follow the unanimous tradition of the governors of this Church, to whom the apostles delivered all the important points of our faith, as well by word of mouth as by daily practice corresponding thereunto, commanding them to deliver the same points successively to their successors; and hence what was taught and practised in the first ages by the apostles and their disciples, the same doctrine is substantially delivered down from age to age by our ancestors, till the present time; and agreeably to this tradition we are sure we believe with as good ground as all true believers did for the first two thousand four hundred and odd years after the creation of the world, before any Scripture was written; and likewise as Job and other Gentiles always believed, without having any Scripture at all; and as the Jews believed still some points only by tradition, after the law was written, (see No. 9;) and finally, with as much ground as the numerous nations converted by the disciples of the apostles and their immediate successors, believed, though the most part of them never had so much as seen the Scripture, but wholly relied, in all their belief, upon what was announced to them by the mouths of the first preachers; and what was then by tradition made so evidently credible to those true believers ought now to be embraced by us, since it is as far from all possibility of being false as the word of God itself, because what the apostles (after receiving the Holy Ghost) taught by word of mouth, is as infallibly true as what they wrote with pen and ink; and if you will give credit to the authority of the holy fathers, they will tell you that the apostles had left us certain points to be believed by tradition; for St. Denis, disciple to St. Paul, says thus, (lib. de Eccles. Hier. c. 1, speaking of the apostles:) "*These first chiefs of the priesthood deliver to us the greatest and most substantial points, partly in written, and partly in unwritten institutents.*" St. Chrysostom (in his commentary on that of St. Paul, 2 Thess. c. 2) says, also, "*It is manifest that the apostles did not deliver unto us all things in writing, but many things without writing; and these are worthy of the very same faith.*" St. Epiphanius says

likewise, (Heresy, 61,) “ *It behoves us also to follow tradition, because all things cannot be had from the Scripture: the apostles delivered some things in writing, and some things by tradition, as St. Paul says, ‘ According as I have delivered unto you,’*” &c. You see, by these two last authorities of the holy fathers, how clearly one of them writes in his commentary on the epistle of St. Paul to the Thessalonians; and the other produces St. Paul’s authority to prove the lawfulness of tradition.

11. The tradition which you see so clearly mentioned by the holy fathers is that which the Scripture commands us to hold; and we call it apostolic tradition, because the apostles taught it only by word of mouth to the first believers, who likewise delivered the same to their own successors, and so came down from father to son in all ages to us; and hence, as this tradition tells us that the same God, who revealed by his apostles, so many other lights to his church, (viz.,) “ that she was to be heard as the mistress of truth, with whom he would ever continue to teach her all truth, and never permit the gates of hell to prevail against her,” &c., (see the next section,) had also revealed the truth of her infallibility in proposing any point of divine faith, as we see that she always proposed her traditions for divine truths received from God, it could not but be evidently credible to us, that God had revealed the infallibility of his church, and consequently the unquestionable truth of such traditions as she proposes for divine truth; and hence we believe the Scripture to be the word of God, because the Church (which we believe to be infallible) tells us so; * and we believe the Church to be infallible, by her traditions delivered to her by the apostles before

* This was also the ground on which *St. Augustine* based his belief in the authenticity of the Scriptures, as the following answer which he gives to the Manicheans clearly proves: *If you met a man who did not as yet believe the gospel, what would you do, if he should tell you, I do not believe it? FOR I MYSELF WOULD NOT BELIEVE THE GOSPEL EXCEPT THE AUTHORITY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH HAD MOVED ME TO IT. St. Augustine, lib. uno contra Epistolam Fundamenti, cap. 5. — ED*

any Scripture was written; and we believe tradition by its own credibility; and we give all the firm assent to what the whole Church by her tradition proposes to us as the true word of God; our understanding adheres so immovably to this, that the testimony of an angel would not persuade us it is false. Gal. c. 1, v. 8. For we receive it, "not as the precepts of men, (as you falsely assert,) but as it is in truth the word of God, according to that of St. Paul, saying, Ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us; ye received it not as the word of men, but (as it is in truth) the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." 1 Thess. c. 2, v. 13. You see, by this discourse, we have reason to say that it is imprudent and impious not to yield all possible submission of understanding to what is proposed as the true word of God by the unanimous tradition of the whole Church; for many have been damned for not believing the Church before the Old Testament was written in the law of nature; and several others were damned for not believing in Christ, and his church, before the finishing of the New Testament, in the law of grace.

12. If you inquire how we can distinguish true from false tradition, I answer, that when a doubt begins to arise in the Church concerning any tradition, we then call a general council, in order to examine, first the prelates, whose countries being so far distant and quite independent of one another, that they could not possibly, without known opposition, receive the same tradition from any other hand, but from that from which they received the whole faith; and hence we most strictly examine all those prelates of different provinces and nations concerning the old approved customs of their respective countries, and institute an inquiry concerning the antiquity and universality of the tradition under debate; and finding in this inquiry a unanimous consent of all kind of testimonies, from all parts of the whole world, it is then declared by them, juridically, that such a point has come down to them by a true apostolic tradition, and therefore is as a true object of divine faith; it is the word of God, delivered to us

by as faithful a conveyance as the very copies of the Scripture; and when we say that we equalize tradition to Scripture, we mean nothing else but that we hold the unwritten word of God, delivered by tradition, to be as true as any written word of God can be, and consequently ought to be believed by us, as well as the written word of God, seeing both were equally delivered by the apostles to the first believers, and so came down to us from age to age, even as the Scripture itself; and we know that it was as much in the power of the Church to have thrust into our hand, in any of those ages, a false copy of the Scripture instead of the true, as to impose a false tradition on all true believers, instead of a true one. By this you may see with what good grounds we believe and receive apostolic tradition.

13. Notwithstanding the truth of what I have told you concerning diligent proceedings of our general councils against all novel doctrines, yet I know that those of your religion commonly allege that Roman Catholics first introduced different points by the decrees of different councils. But to convince the authors of these calumnies, I only inquire, does the decree of the word *Homousion* (first introduced by the general council of Nice against the Arians) argue that the doctrine signified by that word is false, and that it was first introduced by the Nicene council, in the year 325? If they answer, that it argues its falsehood, then they deny the second person of the Trinity to be from eternity, and consequently deny that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son, which is both false and contrary to their own principles, whereby they admit the Nicene Creed, and that of St. Athanasius, of which the Protestants make use in their Book of Common Prayer; but if they answer, that it does not argue that, then I reply, why are they so uncharitable as to calumniate us, by alleging that the doctrine expressed by the word *transubstantiation* was first introduced by us in the council of Lateran? for they have no manner of ground for this assertion, but that this council made use of the word *transubstantiation* even as the council of Nice made

use of the word *homousion*. I would also fain know, from those calumniators, whether it be lawful to infer that the Holy Ghost is not God, and whether he was ever believed to be God until the year 373, because it was then Pope Damasus first decreed the contrary, by a council held at Rome against the Eunomian heresy, which impiously taught that doctrine. Is it lawful to infer that there are not two natures in Christ, and that they were never believed until the year 451, because it was then Pope Leo convened the general council of Chalcedon, which first decreed the contrary against the Eutychian heresy? Is it lawful to infer that the Church hath no power to forgive sins committed after baptism, and that she was never believed to have had that power until the year 252, because it was then the council of Carthage first decreed the contrary against the Novatian heresy? I would show you, brother, several other examples of this kind, if I had not supposed that the aforesaid were quite sufficient; for as the decrees of all these councils, assembled at different times, neither argue the falsity nor the novelty of the aforesaid points, whose truth these councils have defined against the erroneous opinions of the fore-mentioned heretics, even so the decrees of other councils, lawfully assembled by the same Church, do not argue the falsity or novelty of what points they also declared to be true, against the erroneous opinions of other heretics, who started up either before or after the former heretics; and hence it evidently appears how wrongfully the Roman Catholics are accused by Protestants, who allege that we first introduced such a point of doctrine by the decree of such a pope, or such a council; whereas they ought rather to infer the contrary; for the most holy and learned fathers of these councils would never endanger their own salvation by taking on their consciences to declare such or such a point to be true, if they had not, after great examination and mature deliberation, found out evidently, by all true testimonies and antiquity, that such points were believed always so by their ancestors, in every age since the apostles' time, in which they were so taught, by those who first

preached these doctrines by word of mouth; and they would always be so kept in practice without any declarations of councils, if the contrary doctrine had not been taught by some new heretics revolting from the Church; hence it follows that such heretics were the sole occasion of what the councils had decreed concerning these points, as you may manifestly see in the acts of the same councils, of which I shall treat hereafter, sec. 28, No. 3.

SECTION XXV.

Of the Perpetuity and Infallibility of the true Church.

1. WHEREAS the prophet foretold, in these words, that the Church would never forsake the true doctrine of Christ, (Isa. c. 59, v. 20, &c.,) “There shall come a Redeemer to Sion, and to them that shall return from iniquity in Jacob, saith our Lord; as for me, this is my covenant with them. My spirit, that is in thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed’s seed, from this present and forever.” “No, no,” say the Protestant and Presbyterian, “that was not your covenant with them; otherwise our learned Mr. Fox would not have said (in his *Acts and Monuments*, p. 85) that all the world was in a most desperate and vile state, and that lamentable ignorance and darkness of God’s truth had overshadowed the whole earth, when John Wickliff stepped forth as a morning star in the midst of a cloud, the year one thousand three hundred and seventy-one.”

2. Whereas the Scripture declares to the Church of Christ, (Isa. c. 60, v. 15, 18, &c.,) “I will make thee an eternal excellency, a joy unto many generations: iniquity shall be no more heard in thy land, wasting nor destruction in thy borders; but salvation shall occupy thy walls, and praise thy

gates; they shall have the sun no more to shine by day, neither shall the brightness of the moon lighten thee, but the Lord shall be unto thee for an everlasting light, and thy God for thy glory; thy sun shall no more go down, and thy moon shall not be diminished, because the Lord shall be unto thee for an everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "the Lord was not an everlasting light to the Christian church; for our Mr. Fulke (in his Answer to a Counterfeit Catholic, p. 35) says that 'the true church decayed immediately after the apostles' time.'"

3. Whereas the Scripture says of the Church of Christ, (Isa. c. 62, v. 3, &c.,) "Thou shalt also be a crown of glory in the land of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God; thou shalt no more be called forsaken, neither shall thy land be called desolate." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "that cannot be true, for God hath forsaken his church long ago; and it is therefore our Mr. Barkins says (in his exposition on the creed, p. 400) that before the days of Luther, for the space of many hundred years, a universal apostasy from the faith had overspread the whole face of the earth, and that our church was not then visible to the world." Indeed, brother, I acknowledge these last words of Mr. Barkins are true; yet the falsehood of his former allegations evidently appears, as you may further perceive by the twelfth verse of the aforesaid chapter, which says thus of the Church of Christ: "Thou shalt be called a city sought for, and not forsaken." But if we believe your principles, we must say that the Church was not for the space of a thousand years a city sought for, but a city entirely forsaken by all men, and sought not for by any man during all that time.

4. Whereas the Scripture says of the Church of Christ, (Jeremiah, c. 32, v. 38, &c.,) "And they shall be my people, and I will be their God, and I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me forever, for the good of them, and for their children after them; and I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from

them to do them good, but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "you never gave them one heart nor one way, neither was your covenant everlasting with them, nor your fear in their hearts, and since they have departed from you fourteen hundred years before Luther came to reform the gospel; for our Mr. Napper says (on the Revelations, p. 191) that during even the second and third age after Christ, the true Temple of God and light of the gospel was obscured by the Roman Antichrist, that is, by the pope of Rome."

5. Whereas the Scripture says of the Church of Christ, (Dan. c. 2, v. 44,) "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces, and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "your kingdom did not stand forever, nor any considerable time; for our Simon de Vyon (in his discourse on the catalogue of doctors, epistle to the reader) affirms that your kingdom was overthrown in the year six hundred and five, when Pope Boniface was installed in his papal throne then falsehood got the victory: then was the whole world overwhelmed in the dregs of antichristian filthiness, abominable superstition, and traditions of the pope; then was the universal apostasy from the faith."

6. Whereas the Scripture says of the Church of Christ, (Ezek. c. 37, v. 25, &c.,) "They shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant—even they and their children forever; and I will place them, and I will multiply them, and I will set my sanctuary in the midst of them forevermore: my tabernacle also shall be with them; yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "they were not your people, neither was your sanctuary in the midst of them; for our Mr. Whitaker says (in his book against Bellarmine, con. 2, q. 4, p. 223) that the whole church, not only the

common sort of Christians, but also even the apostles, erred, both in faith and manners, even after Christ's ascension, and the Holy Ghost's descent upon them."

7. Whereas the Scripture says, speaking of the Church of Christ, (Psalm 72, v. 7,) "In his days shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of peace, so long as the moon endureth." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "your righteous did not flourish half so long; for our Mr. Whitaker says (Respon. ad Rat. Campiani, rat. 3, p. 48) that the mystery of iniquity had gone through all parts of the Church, and so at last possessed the whole Church." I beseech you, brother, to consider how directly your doctrine contradicts here the express word of God, which further declares (in the following texts) that perpetual covenant that was promised to be made with Christ's Church: "I have made (saith God) a covenant with my chosen; I have sworn to David my servant, Thy seed will I establish forever, and I will build up thy throne to all generations. Psalm 89, v. 3, 4. That this promise was to be fulfilled in favor of Christ, you may plainly perceive by what the angel Gabriel says of Christ: "And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke, c. 1, v. 32, 33. And lest any one should presume to say that all the aforesaid promises of everlasting perpetuity, made to the Church of Christ, would be made void by any sins of hers, or on condition of her walking in God's commandments, hence I shall produce these words of the prophet David, which clearly convict this evasion: "I will make him, saith God, my first born, higher than the kings of the earth; my mercy will I keep for him forevermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him; his seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven, out if his children shall forsake my law, and will not walk in my judgment, if they will profane my justices, and not keep my commandments, I shall visit their iniquities with a rod, and their sins with stripes; but my loving-kindness I will not

take away from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail; my covenant I will not break, nor the thing which is gone out of my lips once. I have sworn in my holiness, if I lie to David, his seed shall continue forever, and his throne as the sun in my sight, and as the moon perfect forever." Psalm 89, v. 27, &c. You may now evidently perceive, by these words of pure Scripture, that all the former promises were only made to the Church of Christ, whom the word of God tells you "to be the Son of David, the Son of Abraham," &c. Matt. c. 1, v. 1. St. Paul affirms that those only of the Church of Christ are the true children of Israel and Abraham, "to whom, saith he, pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenant, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises." Rom. c. 9, v. 4, 6, &c. This truth is further confirmed by the ensuing texts, which clearly show that all the former promises made to the Church of Christ in the old law were again made to the same Church in the law of grace.

8. Whereas Christ himself said to the apostle, (Matt. c. 16, v. 18,) "And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." "No, no, Christ," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "you are mistaken here, for the gates of hell have prevailed against your Church already; for our Mr. Brocard affirms (in his treatise on the Revelations, p. 110) that the Church was trodden down, and oppressed by the papacy, from the time of Pope Sylvester till the coming of Luther; that is, during the space of one thousand two hundred and sixty years.

9. Whereas Christ said to his apostles, (Matt. c. 28, v. 19, 20,) "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "you have not performed your promise herein; for if you had, our Mr. Downham would not have said (in his

treatise of Antichrist, lib. 2, c. 2, p. 25) that the general defection of the Church began to work in the very apostles' time."

10. Whereas Christ said, (John, c. 14, v. 16, 17, 26,) "I will pray my Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name; he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "that Spirit of truth did not abide long in your Church, for it was expelled by the spirit of error; and hence our Catechism against Popery affirms (p. 17) that there is no particular church to be found which from the apostles' time till now has persisted in her purity."

11. Whereas Christ said, (John, c. 16, v. 7, 8, 13,) "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you; and when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment; howbeit, when the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, that Spirit did not guide the world into all truth, until of late, when our Luther and Calvin came to reform the gospel; and hence our Benedict Morgenstern says (Tract. de Eccles. p. 145) that it is manifest to the whole Christian world, that, before Luther's time, all churches were overwhelmed with more than chimerical darkness, and that Luther was divinely raised up to discover the same."

12. Whereas St. Paul says, (1 Tim. c. 3, v. 14, 15,) "These things I write unto thee — that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth." "No, no, Paul, you are mistaken here," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "for if the Church of Christ had been the pillar and ground of truth, our confession of faith would not say (p. 75) that the purest churches under heaven are sub-

ject both to mixture and error." Indeed, brother, it evidently appears, by your doctrine, that your learned ministers did not consult with St. Paul, when they composed that confession of faith; for it expressly contradicts what St. Paul plainly affirms, not only in the former, but also in the following text: "Christ gave himself for his church, that he might sanctify her, cleansing her by the laver of water, in the word, that he might present her to himself, a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, but that she might be holy and without blemish." Ephes. c. 5, v. 25, &c. If, therefore, "all churches under heaven be subject both to mixture and error," as your confession of faith alleges, pray let me know what became of that glorious church, which was, in St. Paul's time, "the pillar and ground of truth, having neither spot nor wrinkle." Could this church become the mistress of lies and damnable errors? Was it for this end Christ gave her those infallible pastors and teachers, of whom St. Paul makes mention in the ensuing text? "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, (*observe what follows,*) that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lay in wait to deceive." Ephes. c. 4, v. 11, &c. These last words clearly evince that the end and intention of Christ, in giving those governors to his Church, was such an end, and such an intention, as could not be attained by giving her such guides and instructors as were merely fallible, when they were legally assembled to deliver the truth; for if these governors even then had been liable to broach gross errors, and publish for divine truths, Christ would not obtain the end for which he gave those governors and preachers to his Church; for how pitifully would they perform their duty, if they became obtruders of gross

and intolerable errors! How could the work of the ministry be edified by misinterpreters of Christ's gospel? It is not by the instruction of false teachers that the people "were to be no more tossed to and fro, nor carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men," &c., because the performance of this must in this passage proceed from the instruction of true and infallible pastors and teachers; and St. Paul expressly declares that Christ hath given to his own Church such pastors and teachers as were to continue always in succession till the day of judgment, at which time we are all to meet "in the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ's age," that is, at the age of thirty-three years; and until we all meet in that age, and in the unity of one faith, (which has not happened as yet,) these true pastors and teachers were still to continue in the Church of Christ, if you believe the words of St. Paul.

13. You have seen now, by clear Scripture, (No. 8, 10, &c.,) that, in the apostles' time, the Church of Christ was a holy and glorious Church, which had neither spot nor wrinkle, but was without blemish, the pillar and ground of truth, a most firm rock, against which the gates of hell could not prevail, having true pastors and teachers, assisted by the Holy Ghost, still directing them to deliver true doctrine; but all these qualities were truly verified of the Church of Christ in the first age; the same were also verified of her in the second age, in the third, in the fourth, in the fifth, in the sixth, in the seventh, and in the eighth age, and so down to the present age, for in all ages, to the consummation of the world, she was promised to be protected by the Father, (as you have seen here, No. 1, 2, &c.,) to be assisted by the Son, (as you have seen, No. 8, 9,) and governed by the Holy Ghost, (as you have seen, No. 10, 11, 12.) Therefore the Church of Christ could never swerve from that true faith which she had once received.

[In addition to the foregoing overwhelming scriptural evidence of the Church's *infallibility*, a few passages from the writings of the fathers may not be inappropriate, in order to

show the harmonious coincidence between them and the Catholic Church of the present time. St. Gregory the Great, in the end of his letter to the patriarch of Constantinople, and the three patriarchs of the eastern churches, (*Epistola* 24, *Indict.* 9,) says, "*As I reverence the four books of the gospel, so I do profess to receive and reverence the four councils; viz., the Nicean, in which the perverse doctrine of Arius is destroyed; the Constantinopolitan also, in which the error of Eunomius and Macedonius is condemned; in like manner the first council of Ephesus, in which the impiety of Nestorius is adjudged. Finally, the council of Chalcedon, in which the pravity of Eutyches and Dioscorus is reprov'd, I embrace with all devotion.*" I presume St. Gregory believed the Gospels to be *infallible in their doctrines.*

St. Irenæus uses the following words, (lib. 3, c. 4 :) "*Truth is not to be sought from others, which you have easily from the Church; with whom the apostles have fully deposited all truth, so that whoever desires it may have from it the living waters.*"

This cannot be said of a church that is capable of leading her children into error. For a church that can err has not all truth deposited with her. St. Cyprian, who lived in the third century, commenting on the 6th c. and 68th v. of the Gospel of St. John, writes thus, (*Epist.* 69, *Floren. Papin.* :) "*Peter speaks there, upon whom the Church was built, declaring in the name of the Church, that though great numbers of such stubborn and self-willed people as will not submit become deserters, yet the Church doth not depart from Christ: which Church is the people united to the priest, and the flock following their pastor.*"

Again, *Lib. de Unit. Eccles.*, he says, "*Take away a ray from the body of the sun: unity will not bear a division of the light. Break a bough from a tree: being broken it cannot bud. Cut off a rivulet from the fountain: being cut off it dries up. Just so the Church, having received the light of Christ, spreads its rays through the whole world; yet it is one light which is thus diffused. Neither is the unity of the body divided. By her fertility, her branches reach over the*

earth, and every place is watered by her copious streams ; yet there is but one head, and one fountain, one mother rich in her numerous issue. By her fruitfulness we are born ; we are nourished with her milk, and we are enlivened by her spirit. THE SPOUSE OF CHRIST CANNOT BE AN ADULTERESS. SHE IS UNCORRUPTED AND PURE. *She knows but one spouse, and with a chaste modesty preserves the sanctity of one chamber : she it is that preserves us for God, and assigns a kingdom to those whom she has begotten."*

The reader has, in the foregoing, evidence of the most unquestionable character to show that the doctrine of infallibility (against which there is so much vapid declamation at the present time) was believed *in the very days of St. Cyprian*, precisely as it is believed by the Catholic Church at the present day.

St. Cyril of Alexandria, who lived in the early part of the fifth century, (*Dial. de Trin. lib. 4.*) writes thus : "*He gave the name of the rock to nothing else but the unshaken and constant faith of the disciple ; on which the Church of Christ is so settled and established AS NEVER TO FALL, but to bear up against the gates of HELL, AND SO TO REMAIN FOREVER.*"

St. Augustine, commenting on the 4th v. of the 57th Psalm, speaketh thus of the Church : "*Did they therefore go astray because they spake lies ? Or rather have they not spoken lies because they were gone astray from the womb ? For it is in the womb of the Church that truth remains. Whosoever is separated from this womb of the Church must of necessity speak lies. I say he must of necessity speak lies ; for either he would not be conceived, or, being conceived, was cast out by the Church.*"

Again, in his commentary on the 23d verse of the 101st Psalm, he says, "*But that Church which was spread throughout all nations now has no longer a being. It is quite lost. This is the cry of those who are not in the Church. O, impudent clamor ! She is not, because you do not belong to her. Beware you have not, for that reason, lost your own being. For she will have a being though you have none. This abominable and accursed calumny, full of presumption and deceit,*

void of all truth, wisdom, and reason, false, rash, and pernicious, the Spirit of God foresaw, when even, as it were, against them he proclaimed her unity, in assembling the people in one, and kingdoms to serve the Lord; because there were to arise some that would say against her, 'It is true she was, but now she is perished.' (Precisely what the sectaries say of her in our day.) Show me, says she, the fewness of my days. I do not inquire for my days in the next world; those are without end. It is not these days of eternity I inquire after; I desire to know the continuance of my days in the world. These days I desire you to show me. Neither was the answer insignificant. And who was it that answered me? He that is the very way — Ego sum via, veritas, et vita. And what was the information he gave me? BEHOLD, I AM WITH YOU TO THE END OF THE WORLD."

And again, (Serm. ad Symb. de Catech. :) "After a profession of the TRINITY follows the HOLY CHURCH. Here is shown God and his temple. For the temple of God is holy, which temple, saith the apostle, ye are. This is the HOLY CHURCH, THE ONE CHURCH, THE TRUE CHURCH, THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, which fights against all heresies. Fight she may, BUT SHE CANNOT BE FOILED. All heresies have gone out from her, like useless branches lopped off from the vine; but she remains in her root, in her vine, in her charity. THE GATES OF HELL SHALL NOT OVERCOME HER." He that is not convinced of the truth of the infallibility of the Catholic Church after a careful and unprejudiced perusal of the foregoing irresistible and unanimous testimony of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, evangelists, and fathers, "neither would he believe though one were to rise again from the dead.]"*

* All the foregoing extracts from the primitive fathers, which are enclosed in brackets, have been translated from the originals by the learned and scholastic Dr. Cornelius Nary, in a masterly defence of the Catholic Church, entitled, "A Reply to the Charitable Address of the Archbishop of Tuam," written in 1728, from which they are copied verbatim. The work being inaccessible to the public, I considered their insertion in this edition appropriate and useful. — ED.

SECTION XXVI.

The Universality and Visibility of the Church of Christ.

1. WHEREAS the prophet says of the Church of Christ, (Isa. c. 2, v. 2, &c.,) "And it shall come to pass in the last days," (the New Testament is called the last days, 1 John, c. 2, v. 18,) "that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it, and many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Sion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "the law and the word of the Lord came not unto us from Sion or Jerusalem, but from Wittenberg and Geneva, because it was in these places our first apostles, Luther and Calvin, began to reform the gospel, which was before unknown to the whole world. And hence our Benedict Morgenstern says (Tract. de Eccles. p. 145) that it is manifest to the whole Christian world, that before Luther's time all churches were overwhelmed with more than chimerical darkness, and that Luther was divinely raised up to discover the same."

2. Whereas the Scripture says of the Church of Christ, (Isa. c. 49, v. 6, 7, 10, 18, &c.,) "And I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation even to the farthest part of the earth; kings shall see, and princes shall rise and adore, for our Lord's sake: they shall not hunger nor thirst. Behold, these shall come from far, and behold, they from the north, and the sea, and these from the south countries — lift up their eyes round about, and see all these are gathered together; they are come to thee, — thy deserts and thy solitary places, (in which nobody before served God;) and the land of the ruin shall now be straight,

by reason of the inhabitants — behold, I will lift up my hand to the Gentiles, and to the people; I will exalt my sign, and they shall carry thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters upon their shoulders, and kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and queens thy nurses; with a countenance cast down towards the ground they shall adore thee.” “No, no,” say the Protestant and Presbyterian, “the church of Christ ought not to come to that height of universality, or visibility, that she would be light to the Gentiles, or convert them; for if that had been some of her properties, we could never pretend that ourselves have the true church of Christ; because we can never make out that hitherto any of our own churches had ever converted the Gentiles to the Christian faith.” Indeed, brother, you have great reason to answer in this manner, for I defy all the wit in your head to show me one kingdom or nation that you have converted from paganism to the Christian faith; for all that both your churches could do herein was to persuade some Roman Catholics, in the beginning of your *deformation*, to embrace Christian liberty, as you term it, and not to be subject to the yoke of Popery; and so from Roman Catholics they became Protestants and Presbyterians, because they found their discipline more easy and pleasant for their bodies than that of the Catholic Church, which obliges the people to confess their sins, to fast, and to mortify themselves with several other kind of austerities, according to that of St. Paul, Coloss. c. 3, v. 5.

3. Whereas the Scripture says of the Church of Christ, (Isa. c. 60, v. 3, 10, &c.) “And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising, and the sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee; therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut, day nor night, that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought; for the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish.” “No, no,” say the Protestant and Presbyterian, “the church of Christ ought not to be always so visible to the world, neither ought her gates to be continually

open ; and hence the author of our Protestant book (entitled *Antichristus*, p. 13) says that the gospel had never open passage from the apostles' time until Luther came to preach it." Truly, brother, this is not what the prophet foretold of Christ's true Church ; but that her gates should be continually open, day and night, to the end that all people might embrace her doctrine, and the nation and kingdom that would not embrace it should perish ; not temporally in this world, in which they often flourish, but eternally in the world to come ; but it would never be damnable to any nation or kingdom not to submit to an invisible church : therefore there must be always a visible Church on earth, which all nations and kingdoms, under pain of eternal damnation, are obliged to obey, when they labor under no invincible ignorance, which very few can pretend to have now-a-days : witness that of St. Paul, saying thus of the preachers of the gospel : " Their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." Rom. c. 10, v. 18.

4. Whereas the Scripture says, (Isa. c. 61, v. 6, &c.,) " Ye shall be named the priests of the Lord, men shall call you the ministers of our God, ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall you boast yourselves — everlasting joy shall be unto them — I will direct their work in truth, and I will make an everlasting covenant with them, and their seed shall be known among the Gentiles, and their offspring among the people ; all that see them shall acknowledge them, that they are the seed which the Lord hath blessed — for as the earth bringeth forth her bud, and as the garden causeth the things that are sown in it to spring forth, so the Lord God will cause righteousness and praise to spring forth, before all the nations." " No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, " the Lord did not cause such great joy and righteousness to shine in his church upon earth, neither was his covenant everlasting with her, and her sacrifice ought not to be always known among the people. For our Sebastianus Arancus affirms (in his *Epist. de abrogandis in universum omnibus Statutis Ecclesiasticis*) that ' through the work of Antichrist, the

external church, together with the faith and sacraments, vanished away presently after the apostles' departure.'”

5. Whereas the Scripture says, (Isa. c. 62, v. 6, 12,) “I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace, day nor night; and they shall call them the holy people, the redeemed of the Lord, a city sought for, and not forsaken.” “No, no,” say the Protestant and Presbyterian, “you did not give such watchmen unto the church at all; neither ought she to be a city continually sought for, and not forsaken; for our Mr. Napper says (on the Rev., p. 161) that ‘from the year 316, God hath withdrawn his church from open assemblies, to the hearts of particular godly men, where it abode invisibly, for the space of one thousand two hundred and sixty years.’” I beseech you, brother, to request your ministers to show you, (if they can,) by some texts of clear Scripture, what became of those watchmen mentioned by the prophet all that time, wherein they allege the Church of Christ to have been invisible to the world. Did these watchmen all sleep for the space of twelve hundred and sixty years, who were never to hold their peace, either day or night? and could the Church of Christ be a city forsaken, and not sought for, all that time? Indeed, brother, this doctrine of your learned ministers not only appears to be contrary to the express word of God, but also contrary to the chief ends for which God established a church upon earth; for the first end was, that the people might be guided in the true way of salvation, and this always requires the visibility of pastors and the flock; hence there must still be a visible flock, to whom these visible pastors ought to administer the sacrament and preach the gospel. The second end for which the Church of Christ was ordained, was, that she might receive the Gentiles, and such persons as strayed from the faith of Christ; but an invisible church, it is evident, could never compass this end; because her gates would be shut, and the people could not know where to knock at. The third end is, that the Church might settle such controversies as might arise amongst Christians; and hence Christ says,

“Tell the church, and if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen and publican.” Matt. c. 18, v. 17. But if the Church had been invisible, she could neither have been told any thing, nor found out in any place. The fourth end was, that the Church might oppose all errors and heresies, according to that of Isaiah, saying, “Every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment, thou shalt condemn.” Isa. c. 54, v. 17. And it was for this end that God gave to his Church those true pastors and teachers, of whom St. Paul makes mention, (Ephes. c. 4, v. 11, &c. ;) but if the Church had been invisible, her pastors could not oppose any errors or heresies ; and so the world might be a sink of errors, and a mass of heresy and confusion.

6. Whereas the Scripture says, (Jer. c. 33, v. 14, &c.,) “Behold, the day shall come, saith our Lord, that I will perform the good word that I have spoken to the house of Israel and to the house of Judah : in those days, and in that time, I will make the bud of justice to spring forth unto David, and he shall do judgment and justice on the earth, saith our Lord ; there shall not fail of David a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel, and of the priests and Levites, there shall not fail before my face a man to offer holocausts — If my covenant with the day can be made void — also my covenant may be made void with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign in his throne, and Levites and priests my ministers ; even as the stars in heaven cannot be numbered, and the sand of the sea be measured, so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites my ministers.” “No, no,” say the Protestant and Presbyterian, “God did not by any means promise to multiply the number of priests, and his covenant with the visible church was not perpetual ; for if it had been, our Mr. Fulke would not say (in his Answer to a Counterfeit Catholic, p. 79) that the whole visible church may become an adulteress, and may be divorced from Christ.” Truly, brother, your doctrine is not that which the prophet foretold in this text ; but that of the house of David there should rise a man, that is, Christ,

whose kingdom would so visibly flourish, that successively, in all ages, his vicegerents would judge and do justice upon earth, and that the priests of this kingdom, by which the Church of Christ is understood, as I observed, sec. 25, No. 7, should be exceedingly numerous, and would never fail to offer sacrifice, expressed by the name of those sacrifices which were, in the time of Jeremiah, known to the world.

7. Whereas the Scripture says, speaking of Christ's time, (Psalm 72, v. 7, &c.,) "In his days shall the righteous flourish, so long as the moon endureth, and he shall rule from sea to sea, and from the river even to the end of the round world; yea, all the kings of the earth shall adore him, and all nations shall serve him." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "righteousness was not to flourish visibly so long as the moon endureth; for our Mr. Fox says (Acts and Monuments, p. 391) that in time of horrible darkness, when there seemed in a manner to be no one little spark of pure doctrine left or remaining, Wickliff, by God's providence, rose up, through whom the Lord would have first awakened and raised up again the world."

8. Whereas the Scripture says (Psalm 22, v. 27) that "all the ends of the world shall remember and be converted to our Lord, all the kindred of the nations shall adore in his sight." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "the ends of the world have not been converted to our Lord, but rather preverted to the devil, by committing a worse kind of idolatry than ever they did before they knew Christ; and hence our Danæus says (in his book against Bellarmin, part 1, p. 781) that the Jesuits, who glory in having converted to the faith of Christ certain islands of the East and West Indies, under color of teaching them Christ, they brought them to worse idolatry than they were before involved in, and changed those miserable Indians, converted by them into sons of hell, and rendered them worse than they had been before." What, brother, is this the charity that your church hath for those Christians, because they believe now in Jesus Christ, "in whose name every knee of celestial, terrestrial, and infernal,

ought to bow"? Philip. c. 2, v. 10. Is it by being converted to the Lord, they became the sons of hell? Is it by adoring the true flesh and blood of Jesus Christ in the holy sacrament, they became worse idolaters then ever they were before they were Christians? See what I have said concerning idolatry, sec. 21, No. 10.

9. Whereas the Scripture says, speaking of the law of grace, (Mal. c. 1, v. 11,) "From the rising of the sun even to the going down thereof, great is my name among the Gentiles, and in every place (note these words) there is sacrifice, and there is offered a clean oblation, because my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "there neither was, nor ought there to be, any sacrifice or clean oblation offered in any place of the world, since Christ offered himself once upon the cross; and it cannot be said in truth that the Lord's name was great among the Gentiles until now of late; for our Crispinus (in his book of the Estate of the Church, p. 338) says that 'John Wickliff began, as from a deep night, to draw the truth of the doctrine of the Son of God.'" I beseech you, brother, to request your ministers to show you where they read in Scripture that the Church of Christ could remain for a certain time in such darkness, and invisibly in a perishing condition; and be sure not to take for an answer this tergiversation of theirs, that she might be reduced to such a low condition as the Jewish church had been in the time of Elias, who complained that "himself only remained a prophet of the Lord," (1 Kings, c. 19, v. 10, 14;) for even then, when Elias spoke these words, the Jewish church was visible and very numerous; and at that very time Elias was told that "Abdias had hid a hundred prophets of the Lord by fifty and fifty in caves." 1 Kings, c. 18, v. 13. Hence it evidently follows that Elias was not the only prophet then left; wherefore these words, viz., "I only remain a prophet," are to be understood thus: "I only remain a prophet, standing openly to oppose their fury, among the apostate tribes of Israel:" and that this was the meaning of Elias you may evi-

dently know from the next chapter, which, as you pretend, favors your doctrine; for it is said there that the Lord told Elias that there "were left in Israel seven thousand men whose knees had not been bowed before Baal," (1 Kings, c. 19, v. 18;) and Elias knew also that only ten tribes of the children of Israel had then fallen from the worship of the true God; for this is manifest by the 12th chapter, v. 21, of the same book, which says that the tribes of Juda and Benjamin offered "Rhehoboam a hundred and fourscore thousand chosen men," to fight with the other revolted tribes; and this is again repeated in the Second Book of Chronicles, with a remarkable declaration how much a Jewish church even then flourished in Juda and Benjamin; "for Rhehoboam himself built fifteen cities enclosed with walls, and the priests and Levites, that were in all Israel, resorted to him out of all their coasts, and after them out of all the tribes of Israel; whosoever had given their hearts to seek the Lord God of Israel came unto Jerusalem to sacrifice; and they strengthened the kingdom of Juda." 2 Chron. c. 11, v. 13, &c. All this Elias knew full well when he spoke the former words, and he knew that "Abiah had four hundred thousand chosen men of war in battle against Jeroboam." 2 Chron. c. 13, v. 3. Elias knew also that Asa had an army of men that bare targets and spears out of Juda, three hundred thousand; and out of Benjamin that bare shields and drew bows, two hundred and fourscore thousand men. 2 Chron. c. 14, v. 8. And Josaphat (who also lived in the days of Elias) "was greater than Asa his father." 2 Chron. c. 17, v. 1, &c. "And the fear of the Lord fell upon all the kingdoms of the land that were round about Juda, so that they made no war upon Josaphat." v. 10. And he built many strong cities, and stupendous was the number of the forces; under him Abnah was a chief of three hundred thousand men. v. 14. Jehohanan a captain of two hundred and fourscore thousand. v. 15. Amasiah offered himself with two hundred thousand mighty men of valor. v. 16. Elida was a captain of two hundred thousand. v. 17. And Jehozabad was a captain of a hun-

dred and fourscore thousand men. v. 18. All which number of soldiers were at the hand of the king; besides others, whom he had put in the fenced cities of Juda. v. 19. By this enumeration you may see how numerous the Jewish church was even at her lowest ebb.

10. Seeing, therefore, that the Church of Christ is the mistress, and consequently of superior dignity, she must in all ages, from her commencement at least, have as many visible professors of her doctrine, as the Jewish church had in her meanest condition; for the prophet foretold "that the glory of the latter house should be greater than that of the former." Haggai, c. 2, v. 9. And St. Paul says that "Christ had obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the Mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises." Heb. c. 8, v. 6. But if we believe your Protestant and Presbyterian doctrine, Christ must be a Mediator of a far worse covenant, and his Church established upon worse promises, and consequently less glorious, than ever the Jewish synagogue hath been, even since the coming of Christ; ever since he came, the Jews have professed openly their religion, and had still visible synagogues in divers famous nations and cities of the world; and yet you allege that the true Church of Christ had not as much as one visible Church for the space of many hundred years, during which time you affirm that there could not be one found, in the whole face of the earth, who had the courage or devotion to acknowledge openly the true faith of Christ. Now, what can be more contrary to the honor of Christ than this wicked device? What can be more opprobrious to all the Christians of those times, than this cursed opinion of your ministers, which gives a great advantage to the Jews and infidels to exclaim against the Christian religion; for they may hereby pretend to affirm that the Christian Church could not be the Church and kingdom of the true Messiah, which the prophets clearly foretold should be eternal, conspicuous, and glorious, through all ages, until the consummation of the world; they may also pretend that Christ could not be the true Messiah,

because, according to this opinion, he palpably failed in his promise to the Church; nay, I see that it hath caused already some Protestants to stumble at Christian faith, and plunge them into atheism; for example, David George, a Protestant of Holland, blasphemed against Christ, in his history printed at Antwerp, in the year 1568, saying, "If the doctrine of Christ had been true and perfect, the Church which they have planted had continued; but now it is manifest that Antichrist hath subverted the doctrine of the apostles, and the Church by them begun, as it is manifest in the Papacy: therefore the doctrine of the apostles was false and imperfect." Hereupon he became an apostate from the Christian religion, who was before a great man in your church, as Osiander relates in his Epitome, cent. 16, par. 2, p. 647. By such another conceit, Barnardus Ocbin renounced the divinity of Christ, as your Beza writes, *De Poligamid.* p. 4. Adam Nauserus, a Calvinist, the chief pastor of Heidelberg, in the end turned a Turk, and was circumcised at Constantinople, as Osiander relates in his Epitom. con. 16, part 2, p. 118; and that learned Zuinglian Almannus held at last that the true Messiah was not yet come, because the prediction of the prophets concerning his kingdom were not yet fulfilled of the church of his religion; and hence he renounced Christianity, and became a blasphemous Jew, as Beza relates, *Epist.* 64, p. 308. All this dereliction of faith and morality was the result of the reformation; for Luther and Calvin had scarcely separated from the Church, when their disciples separated from them; nor had the founders a better right to innovate than their followers, who formed new sects of their own, and propagated the most impious and profligate doctrine. Of this Luther himself bitterly complains, (*in Respon. ad Mul.*) "I have experienced," says he, "no greater nor more capital enemies than those sweet brethren of ours, whom, as our children, we have nourished in our bosom, and now are become masters of new sects." But Luther was the prime cause of those divisions, and therefore need only blame himself, not *Æcolampadius*, *Carolstadius*, and *Zuinglius*, to whom he alludes. What blessed effects

the new reformation produced on the minds of the people, even at the time of its greatest perfection, that is, 1537, we learn from Capito, a Protestant minister at Strasburgh, in a confidential letter to Farel. "God has discovered to us," says he, "the injury we have done to the Church by our precipitate decisions, and the inconsiderate vehemence which induced us to reject the pope; for the people, accustomed to, and, as it were, bred up in licentiousness, have completely cast off the yoke; as if, by destroying the pope's authority, we at the same time meant to destroy the efficacy of the Scripture, the sacrament, and the ministry. The people openly tell us, 'I know enough of the gospel; I have no occasion for you; go and preach to those that are disposed to hear you.'" These are not exaggerations; they are what a new pastor communicates in confidence, and by them we see the sad effects of the reformation. You may see by these very examples how dangerous and pernicious it is to hold that the Church of Christ could be either fallible or invisible; and hence St. Paul says, "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost." 2 Cor. c. 4, v. 3.

11. Whereas the Scripture says, (speaking of the law of grace, Mich. c. 4, v. 1, &c.) "In the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of mountains, and high above all the hills, (what more visible?) and people shall flow into it, and many nations shall hasten, and shall say, Come, let us go to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us his ways, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God, forever and ever." "No, no," say the Protestant and Presbyterian, "the God of Jacob did not teach the people his ways, neither did they walk in his house visibly, any considerable time; for our Mr. Parkins says (expounding the creed, p. 307) that, during the space of nine hundred years, the Popish heresy had spread itself over the whole world." Pray, brother, ask your ministers how that Popish heresy could reign so universally and so long, without being then condemned by the true Church, in some

corner or other of the whole world; for the prophet says of the Church of Christ, "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper, and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment, thou shalt condemn." Isa. c. 54, v. 17. Since, then, it is the property of the Church of Christ to condemn all such tongues as do rise against her in judgment, ask your ministers in what village or city, in what province or country, in what kingdom or nation, did the true Church then condemn that Popish heresy; when she had separated from the whole body of the Church, as all heretics do, according to that of John, speaking of heretics: "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would, no doubt, have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they are not all of us." 1 John, c. 2, v. 19. If, then, all heresies go out of the Church, that they might be made manifest, and known to the people, how could it happen that then the true Church made no manifest declaration against that Popish heresy? How could the chief promoter of that heresy be able in the beginning to obtrude his strange and novel doctrine on the whole Christian world, from the rising to the setting of the sun? and this so silently that no mention should be made in any ancient history or chronology of the least impediment it met with, or of the least contradiction made any where on the whole face of the earth against it? Is it possible that the four parts of the world, differing in customs, manners, languages, interests, and opinions, and so distant from each other in places and affection, should be all found, at one time, to consent unanimously to that heresy? Could so great a revolution as this be effected at the persuasion of any one pope? and done so silently, that no one single writer then living would record who that pope was, or by what means he, or the chief promoter of that heresy, could effect a change so incredible throughout the world, without finding any where, among good or bad, learned or unlearned, any manner of opposition? Can any man in his senses imagine that, in the beginning of such an alteration, there would be neither grace

nor judgment in all Christendom, to oppose such a new heresy, and say that it was quite contrary to what they were formerly taught by their predecessors? For at that time this very assertion would have prevented many thousands, in several nations, from embracing that paradox, and cause some of them to write then on that subject, that they might transmit the knowledge of it to posterity, as we see they have done with all other heresies, and with several other things of far less importance; nay, we see that they did not hesitate to set down the very ceremonies which were successively added to the mass; neither did they forbear to relate the personal and private vices even of the popes themselves; and yet we cannot discover by the writings of any ancient authors that ever the Roman Church separated from any known society of Christians then in existence, and more ancient than itself; but to the contrary we see that these authors declare, unanimously, that all heretics had departed from her, as you may see hereafter, sec. 29, No. 3.

12. You have now seen, both in this and in the last section, that the Church of Christ must always have visible pastors, and that these pastors must be lawfully called to that charge; for those who enter in by usurpation, without being sent by lawful commission, are not true pastors, but thieves and robbers; for "he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." John, c. 10, v. 1. Uzziah was struck with the leprosy for presuming to usurp the office of a priest, (2 Chron. c. 26, v. 19;) and another example of the same kind may be seen in the first of Chronicles, (c. 13, v. 9, &c. ;) and hence people are forbidden in the New Testament to assume this office unless they be called. "No man," saith Paul, "taketh this honor unto himself but he that is called of God, as Aaron was." Heb. c. 5, v. 4. See sec. 18. The way the Jewish church had to distinguish the lawful pastors from usurpers, was this — that none among them were promoted to the priesthood but those who were descended from Levi by Aaron. The law of grace, of which the former was a type

has the same way of distinguishing the true and lawful pastors from usurpers and unlawful ones; for none are considered to be lawful and true pastors in the Church of Christ but those only who are lawfully descended from the holy apostles, by visible ordination and personal succession; and this was what caused the holy fathers to prove the truth of the Church by the lawful succession and vocation of the pastors, up to the very apostles; for they knew that our Savior himself had called twelve apostles, and sent them with commission to preach the gospel and govern the Church. Matt. c. 28, v. 20. They knew also that the same apostles called and ordained other pastors, as is evident in the election of Matthias, (Acts, c. 1, v. 26;) and likewise other chief pastors, viz., bishops, received power from the apostles to choose and ordain others, as is manifest by St. Paul's words to Titus, c. 1, v. 5. So that whosoever now desires to know where the true Church of Christ is to be found, or those pastors of which St. Paul makes mention in his epistle to the Ephesians, (c. 4, v. 11, &c.,) he ought to find out who those pastors are that have succeeded, one after another, by lawful ordination, until the very apostles; and with them only he will be sure to find the Church of Christ. For these are the only pastors whom St. Paul commands us to obey, in these words: "Obey your prelates, and be subject to them, for they watch as being to render an account for your souls." Heb. c. 13, v. 17. And Christ himself said thus of them: "He who hears you hears me, and he who contemns you contemns me." Luke, c. 10, v. 16. "Whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, in the day of judgment, than for that city." Matt. c. 10, v. 14, &c. You see, therefore, by clear Scripture, that we are obliged, under pain of eternal damnation, to hear and obey those pastors who are lawfully sent, and employed to watch over our souls; and we are under no less obligation to beware of false teachers, for Christ speaks thus of them: "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's

clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves; ye shall know them by their fruits." Matt. c. 7, v. 15. "Take heed that no man deceive you, for many shall come in my name, and deceive many." Matt. c. 24, v. 4, 5. Seeing, then, you know evidently, by all the texts of Scripture produced in this and the foregoing section, (see sec. 18,) that there must be always lawful and visible pastors in the Church of Christ, and that false teachers were also to appear, teaching perverse doctrine, you ought to choose the secure way of salvation, by adhering to those true and lawful pastors who give evident proofs of their lawful mission and lineal succession in every age to the time of the apostles.

SECTION XXVII.

Of the Invisibility of the Protestant and Presbyterian Churches, before Luther and Calvin's Time.

1. **THERE** is a custom common to both foxes and heretics, as St. Augustin observes, commenting on the 80th Psalm; for as foxes have two entrances to their den, to the end that they may save themselves by the one, when pursued by the other, so heretics have also cunningly contrived two ways of answering, that they may escape by the one, when they find themselves entrapped by the other. This custom is in great request both with Protestants and Presbyterians; for when they are pressed to show the visibility of their churches before Luther and Calvin, they say that they were invisible, and therefore could be neither known nor shown; but when it is proved by Scripture that the true Church must be always visible, then they make many shifts to show that they were visible; and when the contrary is proved against them, then they run back again to the den of invisibility, and so think to escape by this means; but this den of invisibility is sufficiently stopped by what I have produced in the last section;

and I shall now hunt after them in all directions, until I stop up their den of visibility. Some of them would fain prove their church to have been visible in the Waldenses and Albigenses; others would have it to have been visible in the Wickliffites; some say that it was visible in the Hussites; others would have it to have been in Greece; and some of them say that it was visible in Ethiopia and Armenia, pretending that these nations were Protestants before Luther and Calvin's time; and the rest leap to the purer times, before the pontificate of St. Gregory, and allege that the primitive church and the holy fathers were of their own religion; but after making this monstrous leap of nine hundred or a thousand years, and there finding both pastors and flock at the sacrifice of the mass, (which they abhor as idolatry,) they run back to the den of invisibility, alleging it to be unnecessary for the Church of Christ to be still visible. These different answers clearly evince that they have no great certainty of their pedigree; and I will now show you the insufficiency, by which you will plainly perceive how the Protestant and Presbyterian religion was unknown to the whole world before Luther and Calvin's apostasy from the Roman Church, at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

2. Mr. Jewel, and Mr. Jennings, and many other Protestants, appeal to the fathers of the first five ages; but this pretence is both idle and false; first, it is idle, because, were it true that the fathers of the primitive church were Protestants, yet that would not suffice to prove now a continual succession of pastors, in every age of the eighteen hundred years now elapsed; for I ask, what became of the Protestant church during the thousand years that intervened between the fathers and Luther? Did it perish, or not? If it perished, then it cannot be the true Church, which ought to be perpetual and visible, as you have seen, sec. 25. If the Protestant church did not perish, but remained visible for the thousand years between the fathers and Luther, then the question remains unanswered, viz., where was it, then, when Luther was a Roman Catholic? In what kingdom, province, or city,

did she then preach the gospel as she does at present? This you were never able to prove; whence it follows that granting the fathers to have been Protestants, yet your Protestant church could not claim the title of being still visible, since the time of Christ. Secondly, this pretence is false, viz., that the fathers were Protestants; for the Christians of the sixth age knew better what was the religion of the fathers, and of those of the fifth age, by whom they were instructed, and with whom they conversed, than Protestants, who first appeared a thousand years after them; but these Christians of the sixth age have protested before God, and took it upon their conscience, that they taught and practised the same religion which they had received from their immediate predecessors, both in writing and by word of mouth. Therefore, if the Christians of the sixth age were not Protestants, neither were the fathers nor the Christians of the fifth age Protestants; and you may likewise conclude with the Christians of every age, even until the apostles' time. That the fathers were not Protestants is evident to any one that reads their writings; for they acknowledged the pope's supremacy, the real presence, transubstantiation, purgatory, invocation of saints, the lawfulness of images, and offered the sacrifice of the mass, as you may see in the answer to Mr. Jennings's challenge. Therefore the fathers were not Protestants; and if they had been, surely your own chief reformers would not rail so much at them as they do; for Luther says thus of them: "In the writings of Jerom there is not a word of true faith or sound religion; of Chrysostom I make no account; Basil is of no worth; he is quite a monk; I weigh him not a hair; Cyprian is a weak divine." *Coloq. de Patribus*. And he further says that "the authority of the fathers is not to be regarded." *Tom. 2, Wittemb. p. 434*. As for Calvin, he ingeniously confesses that the fathers were against him in many points. "It was a custom," saith he, "about one thousand three hundred years ago, to pray for the dead; but all of that time, I confess, were carried away into error." *Lib. 3, Inst. c. 5, sect. 10*. He confesses, also, that the fathers

taught satisfaction, free-will, merit, fasting in Lent, &c. &c. And hence Mr. Whitaker says, "It is true what Calvin and the Centuriators, [or Magdeburgians,] have written, that the ancient church hath erred in many things, as touching limbo, free-will, merit of works, &c." Cont. Bellar. contro. 2, q. 5, p. 299. And he further says that "the Popish religion is a patched coverlet of the fathers' errors." Cont. Durum. lib. 6, p. 423. Mr. Cartwright speaks thus of St. Augustin, (according to Mr. Whitgift, in his Defence, p. 103 :) "I appeal to the judgment of all men, if this be not to bring in Popery again, to allow of St. Augustin's saying." You may judge, by these acknowledgments of your own authors, that the holy fathers were neither Protestants nor Presbyterians. Now let us see your other pretences.

3. That the Protestant church may be contained in the Waldenses, Albigenses, &c., two things are to be proved by Protestants. The first is, that these people have ever continued since the apostles' time, for the Church of Christ's perpetuity requires this. The second is, that the Waldenses, Albigenses, &c., were entirely of that faith which Protestants now profess in their confession of faith; for without this these people could not be Protestants; but neither of these two things can be proved by Protestants, or by any man living. The first is sufficiently disproved, because the Waldenses first appeared about the latter end of the twelfth century, and their only ringleader was one Waldo, a rich merchant of Lyons, in France, as your own Mr. Fox testifieth. Acts and Mon. p. 628. How can it then be proved that the Waldenses had continued since the apostles' time, seeing their first author was in the beginning a Roman Catholic, and lived in the twelfth century. Supposing, then, that Waldo became a Protestant, which is false, the question still remains unanswered, viz., Where was the Protestant church before Waldo? And as the Waldenses did not continue since the apostles' time, so they did not agree entirely either with Protestants or Presbyterians in the principal articles of their religion; "for they did not believe justification by faith," as Luther hinse!f

affirms; Colloq. de Stor. And Calvin says (Epist. 224) that they believed the real presence in the Popish sense of transubstantiation; they agreed with Catholics in several other points, viz., in the number and nature of the sacraments, the vow of chastity, the necessity of baptism, &c. But they maintained with these things divers gross errors, which are condemned both by Catholics and Protestants; for they held that churchmen, by mortal sin, lost all their spiritual authority; that the civil magistrates, by mortal sin, fell from their dignity; and that churchmen should possess no personal property; for which opinions they called themselves the poor men of Lyons, and sought the confirmation of this title from Pope Innocent the Third; but this request they could not obtain. As these different opinions show that the Waldenses were not true Protestants, so the following points which they held will show that they were not Presbyterians; for they admitted no form of prayer except the Lord's prayer; but the Presbyterians admit many other forms of prayers of their own making, and have entirely rejected the Lord's prayer, as you have seen, sec. 23, No. 1. The Waldenses held that there were three kinds of orders in the church, viz., deacons, priests, and bishops; but the Presbyterians have abjured episcopacy, and the whole hierarchy of the church: the Waldenses held that all oaths were unlawful; but the Presbyterians have displaced (since King James was banished) all the episcopal ministers in the kingdom of Scotland for not taking unlawful oaths. Truly I find nothing wherein the Waldenses agreed more with Presbyterians than with other Protestants, except in this alone, that they contemned the Apostles' Creed, like the Presbyterians.

4. That the Albigenes were neither Protestants nor Presbyterians is also evident; for they began in the same age with the Waldenses, and derived their name from Alby, a town of Languedoc, in France, where the greatest part of them remained; and they were a branch of the Waldenses, as your own Osiander (Cent. 13, lib. 1, c. 4) and Mr. Fulke (de Success. Eccles. p. 332) do confess; so that their late

rising proves that they had not continued since the apostles' time, and consequently that the Protestant or Presbyterian church cannot be shown to have continued in them; and their pretence herein is also deficient, because these sectaries did not believe the Protestant or Presbyterian's confession of faith; for they held the same doctrine with the Waldenses, except some few things that they added of their own; for they maintained, with the Manicheans, that there were two principles, viz., God and the devil; they denied, with the Sadducees, the resurrection of the body; they rejected baptism with the Manicheans, Selucians, and other ancient heretics; and hence some Protestant writers declare that they were not of themselves; for Mr. Jewel, speaking of them, says, (in his Defence of the Apolog. p. 48,) "They were not of us." And Osiander rejects them more clearly in the following words: "Their doctrine was absurd, impious, heretical; they remained obstinately in their errors and impiety, and men think that they have been possessed with Anabaptistical fury." Seeing, therefore, that neither your Protestant nor Presbyterian church can be found visible among the Waldenses, nor in the Albigenses, let us examine if they were visible among the Wickliffites.

5. John Wickliff, from whom the Wickliffites are named, was a priest and rector of Lutterworth, Lincolnshire, but was deprived of his benefice by the archbishop of Canterbury, as your own Mr. Stow relates, (in his Annals, p. 425;) and he lived in the year 1371, as Mr. Fox testifieth, Acts and Mon. p. 85. Therefore the church of the Wickliffites, which began so long after the apostles' time, cannot be the perpetual church we are seeking for; and that these sectaries were neither Protestants nor Presbyterians is evident; for they did not believe the Protestant confession of faith; hence Melancthon says of Wickliff, (ad Miconium,) "Truly he neither understood nor held the justice of faith." Nay, after his apostasy, he held several points of the Catholic doctrine, viz., the lawfulness of holy water, the honoring of relics and images, the intercession of our blessed Lady, the apparel and

tonsure of priests, the ceremonies of the mass, and all the seven sacraments, as you may see in his own works, which were written after his apostasy; he also maintained several gross errors condemned both by Catholics and Protestants; for he held that all things fell out by an absolute and fatal necessity, and that God ought to obey the devil, that baptism administered by churchmen in the state of mortal sin was invalid; nor could they confer holy orders; and that ecclesiastics ought to have no temporal possessions or property in any thing, but ought to beg; that princes and magistrates fell from their dignity and power by committing a mortal sin; that their subjects might punish them as they pleased; therefore one of his disciples, Sir John Oldcastle, rose up in rebellion against the king, at St. Giles's field; but, fourscore of his associates being taken, thirty-seven of them were condemned and executed in the same field, as Mr. Stow relates. p. 551. You may now perceive, brother, that the Wickliffite principles were contrary to your Protestant and Presbyterian doctrine and practice, this last point only excepted, wherein you do not differ much from them; for the Wickliffites taught that subjects ought to punish their sovereigns when they misbehaved; but your Protestants and Presbyterians have only beheaded and banished their lawful princes, for not misbehaving themselves before God and man; as appears in the case of King Charles the First, and in that of his son, King James the Second. Let us compare the meekness of Jesus with the violence of the Wickliffites. "Whosoever shall not hear you," says Jesus, "shake off the dust from your feet, for a testimony to them." "Whosoever shall not hear you," say the Wickliffites, "draw out your sword and strike him." Protestants claim them as their ancestors in the faith; but in our opinion, they ought to reject them; for neither doctrine nor practice of ancestors can shed any lustre on their posterity.

6. Having confuted the Protestant and Presbyterian pretences to visibility in France and England, before Luther and Calvin's time, let us now travel to Bohemia, and see

whether we can find them to have been visible in the Hussites, who took their name from one John Huss, that lived about the year 1405. He was first a Roman Catholic, and a priest, according to your own Mr. Fox, who speaks thus of him, (in Apocolip. c. 11, p. 290:) "What did the Popish faith define of transubstantiation which he did not confirm? who said mass more religiously than he? who kept more chastely the vows of priestly single life?" Yea, he affirmeth also that Huss maintained free-will, justification by works, the veneration of images, and several other points of the Roman Catholic religion. But along with these he obstinately held the aforesaid doctrine of the Wickliffites, concerning churchmen and princes; and moreover urged the communion to be given under both kinds to the laity; yet this is no proof that either the Protestant or the Presbyterian church have been visible in the Hussites; because these heretics did not believe in your Protestant or Presbyterian confession of faith; and in case they had believed that, as they certainly did not, yet it would not suffice; because the question would still remain unanswered, viz., where was the Protestant and Presbyterian religion visible before the Hussites, who began so late?

7. Now, brother, seeing we cannot find the visibility of your Protestant or Presbyterian church among any sect that professed publicly the worship of God in Europe before the year 1517, at which time Luther first began to revolt against the Roman Church, let us see what pretence you can have of showing your visibility among the Greeks, who were at least seven or eight hundred years in communion with the see of Rome, as the first eight general councils do testify, which were all held in Greece, and have been approved by the popes of Rome; and the principal reason that caused the Roman Church to reject the Greek communion was, because they denied the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, about the year 764. They have often retracted this same error, and were therefore reunited to the Roman Church, as appears by their last submission in the general council held

at Florence in the year 1438. And hence it is evident that your pretence of being visible among the Greeks is frivolous; and it is far from probable that we can manifestly show the contrary by the decrees of that council which the Greeks held at Constantinople in the year 1642, in order to reject and condemn your Protestant and Presbyterian principles.

8. Your pretence of being visible among the Armenians is also frivolous, for they were in communion with the see of Rome until about the year 685, as Baronius informs us in his Annals. And after they had revolted from her, they never believed the doctrine of your confession of faith; for they still believe the real presence, they say mass, they pray for the dead, they invoke the saints, and maintain several other articles of the Catholic faith; they were reunited to the Church of Rome along with the Greeks in the afore-mentioned council of Florence; but they fell again, since that period, from her communion, and maintain now some errors which are condemned both by Catholics and Protestants; for they deny the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, with the Greeks; confound the two natures in Christ, with the Eutychians, and reiterate baptism; all which do evidently show that the Armenians neither were nor are Protestants or Presbyterians.

9. Your pretence to visibility in Ethiopia is mere stuff, without any ground or probability; for the Ethiopians were Roman Catholics almost for the space of five hundred years after Christ; and since their schism they never believed the doctrine of your confession of faith; for they still agree with the Roman Catholics concerning the number and virtue of the seven sacraments; they invoke the saints; they pray for the dead, and say mass; they believe transubstantiation, as Dr. Stratfort showeth from their own authors; and they call the pope of Rome the head of all bishops, as is evident by their emperor's letter to Pope Clement the Seventh, whereof part is recited in the supplement to Spondanos; they maintain divers errors which neither Catholics nor Protestants

hold ; for they deny the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, with the Greeks ; affirm (with the Monothelites) that there is but one will in Christ ; they say (with the Eutochians) that he has but one nature ; they abstain from certain meats, like the Jews, and observe, with them, the precept of circumcision ; all of which evidently show, that the Ethiopians neither were nor are Protestants or Presbyterians.

10. Having sufficiently proved to you, brother, the falsity of all your pretences concerning the visibility of your church before Luther's time, hence I advise you to urge your ministers to show you, authentically, that kingdom or nation, that city or parish, that society or community of Christians, which, before Luther, either believed or taught your principles, as they are now contained in your confession of faith ; and though I know this to be as impossible for them to show you, as it is for you to drink the whole sea in one draught, yet I am sure they will strive to come off by telling you some silly fables, which they have invented ; but acquiesce not to such groundless stories, but rather oblige them to gratify your request with written authorities, and that authentically deduced from those authors who are known to the world before Luther and Calvin's days ; and if you stick close to them by demanding this proof, then you shall see how miserably they will strive to shift you off, by introducing some impertinent and silly story of their own invention, reflecting on the pope or on Roman Catholics ; and if you show that you are not versed in the Greek or Hebrew languages, then they will be sure to come off by persuading you to wonderful things contained in those languages of which they find you were ignorant ; if they find that you have not studied philosophy, then they will strive to shift you off by inferring some illegal consequences, which are seemingly deduced from certain premises. (See sec. 24, No. 1.) And if they pretend to come off by the den of invisibility, then tell them that it is contrary to the express word of God, that the true Church of Christ could be at any time invisible to the whole world, (as you have seen, sec. 26 ;) that it is also against their own prin

ciples that this Church could be invisible; for Protestants commonly assign two necessary marks of the true church, to wit, the right preaching of the word, and the administration of the sacraments; and the Presbyterians add to these two marks, their disciples, as a third mark, and, in proof hereof, produce the authority of their own authors; for Mr. Whitaker says, (lib. 3, cont. Duræum, p. 249,) "The administration of the word, and sacraments being present, do constitute a church, and being absent, do subvert it." Mr. Willet says (in his Synopsis, p. 69, 71) that "these marks cannot be absent from the church, and that it is no longer a church that hath not these marks." And hence you may inquire from your ministers, whether their church, (which some of your authors teach,) to have been visible for the space of nine hundred, some for a thousand, and others for twelve hundred and sixty years, (see sec. 26, No. 1, 5,) always had, since the apostles' time, the preaching of the word, and the administration of the sacraments, or not. If it had always these marks, it could not be at any time invisible to the whole world. And if it was visible, let them show you in what kingdom, nation, or city, they have always, since the apostles' time, preached the word of God, and administered the sacraments after the same manner that their confession of faith prescribes to them now to perform them. And if they will not show you this authentically, — which I defy them to do, — you may then rightly conclude against them, that, according to their own principles, they had no church at all in any part of the whole world, until Luther and Calvin's time; for until then they wanted these two or three marks, which they require as absolutely necessary to constitute a true church: as for an invisible church, it may be well termed the kingdom of Satan, for no church, though ever so invisible, can be imagined without eternal faith; at least St. Paul affirms that "faith comes by hearing, and that hearing cometh by preaching the word of God." Rom. c. 10, v. 14, 17. But in an invisible church, there could be no preaching nor hearing of the word of God, and consequently that invisible church

could have no faith, if you believe St. Paul; so that your ministers' invisible church, which before Luther and Calvin's time wanted faith, preaching, and the administration of the sacraments, cannot be the true church of Christ, but rather a chimerical church, purposely invented by Satan and his disciples, in order to deceive poor ignorant souls.

11. Now, brother, since we cannot discover that your church was visible or invisible before Luther and Calvin's days, I request of you to let me know by whom were these men taught, or who sent them to teach these new notions of theirs, which were unknown to the world before their coming; for, as I have hinted above, St. Paul says that "faith comes by hearing;" and he asks, "How can one preach except he be sent?" Rom. c. 10, v. 15, 17. Therefore I have great reason to inquire, From whom did Luther and Calvin hear these new doctrines which they taught? or who sent them to teach that doctrine? for I suspect that they are some of those false teachers, which the Scripture writers foretold should come to deceive the people, by teaching them false and erroneous doctrine; for God speaks thus of those who preach without a lawful commission: "I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran; I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied; I have heard what the prophets said, that prophesy lies in my name; they are prophets of the deceit of their own hearts, which think to cause my people to forget my name; behold, I am against them that cause my people to err by their lies and by their lightness, yet I sent them not, nor commanded them; therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the Lord." Jer. c. 23, v. 21, 25, 26, 27, 32. And St. Paul says also, (speaking to the pastors of the church,) "I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God; take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood; for I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock; also of your own selves (Luther and Calvin were first Roman Catholics) shall

men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them; therefore watch." Acts, c. 20, v. 27, &c. "And though an angel from heaven preach another gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed: as I said before, I say now again, if any man preach another gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Gal. c. 1, v. 8, &c. Since, therefore, I find that the doctrine taught by Luther and Calvin is contrary to the word of God, (as you have clearly seen in what I have examined hitherto,) and that they have not received it from their predecessors, or from any society of Christians, who continually taught it in all ages, from the apostles' time, and that they were not lawfully sent to preach it, (see sec. 26, No. 12,) I think I have great reason to believe that they were some of those false prophets mentioned in Scripture; and consequently that the churches which they have established are not the true church of Jesus Christ.

SECTION XXVIII.

Which shows that the Prophecies of the Old Law, concerning the true Church of Christ, are only verified of the Roman Church.

1. You have seen by the texts of Scripture produced, (sec. 25 and sec. 26,) that it was foretold of the Church of Christ, that she would convert the Gentiles to the Christian religion; and the apostles could not wholly fulfil these predictions, by reason of the distances of several kingdoms, to which they could not reach, and the cruel tyranny wherewith both they and the Christians of those times were persecuted, as Christ himself had foretold. Luke, c. 21, v. 12, &c. So that the full performance of the predictions, and the charge which Christ gave his apostles, by commanding them to go and teach all nations, (Matt. c. 28, v. 19,) were to be fulfilled by the successors of the apostles; and those of the

Roman Church alone have performed all that ever was performed of it; for it was this Church alone that converted to Christianity all the nations that ever since the time of the apostles acknowledged the name of Christ, as all ancient and modern authors unanimously testify; and as it would be tedious to produce their testimony, I shall therefore only produce your own Protestant authors, who are forced to acknowledge the same, to wit, Mr. Fulke, (in his Answer to a Counterfeit Catholic, p. 35,) Sebastianus Francus, (Epist. de abrogandis in universum omnibus Statutis Ecclesiasticis,) Mr. Napper, (upon the Revel. p. 43, 68,) Mr. Brocard, (upon the Rev. p. 110, 123,) Martin Bucer, (lib. 1, de Scripta Anglicana de Regno Christi, p. 12, 18, &c.,) and Philippus Niolai, who wrote two entire books upon this subject. Both the former and following Protestant authors declare that the conversion of several nations to Christianity was altogether accomplished by the Roman Church at that period, during which those of your religion confess commonly that she was a true Church, to wit, in the first three hundred years before the conversion of Constantine the Great, the first Christian emperor; hence Mr. Barlow, bishop of Rochester, says (in his Defence of the Articles of the Protestant Religion, p. 34) that "in the primitive nonage of the church, the promises of sovereign allegiance thereunto were not fully accomplished, because in these days the prophecy of our Savior was rather verified — You shall be brought before kings for my name's sake, and by them be persecuted," &c. Mr. Whitaker, advert- ing to the examples of many countries converted to Christianity by the Roman Church, since the time of St. Gregory, says that "these countries and many nations, after the time of Gregory, mentioned by Bellarmin, were not pure, but corrupt." Lib. cont. Bellar. p. 336. And Symon Lythus makes use of the following words: "The Jesuits, within the compass of a few years, not satisfied with the confines of Europe, have filled Asia, Africa, and America, with their idols." Respon. altera ad alteram Gretseri Apologiam, p. 331. Though these authors endeavor to render the Roman Church odious to the ignorant, by falsely accusing her of idolatry,

(as you have seen, sec. 21,) yet, on the other hand, you see they acknowledge that it was she only that converted to Christianity all those nations which were ever converted since the time of the apostles; so it appears most clearly that she only hath herein accomplished that which was foretold of the Church of Christ.

2. You have seen (sec. 26) that the Church of Christ must be universal both for time and place; that is, she must continue from the time of Christ until the end of the world. "For of Christ's kingdom there shall be no end." Luke, c. 1, v. 32, &c. She must also be diffused over all nations, (Isa. c. 2, v. 2,) still teaching the same doctrine. (See sec. 25.) But these two properties are only verified of that society of Christians which are in communion with the see of Rome, as is evident. If we speak of the time before Luther and Calvin's apostasy, there were no Protestants or Presbyterians at all that could then contest with her, as you have seen, (sec. 27;) neither was there in those times any other society of Christians that assumed the name of Catholic or Universal Church, if we except the sects and heretics that went out from her, which, being condemned by this Church, remained as unprofitable boughs cut off from the vine; "she only remaining the holy Church, the only Church, the true Church, and the Catholic Church," as St. Augustin affirms, lib. 1, Symbol. c. 6. Your own Mr. Fulke says (in his Confutation of Purgatory, p. 334) that "she retained by succession the faith which she first received from the apostles, until Tertullian's days," that is, until about the year 230. Mr. Whitaker (de Ecclesia, p. 278) affirms the same; and he further says, (lib. de Antichristo, p. 85,) "I do acknowledge that the Roman Church was pure and flourishing, and inviolably taught and defended the faith delivered unto her by the apostles, for the first six hundred years after Christ." Mr. Napper says (upon the Revel., p. 68) that "the anti-christian and Papistical government hath begun to reign universally, and without debatable contradiction, twelve hundred and sixty years before Luther." You may now most

clearly see that your own Protestant authors acknowledge that the Roman Church was the only universal church before Luther's time; and if we make now a comparison between her and the Protestant churches since Luther arose, we shall find they come very short of her in universality; which to show, I will make use of St. Augustin's argument proving the universality of the Roman Church, against the Donatists, lib. de Unitate Eccles. c. 3. "These sects," saith he, "are not found in many nations where this Church is; and this, which is every where, is found also even where these sects are." I may now as lawfully say the same to Protestants and Presbyterians; for they are not to be found in many nations, where the Roman Catholic religion is publicly professed, but Roman Catholics may be found where the Protestant is the established religion; nay, there are many large kingdoms and provinces, in Europe itself, in which neither Protestants nor Presbyterians are to be seen or found, as in Spain, in Portugal, Sicily, Naples, Bohemia, and Italy; in France, Germany, Poland, and Hungary, they are not a handful in comparison to the Roman Catholics; and in those northern countries, out of which they have banished by force the public exercise of the Catholic religion, there are still some Roman Catholics, who always profess their faith, notwithstanding what hardships, disabilities, and persecutions they suffer for professing it. As to other parts of the world in which the Roman Catholic religion doth wonderfully flourish, the name of Protestant or Presbyterian is not as much as known to them; for the Catholic religion is not only professed in the most famous kingdoms and provinces of Europe, but is also to be found in Africa, Asia, and America, according to your own Simon Lythus, quoted in this section, No. 1; and though in different countries the public profession is heretical, Mahometan or pagan, yet even there the Roman Catholic faith is professed among them; and what the Catholic Church hath lost in Europe by Luther and Calvin's apostasy she hath gained, with much increase, by the propagation of the Catholic faith in the East and West Indies, and at present in the

great kingdom of China, where many hundreds of thousands have embraced the Roman Catholic faith; and in proof hereof I need no other testimonies than the acknowledgment of your own authors, produced in the first paragraph of this section; and see also sec. 26. So that you may plainly perceive that it is only the Roman Church — by which we understand, not the diocese of Rome in itself, but all those in communion with that see — which can be taken for the Catholic or universal Church, and consequently for the true Church of Christ, which both your creed and your Bible declare to be universal, and command you to hear and obey. Matt. c. 18, v. 17. Rom. c. 13, v. 7, &c.

3. It was foretold of the Church of Christ, that she should condemn all heretics, according to the following text: "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper, and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn." Isa. c. 54, v. 17. This commission of condemning heretics, given to the Church of Christ, is also declared by St. Paul to Titus: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted and sinneth, being condemned of himself." Tit. c. 3, v. 10, &c. Hence St. Peter knew it to be his duty to reprehend and condemn the heresy of Simon Magus, who was the first heretic that appeared in the church; for he thought to purchase for money the power of giving the Holy Ghost. Acts, c. 8, v. 20, &c. And there is no society of Christians in the world that hath continually, since the apostles, performed this duty, but those in communion with the see of Rome, as is evident by all histories, and the decrees of ancient and modern councils held by this Church, in order to condemn the false and erroneous principles of all those heretics that opposed the true doctrine of Christ; she therefore first held a council at Rome, convened by Pope Anicetus, about the year of Christ 165, and condemned the opinions of certain heretics, who taught that Christians ought to imitate the Jews concerning the time of celebrating the feast of Easter. Pope Victor also held a council at Rome, in

197, against the former heretics, and he caused another council that year to be assembled in Africa for the same purpose. The Marcionite heresy was condemned in France, by a council held at Lyons the same year; the Montanist heresy was condemned by a council held at Jerusalem, in 244. And other heretics were condemned that year by a council held in Arabia. The Novatian heresy was condemned by a council held at Rome, in 254. There was a council held in Alexandria, which condemned the heresy of Sabellius, in 263. The heresy of Paul Samosatenus was condemned by the council of Antioch, in 272. The Donatist heresy was condemned by a council held at Rome, in the time of Pope Melchiades, about the year 313. The Arian heresy was condemned by a council held at Alexandria, in 315. This heresy was also condemned by the first general council of Nice, (wherein 318 fathers were assembled,) in 325. The heresy of one Photinus was condemned by a council held at Sirmium, in 349. The council held in Rome condemned the heresy of Valens and Ursacius in 368. The Apollinarists, and several other heretical principles, were condemned by another council held at Rome, in 373, and also by the first general council of Constantinople, (in which 150 fathers were assembled,) in 381. The Priscillianist heresy was condemned by the council of Saragossa, in 385. The heresy of Jovinian was condemned by the council of Milan, in Italy, in 390. The Pelagian heresy was condemned by the council of Carthage, in 416, and by another held in France, in 429. The Nestorian heresy was condemned by the general council of Ephesus, (in which 200 bishops were assembled,) in 431. The Eutychian heresy was condemned by the council of Chalcedon, (in which 630 fathers were assembled,) in 451. The heresy of one Anthymius was condemned by the council of Constantinople, in 536. There were other heretics condemned that year by the council held at Jerusalem. Dydimus, Evagrius, and other heretics, were condemned by the second general council of Constantinople, (wherein 165 fathers were collected,) in 553. The council of Braga, in Portugal, con-

demned the Priscillianist heresy, which appeared in that kingdom in 563. The council of Seville condemned other heretics in 619. The council of Milan condemned the Monothelite heresy in 679. This heresy was also condemned by a council held in France the same year. The third general council of Constantinople (in which 170 fathers were assembled) condemned likewise the same heresy, together with several others, in 681. The Iconoclast heresy was condemned by the council of Rome, in 726. This heresy was also condemned by the second general council of Nice, (at which 350 bishops assisted,) in 787. The fourth general council of Constantinople (at which 383 bishops assisted) condemned the heresy of Photius, in 869. The heresy of Berengarius was condemned by the council of Paris, in 1050. The heresy of Peter Abelard was condemned by the council of Soissons, in 1120. The second general council of Lateran (in which 1000 prelates assembled) condemned the heresy of one Peter de Bruis, in 1139. The heresy of Gilbert Porretanus was condemned by the council of Paris, in 1147. There was another council held at Paris in 1170, which condemned the heresy of Peter Lombard. And another council, which was held in France, condemned the Albigensian heresy, in 1176. And both they and other heretics were condemned by the third general council of Lateran, in 1179. The heresy of one Amauri was condemned by a council held at Paris, in 1200. The doctrine of one Joachim and several other heretics was condemned by the fourth general council of Lateran, (in which above 412 prelates were assembled,) in 1215. The general council of Vienna (in which 400 fathers were assembled) condemned the heresy of the Beguards and Beguines, in 1311. John Wickliff's heresy was condemned by a council held in England, in 1382. This heresy, together with that of John Huss, and Jerom of Prague, was also condemned by the council of Constance, (in which above a thousand fathers were assembled,) in 1414. The general council of Trent (in which six cardinals, four legates, three patriarchs, two hundred and sixty bishops, and several

other prelates of inferior dignities, were assembled) condemned the heresy of Martin Luther and John Calvin, about the year 1545.

It would be too tedious for me to particularize here all the errors of the aforesaid condemned heretics. I therefore refer the curious reader to them in the proceedings and decrees of the afore-mentioned councils. Hence you may evidently perceive that it was the Roman Church alone that hath exercised, in all the preceding ages, the charge of condemning heretics. This was foretold of the Church, and granted to her in the law of grace. You may also perceive, by the assembling of those councils in all ages, that the Roman Church was both universal and visible to the whole world ever since the apostles' time, which properties were clearly foretold of the Church of Christ, as may be seen, sec. 26. And hence, brother, you may justly conclude that the Roman Church is the only true Church of Jesus Christ, because all the prophecies that relate to the Church of Christ are only verified in her; because her doctrine is exactly conformable to the express word of God, as is evident by what I have proved to you in this treatise, which I shall now conclude with the following section.



SECTION XXIX.

Of the Opinions of the Fathers concerning the Roman Catholic Church.

1. I REMEMBER, brother, you told me, at our last conference, that you would believe the holy fathers' authorities concerning the true Church; and hence I thought it fit to let you know their opinion of the Roman Catholic Church. St. Irenæus, who lived in the year 180, says thus: "*The founders of the Church delivered the episcopacy and govern-*

ment of the Church to Linus; who was succeeded by Anacletus, Clement, Evaristus;” and so he enumerates all the rest of the bishops of Rome, in constant succession, down to the bishop who then ruled the Church; and after numbering them so, he then concludes with the following words: “*This is a most full demonstration that the same lively faith, taught by the apostles, is still, even unto this day, preserved in the Church, and truly delivered.*” Lib. 3, c. 3. Tertullian, who lived in 220, speaks thus of the Roman Catholic Church: “*What I believe, I received it from the present Church, and the present from the primitive, the primitive from the apostles, the apostles from Christ.*” De Pres. c. 21. And he further says, “*That is true which was first, that is first which was from the beginning; that was from the beginning which was from the apostles.*” Lib. 4, cont. Mar. c. 5. St. Cyprian, who lived in 250, says thus: “*We know Cornelius, the bishop of Rome, to have been elected by Almighty God, and Christ our Lord, the Bishop of the most holy Catholic Church; neither are we ignorant that there ought to be one God, one Christ our Lord, one Holy Ghost, and one bishop in the Catholic Church.*” Epist. — And he further says, “*They are so bold as to carry letters from profane schismatics to the chair of Peter, to the principal Church, from which the unity of the priesthood originates, not considering the Romans to be those whose faith was praised by St. Paul.*” Rom. c. 1, v. 7, c. 16, v. 19, &c. “*To whom misbelievers cannot have access, (Epist. 55,) for the Church never parts from that which she has once known; the Church is the spouse of Christ, which cannot play the adulteress.*” Lib. de Unitate Eccles. Lactantius, who lived in 320, says thus, speaking of the Roman Catholic Church: “*It is she alone which, as the ancient fathers write, retains the true worship: she is the fountain of truth, and the temple of God — into which whosoever shall not enter, or out of which whosoever shall depart, can have no hope of everlasting life and salvation.*” Lib. 4, de Divin. Inst. c. ult. St. Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, who lived in 400, applies that of the Canticles, c. 6, v. 9, to the

Roman Catholic Church, saying, "*My dove, my undefiled is but one; one is this virgin, this chaste one, this spouse, the holy city of God, the faith, the foundation of truth, the firm rock, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail.*" And, giving an abridgment of her faith, he congratulates himself in the beginning, because he had nothing to do with filthy heresies, but had made his approach to the calm coasts of truth. "*For now,*" saith he, "*being free from all fear, trouble, and tediousness, and being in an excellent posture, by reason of the firm tranquillity and security here breathing, how did we rejoice in spirit, being received into a serene haven! We have passed many evils in our navigation through the aforesaid seas of heresy; but now, having in sight the city, (viz. the Church,) let us make haste to this holy Jerusalem, and virgin of Christ, and spouse, and secure foundation and rock, our reverend mother, most seasonably saying, Let us ascend to the mountain of the Lord, and into the house of the God of Jacob, and she will teach us our ways; let us address to her these words of her spouse — Come, my spouse from Libanus, because thou art all fair, and there is no spot in thee.*" And that he means the visible Church on earth, is evident by these words, in which he flies to the Church, saying, "*To the end that, being placed in thee, we may rest from the troubles of the foregoing heresies, in thee, our holy mother the Church, and in thy holy doctrine, that we may be refreshed in thy truth, with the holy and only faith of God.*" Optatus, who lived in the 4th century, excludes the Donatists from the number of Catholics, because they did not communicate with the see of Rome, (lib. 2, cont. Perm.;) and St. Athanasius confounds the Arians, when he says, "*Behold, we have proved the succession of our doctrine, delivered from hand to hand, from father to son; but as for you, O you new Jews and sons of Caiphas, what progenitors can you name for yourselves?*" Lib. 1, de Decret. Niceni Concilii. St. Chrysostom, a father of the 4th century, writing on these words, "*The queen stood at the right hand,*" (Psalm 45, v. 9,) says, "*The Church is opposed, and overcomes; being pur-*

sued by snares, she gets the advantage; provoked with wrongs and reproaches, she becomes more illustrious; she is hurt, but yields not to the print of the wounds; however she may be tossed, she is not overwhelmed; she endures great tempests, and yet, notwithstanding, suffers not shipwreck; she wrestles, but she is not thrown down." "I will adduce a short and clear declaration of my mind," says St. Jerom, "that we ought to remain in that Church, which, being founded by the apostles, endures even unto this day." Dial. cont. Lucifer. And he also makes use of the following words in his epistle to Pope Damascus: "I speak to the successor of the fisherman, (meaning St. Peter,) and to the disciple of the cross, following none but Christ: I am joined in communion with your holiness, that is to say, with the chair of Peter; for upon that rock I know the Church is built; whoever eats the lamb out of this house is profane; if any one be not in the ark, he will perish in the deluge." And in his commentary on that of St. Paul, 1 Tim. c. 3, v. 15, he also says, that "Pope Damascus was ruler of the house of God, which St. Paul called the pillar and ground of truth." St. Augustin, bishop of Hippo, who was converted to the Christian faith in 387, says, that "the succession of bishops from the seat of Peter, to whom our Lord, after his resurrection, commanded his sheep to be fed, to Anastasius, the present bishop (of Rome, then living) held himself within the lap of the Church." Cont. Epist. Fundam. c. 4. And he also says, "If thou seem to thyself to have been already sufficiently tossed, and would put an end to those labors and pains, follow the way of the Catholic discipline, which hath proceeded from Christ by his apostles, even unto us, and from hence (mark these words) shall descend, and be conveyed to posterity." Lib. de Utilitate credendi, c. 8. And speaking of the great authority of the true Church, he subjoins these remarkable words to his friend Honoratus, c. 17: "Since, therefore, we see such great help and assistance from God, shall we make any doubt or question at all of retreating to the bosom of that Church, which to the confession of mankind, from the see apostolic, by the succes-

sion of bishops, hath obtained the sovereignty and principal authority? while heretics in vain bark around it, being partly condemned by the gravity of councils, partly also by the majesty and splendor of miracles, unto which not to grant the chief place, is either indeed extreme impiety, or the effect of a very rash and dangerous arrogance." And he further says (Epist. 50) that "the Catholic Church alone is the body of Christ, and that out of this body the Holy Ghost quickens no man." And a little before these last words, he says, "For as a member, if it be cut off from the body of a living man, cannot retain the spirit of life, so a man who is cut off from the body of Christ, cannot retain the spirit of justice." And speaking of the Donatists, who held that the Church had perished in all places, but remained with themselves in Africa, "This they allege," saith he, in Psalm 101. "This opinion is so damnable, so detestable, so full of presumption and falsehood, an opinion maintained with no truth, enlightened with no wisdom, seasoned with no salt, vain, rash, heady, pernicious; the Holy Ghost foresaw that the Church is not hidden, because it is not placed under a bushel, but upon a candlestick, that it may shine to all who are in the house; a city seated on a hill cannot be hid—but it is, as it were, hid to the Donatists, because they hear its clear testimonies, which prove that she is diffused all over the whole world, (note these words,) and they choose rather with shut eyes to dash against that mountain, than to go up to it." Lib. de Unitate Eccles. c. 14. Writing against a Manichean book entitled *Fundamenti Epistolam*, he speaks thus: "Not to speak, then, of that wisdom which you do not believe to be in the Catholic Church, there are many things which most justly keep me in her bosom. The consent of people and nations keeps me in it. The authority begun by miracles, nourished by hope, increased by charity, and confirmed by antiquity, keeps me in it. The succession of prelates, from the seat of St. Peter, the apostle, to whom Christ committed his flock after his resurrection, to him who at present sits in his chair, keeps me in it. In fine, the very name of Catholic, which, not without reason, amidst so many heresies,

this Church alone has so attained, that, whereas all heretics would be called Catholic, yet if any stranger should ask where the Catholics assemble, no heretic dare show his own church or house." St. Austin, lib. uno, contra Epist. Fund. cap. 4.

I might produce several other authorities to this purpose, not only from the aforesaid holy fathers, but also from several other ancient doctors and writers, who lived in the first five hundred years after Christ; but I thought that it would be too tedious and unnecessary; because the truth of this matter is sufficiently proved, by what I have already adduced from the word of God and the aforesaid fathers; I will therefore conclude with that of St. Ambrose, who was also a father of the 4th century, who speaks thus of the Roman Catholic Church: "*She cannot suffer shipwreck, because Christ is exalted on the mast, that is, on the cross; the Father stands pilot at the stern; and the Holy Ghost preserves the forecastle.*" Lib. de Salom. c. 5. Therefore the Roman Church is the true and infallible Church of Jesus Christ, which exists in all ages from Christ's time, and will be so to the consummation of the world, protected by the Father, assisted by the Son, and governed by the Holy Ghost; as you have seen by clear Scripture, sec. 25, No. 12.

You have now seen, brother, by this treatise, that your pretended reformation is but a thick Egyptian darkness, which obscures the true doctrine of Jesus Christ; and your ministers have nothing but mere promises of truth, grounded upon their own foolish fancies, passing from one falsehood to another. If, therefore, you are disposed to believe the express word of God, or to live and die in that faith without which St. Paul affirms it to be impossible to please God, (Heb. c. 11, v. 6,) you ought to enter without delay into the Roman Catholic Church; for you have now seen that she is the true Church, which alone has endured without spot or wrinkle since the time of the apostles: she is the Church that hath enlightened the whole world with the Christian faith; she is the only Church that has been always admirable for her unity,

and eminent for her sanctity, that replenished the heavens with innumerable glorious saints, who have all lived and died in that communion; she is the only Church that is universal, both for time and place; she is the Church that hath her gates continually open both day and night, to receive the strength of the Gentiles; she is the Church which alone hath a continued succession of visible pastors, lawfully descending, without interruption, from the time of the apostles; she is the Church that still adheres so closely to the faith she once received, (Rom. c. 1, v. 7, c. 16, v. 19, &c.,) that she never departed from it, notwithstanding all that pagan cruelty or heretical impiety hath ever opposed to her doctrine; so that she was justly called the pillar and ground of truth, a firm rock, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail; this Church is the chaste virgin and true spouse of Jesus Christ, which has been falsely accused by various heretics; "yet she still remains in her root, in her vine, and in her charity." St. Augustin, lib. 1, Symbol. c. 6. Her Heavenly Spouse has manifested her innocence, and brought in due time confusion on her enemies. What can you do more fitly, than to embrace the doctrine of this infallible Church, that, after so many dangerous errors and wanderings, you may return to your father's house, with the prodigal child? (Luke, c. 15, v. 18;) and in so doing, you will be sure to walk in the way of salvation; which the Lord God, of his infinite mercy, grant unto you, and to all other poor souls which have strayed from the true faith of Jesus Christ. **AMEN.**

APPENDIX.

THE

“REFORMED” CHURCHES

PROVED

DESTITUTE OF A LAWFUL MINISTRY

“How shall they preach, except they be sent?” — ROM. x. 15.

THE INTRODUCTION;

CONTAINING SOME DIRECTIONS FOR PERSONS WHO EITHER
HAVE THEIR RELIGION YET TO CHOOSE, OR ARE
ALREADY ENGAGED IN A WRONG CHOICE.

EVERY man, come to the perfect use of reason, is bound to be of some religion to serve God in, according to the condition or station allotted to him by the divine Providence; and it is a concern of the highest importance not to be mistaken in the choice of it; for nothing less than a man's eternal welfare depends upon it, and all is lost if he makes a false step in it. Indifference must therefore be laid aside; for he who is indifferent whether he saves his soul or not, will most certainly perish. Neither must he consult interest, ease, or education; for if he does, he will be in the utmost danger of making a wrong choice. Interest and ease will press hard upon him to embrace that religion which favors them most, whether it be the true one or not; and education, if it be allowed to determine a man in the choice of his religion, will fix him as immovably in Judaism, Mahometanism, Socinianism, or Quakerism, as in the true Church of Christ. No man, therefore, ought to consider whether the church, whereof he is a member, be the church of the country where he is born; whether it be most favorable to his interest, liberty, and ease; or, finally, whether it be the church in which he is most like to make his fortune; but his whole examination ought to be of this one single point, viz., whether it be the true Church of Christ, in which alone salvation can be attained.

But how is it possible for the greatest part of mankind,

such as soldiers, tradesmen, servants, or day-laborers, who are usually of limited capacities in relation to things out of their proper sphere, destitute of learning, and embarked in the cares and solitudes of this life, — how is it possible, I say, for these to be duly qualified for this important choice? The reason of the difficulty is plain, because there is but one faith, according to St. Paul, and but one holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church, according to the Nicene creed; whereas there are innumerable other churches, which all pretend to be the true church of Christ. Lutherans say they are this church; Calvinists say the same; Independents, Anabaptists, Quakers, and many more, put likewise in their claim; and the Church of Rome condemns all these, and says she is the only true Church upon earth. And is it, then, possible for ignorant laics, amidst the daily hurry of business and throng of temporal concerns, to have either leisure or capacity to inform themselves exactly of all the disagreeing systems of so many churches at variance with one another, to examine to the bottom the grounds of their several pretensions, the truth or falsehood of their particular doctrine wherein they are divided, and all the reasons and scriptural texts that appear to be for or against them? Nothing can be plainer than that this is morally impossible. And so we must conclude the greatest part of mankind is in no condition to find the true Church, or determine themselves in the choice of their religion by this sort of examination, which entirely surpasses their capacity.

It is, however, certain that, since Christ has established upon earth a Church for the salvation of men of all states and conditions, whether poor or rich, servants or masters, learned or unlearned, it must be possible for men of all states to distinguish the true Church of Christ from such other churches as are no part of it; for otherwise they would not have it in their power either to mend their choice, if they have already made a bad one; or to make a right choice, if, by the misfortunes of their education, they should be engaged in a wrong way; or even to know that they are in the true Church, when

the divine Providence has effectually bestowed that blessing on them.

Hence it follows that there must be some other way besides the examination of particular points of doctrine for ignorant people either to make a rational choice of their religion, or to fix them with an entire security in the religion they have received by education, in case it be their happiness to have been brought up in the true one.

But what way is there proportioned to their capacities to discern the only true Church from so many others, which all pretend to be this one true church? I answer, there are a great number of general arguments, plain and easy to be understood, which mark out the true Church as clearly as a pillar set up at the meeting of several roads directs travellers to the way they are to take; and there are likewise some general principles by which a false church may be known as clearly as rocks and shelves under water are known by the marks set up to warn seamen against them.

Let us, then, suppose a person is deliberating whether he shall embrace the Roman Catholic faith, or continue a member of the church wherein he has been educated. I assure him he will stand in no need of learning to make a right choice, but only of some natural good sense, and a hearty resolution to save his soul, if he will but weigh with attention, and without prejudice, the following general considerations I shall lay before him.

1st. There are in the Gospels the fullest and plainest promises of a perpetual infallibility made by Christ to his Church, as will appear from the following texts: "Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. c. 16, v. 18. "I will ask my Father, and he will send you another Comforter, to abide with you forever." John, c. 14, v. 16. "The Comforter; which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John, c. 14, v. 26. "I have yet many things to say unto you; but you cannot bear

them now. However, when the Spirit of truth is come, he will lead you into all truth." John, c. 16, v. 13. "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Matt. c. 28, v. 20. All which is confirmed by St. Paul calling the Church of Christ "the pillar and ground of truth." 1 Tim. c. 3, v. 15.

Nothing, surely, can be stronger for the proof of an infallible church than these texts. There must, therefore, be such a church upon earth, if Christ has been true to his word. Now, all the self-styled reformed churches in the world unanimously own themselves to be fallible. It follows, therefore, that the Roman Catholic Church alone is the infallible church of Christ, as she has always maintained her claim to that title. And surely a Christian who seriously resolves to save his soul will choose an infallible church for his guide, rather than a fallible one.

2dly. Protestants generally accuse us of a want of charity in denying the possibility of salvation to any but those of our own communion. I presume, then, their charity is more extensive than ours; for otherwise it would be ridiculous to declaim against us for the want of it; and so they can do no less than to allow the possibility of salvation to Roman Catholics; that is to say, they are convinced in their hearts that Roman Catholics may be saved in their religion; because otherwise it would be no charity to tell them so, any more than it would be a charity to tell a man that he can be saved in a damnable state.

Now, in a dispute about the truth of revealed mysteries, which are above our understanding, and which, by consequence, cannot be decided by the force of human reason, it cannot be doubted but the safest and wisest course we can take to secure the salvation of our souls, is to depend upon the greatest authority upon earth. And, therefore, since the authority of both Catholics and Protestants, joined together, is greater than that of Protestants alone, it follows plainly that it is safer for any man to choose the Roman Catholic Church preferably to any of the reformed churches, which

alone allow salvation to be attainable in their own communion; whereas the declared enemies of the Roman Catholic Church allow it to be attainable in the communion of that Church. Catholics, therefore, cannot be suspected of partiality in their own cause relating to this point, because they have their very enemies on their side; but Protestants may be suspected of partiality, because they are the sole judges in their own cause, and have not only the whole body of Roman Catholics now extant in the world, but the authority of all the councils, bishops, and pastors, of the Catholic Church, for fifteen ages before the reformation, against them. Mr. Lesly, in his *Case Stated*, is pleased to call this a childish argument; but I have not yet seen a solid answer to it.

3dly. There are numberless examples of persons brought up Protestants from their infancy, who in their last sickness have embraced the Catholic faith. A no less man than King Charles the Second was one of those. But I dare boldly challenge Protestants to produce one single example of a person brought up from his infancy in the Roman Catholic faith, who ever changed his religion upon his death-bed. Whence I conclude that even in the judgment of many persons brought up with a prejudice to us, it is safer dying a Catholic than a Protestant. And then I am sure it is likewise safer to live in the Catholic Church; because many, who have laid a design of dying Catholics, have been justly disappointed, either by a sudden death, or the want of opportunity to be reconciled in their last sickness.

4thly. Whereas great numbers of Protestants, by becoming Catholics, have not only changed their religion, but manners, and, from libertines they were before, have become sober and regular Christians, nay, even embraced the austerities of a religious state, — I never heard of any Catholic, who, upon his turning Protestant, ever became either more sober, more chaste, more just, more charitable, or pious, than he was before. On the contrary, the lives of those who fall from the Catholic religion are generally so disedifying, and even publicly scandalous, that they are a dishonor, rather than a credit

to the church they come over to. Nay, in the very beginning of the reformation, it was notoriously remarkable that libertinism and impiety increased proportionably as Luther and Calvin's new gospel made its progress; which the reader will find proved with the utmost evidence from Protestant testimonies in the following Tract, Art. 3.

But is it any wonder that persons broke loose from the whole restraint of confessing and punishing their sins should be more easily carried away by all the inclinations of corrupt nature, than they who believe themselves bound in conscience to confess their most secret sins, to perform the penance imposed upon them, to restore whatever they possess unjustly, to make reparation of honor if they have wronged their neighbor in his fame, and to avoid all the immediate occasions of relapses? It is morally impossible it should be otherwise; and it follows from it that Roman Catholics, who are under all these and many more restraints, must needs be in a safer way to heaven than they who have none of these restraints laid upon them.

I hope, however, no one will suspect I pretend to accuse modern Protestants of directly encouraging libertinism or vice by any positive principle of their religion. For I should wrong them if I did. But what I say is, that they have deprived themselves of the most powerful remedy against vice by reforming away the sacrament of penance, which we may properly call the strongest fence about the law; and this being pulled down by the reformation, there is no need of encouraging the people to break in upon God's commandments. It suffices that the restraints of shame and fear, the one of confessing, the other of punishing, their sins, are removed from their hands; because corrupt nature, thus set at liberty, will after that act its own part, and be too hard for the commandments left thus unguarded.

5thly. A motive which sufficed to fix so great and learned a man as St. Austin in the religion he had chosen is surely no weak one, and may suffice to direct any man, whether earned or unlearned, in the choice he has to make. Let us,

then, hear his own words. "*Lastly, (says he,) the very name of Catholic holds me; of which this Church alone has not without reason so kept the possession, that though all heretics desire to be called Catholics, yet, if a stranger asks them where Catholics meet, no heretic dare to point out his own house or church.*" But what church is it in which St. Austin was held steadfast by the very name of Catholics? His words immediately preceding are a full answer to this question. "*Thirdly, (says he,) a succession of bishops descending from the see of St. Peter, to whom Christ, after his resurrection, committed his flock, holds me in the Church.*" *Contra Epist. Fund. c. 4.* It is plain, then, it was the Church in communion with the see of Rome St. Austin had chosen for his guide. It was in this Church he was held by the very name of Catholic; because she had always had, and has had ever since, so full and undisputed a possession of this honorable title, that no communion separated from her was ever able either to gain it to itself, or dispossess her of it.

But what means the word *Catholic*? It is a Greek word, and signifies the same as *universal*. And this is so essential a condition of the true Church, that no society upon earth can pretend to be a part of it unless it be to the communion of that Church which has universality both of time and place — of time, by being the standing Church of all ages since the time of the apostles; and of place, by having on its side the agreement of people and nations, according to St. Austin's expression; both which parts of the Church's universality are clearly marked out in the word of God.

Her universality of time is marked out by Christ promising his apostles that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." *Matt. c. 16, v. 18.* "And that he will be with them always, even unto the end of the world." *Matt. c. 28, v. 20.* And by Isaiah in these prophetic words: "This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord. My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put into thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of

the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and forever." Isa. c. 59, v. 21.

Her universality of place is marked out, 1st, by God's promise to Abraham, that all nations of the earth should be blessed in his seed. Gen. c. 22, v. 18. 2dly, by the Psalmist: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Psalm 2, v. 8. And again: "Praise the Lord, all ye nations; praise the Lord, all ye people." Psalm 116, v. 1. 3dly, by Isaiah describing the future glory of the Church of Christ in the multitude of people and nations flocking to her. Isa. 60. And lastly, by Christ himself giving a commission to the apostles and their successors "to go and teach all nations." Matt. c. 28, v. 19.

Here, then, it behoves the reader to examine impartially whether these two parts of universality are to be found in the Church of Rome, or in any of the reformed churches; because in whatever church they are found, it cannot be doubted this is the true church of Christ.

As to the Church of Rome, — that is to say, the church in communion with the see of Rome, — she has not only had an uninterrupted visible being from the time of the apostles to this day, but has always been the most illustrious society of Christians upon earth. She has, therefore, the universality of time promised by Christ, and foretold by Isaiah. She has likewise preached the gospel in the most remote and barbarous nations in the world, who have all received the faith of Christ from her bishops and pastors; and not only they, but likewise those very nations of Europe, in which the reformed churches are now established — as England, Scotland, Ireland, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, and the Protestant parts of Germany and Switzerland; for all these were converted from heathenism to Christianity by missionaries sent by the Church of Rome, as is manifest from their unanimous profession of the religion called Popery, for several ages after their conversion, till the pretended reforma-

tion. Nay, she has, at this very time, bishops and pastors propagating the gospel among the infidels both of the East and West Indies. Therefore universality of place, or, as St. Austin calls it, the agreement of people and nations, cannot possibly be denied her.

But can any of the "reformed" churches lay claim to this universality either of time or place? Alas! it is but two hundred and five years ago since the very first of them began to creep out of the shell, and it was some years after before the rest came into the world. It is plain, then, that the very eldest of them wants near fifteen hundred years of universality of time; and as to universality of place, I should be glad to know what barbarous or heathen nation has ever been converted by missionaries of any of the "reformed" churches, though they have all the opportunity imaginable to do it, by reason of the great trade several of them have both in the East and West Indies. Nay, is there any one of those churches that ever extended itself beyond what we may properly call a corner of the earth, comparatively to the large extent, both in and out of Europe, of the Roman Catholic Church? This, therefore, makes it likewise plain that they have no universality of place; and being all separated from the communion of the Church of Rome, which has universality both of time and place, they can be no part of the Catholic Church, nor have any claim to that honorable title; the consequence whereof is, that they are no part of the true Church, in which alone salvation can be obtained, according to this saying of Christ, "If he will not hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican." Matt. c. 18, v. 17. That is, let him be regarded as a reprobate, or one in a damnable state.

6thly. The "reformed" Churches, not one excepted, are either guilty of schism, or no church in the world was ever guilty of it. Nay, we may confidently say they have the plainest marks of schismatical churches it is possible for a church to have. For what is schism but an obstinate and wilful separation from the communion of the true Church of

God? Now, the first reformers boasted openly that they had separated themselves from the whole world; and it is plain fact they did so. If, therefore, God has always had a true Church upon earth, as I take it to be an undeniable truth he has, the consequence is, that they had separated themselves from the true Church, as well as from other churches, which surely suffices to convince any man that his soul cannot be safe in any of the "reformed" churches.

7thly. There can be no true Church, but what has its origin from Christ and his apostles; and this is likewise a truth which cannot be contested. Now, it is a plain, historical fact, that the "reformation" began near upon fifteen hundred years after the ascension of Christ, that is, anno 1517; and by consequence, that there were none of the present "reformed churches in the world before that time, because there could be no "reformed" churches before the reformation which gave them their birth. And how, then, can any of these churches pretend to be a part of the true one — that is, of the Church established by Christ and his apostles? Did they incorporate themselves with any preëxistent church that was a part of the true one? No: they separated themselves from the whole world: they therefore began upon a new establishment, and are no more a part of any Christian church that was before them, than they are a part of the Jewish synagogue; and so they can be no part of the Church founded by the apostles, which was surely before them.

If any one pretends that the "reformed" church, whereof he is a member, has always had a being, though it has not always been visible to men, I really pity his case, and advise him, as a friend, to give up the cause, honestly and fairly, rather than have recourse to such a wretched shift for its defence, which, in reality, is a cover for the most ridiculous sect upon earth. For who will pretend to defeat an invisible host? And so a Muggletonian or Quaker will be as safe behind his intrenchment of an invisible church, and, with the help of this ingenious invention, trace the origin of his church to Christ and his apostles as easily as any "reformed" church in Europe.

8thly. There can be no security of salvation in a church whose very rule of faith is an inexhaustible source of divisions, errors, and contradictions. Now, whereas the Catholic rule of faith is the word of God, as interpreted to us by the Church of Christ, that of the reformed churches is Scripture interpreted by private judgment. So that the guide of Catholics is the greatest authority upon earth; and the guide of Protestants is every man's private judgment; because whoever appeals to the Scriptures, and throws aside the Church's interpretation of them, appeals effectually to his own private judgment, and acknowledges no other guide; which I justly call an inexhaustible source of divisions, errors, and contradictions; and I need not insist upon any other proof of it than the numberless jarring sects, all spawned from the "reformation," which set up this pernicious rule, and soon saw the natural fruits of it in as monstrous a Babel of confusion, as the infinite diversity of private judgments must unavoidably produce. The reader will find this shown at large towards the end of the third article. And so I leave every man of common sense to judge, whether (considering the sublimity of divine mysteries on the one hand, and the narrow compass of human reason, together with its proneness to be biased by interest or prejudice, on the other) — whether, I say, persons be not safer, as to their eternal salvation, under the conduct of pastors who reject a rule which is the fruitful source of errors, and adhere to the authority established by Christ himself for our guide, than they that are guided by ministers who, by a fundamental principle of their religion, are bound to own that Scriptures interpreted by private judgment is the only rule of their faith.

9thly. No man can hope to work his salvation in a church which has no lawful ministry; that is, no lawful power to preach the word, and administer the sacraments; and,

10thly. The only Church in which a Christian can hope to work his salvation is that which derives its doctrine from Christ and his apostles.

If, therefore, I prove these two points, viz., that none of

the "reformed" churches have a lawful ministry, and that the Roman Catholic Church is the only church upon earth that derives its doctrine from Christ and his apostles, the undeniable consequence will be, 1, that salvation cannot be hoped for in any of the "reformed" churches; and, 2, that it can only be attained in the Roman Catholic Church.

The proof of these two important points is the whole subject of the following small treatise; and I may truly say it goes all at once to the very bottom of the cause, in such a manner, that, without the examination of any one particular point of doctrine, both the learned and unlearned may not only clearly see what churches are to be avoided as so many rocks on which their eternal salvation will most certainly suffer shipwreck, but likewise find that Church, which alone is a safe harbor, wherein it may be secured.

The endeavors I have used to set this whole matter in its clearest light will perhaps displease such insincere souls as hate the light, because it incommodes them. But I hope they will be acceptable to all sincere lovers of truth, whatever persuasion they are of; and it is for these alone the following sheets are designed, which have no other end in view than to mark out to them the way of truth and salvation; that they either may walk on steadily in that way, if they find themselves already in it, or enter into it, if choice or education has misled them into a wrong path.

ARTICLE I.

No lawful Ministry without a lawful Mission.

EVERY civil government has within itself a source from which all lawful power and authority is derived; and no particular member of any society can lay claim to any part of this power or authority, unless it flows to him from that source. No man, for example, is treated as a public minister, unless he shows his credentials from the prince or state that sends him; nor respected and obeyed as a magistrate, unless he be called to that dignity, and vested with that authority annexed to it by superior powers. Nay, it would be highly ridiculous in any man to intrude himself into the very meanest office even of a private family, without the express or presumed consent of the master or mistress of it. This is the established order of the government of the world, and so manifestly conformable to reason and common sense, that without it all states or kingdoms, or even lesser societies, would be no better than so many Babels of disorder and confusion.

Now, the same principle is applicable to the Church as well as secular states, but with this material difference, viz., that, as every secular state formed itself, at first, by common consent, into a civil society, so had it the liberty to choose what form of government and establish what laws it pleased for the public good. But the Church, as such, is a divine society, as having a divine origin. For it was not established by men, but by God himself. Jesus Christ, God and man, was its immediate founder and lawgiver; and he is still its supreme head, governor, and sovereign pastor. It is, therefore, bound to keep those laws, that form of government under him, and that method of conveying it down, which was at first established by him. Nor is there any power upon earth can

change the laws or dispense with the conditions, or deviate from the ways and methods, he has marked out to us. ?

Here, then, we need but consult the word of God to inform ourselves upon what footing the conveyance of the ecclesiastical ministry is established by him. Let us first hear Christ himself speak in the following sacred words: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and robber." John, c. 10, v. 1. Here all are declared thieves and robbers, that is, usurpers of the sacred ministry, who "enter not by the door." And lest we should mistake the meaning of this figurative expression, he explains it thus, (v. 7 :) "Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep." So that whoever enters upon the ministry, and has not his mission from Christ, either immediately, as the apostles had, or mediately, by deriving it from them or their lawful successors, are here marked out in the character of thieves and robbers. Whence it plainly follows that any society of men, let them be as numerous as they please, or boast of their purity as much as they please, can never be a true Church, if it has not a ministry originally derived from Christ by an uninterrupted succession of lawful pastors; because the true Church can never be without true pastors; and without a ministry originally derived from Christ by an uninterrupted succession in the same communion, there can be no true pastors.

This, then, is the foundation of the ecclesiastical ministry laid by Christ himself; and St. Paul, his faithful apostle and interpreter, teaches the same doctrine in his Epistle to the Romans, c. 10, v. 15. "How shall they preach except they be sent?" For if they be not sent, they can be nothing else but intruders into the sheepfold, usurpers of the sacred ministry, and, in a word, thieves and robbers.

But the example of Christ himself is most certainly of the greatest weight to convince us that no man can legally enter upon the sacred ministry, except he be sent according to the order established by God. For if the Son of God took not

upon him the preaching of the gospel but as sent by his eternal Father, what sacrilegious arrogance and presumption must it then be in men to assume to themselves this sacred function without a commission from any lawful authority? Our Savior therefore, to render us sensible of the necessity of a true mission for every minister of the gospel, judged it requisite, upon several occasions, to prove his own mission to the Jews. I shall omit a great many passages for brevity's sake, and only quote a few from St. John, who writes thus: "Now about the midst of the feast Jesus went up into the temple and taught: and the Jews marvelled, saying, How knoweth this man letters, having never learned? Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he will know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory, but he that seeketh his glory that sent me, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him." John, c. 7, v. 14, 15, &c.

However, the Jews persisting still to question his authority, he answered them, "I am not come of myself, but he that sent me is true, whom ye know not. But I know him, for I am from him, and he hath sent me." v. 28, 29.

Again, the following words are very remarkable: "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him. For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say and what I should speak." John, c. 12, v. 48, 49.

Here our Savior declares positively that he spoke nothing but what he was commanded to speak by his Father. And this implies no less than that, if he had preached any doctrine either contrary to, or beyond, the commission he had received from his Father, (which indeed the impeccability of his sacred person rendered impossible,) he would have preached without the authority requisite for that function.

However, to render us still more sensible of the necessity of an uncontested mission, our Savior would prove his by a great number of illustrious miracles, and more particularly by

that which, for its circumstances, appeared more illustrious than the rest. For, though all the miracles of his life were to show from whom he came, as they did by the divine power and goodness which shined in them, yet the raising of Lazarus, and the loud prayer he made to his Father before it, were not only intended, but expressly declared, to be done for the notifying and proving of that mission, from which alone all other true missions were to be derived afterwards to the end of the world. For St. John expressly tells us, that, when he was upon the point of raising Lazarus, "He lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I know that thou hearest me always. But because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." John, c. 11, v. 41, 42. It is plain our Savior here proves his mission from the miraculous power given him to raise Lazarus, as being a divine and public testimony of it, since it was asked, for that very end, in the people's own hearing; and no sooner asked but granted.

Thus did our Savior take care not only to assert but prove his mission, in order to mark out clearly to his Church the sacred source from whence the lawful exercise of the ecclesiastical ministry must indispensably flow. Christ himself had his mission from God, "who gave him all power in heaven and in earth." Matt. c. 28, v. 19. He communicated it to his apostles. "As my Father sent me, even so I send you." John, c. 20, v. 21. And again: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them," &c. Matt. c. 28, v. 19. The apostles, as the Church increased, ordained bishops and priests, according to the power they had received from Christ, and assigned to each of them the particular churches they were to feed and govern. These took care to transmit the same power to their successors, as these did likewise to theirs. And so the sacred ministry of governing and feeding the flock of Christ, by preaching the word and administering the sacraments, has been handed down by an uninterrupted suc-

cession from the apostles throughout all ages to the present time, and will be continued in the same manner to the end of the world, according to St. Paul. Ephes. c. 4, v. 11, 12, 13.

For this reason, Tertullian, in his Book of Prescriptions, (c. 37,) pressed the heretics of his time with this question: "*Qui estis vos? Quando et unde venistis?*" Who are you? When and whence did you come? Whence have you your mission? How can you prove that you have entered by the door, and are not thieves and robbers? The same Tertullian (c. 3) writes thus: "*Let them produce (says he) the origin of their church, let them give us a list of their bishops, drawn down by succession from the beginning, so that their first bishop had either an apostle, or an apostolical man, continuing to the end, in the communion of the apostles for his predecessor.*" In effect, the constant practice of the ancient fathers, to prove against heretics the truth of the doctrine taught by the Catholic Church, was by showing this uninterrupted succession of Catholic bishops and pastors, in the same communion from the apostles, and, on the contrary, to defy their adversaries to show any such succession of bishops teaching the discriminating doctrine of their sects.

St. Cyprian (Epist. 76) says of Novatian that "*he was not in the Church, nor could he be counted a bishop, (as to the power of jurisdiction,) because, despising apostolical tradition, he came of himself, and succeeded to nobody, to wit, in his own communion.*"

"*A succession of bishops,*" says St. Austin, (Contra Epist. Fund. c. 4,) "*descending from the see of St. Peter to the present episcopacy, holds me in the Catholic Church.*" And St. Optatus writes thus to the Donatists: "*Since you pretend to be the Church of God, show the origin of your bishops.*" For if they had pretended to produce a catalogue of bishops descending from the apostles, they would have been answered that those were not bishops of the Donatist, but Catholic Church, and that therefore Donatus himself was the first bishop of the separate church he had set up, and

could show no succession of bishops that were before him of his communion.

This shows plainly what the ancient fathers thought of all communions that had separated themselves from the Catholic Church, and that they regarded them no otherwise than as usurpers of the ecclesiastical ministry, as invaders of the priestly office, and, in a word, as societies destitute of all power and authority of either preaching the word or administering the sacraments. The consequence whereof is, that they were no part of the true Church of Christ, from which the true ministry is wholly inseparable. Nay, Mr. Lesly, a writer of the Church of England, well known, has the same contemptible opinion of all the dissenting Protestant churches as the fathers had of the heretical and schismatical communions of their times. For, in his *Treatise of private Judgment and Authority*, (p. 222,) he writes thus: "*The dissenters have no commission or succession to show: they have thrust themselves as guides upon the road towards heaven, not above 140 years ago, in utter contempt and opposition to all the guides of God's appointment from the days of the apostles.*" Whence he justly concludes that they have no authority at all either to preach the word, or administer the holy sacraments, which God has instituted, or to bless in his name.

Here Mr. Lesly agrees exactly with me in the important principle I have laid down; and I should be glad he agreed as well with me in the application of it. But how unjust are men in their balances! How clearsighted are they in seeing the defects of others, and how blind at the same time not to see their own in the very same kind!

He tells us, first, the dissenters have no commission or succession to show. I grant they have not. But how will he show the commission or succession of the Protestant Church of England? since it is an undeniable fact that, for nine hundred years together before the pretended reformation of that church, all her bishops were in communion with the Church of Rome, and agreed with her in sacraments, doctrine

and practice; as in monastical vows, in praying for the relief of the dead, in the invocation of saints, in adoring the blessed sacrament, and receiving the definitions of former councils for transubstantiation, the veneration of holy images and relics, and the pope's supremacy, &c.

First, then, I ask from whom the first Protestant bishops of the Church of England had their commission to teach a doctrine directly opposite, in all the fore-mentioned articles, to that of all the Catholic bishops, their predecessors. If they pretend to have had it from them; the thing is wholly incredible, as will appear more fully hereafter. Yet I cannot imagine how they came by it in any other way, unless it was sent them immediately from heaven, and so their mission was extraordinary, like that of the apostles; which also will not be easily believed without good proofs, and I fear it will be a hard task to find any.

I ask, secondly, from whom the first Protestant bishops of the Church of England derived their succession; that is, from what bishop of their own communion; since all the English bishops before them were Roman Catholics, that is, in the communion of the bishop of Rome. If they allege the validity of their ordination, and their being in possession of the ancient episcopal sees of their Catholic predecessors, who certainly derived their succession from the apostles, I answer that, though their ordination were valid, (which we utterly deny,) this would be insufficient to prove their succession to be truly apostolical; because there is something more required to make good this title than a valid ordination, and the possession of the episcopal sees of their predecessors; viz., their being members of the same church and communion with those whose successors they pretend to be. For otherwise it will follow that the Arian and Donatist bishops were the true successors of the apostles; because their ordination was most certainly valid, and they filled the ancient sees of the Catholic bishops, their predecessors. But since it would be highly absurd to grant this, (because persons cut off by heresy and excommunication from the Church founded by

the apostles cannot possibly be called their true successors,) it is manifest the English Protestant clergy will never prove their succession to be apostolical, unless they can convince us that they are members of the same church and communion with the Catholic bishops that went before them, any more than the Arian and Donatist bishops formerly were. Hence it plainly follows, that if some expedient be not found out to fill up a gap of nine hundred years, in all which space of time there were no Protestant bishops or parsons in all Great Britain, they may as well pretend to derive their succession from Aaron as from the apostles.

But to return back to Mr. Lesly. He tells us, 2dly, that "the dissenters thrust themselves as guides upon the road towards heaven, not above a hundred and forty years ago." And pray how many years ago is it that the bishops and parsons of the reformed Church of England appeared first as guides upon the road towards heaven? If Mr. Lesly be unwilling to satisfy his Protestant brethren in a point of that importance, I shall do it for him. The pretended reformation of England began about the year 1533, and Queen Elizabeth came not to the crown till the year 1558. So that it was not finished till some years after the middle of that century. Now, if we count back 140 years from the time that Mr. Lesly wrote his book "Of private Judgment and Authority," we may, by a very easy computation, discover the exact epocha of time when his Protestant bishops and pastors appeared first "as guides upon the road to heaven;" and the difference of age between his church and that of the dissenters will be found to be so inconsiderable as no ways deserved his notice. We are likewise sure the Protestant guides of the Church of England were never sent or sought for by any of the Popish bishops, their predecessors; and so they likewise sympathize in this with the dissenters, that they "thrust themselves as guides upon the road to heaven;" unless they will claim an extraordinary mission immediately from God; for which if they can show the testimony of miracles, as the apostles did, we shall be ready to believe them

Lastly, Mr. Lesly tells us that the dissenters thrust themselves as guides upon the road, in utter contempt and opposition to all the guides of God's appointment from the days of the apostles. It seems, then, that there were guides of God's appointment from the very time of the apostles till the pretended reformation; and if they were of God's appointment, they could not be false guides. But of what religion were these guides of God's appointment? Were they Protestants or Papists? They could not be Protestants before there were any reformed churches in being: it is plain, then, they were all Papists before the reformation; at least in the island of Great Britain, where no religion but Popery was ever professed for 900 years together, till the change of it introduced by Henry VIII., carried on by Edward VI., and finished by Queen Elizabeth. It was, therefore, effected in utter contempt and opposition to all the bishops and pastors, who had been the guides of God's appointment for 900 years together.

And how, then, can Mr. Lesly reproach the dissenters with this unwarrantable proceeding, since it is plain they only followed the example his church had set them? Nay, may we not legally conclude against him, as he does against the dissenters, that his church "has no authority at all either to preach the word or administer the holy sacraments which God has instituted, or to bless in his name"? And so, according to his own principle, she is no part of the true Church of Christ, as being destitute of a lawful mission, and guilty of having usurped the sacred ministry without commission or succession.

But let that be as it will, it is manifest, both from Scripture and tradition, that there can be no lawful ministry without a lawful mission; which is precisely the principle I have established. Nor do I know any Protestant so unreasonable as to deny it, though they all differ from us in the application of it. On the contrary, all the reformed churches labor with their utmost force to prove the legality of their mission, some one way, some another; and it shall now be my business to prove that it is impossible for any of them to make good their title;

which if I do, every Protestant, whatever reformed church he is a member of, must be sensible that he is out of the way of salvation; because salvation cannot be attained to in a church in which there is no lawful administration of the sacraments, or under the conduct of guides who have not "entered into the sheepfold by the door," and are stigmatized by Christ himself with the infamous character of thieves and robbers.

ARTICLE II.

The Disagreement amongst Protestants concerning their Mission.

DISAGREEMENT and contradictions, in a dispute about a title which, for its importance, ought to be clear and uncontested, are, of themselves, a strong proof of its nullity. There is not, for example, a bishop or inferior pastor in the communion of the Church of Rome but can prove the validity of his title to the sacred ministry as clearly as an officer in the army can show his commission for the respective post he is in. And it cannot be doubted but the reformed churches would prove theirs with the same uncontested evidence, and there would be the same harmony amongst them in this point as there is amongst Roman Catholics, if their title to the ministry were grounded upon a solid foundation, like that of the Church of Rome. Whereas, on the contrary, nothing perplexes Protestants more than the question Tertullian puts to the heretics of his time, Who are you? Whence did you come? That is, when we press them to give an account of their mission or vocation to the ministry of the gospel. Because the first reformers having broken off from the communion of the whole world, (as both Luther and Calvin attest in their writings,) it is hard to conceive what way a lawful mission could possibly be conveyed to them. And if the first reformers had no lawful mission, their successors can have none.

Here, then, they all find themselves involved in an inextricable labyrinth of difficulties, what way soever they turn themselves; and they vary in their opinions about it just according as they are pressed on this or that side by the arguments of their adversaries. They who chiefly consider the difficulty of maintaining their pretensions to an ordinary mission fly for shelter to an extraordinary one; and they who find themselves driven out of this intrenchment endeavor to make the best shift they can by having recourse to an ordinary one.

As Luther and Calvin, with some others, were the apostles of the reformation, so we find them, of course, at the head of that party which stood up for an extraordinary mission. For they considered that they had set up a new gospel, a new church government, a new ministry, a new communion, and had separated themselves from all Christian societies in the world. They judged it, therefore, the best and safest course they could take, never to trouble their heads with proving their ordinary mission, which they plainly saw was a defenceless cause; and so resolved to set a good bold face upon the matter, and challenge to themselves an immediate mission to reform the church, not from men, but from God himself. But lest those who may be sensible of the folly and extravagance of this pretension should suspect the truth of it, and imagine I pretend to fight against my own shadow, I shall prove it with the utmost evidence from their own writings.

First. Martin Luther speaks thus of himself: "I am sure," says he, "I have my doctrine from heaven." Tom. 2, fol. 333. And again, "I was the first to whom God vouchsafed to reveal the things which have been preached to you." Tom. 7, fol. 274. And, tom. 2, fol. 305, he writes thus: "Since now I am certain I preach the word of God, it is not fit I should want a title for the recommencing of the word and work of the ministry, to which I am called by God; which I have not received of men, nor by men, but by the gift of God and revelation of Jesus Christ." This is a plain and positive averring that he had not his doctrine by succession from any that went before him, nor, by consequence, from

the Apostolical Church, which surely was before him; and this alone suffices to condemn him and his doctrine, unless he can prove effectually that he had it immediately from heaven.

Calvin is full as plain upon the matter, (Epist. 190,) to the king of Poland, where he writes thus: "Since, by the pope's tyranny, the succession has been interrupted, the Church could not be reëstablished without a new ministry. So that the commission our Savior gave us to assemble the churches was wholly extraordinary. And since the supporters of true piety appeared suddenly in an extraordinary manner, their vocation is not to be examined by the common rules, but they were raised immediately by God, to the end that, having established the churches, they should ordain other pastors to succeed them."

In another work, entitled, "The true Method of reforming the Church," he writes in the following manner: "I have already said that an ordinary vocation is necessary when the state of the Church is uncorrupted, or at least tolerable. But will this tie up the hand of God, and hinder him from raising in an extraordinary manner prophets and other ministers to reëstablish his Church, when it is utterly ruined?" He then proceeds to apply this to the first reformers, as men raised by God in an extraordinary manner.

Theodorus Beza, who succeeded Calvin in the government of the church of Geneva, maintained the same in his conference with the cardinal of Lorain, at Poissy, where he tells his adversary that, though some of the first reformers might have insisted upon their mission as derived from the Church of Rome, yet they voluntarily renounced their ordination as the mark of the beast, and chose rather to depend upon an extraordinary vocation; because the ordinary mission was in reality extinguished in the Roman Church, in which there was nothing but a horrible disorder and confusion. Hist. Eccl. p. 580.

But he explains himself more fully in a dispute he had with a Protestant writer called Adrian Saravias, who, in a book written by him "Concerning the Degrees of Ministers of the

Gospel," maintained that particularly those of the first reformers who had been ordained in the Church of Rome stood in no need of an extraordinary mission, but that the ordinary one they had received by virtue of their ordination sufficed. And as for others, he said that every Christian well instructed in the Scripture had both a power and obligation to reform all abuses and errors that crept into the church.

This latter part of his opinion Beza refutes by telling him that, at that rate, "every man that has but a good opinion of his own learning will, under pretence of reforming the church, set up for a preacher of a new gospel, and form separate assemblies, as Anabaptists and Libertines are wont to do." "But God forbid," says he, "that we should open a gate to such a pernicious licentiousness." And so far he had most certainly truth on his side.

But he rejects the other part of Saravias's opinion with a great deal of heat. "Pray," says he, "what sort of ordinary vocation is that which you attribute to all but a few of those who were raised by God? You cannot but mean a Papistical vocation, since it appears plainly enough, from what you say, that, if the bishops of France should now withdraw themselves and their churches from the pope's tyranny, and purge themselves of all idolatry and superstition, they would stand in no need of any other vocation than what they have already. What! can we imagine that Papistical ordinations, which are no better than an infamous commerce with the Romish harlot, and more polluted than the pay of prostitutes, forbid by God to be offered in his temple, which empowers some to corrupt the gospel instead of preaching it, and others only to offer sacrifice, which is a most horrible abomination, — can we imagine, I say, that these wicked ordinations should stand good in such a manner, that, as often as God gives the grace to any of these spurious bishops to come over to true Christianity, all the impurity of their ordinations should be immediately purged away? But with what face or confidence will any one, whose heart God has touched, pretend to detest Popery without abjuring the irregular ordination he has received?

Or, if he abjures it, how can he assume an authority to preach in virtue of it? I do not deny, indeed, that when such persons are found to be well instructed, edifying in their lives, and capable of feeding the flock, they may be reordained, and of spurious bishops rendered legitimate pastors."

It is plain, then, what Calvin and Beza thought of the mission of the first reformers; which is still more confirmed by the profession of faith required to be made by the Hugonots of France, in the composing whereof these two reforming apostles had the chief hand. The 31st article of it is thus worded: "We believe that no man ought by his own authority to arrogate to himself the government of the church; but that it ought to be conferred by election, as far as is possible and God will permit; which exception we add expressly, because it has been necessary sometimes, and even in our days, (in which the state of the Church was interrupted,) that God should raise persons in an extraordinary manner to reestablish the Church fallen into ruin and desolation."

This article contains three things: 1. The general rule; 2. The exception from this general rule; and, 3. The application of this exception to the first reformers. The general rule is, that "no man ought, by his own authority, to arrogate to himself the government of the Church, but it ought to be conferred by election." The exception is, that "God permits sometimes that the observance of this rule is impracticable, and then he raises men in an extraordinary manner to supply the defect of an ordinary vocation." And the application of this exception to the first reformers is, that "it has been necessary sometimes, and even in our days, (in which the state of the Church was interrupted,) to raise persons in an extraordinary manner to reestablish the Church, fallen into ruin and desolation."

Whence it is plain that, if the first reformers had exercised the ministry by virtue of an ordinary vocation, they would have been comprehended within the general rule, and not within the exception. Whereas the 31st article puts them in the exception, in supposing them to have been in such cir-

cumstances that God did not permit the ordinary vocation to take place.

Conformably to this article, the synod of Gap, held anno 1603, decreed that it should be maintained in its full force without insisting upon an ordinary vocation derived from the Church of Rome. The decree of that synod was delivered in the following words: "Concerning the 31st article of our profession of faith, the question being put, Upon what foundation the authority our first pastors had of preaching and reforming the Church was to be settled, — whether it should be upon their mission derived from the Church of Rome, — the assembly resolved that it should be wholly ascribed to an extraordinary vocation, whereby God moved them interiorly in an extraordinary manner, and not to the little they had still left of the corrupt mission of the Church of Rome."

And in the same profession of faith, Art. 28, they declare that "they condemn all Popish assemblies, because the pure word of God is banished out of them, and the holy sacraments are corrupted, bastardized, falsified, or, rather, entirely annihilated; and all idolatry and superstition are practised in them; and that whoever follows their practices, or communicates with them, cuts himself off from the mystical body of Jesus Christ."

From all these proofs, it is manifest that I have not wronged the truth in attributing both to Luther and Calvin, and many of their followers, the folly and extravagance of pretending to an extraordinary mission, or immediate vocation from God. But those who followed them some years after, finding it impossible to stand their ground against the force of the arguments urged by Catholic divines against this presumptuous and exorbitant pretension of their first reformers, were reduced to the necessity of taking up with an ordinary mission, and maintaining that their forefathers had no other.

But here, again, they are forced to run into disagreeing systems. Some of those who are for an ordinary mission, being convinced that in all ages it was continued by the succession of bishops, stand up for episcopal ordination, and maintain,

consequently, that there can be no lawful ministry without it. And thus far they agree with the Church of Rome. But then, as to the exercise of episcopal or pastoral jurisdiction, some (as the Protestants of Sweden and Denmark) will have it depend upon the superior consistory; others, as Cranmer, on the prince's will and pleasure; and others assert, again, its independency on the civil power, which is the opinion of many in England; and these derive its source from the Church of Rome.

But the Protestants of France, not believing episcopacy to be of divine institution, have taken up a system wholly different from these. The famous minister Claude, to prove the Protestant mission to be ordinary, thinks it sufficient to show that their first pastors were established by the people; in whom he places the source of authority and vocation. And, therefore, in his *Defence of the Reformation*, (p. 345,) he maintains that, provided the people call a man to the ministry, and he gives his consent, this gives him a lawful mission without any other formality.

The minister Jurieu, in his answer to Mons. Nicol, (p. 573,) lays this for the foundation of his system, viz., that as every civil society has a natural right to choose its own officers or magistrates for the civil government, and make what laws it thinks most fitting for its preservation, so every church has no less a natural right (that is, independent of any divine institution) to choose its own guides and rulers, and make its own laws for the same end.

But this is putting the Church of Christ upon the same footing with the secular state, without any regard to the difference there is betwixt them both as to their first institution, and the end of it. For (as I have already observed) all secular states are mere political societies formed by men, and tending to an end that is merely human. They are, therefore, subject to the will and pleasure of men, who may choose what rulers, and install them by what methods, they think fitting. But the Church, as such, is a society which has Christ himself for its immediate founder and lawgiver. He is,

therefore, tied down to the laws his infinite wisdom has established for its government, and the continuation and conveyance of its ministry; so that every national church, as it is a part of the Church in general, and, by consequence, subject to such laws as regard the whole Church, is bound to follow those laws.

The end of its establishment is likewise wholly spiritual, to wit, the salvation of souls; which end cannot be attained but by the supernatural means of grace, nor grace, but by the sacraments; which Christ (who is the only master both of his grace and of the way of conveying it to us) has instituted as so many channels for the conveyance of it to our souls; and the administration whereof, together with the preaching of the holy word, he committed to his apostles and their successors descending from them by a spiritual generation, according to the methods established by him. And so Mr. Jurieu's fine parallel between a national church and a national state is a mere empty flourish, fit only to impose upon the ignorant laity, whose vanity it agreeably flatters, by making them the source of all authority, both civil and ecclesiastic.

Thus we see the disagreement and confusion amongst Protestants concerning a point of the greatest importance, and upon which the whole superstructure of the reformation depends as upon a foundation, without which it cannot possibly subsist. It has been fully shown, 1. That nothing less than an extraordinary mission was claimed by the first reformers; 2. That, though some of their followers endeavored at first to support this extravagant pretension, the greatest part have since rejected it as a defenceless cause, and stand up for an ordinary mission; and, 3. That these advocates for an ordinary mission are all at variance amongst themselves about the manner of its conveyance, and put to the hardest shifts to patch it up as well as they can.

I shall, therefore, now proceed to prove that the first reformers had no mission at all, either ordinary or extraordinary, but climbed up to the sheepfold by another way, like thieves and robbers. And if the first reformers had no mission, I

am sure their successors in the sacred ministry can have none; because no man can transmit to another what he has not himself. Nay, we may as well say that a son can inherit a good estate of a father who has not a groat to leave him. So that, if the very fathers of the reformation had not a lawful mission, it is an inconceivable riddle how their children should come by it; as it is inconceivable how the successors of the apostles should have had a lawful mission, if the apostles themselves had none. Whence I conclude that, if it be made manifest that the first reformers were wholly destitute of such a mission, it will likewise be fully proved that their successors are in the same unhappy condition; and that they who are members of any of the reformed churches founded by them, as they continue to be abettors of their sacrilegious usurpation of the holy ministry, can be regarded no otherwise than as persons who are out of the true Church of Christ, in which alone salvation can be attained.



ARTICLE III.

The first Reformers had no extraordinary Mission.

WHENEVER it has pleased God to raise men in an extraordinary manner to be the guides of his people, (as he raised Moses to lead them out of Egypt, and as he raised the apostles to preach the evangelical law to the whole world,) he never failed to distinguish them by such incontestable marks of their extraordinary mission as were a solid motive to the people to form a rational judgment upon, that they were undoubtedly sent by God, and that he had bestowed those marks upon them as a declaration and testimony of his will, that they were bound to acknowledge them for their pastors, and suffer themselves to be guided by them. And this is so perfectly conformable to the usual methods of God's infinite

wisdom and goodness in providing means proper for their respective ends, (especially in relation to things immediately appertaining to the salvation of souls redeemed with the sacred blood of Jesus Christ,) that without it the people would not be guarded against the seduction of false guides, who might equally pretend to an immediate commission from God; and so every impostor might set up for an inspired man, and put his cheats upon the people under the cover of this religious mask.

It is therefore necessary the people should have some sure marks to distinguish lawful pastors from seducers; but more especially when new doctrines are proposed to them, whereof there is but one example either recorded in the New Testament, or ever allowed of by the Catholic Church, viz., the first preaching of the evangelical law, which doubtless was a new law and a new doctrine; and therefore the persons chosen immediately by God for this great work were clearly distinguished from impostors or seducers by three marks, to wit, holiness of life in a most eminent degree, holiness or purity of doctrine, and the gift of miracles. These were the marks by which the faithful were fully assured that the apostles had their commission from God. For nothing was more holy than their lives, nothing purer than their doctrine; and God declared himself to be the author of it by giving them the power of working the most stupendous miracles in confirmation of it.

But I find nothing of these marks of an extraordinary vocation in any of the first reformers. For as to holiness of life, the very best amongst them were only so because they were not quite so bad as the rest, and their greatest admirers could never commend them either for austerity of life, or any one eminent virtuous quality that raised them above the ordinary level of mankind. Nay, there was not one amongst them, but was guilty of the deadly sin of calumny in a very high degree, in aspersing and misrepresenting the doctrine of their mother Church, as the only means to give some color to their apostasy.

But some of them were eminent for nothing but the viciousness of their lives. Witness Martin Luther, the very patriarch of the reformation, who has left us in his own writings such monuments of his haughty, scurrilous, unmortified, nay, even vicious and impious disposition, that his greatest enemies cannot paint him in blacker colors than he has done himself; as will appear more fully hereafter, when I come to speak of his doctrine.

Carlostadius, another head reformer, is a second instance of this truth. He was the first amongst the reforming priests who married publicly; and Melancthon, who was personally acquainted with him, gives him the character of an ignorant and brutal man, void of piety and humanity, and rather a Jew than a Christian, though of a crafty and turbulent nature. *Lib. Testim. Pref.* Most excellent qualifications to fit a man for a reformer of the Church of Christ, called by God in an extraordinary manner!

I omit others, to avoid prolixity, or appearing to take a pleasure in exposing the memory of persons who have long since had their trial at the great tribunal. But I cannot forbear saying something of Archbishop Cranmer, the first reformer of the Church of England, and Burnet's chief hero in his unfaithful history of the English reformation. But with all his skill in daubing over and disguising historical facts, he cannot hinder an impartial reader from forming this judgment of his hero, viz., that if, instead of reforming his mother Church, he had applied himself to reform the irregularities of his own life, it is probable England would not have become the theatre of those astonishing as well as scandalous disorders publicly committed during the thirteen last years of King Henry's reign, whereof he was the chief author by his pernicious counsels, and base compliances with that prince. And yet this man, who had delivered up the ecclesiastical authority to profane secular hands, sacrificed the patrimony of the Church to the avarice of his prince, prostituted his conscience to all his disorderly lusts, played the hypocrite and dissembled his religion for at least thirteen years

together, — this man, I say, was, in the following reign, in quality of primate of England, the chief ecclesiastical tool of the court in promoting all the changes of religion then set on foot, which were varnished over with the plausible name of a godly reformation. But is it, then, possible that God should be the author of a work, when such wicked men as these are the principal actors in it? Does he usually employ such instruments as these to bring about his designs of an extraordinary mercy? If the thing be not absolutely impossible, it is at least without example; and I cannot but think it much more conformable both to reason and the usual methods of Providence, to say that, when wicked men prosper in their designs, they are not instruments chosen by God in his mercy, but suffered by him in his anger, as scourges to punish the sins of the people.

It is plain, however, that the first reformers were wholly destitute of the first mark of an extraordinary vocation, to wit, holiness of life. Now, then, let us see whether they were distinguished from false guides by the second, to wit, holiness or purity of doctrine, which is wholly indispensable, because false doctrines can only have the father of lies for their author. It is true, indeed, their boast at first, in order to impose upon the weakness and credulity of the people, was that they would teach nothing but the pure word of God. But they fell very short of performing this noble promise; whereof I shall give some few remarkable instances.

1st. The word of God teaches very plainly that vows made to God are binding. “When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it; that which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt keep and perform.” Deut. c. 23, v. 21, 23. And St. Paul says, of widows consecrated to God, that, “when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry, having damnation to themselves, because they have cast off their first faith.” 1 Tim. c. 5, v. 11, 12. But the first reformers could not relish this holy doctrine, and made bold to give the word of God the lie, by teaching publicly that monastical vows did not oblige persons

of either sex that had made them. Accordingly, both pens and pulpits were employed to encourage the violation of them, and scriptural texts were taught to speak a language agreeable to flesh and blood. But because example is usually more prevalent than words, Martin Luther, an Austin friar, to the everlasting shame of the reformation, thought fit to confirm by his own practice the doctrine he had preached; and, lest the female sex should want an example of the same kind, he made choice of a nun for his bride, and so became guilty of a double sacrilege. Their example, how exorbitantly scandalous soever, was followed by many who otherwise would never have thought of changing their state. And thus apostate friars, priests, and nuns became the nursing fathers and mothers of the reformed churches, and the new gospel was propagated, like mankind after the fall of Adam, not by a spiritual but carnal generation.

2dly. It is manifest, from the word of God, that the state of virginity is encouraged by Christ, (Matt. c. 19, v. 11, 12,) and recommended in express terms by St. Paul. 1 Cor. c. 7, v. 7, 8. "I would," says he, "that all men were even as myself. — I say, therefore, to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I." And again: "So, then, he that giveth his daughter in marriage doth well, but he that giveth her not doth better." v. 38. Whence it follows, by an undeniable consequence, that the state of perpetual virginity is possible by the help of God's grace; for otherwise it could not be lawfully recommended. But Martin Luther scrupled not to contradict the word of God, and maintain the absolute impossibility, nay, unlawfulness of it.

Let us hear his own words. "God declares," says he, "that he will have no man live unmarried, but to be multiplied. — If any man resolves to continue unmarried, let him put off the name of man, and make it appear that he is an angel or spirit; for to man God does not allow it by any means." Epist. ad Wolf. tom. 7, fol. 505, 1.

Again, Serm. de Matrim., tom. 5, fol. 119, 1, he writes thus: "Increase and multiply is not a precept, but more

than a precept, that is to say, a divine work, — which is as necessary as to be a man, and more necessary than to eat, drink, sleep and wake. — As it is not in my power not to be a man, so it is not in my choice to be without a woman; and again, as it is not in thy power not to be a woman, so it is not in thy choice to live without a man.”

Nay, his extravagance went still farther. For though polygamy — that is, the plurality of wives or husbands — be positively condemned in the New Testament, he blushed not to teach the lawfulness of it; as will appear from the following pieces. “What if one of the married couple,” says he, “should refuse to be reconciled to the other, and would absolutely live separate, and the other, not being able to contain, should be forced to seek another consort — what must he do? May he contract with another? I answer that without doubt he may.” In 1 Cor. 7, tom. 5, fol. 3, 2. “Put the case,” says he, “that one should fly from the other till there has been a third or fourth marriage — may the husband marry another wife as often as his former leaves him, so as to have ten or more of these deserters still alive? Again, may the wife have ten or more husbands who are all fled? I answer that we cannot stop St. Paul’s mouth, nor contend with such as think fit to make use of his doctrine as often as need requires. His words are plain, that a brother or sister is free from the law of marriage if the other departs, or will not consent to live with the other.” Ibid., fol. 112, 2.

“It is fit,” says he again, “the husband should say, ‘If thou wilt not, another will.’ If the mistress refuses, let the maid come. But first he should a second and third time admonish his wife, and before others make known her obstinacy, that she may be publicly reprehended. If after that she refuses, divorce her and advance Esther in the place of Vashti.” Ibid., fol. 123, 1. Strange doctrine for a man called by God in an extraordinary manner! Nay, does it not manifestly show him to have been a most wicked impostor?

His doctrine concerning free-will is no less contrary to the word of God; for he utterly denies it. “Free-will,” says he,

“after sin, is no more than an empty name.” Tom. 2, fol 3, 2. And in his treatise *De servo Arbitrio*, he writes thus: “Man’s will is in the nature of a horse. If God sits upon it, it tends and goes as God would have it go — if the devil rides it, it tends and goes as the devil would have it; nor can it choose which of the riders it will run to, or seek; but the riders themselves strive who shall gain or possess it.” Tom. 2, fol. 434, 2. And again, in the same treatise, (fol. 460, 2,) “If God foresaw,” says he, “that Judas would be a traitor, Judas of necessity became a traitor; neither was it in the power of Judas, or of any other creature, to do otherwise, or to change his will.” Thus wrote this great reformer; and he was followed in this impious doctrine by Calvin, who taught that grace necessitates the will, and that God is the author of all our sinful as well as virtuous actions; to which he added several extravagant errors of his own, which I omit for brevity’s sake.

Lastly, it is an incontestable truth, that doing penance for our sins is a duty commanded by the word of God. “Bring therefore forth fruits worthy of repentance,” (Luke c. 3, v. 8,) which all the fathers have understood for penitential works to punish our sins. And again, “Except you do penance, you shall all perish.” Luke, c. 13, v. 5. It is likewise a truth taught us by the word of God, that the narrow way is the only way to heaven. “Enter ye in at the strait gate,” says Christ, “because strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life,” (Matt. c. 7, v. 13, 15;) which he confirms thus: “If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily and follow me.” Luke, c. 9, v. 23. But if we examine the doctrine and methods of our new gospellers, we shall find them all busy in enlarging the way to heaven, instead of recommending the narrow one marked out in the gospel.

The solemn fast of lent, of ember days and vigils, so venerable for their antiquity, were utterly abolished wherever Calvinism prevailed, and by degrees in all the reformed churches. Abstinence from flesh on Fridays and Saturdays

was represented as a superstitious distinction of meats condemned by St. Paul. Penance was struck out of the number of sacraments. Doing penitential works to satisfy for our sins was declaimed against as injurious to the infinite satisfaction of Christ. The austerity of monastical discipline, religious vows, and the single life of priests, were run down as an insupportable yoke imposed by the tyranny of popes; and in consequence of this commodious doctrine, monks and friars were permitted to throw off their frocks, virgins their veils, and priests to exchange their breviaries for more diverting company. In a word, ecclesiastical authority was rendered precarious, and every man constituted judge of his own practice as well as faith.

Strange reformation! Is it, then, possible that doctrines so favorable to all the inclinations of corrupt nature should be inspired by the Holy Ghost? or that the teachers of them were commissioned by God to publish them in his name? I leave every one to form what judgment he thinks fitting upon the matter. However, let Protestants varnish things over as they please, they will find it a hard task to convince any man of common sense, that persons who were the authors of such scandalous relaxations in discipline and morality had either the Holy Ghost for their guide, or the word of God for their rule. The reason hereof is plain, because the Spirit of God is unchangeable, and cannot lead different persons, whom he owns for lawful ministers under him, through ways directly opposite to one another, so as to empower some to preach one sort of gospel, and others another. Now, I can scarce think any Protestant so unreasonable at present as to deny that those great lights of the Church of ancient times, viz., St. Cyprian, St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nazianzen, St. Jerom, St. Epiphanius, St. Chrysostom, and St. Austin, were all guided by the Spirit of God. But did any of these great men rail at religious vows, or the celibacy of priests? Did they exhort monks and virgins to quit their solitary cells and return to the world? Did they abolish the fast of lent, and other fasts still kept up in the Church of

Rome? Or were they declared enemies to confessing our sins and doing penance for them? Alas! we need but cast an eye upon their writings, or the history of their lives, to find that, as they practised themselves all sorts of corporal austerities, so they constantly, exhorted all the faithful under their conduct to do the same. They wrote whole volumes in praise of virginity, and persuaded as many as they could of both sexes to embrace that holy state. And yet it is certain these great saints and pillars of the Church were guided by the Spirit of God. And how, then, is it possible that the same Holy Spirit should in after times conduct men into a way as opposite to it as black is to white? This argument proves so convincingly that the pretended reformation was not the work of God, that, unless a man be resolved to bid defiance to the clearest truth, it is morally impossible not to yield to it.

But what is still a further confirmation that the hand of God had no part in this work, and that the authors of it undertook it without any commission from him, is, that there is no example, since the coming of Christ, of persons truly called by God to labor in his vineyard for the conversion of souls, either from infidelity to the Christian faith, or from sinful lives to repentance, but the generality of their first disciples or followers were remarkable for such solid piety and true Christian zeal, that God Almighty seemed to take a pleasure in pouring forth a plentiful benediction of grace, not only on the laborers themselves, but likewise on their spiritual children, whom they had begot "in Jesus Christ through the gospel;" and this was equivalent to an authentic declaration, that they were the instruments of his mercies, and served under his authority. But we find the very reverse of all this in the first disciples or followers of Luther, Calvin, and other pretended reformers.

Let us but compare their deluded proselytes with the true converts of the blessed apostles, and we shall see the truth of what I say in the clearest light. For, whereas nothing was ever more edifying than the lives of the first Chris-

tians converted by the apostles, nothing, on the contrary, was more disedifying than the lives of the first pretended converts from the Church of Rome made by the apostles of the reformation. We find them, indeed, very zealously busy in railing at the pope and his bishops, in running down religious vows, breaking the images of Christ and his apostles, pulling down pictures, destroying abbeys, plundering churches, and other such noble exploits; for all this sort of zeal either cost them nothing, or brought good money into their coffers; but it extended not to the demolishing of vice, or pulling down the "idols of their sinful passions, such as luxury, avarice, intemperance, revenge," &c., all which escaped their religious zeal, and were not only left unreformed, but had the reins let loose to a greater licentiousness than ever.

I doubt not but if Protestants shall happen to read this piece, they will immediately accuse me of slander. But let them have a little patience, and treat me as unmercifully as they please, if I do not produce witnesses above all exception to vouch for the truth of what I say. First, then, let us hear Erasmus, who was an eye-witness of what happened, and writes thus in his letter against false gospellers.

"You declaim bitterly," says he, "against the luxury of priests, the ambition of bishops, the tyranny of the pope, the frothy stuff of sophists, the devotions of Catholics, their fasts and masses; and you are not content to retrench the abuses that may be in these things, but will needs abolish them entirely; that is, you will pluck up and destroy the good corn together with the tares. But what do you offer us better in exchange to make us quit our ancient practices? Consider the people who boast themselves to be of the evangelical profession, and observe whether there be not as much luxury, as much debauchery and avarice, amongst them, as amongst those they hate. Show me one, whom your new gospel has changed from a drunkard to a sober man; or one who, having before been either quarrelsome, or revengeful, or covetous, or given to detraction or impurity, is become meek,

liberal, affable, or chaste. You will say there is always a mixture of good and bad in human things, and I ought to consider the good men that are amongst those of the evangelical profession. I must therefore be very unlucky; for hitherto I have not met with one that is not become worse than he was before he embraced the new gospel." Thus speaks Erasmus, who was no violent or prejudiced man.

But let us hear Luther himself set forth the fruits of his reformation. "We see," says he, "that, by the devil's malice, men are at present more covetous, more cruel, more addicted to vice, more insolent, and far worse than they were under the Papacy," (Ser. in Dom. 1, adv. edit. Arnent., fol. 5;) and Robenstock, in his book entitled Colloquia D. Lutheri, (tom. 1, p. 37,) recites his words as follows: "Men are become so extravagant by the gospel we have preached to them, that they think every thing lawful that flatters their passions, and have lost all fear of hell fire. There is but one peasant in the district of Witteberg, who endeavors to instruct his family according to the word of God. All the rest go straight to the devil."

Jacobus Andreas, a German "reformer" of the 16th century, in a sermon upon the 21st chap. of St. Luke, makes the same bitter complaint of the scandalous lives of their converts from Popery. "*To make it plain (says he) to all the world that they are not Papists, and place no confidence in good works, they take care to practise none. Instead of fasting, they spend their time in sotting and drinkings. When they ought to relieve the poor, they fleece and oppress them. Oaths, blasphemies, and imprecations, are their usual prayers; so that Jesus Christ is not so blasphemed among the Turks as he is among them. In a word, instead of humility, nothing reigns among them but haughtiness, arrogance, and pride; and this sort of life is called evangelical.*"

Andreas Musculus, another reformer of the same age and country, in a sermon upon the fourth Sunday of advent, describes the disorders reigning amongst those of his party in the same pathetic manner. "*As to us Lutherans, (says he,) the matter stands thus: If any one has a mind to see a set*

of wicked men, drunkards, libertines, liars, cheats, and usurers, let him go to a town where the gospel is preached in its purity, and he will see, as clearly as the sun may be seen at noonday, that there is not so much insolence and wickedness practised among Turks and infidels as amongst evangelical people, where all the reins of the devil are let loose."

Let us now turn from this edifying picture of the "reformed" (?) sects in Germany, as drawn by their own artists, to that of England; painted by Richard Jeffrey, who, having ascertained the true character of the reformed saints in his travels for that purpose, made a public show of them in his sermon at the Cross, on the 7th of October, 1694, in the following words: "*I may freely speak (saith he) what I have plainly seen in the course of some travailes, and observations of some courses; that in Flanders was never more drunkenness, in Italy never more wantonness, in Jury (Judca) more hypocrisy, in Turkie more impiety, in Tartary more iniquity, THAN IS PRACTICED GENERALLY IN ENGLAND: particularly in London is this to be seen,*" &c. Dr. King, bishop of London in 1612, writing on the book of Jonas, page 442, lecture 32, speaks as follows: "*So far is it off (saith he) that we are become (by the Protestant reformation) true Israelites with Nathaniel, or almost Christians with Agrippa, that we are proved FULLY ATHEISTS, and that which Tully reporteth amongst his wonders in nature, that in one country drought causeth dirt, and rain stirreth up dust, may be TRULY APPLIED TO US, that abundance of grace hath brought forth in us abundance of sinne; and some tooke occasion by the law to waxe more sinfull; so iniquity hath never been so ryfe amongst us, but throug the rifeness of the Ghospell."* Does the gospel of Christ produce such effects as these? Or can a system be of divine appointment which produces such gross demoralization as is here reluctantly admitted by its own advocates?

Lastly, Calvin himself comes in for a witness of this truth, that the (so called) reformation was in reality a deformation of every thing worthy of the Christian name. "*Of the few (says he) that have separated themselves from the tyranny of*

the pope, the greatest part are rotten at heart. They appear outwardly to be full of zeal; but if you search them to the bottom, you will find them full of hypocrisy and deceit." In Dan. c. 11, v. 34. And amongst Calvin's letters, there is one written to Farel, by Capiton, a minister of Strasburg, where he says that God had rendered them sensible how much they had prejudiced souls by their precipitation in throwing off the pope's authority. "*The multitude (says he) has entirely shaken off the yoke, being trained up to libertinism; as if, by pulling down the pope's authority, we intended to destroy the word of God, the sacraments, and the whole ministry. They even have the impudence to tell us, 'I am sufficiently instructed in Scriptures; I can read, and stand in no need of your direction.'*"

Thus God confounded the enemies of the Catholic Church, by turning against them the principal argument they had made use of to render her odious to the people, to wit, the scandals, abuses, and irregularities committed by some corrupt members of that Church, but always detested and opposed both by her public doctrine, and by all her sound and uncorrupted part, who made that doctrine the rule of their practice. Nay, the argument is retorted upon them with much greater force than could ever be objected against the Church of Rome; because it is no wonder that corruption in manners, abuses in practice, and relaxation in discipline, should, in the course of many ages, get into the Church, notwithstanding the holiness of her doctrine, and severity of innumerable canons made to prevent them. For we need not seek for any other source of this evil than the general corruption of human nature, always inclined to liberty and ease, and always tending to it, whatever restraints are laid upon it. But I defy the blackest malice to attribute it to any principle or branch of doctrine authorized or acknowledged by the Church of Rome. Whereas the general inundation of libertinism and vice, (as it is attested by the fore-mentioned authors, who saw it with their own eyes,) in the very infancy of the most solemn reformation that ever was pretended to be made in God's

Church, cannot possibly be ascribed to any other cause than the pernicious doctrines of the authors of it; for in reality those very doctrines paved the way directly to it.

As for example, what other fruit than an utter contempt of religion could be expected from a reformation established upon the ruins of broken vows, cemented by rapine, sacrilege, and plunder? Was not the impious doctrine of making God the author of sin, denying the liberty of man's will, and teaching "the impossibility of keeping the commandments," — was it not, I say, sapping the very foundations of all Christian morality, and giving men a general license to be as wicked as they pleased? For men cannot be obliged to impossibilities; and when they are once persuaded that they cannot be virtuous, what can we hope better than to see them most impudently wicked? Again, abolishing the ancient holidays and fasts, and reforming away the sacrament of penance, could have no other effect than the introducing of libertinism, and a general decay of piety and devotion.

I shall end with some reflections upon Capiton's complaint of the people's insolence towards their ministers. For if he had but traced this evil to its true source, it might have opened his eyes to let him see that the mischief he complains so bitterly of was but the natural fruit of a tree of their own planting. The first reformers had set up the standard of rebellion against their mother Church, and behaved themselves with the utmost insolence towards their lawful superiors. And could they, after that, have the weakness to imagine the people would be more submissive and respectful to their upstart guides, than they themselves had been to the guides of God's own appointment, as Mr. Lesly justly styles them? Nay, they had not only set them the example, but taught them their lesson of rebellion against the Church, by settling it, as a fundamental principle of the reformation, that "Scriptures interpreted by the private spirit are the only rule of faith;" which in effect was making every body a judge of the faith, and putting the people upon the level with their guides in spiritual matters. What wonder is it, then, they should pretend

to control them, or even claim a right to reform their reformers? according to this celebrated saying of Tertullian, "What was lawful to Marcion was likewise to the Marcionites;* for in like manner what was lawful to Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, &c., was no less lawful to their disciples or any other whatsoever, "to follow their private judgment in changing the faith."

It was thus the reformation became at length a mere Proteus, and changed its shape as often as a stage-player changes his dress. Luther began the farce, and expected all should at best be but actors under him, and dance to his pipe. But Carolostadius, Zuinglius, and Calvin, took themselves to be as able reformers as Luther, and so thought fit to reform his reformation; nay, they all reformed their own reformations, backward or forward, just as the fancy took them. The Church of England, reformed not only her own mother Church, but all the reformations that had got the start of her, and a new scene of reformation appeared in Great Britain as often as new reformers mounted the stage. The reformation of Henry VIII. was reformed by Edward VI., and his by Queen Elizabeth, whose superior genius not being fully satisfied with what had been done before her, by the force of her own ingenuity fabricated a new religion of a kind of linsey-woolsey texture, made up of several fragments of Lutheranism and Calvinism, and some pieces of Popery to make a show with; for which reason the Presbyterians thought themselves bound in conscience to reform the reformation of Queen Elizabeth. The fanatics and Independents, after that, reformed the Presbyterians; and the Brownists and Quakers have reformed them all.

Here we see a complete Babel of jarring reformations, chopping and changing, building and destroying, doing and undoing; and all these changes, incoherencies, and contradictions, flowing from a principle settled by the first reform-

* Idem licuit Valentinianis quod Valentino, idem Marcionitis quod Marcioni de arbitrio suo fidem innovare. Lib. de Præscrip. c. 42.

ers, and still maintained by the reformed churches, as is manifest from Mr. Lesly's *Case Stated*, p. 46, where he has these remarkable words: "*Private judgment is all we have for the belief of God and of Christ*; in short, we must trust to it in every thing without exception." Nay, the doctrine of private judgment, in opposition to church authority, is so essentially necessary to support the whole building of the reformation, that whoever gives it up must at the same time give up the reformation itself. Now, I ask whether a principle which is an inexhaustible source of confusion, incoherencies, heresies, and schisms, can be a doctrine according to the word of God. If it be, we must join issue with Calvin's blasphemy in teaching that God is the author of sin. But I have now said enough to make it plain that the two first marks of an extraordinary vocation, to wit, holiness of life and purity of doctrine, were wholly wanting in the first reformers. Let us now see what is to be said concerning the third mark, viz., the gift of miracles.

ARTICLE IV.

No extraordinary Vocation without the Gift of Miracles.

IF the first reformers had a commission immediately from God to reform the public faith and discipline of the Church, it follows that they were vested with a power and jurisdiction, not only of larger extent than the ancient prophets ever had, but even fully equal to that of the apostles themselves. For,

1st. It made them the source of a new ecclesiastical ministry; because the former, which Christ had established, remained no longer in force, as they pretended.

2dly. It gave them a power to establish articles of faith unknown for such to the whole world; to revoke the decrees of ancient councils, declare such doctrines orthodox

as had been condemned by the universal Church in former ages, pull down the ancient form of church government, and set up a new one in its place.

3dly. It gave them a jurisdiction over the whole Christian world, and full authority to plant their new gospel wherever Christianity was professed; because an extraordinary commission to reform the faith and discipline of the Church regards one nation no less than another.

4thly. It gave them a power to suspend, depose, and excommunicate the whole body of bishops and pastors upon earth, if they refused to submit to their new gospel. Nay, if their commission was really from God, all bishops deposed and excommunicated by them were bound to regard themselves as validly deposed and excommunicated, and have recourse to their authority to be reëstablished in the exercise of their functions, even though they should have afterwards embraced the reformation.

Lastly. If they really had a commission immediately from God to reform both the faith and discipline of the Church, as soon as they had manifested themselves to the world, and published their reformation, all Christians upon earth, that is, the whole Greek and Latin church, Armenians, Jacobites, Nestorians, Eutychians, &c., were bound to renounce their former pastors, and submit to the new ministry established by them.

This was the real extent of the extraordinary commission pretended to by the first reformers; and it is manifest their pretension was at least as mad and extravagant in appearance, as that in another kind would be of a man who should issue forth a proclamation that God had constituted him universal monarch of the world, with full power to depose all emperors, kings, and princes, that should refuse to own his title. Now, what judgment would the world make of a man laying claim to such a universal monarchy as bestowed immediately by God? Would any thing less be demanded of him than clear and uncontested miracles to prove his title, since without that proof it could not be made manifest either

to sense or reason? And if he should refuse to yield to so reasonable a demand, would he not be treated either as a madman or as a cheat and impostor? It cannot be questioned but he would; and it follows from it, that, unless the first reformers had the gift of miracles bestowed upon them, we must form the same judgment of them; because their claiming an immediate commission from God to reform both the faith and discipline of the Church, — that is, to degrade all her former bishops and pastors, reverse the decrees of her ancient councils, abolish her most solemn devotions, and make themselves the source of a new ministry and succession, — was, at least in all appearance, an extravagance equal to the imaginary one I have mentioned, and by consequence wholly unjustifiable without the testimony of miracles to support it.

The reason hereof is clear; because, in the case of such an extraordinary pretension as that of an immediate mission from God, no man can expect to be believed without extraordinary proofs, much less upon his own bare word, by reason of the important consequence of it, which is either the salvation or damnation of millions of souls. For the pretenders to such a mission are either seducers or not: if they be, the people are bound to shun them; if not, they are bound to listen to their voice, because there is certainly an indispensable obligation of obeying persons raised by God in an extraordinary manner. For as he gives such persons an unquestionable authority to govern the people, so he lays, by consequence, an obligation on the people to submit to their government, the one being wholly inseparable from the other. The people must, therefore, have some rational grounds to judge by, that the pretenders to such an authority are really vested with it; because it is impossible they should comply with the duty of obedience without knowing the person they are bound to obey. And how can this be known in the case of an extraordinary vocation, which of itself is not manifest either to man's sense or reason, unless the pretenders to it prove their immediate commission from God by

showing his seal to it from the visible testimony of signs and wonders, as the apostles did, and even Christ himself, who declares in the gospel, that "if he had not done among the Jews the works which no man ever did, they had not had sin," (John, c. 15, v. 24;) which amounts to a positive declaration that miracles are a necessary proof of an extraordinary vocation.

This was most certainly the judgment of the ancient fathers, who objected the want of miracles as a conclusive argument against the teachers of new doctrines. Has Novatian (says St. Pacian) the gift of tongues or of prophecy? Has he restored life to the dead? For without some of these miraculous gifts he cannot claim a right to establish a new gospel. For the same reason Tertullian, requiring of Hermogenes and Nigidius an account of the authority they took, demanded at the same time miracles for a proof of their mission. *Volo et virtutes eorum proferri.* Because, (says he,) when Christ sent his apostles to preach, he gave the power of working the same miracles himself had wrought. Lib. de Præscript. c. 30. And the same Tertullian observes that no man coming as sent, or under the authority of another, ever pretended to be believed upon his own bare word—*Nemo veniens ex alterius autoritate ipse eam sibi ex sua affirmatione defendit.*

Luther, therefore, may tell us, as often as he pleases, "that he had his doctrine from heaven, and received his ministry not of men, nor by men, but by the gift of God and revelation of Jesus Christ." Calvin may likewise tell us, if he pleases, "that the commission our Savior gave him and his fellow-reformers was wholly extraordinary, and not to be examined by the common rules." Theodorus Beza may bluster and swagger against the ordinary mission, and their synods and confessions of faith may stand up for the extraordinary vocation of their first reformers; but unless they show miracles to prove it, no man in his senses will believe them.

It will perhaps be asked, whether the gift of miracles be a sure mark of an extraordinary vocation, as well as a necessary

proof of it. I answer, it is not. Nay, on the contrary, all the holy bishops and pastors, who, since the time of the apostles, have confirmed the truth of the faith they preached by uncontested miracles, never had any other than what we call an ordinary mission, — that is, a mission received from the lawful successors of the apostles, — so that there is not an example, since their time, allowed of by the Catholic Church, of any one person sent immediately by God to “preach the word and administer the sacraments.” For that must of necessity have made a breach in the apostolical succession of the sacred ministry, contrary to the doctrine of all antiquity, as well as to the promises of Christ, that it should be continued in the Church to the end of the world.

But do not we ourselves cry up many persons as “raised by God in an extraordinary manner,” such as St. Benedict, St. Bernard, and other founders of religious orders? I answer, that, if the meaning of it be that God, by a superabundant effusion of his holy grace, has been pleased, from time to time, to render these and many other such persons proper instruments of his mercies for the conversion of sinners, and to repair the gradual decays of Christian morality, (which is a reformation the Church continually prays and labors for,) nothing is more certain than that God many times raises men in this manner for the service and edification of his Church. But did any of these persons separate themselves from the communion of their mother Church? Did any of them set up altar against altar, church against church, or rebel against their lawful superiors under pretence of an extraordinary vocation to the ministry? On the contrary, they did every thing according to the canons of the Church, and their mission was conveyed to them by the ordinary channel. Nay, they were the very patterns of humility, submission, and obédience to superior powers, and never made a step but as directed by them: much less had they the presumption to think themselves wiser than the Catholic Church, or assume an authority to reform her faith, which, according to Tertulian, is wholly irreformable. “*Regula fidei una omnino est,*

sola immobilis et irreformabilis," (c. 1, de Virgin. Velandis;) because Christ has promised to his Church the spirit of truth for her guide, (John, c. 16, v. 13,) and "to abide with her to the end of the world." Matt. c. 28, v. 19. So that the reformation these holy men undertook regarded wholly the correction of manners. It was not their business to preach a new faith, but to exhort the people to live up to the sacred maxims of the faith they had received from their forefathers; and there is not a Christian in the world but is bound to contribute to this sort of reformation, if not by preaching, at least by practice and example; so that if Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, and Archbishop Cranmer had labored for a reformation of this kind, and proceeded in it according to rule and order, the whole world would have admired their zeal; nor would any of them have stood in need of an extraordinary mission, but only of a greater stock of humility, mortification, obedience, and other virtues, to qualify them for it; and God, who can work miracles by what instruments he pleases, might perhaps have bestowed that blessing on them, as he has done on many others, laborers in his holy vineyard. Whereas these proud pretenders to an extraordinary vocation were so far from being endowed with the gift of miracles, that Erasmus was wont to reproach them that not one amongst them could even so much as cure a lame horse, much less give sight to the blind, health to the sick, or life to the dead.

But was not the sudden and stupendous progress of the reformation a kind of miracle, and sure mark of the divine approbation of it? I answer, 1st, in Mr. Dryden's pithy expression, that "a downhill reformation rolls on very fast" I answer, 2dly, that success is the most equivocal mark that possibly can be of the divine approbation of any undertaking. For if it were a solid proof of it, every successful and prosperous wickedness would have the divine approbation to justify it. The famous rebellion in '42 was prosperous in all its undertakings; yet I hope no good subject will say that God approved it. The progress of Mahometanism is

without example; and will any Christian say it is a religion approved by God? Again, the progress of Arianism was so prodigious, that there were sometimes assemblies of above three hundred Arian bishops at once. It was supported by Christian emperors and kings; the most zealous champions of the Catholic faith were either murdered, or imprisoned, or sent into banishment. In a word, the Christian world was astonished at the general inundation of it. And yet I never heard any Christian call this a miraculous event, or insist upon it as a mark of God's approbation of it.

Yet there is a peculiar circumstance, which renders this progress of Arianism still more astonishing; to wit, that it was a mere speculative heresy, and no ways flattering men's passions or proneness to libertinism. For it neither dispensed with fasting, nor religious vows, nor confession of sins, nor doing penance for them, but kept up all the rigor of ecclesiastical discipline; whereas the reformation had the most powerful attractives to draw into its interest all persons of a worldly, sensual, and carnal disposition, of which there are always great numbers in the Church. Princes, and other men of figure, were charmed with the alluring prospect of enriching themselves with the plunder of the Church's patrimony. Priests, friars, monks, and nuns, were prevailed upon by the temptation of exchanging their confinement, austerities, and breviaries, for the worldly pleasures of liberty and ease, and the more agreeable company of wives and husbands; and the common people could not but be very well content to be rid of so many troublesome facts, and the importune exhortations and reprimands of their confessors; so that the great and sudden progress of a reformation, so agreeable to all the inclinations of corrupt nature, and wherein all sorts of passions found their account, is so far from having the appearance of a miracle, that we may rather call it a miracle of God's grace that it stopped where it did, and look upon the preservation of his Church from such a powerful and dangerous contagion as a most remarkable instance

of the indefeasibleness of his promise, "that the gates of hell shall never prevail against her."

I conclude, from what has been said, that Luther and Calvin, the two principal reformers, were two rank cheats and impostors; because whoever sets up for an inspired man, and pretends to an extraordinary commission from God to reform his church, deserves no better name, if he cannot make good his title, and is even convicted of falsehood.

Those of the Church of England will say, What have we to do with Luther and Calvin? For we are neither Lutherans nor Calvinists, but have a reformed church of our own, which, by its worthy members, is justly called the best church in the world. I confess I have often been surprised at this expression; because the Nicene creed, allowed of by that church, tells us there is but one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church. St. Paul says, likewise, that there is but one faith; and to be sure the creed speaks of the true Church, and St. Paul of the true faith, and by consequence but one true religion. This being so, I cannot well conceive how either the Church of England, or any other, should be the best church in the world. For that implies a comparison, and supposes that there are several very good churches, faiths, and religions, in the world, but, like trades, houses, or families, some better than others—a strange absurdity! contrary to Scripture, and unknown to all antiquity, which never admitted but of one Church and communion of all the faithful throughout the whole world, united in the profession of one and the same true faith.

But let that be as it will. If the Church of England be the best church in the world, one necessary condition, to make her so, is to profess the best faith in the world. Now, then, I desire some worthy member of that church to answer me this short question, to wit, whether Luther and Calvin were cheats or not. If he denies it, he must give himself the trouble to confute both this and the two preceding articles, which I conceive will be a hard task to perform.

because in the second article he will find it fully proved, both from their own words and other authentic testimonies, that they effectually set up for inspired men, and challenged to themselves an immediate commission from God. And he will find it demonstrated, in this and the preceding article, that they were wholly destitute of all the marks of such a mission; nay, over and above, that some of their doctrines were so exorbitantly scandalous, that it would be blasphemy to attribute them to any other than the father of lies.

But if the advocates for the Church of England be convinced by the force of these arguments (as I hope every reasonable man will be) that Luther and Calvin were rank impostors, then they do not act rationally, unless they have an entire diffidence of all the changes they made both in the public faith and discipline of the Church, and suspect the new doctrines they broached to have been the fruit, not of a sincere conviction of judgment, but either of their violent hatred to the pope and their mother Church, or of some other criminal passion; for it is certain there is no sort of wickedness which an avowed impostor is not capable of. But ought not those, then, of the Church of England at the same time to suspect the truth of all the doctrines they have espoused after the examples of such notorious seducers? Would they think it safe to drink the waters of a poisoned source, or eat a fruit growing from a poisonous root? No, surely. They ought, therefore, to have at least a diffidence of, and suspect, all the doctrines wherein they differ from the Church of Rome, because they all flowed from a poisonous source. Two rank impostors were the primary authors of them, in opposition to the whole visible Church then upon earth; and this alone is sufficient for any rational man to reject them. Neither will it any ways avail the advocates of the Church of England to say they are neither Lutherans nor Calvinists; for it is not the name, but doctrine, that makes men disciples of this or that sect; and they will, in spite of their hearts, be the true disciples of two notorious seducers, as long as they sympathize with them in all the doctrines

wherein they differ from the mother Church, though they follow them not in those that are grossly scandalous. I shall now proceed to prove that the first reformers had not even an ordinary mission

ARTICLE V.

The first Reformers had no ordinary Mission.

It appears manifestly, from what has been said, and even from plain fact, that the first reformers took upon them to change the whole face of religion, both as to faith, government, and discipline. The pope was stripped of all his authority, both as patriarch of the west and head of the Catholic Church. The real presence of the sacred body and blood of Christ in the blessed sacrament, believed by the whole Christian world, both east and west, was transformed into a mere figurative presence. The holy sacrifice of the mass, offered from east to west, according to the prophecy of Malachy, was rendered execrable and odious as much as in them lay. The invocation of saints, and the relative honor paid to their pictures, images, and relics, though practised by all the most eminent lights and saints of antiquity, were run down for rank idolatry. The sacraments instituted by Christ were reduced from seven to two. The solemn ceremonies of baptism, more ancient than the first Nicene council, were abolished. The rule of faith, which till then was the word of God delivered to us either in the canonical books or by apostolical tradition, was changed into that of Scriptures interpreted by the private spirit. In a word, the solemn fasts of Lent, Ember-days, and Vigils, religious vows, confession, and doing penance for our sins, were utterly reformed away.

I confess, when I barely consider the extraordinary nature of such an undertaking, and the prodigious extent and con

sequences of it, I cannot wonder the first reformers should form a judgment that nothing but an extraordinary commission from God could justify it in any manner, how extravagant soever their pretension to it was. For what power upon earth could give a commission to any set of men to subvert in this manner a religion which had at that time the prescription of near upon fifteen hundred years, as shall be proved hereafter? The thing is wholly inconceivable in itself, unless we can imagine, with any color of reason, that the whole Church of Christ had been utterly blind, void of all piety and zeal, and under a continual dotage for so many ages together, and was cured all on a sudden of this blindness, lethargy, and dotage, by the voice of these powerful charmers, so as to give them a *carte blanche* to act just as they pleased.

It is certain, however, that both Luther, Calvin, Theodorus Beza, and others, were of opinion that nothing less than an extraordinary vocation could serve their turn; and this shows manifestly that they knew nothing of the ordinary one, which their ingenious successors have since invented for them; which I think is a good proof that they had no ordinary mission; because it is but congruous to common sense to judge that if they had had it, they would have known it, and accordingly insisted upon it.

Let us, then, examine the reasons why they judged themselves safest under the shelter of an extraordinary mission. The first was, because they had separated themselves from the communion of the whole Christian world; so that there was not a visible society of Christians upon earth into which they could incorporate themselves, as will appear more fully hereafter. From what source, then, or through what channel, could the ordinary mission be conveyed to them? Can waters have their ordinary course when the pipes and conduits, through which they used to pass, are stopped or broken? In reality, they might as well have looked for an ordinary mission from the world in the moon, as from any Christian society upon earth.

Another strong reason against the ordinary mission of the first reformers, which they could not but be sensible of, was because it appears manifestly from the practice of all antiquity, that there never was any ordinary mission acknowledged by God's Church, but was derived by an uninterrupted succession from the apostles, and conveyed down from age to age, and from person to person, by the bishops, who were their undoubted successors. And this truth is supported by such a constant and universal tradition, (as has been shown in the first article,) that no man of any sincerity can doubt but it has its source from the apostles themselves. Now, all the bishops, at least of the western churches, were true sons of the Roman Catholic Church, and zealous defenders of her faith, when Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, &c., first set up for reformers. And can it enter into the imagination of any man of common sense, that either any of these bishops would, or that the fore-mentioned reformers thought they would, give them a commission not only to subvert the whole frame of ecclesiastical government established by that Church, but even to set up new churches, faiths, and religions, in opposition to her? Truly, it may as easily be believed that a king shall give a commission to a band of ruffians to come and cut his throat.

Here, then, I shall ask them, in Tertullian's words, *Qui estis vos? Quando et unde venistis?* Who were these reformers? Whence did they come? Who gave them a commission to pull down their mother Church, and turn her faith and discipline out of doors? Were they the people, or secular princes, who gave them this authority? Alas! how can the laity, who have no ecclesiastical power or jurisdiction themselves, give it to others? Nay, they may as well pretend to give them the power to fly, or to give health to the sick, sight to the blind, and life to the dead. Or did they receive it from the Greek church, or from any of the other churches of the east? All these were utter strangers to them in the beginning of the reformation, and, since they have been informed of their proceedings, have disowned them as a spurious race.

and openly declared against their doctrines; as is demonstrated from incontestable records in Mr. Arnauld's *Perpétuité de la Foi*, to the everlasting confusion of the French Hugonot ministers, who were so indiscreet as to provoke him to it.

Lastly. Will they pretend to have received their power and jurisdiction from the Church of Rome? If so, I must repeat in short what I have said just now, viz., that no man in his senses will believe the Church of Rome ever gave a commission to any man to destroy herself; so that the consequence of all is, that they had their commission from their own dear selves, as thieves and robbers have who plunder and murder upon the highway, according to our Savior's character of false guides. John, c. 10, v. 10.

But I must here observe, over and above, that the advocates for the ordinary Protestant mission from the Church of Rome do hereby fairly acknowledge her authority to give a lawful mission; the immediate consequence whereof is, that they must likewise acknowledge her to have been the true Church of Christ at the very time when they formed their schism against her; because a false church cannot give a lawful mission to preach the word and administer the sacraments; and so, by another undeniable consequence, they apostatized from the true Church of Christ, acknowledged for such by themselves.

It follows, again, that, as they are bound to acknowledge her authority to give a lawful mission, so they must likewise own she had a power to suspend, interdict, and excommunicate such members as set up the standard of rebellion against her; for the one is wholly inseparable from the other. But this spoils all, and utterly destroys the pretended ordinary mission of the reformed churches from the Church of Rome; because the first authors of the reformation were effectually excommunicated by her; and persons excommunicated have neither themselves the power of exercising their ministry, nor by consequence of conveying it to

others; for no man can give that power to others which he has not himself.

This will fully answer the question chiefly insisted upon by those who justly stand up for the divine institution of episcopacy, viz., whether those amongst the reformers, who had been validly ordained by the Church of Rome, had not a power, by virtue of their ordination, to preach the word and administer the sacraments. For I answer, 1st, that excommunication deprived them of all power of exercising their respective functions. I answer, 2dly, that their power of preaching the word could go no farther than as it had a conformity to the doctrine of the Church that gave them their orders. For I take it to be a certain truth that they had no power given them to cut the throat of their own Church; as Dr. Whiston and others ordained by the Church of England had no power, by virtue of their ordination, to teach doctrines condemned by that church; and as the Arian and Donatist bishops, who had been validly ordained by the Catholic Church, had no power, by virtue of their ordination, to preach their impious doctrines. Nay, we may as well maintain that the commander of a party, who has a commission to attack the enemy wherever he meets them, has a power given him to burn, pillage, and destroy both friends and foes; which is most highly ridiculous, because exceeding a commission is as unwarrantable as acting contrary to it.

But has not every pastor a power, nay, obligation, to reform errors and abuses crept into the church? I answer, that, if we may depend securely upon the promises of Christ, the Catholic Church will never be guilty of any errors against faith, and therefore will never stand in need of being reformed by any of her pastors. So that my direct answer to the question is, that it implies no less a false supposition than if it should be asked whether any pastor has not a power, nay, obligation, to reform errors taught by the apostles.

But as to abuses in practice, every pastor is bound to do his best to reform them, provided they be real ones. But he

ought to be very well assured that they are so, before he undertakes to correct them; for, if every private pastor had an authority to reform merely supposed or imaginary abuses, endless divisions and schisms would be the unavoidable consequence of it. In effect, this was the sole occasion of the ancient schisms of the Donatists and Novatians, and that of the Anabaptists in our latter days. The Donatists pretended that the allowing of the validity of baptism conferred by heretics was an abuse; the Novatians cried out against the pretended abuse of admitting those to penance who had fallen in the persecutions; and the Anabaptists clamor with the same violence against infant baptism, as an abuse against the plain word of God. But because the Catholic Church never regarded these practices as abuses, but, on the contrary, as a discipline supported by apostolical tradition, it was unlawful for any of her pastors to take upon them a power to reform them of their own heads.

Suppose a bishop or parson of the Church of England should of his own head undertake to abolish the sign of the cross in the administration of baptism, the ceremonies of ordination, of blessing churches, and other such practices still retained in their church, under pretence of reforming abuses as smelling too rank of Popery, — I ask whether that plea would be admitted. I rather believe such a pretended reformer would be very warmly opposed by his fellow-bishops or parsons, who in this case would be clear-sighted enough to perceive a difference between real and imaginary abuses; and I heartily wish it may open their eyes to let them see that the fiery zeal of the first reformers against every thing they were pleased to call abuses, (as monastical vows, the celibacy of priests, the invocation of saints, honoring their relics, images, or pictures, and praying for the souls departed,) was not a zeal according to knowledge, but a cloak to cover the irregularity of their unwarrantable and uncanonical proceedings.

But I shall now proceed to another sort of argument, to prove that the first reformers, whether ordained or not ordained

by the Church of Rome, could not possibly have a lawful mission from her; and this I shall prove from their own writings, as likewise from the writings of the true sons of the Episcopal Church of England, who have thereby given a mortal stab to their own church.

ARTICLE VI.

Protestants convicted, from their own Writings, that they have no lawful Mission from the Church of Rome.

THE principle I go upon is this, viz., that an heretical, idolatrous, and antichristian church has no power or authority to preach the word or administer the sacraments; because this power belongs wholly and solely to the true Church of Christ; and an heretical, idolatrous, and antichristian church cannot be the true church of Christ. If, then, it will appear that the Church of Rome has been constantly represented as an heretical, idolatrous, and antichristian Church, both by the first reformers and their successors, it will plainly follow from their own doctrine and writings that none of the reformed churches can possibly have a lawful mission from her, because she has no lawful ministry herself, if she be the monster described in those noble epithets.

First, then, let us see how the Church of Rome was set forth by the first reformers. Luther declares, indeed, in his book *De abroganda Missa*, that he had at first no small difficulty to work himself into a belief that the pope was Antichrist, his bishops the devil's apostles, and the Catholic universities his stews. But with the help of some powerful medicines, as he speaks himself, this hard morsel went down at last; and after that the pope was the very Antichrist foretold in the Revelations, the Church of Rome was the scarlet whore, her synods the synagogues of Satan, and her bishops the devil's apostles. Nay, in a book he wrote against the pope's bull,

instead of calling him pope or bishop of Rome, he styles him *Antichrist*, in the very title prefixed to it, thus — “Against the execrable Bull of Antichrist;” which shows that among the Lutherans he was very well known by that name.

Calvin maintained, in express terms, that the bishops of the Church of Rome were not true pastors, but the most cruel butchers of souls, (Instit. l. 4, c. 10;) and in the same treatise, (l. c. 2, § 2,) he tells his reader that “in the Church of Rome, instead of the Lord’s supper, a horrible sacrilege is substituted in its place; that the worship of God is entirely disfigured by a heap of superstitions; that the essential doctrine of Christianity, without which it cannot subsist, is either buried or utterly destroyed; that her public assemblies are schools of idolatry and impiety; and that no man ought to be afraid of separating himself from the Church by avoiding to be an accomplice in her crimes.” In his letter to the king of Poland, he declares positively that her ministry was interrupted; and in his Method of reforming the Church, that she was fallen into utter ruin.

Theodorus Beza, his faithful disciple, told the cardinal of Lorain that they had renounced the Papistical ordinations as the mark of the beast; as he likewise told Saravias that “they were no better than an infamous commerce with the Romish harlot, and more polluted than the pay of prostitutes, forbid by God to be offered in the temple.”

The 31st article of their profession of faith declares that “the Church was fallen into utter ruins and desolation.” And the 28th article condemns all Popish assemblies, “because the pure word of God was banished out of them, and the holy sacraments were corrupted, bastardized, falsified, or rather entirely annihilated; that all idolatry and superstition was practised in them, and that whoever followed their practices, or communicated with them, cut himself off from the mystical body of Jesus Christ.”

From these principles they argued very consequently, and inferred that they could not possibly receive a lawful mission

from the Church of Rome, but that the safest course they could take was to insist upon an immediate and extraordinary vocation from God. And truly, if the premises were true, the consequence would be undeniable.

But have those of the Episcopal Church of England been more moderate in their writings? I leave the reader to judge whether they have or no.

Perkins, in his Exposition upon the Creed, (p. 400,) writes thus: "We say that before the days of Luther, for the space of many hundred years, a universal apostasy overspread the whole face of the earth."

The Book of Homilies, ordered, by the 35th article of religion, to be read in churches, as containing a godly and wholesome doctrine, in the Homily against the Peril of Idolatry, (3 part, London, 1687, p. 251,) has these remarkable words: "Laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children, of whole Christendom, have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry; and that for the space of eight hundred years and more."

Mr. Napier, in his book upon the Revelations, (prop. 37, p. 68,) writes thus: "From the year of Christ 316, the Antichristian and Papistical reign has begun," &c.

Dr. Beard, in his book entitled Antichrist the Pope of Rome, tells his reader that "the pope has set up a new God, namely, a piece of bread in the mass; that he exalts himself above all that is God, nay, above God himself."

Mr. Sutcliff, in his Survey of Popery, writes that "Popery, as a sink, has, together with heresies received into itself, most gross and heathenish idolatry; that it is nothing else but a pack of old and new heresies; the Romish Church consists of a pack of infidels; that the pope is Antichrist; that the Popish Church has no true bishops or priests; and, finally, that Popery, in many points, is more abominable than the doctrine of Mahomet."

Stillingfleet, a doctor and bishop of the Church of England, has written a large volume to prove Roman Catholics

idolaters; and Mr. Lesly, in his Case Stated, following Stillingfleet's system, has employed about thirty pages to prove us as rank idolaters as heathens ever were.

Lastly, a scurrilous libel, entitled *A Protestant's Resolution*, showing his Reasons why he will not be a Papist, written by way of questions and answers, in the form of a catechism, reprinted several times a few years ago, and industriously dispersed throughout the kingdom, has the following question and answer, p. 10:—

“Q. What was there in the Romish religion that occasioned Protestants to separate themselves from it?”

“A. In that it was a superstitious, idolatrous, damnable, bloody, traitorous, blind, blasphemous religion.”

This, indeed, is outrageous in the highest degree, and more becoming the brutality of a savage, than one that sets up for a guide and teacher of Christians. I omit innumerable others, to save myself the trouble of transcribing volumes, and appeal to the generality of Protestant laics, whether the idea of Popery being a religion full of gross errors, superstitions, and idolatry, has not been familiar to them from their very childhood; and since such notions are not born with us, they must have been instilled into them by their teachers. I pray God to convert their hearts, and forgive them the guilt of so grievous a sin.

It is, however, plain and undeniable that the generality of Protestants have in a manner conspired together to give this foul character of the Church of Rome; and so they stand convicted by their own doctrine and writings, that they cannot, without the greatest incoherency, and even absurdity, pretend to derive a lawful ministry from that Church, for the reason I have already often repeated, viz., because an heretical or idolatrous church has herself no lawful ministry, and therefore cannot communicate it to others. Nay, though a person had a lawful mission before, he would forfeit it by communicating with such a church; because whoever communicates in sacraments or worship with heretics, schismatics, or idolaters, becomes guilty of their heresy, schism, or

idolatry, and is thereby rendered incapable of exercising his functions lawfully. And this alone is a convincing proof that neither Luther, nor Calvin, nor Zuinglius, nor Carolostadius, nor Bishop Cranmer, nor any of the first reformers, could possibly have a lawful ordinary mission according to their own doctrine, wherein they have represented the Church of Rome as an heretical and idolatrous Church; because they had all communicated with her for many years in all her sacraments and worship.

Now, then, I leave Protestants to consider seriously from whence they have their ministry or mission. By their blind zeal against Popery, and violent hatred to the Church of Rome, they have effectually stopped up the channel against themselves, through which alone it had passed for fifteen hundred years before the reformation; and when they separated themselves from that Church, as they never incorporated themselves into any other society of Christians, so have they been from the very beginning, and continue still to be, a separate body and communion from all other Christian churches, as well as from the Church of Rome; and so they cannot have received their mission from any of these. Neither can they have received it from the people or secular magistrate, because they have no ecclesiastical power or jurisdiction themselves. How, then, do they come by it? It certainly behoves them to give a satisfactory answer to this question; because the salvation or damnation of millions of souls depends upon it.

Some will perhaps say, that, though the Church of Rome be painted in very black colors by great numbers of Protestant teachers, yet the more moderate part pretend not that she has lost the faith, but only obscured it; that the foundation remains good, but she has built a great deal of stubble and straw upon it; that, therefore, she has always had a lawful ministry, and, by consequence, a power to communicate it to others. But these are all empty words, and serve for nothing else but to throw a mist before the people's eyes. I shall therefore propose two dilemmas to clear the whole matter

· **First.** Either the Church of Rome is a superstitious and idolatrous Church, or not. If she be, she has no lawful ministry, nor, by consequence, a power to communicate it to others. If not, what opinion must all rational men have, not only of the first reformers, but of the generality of Protestant teachers? Must they not regard them as men void of honor and conscience, as seducers, impostors, and the foulest calumniators that ever were upon the face of the earth? Nay, must they not think their leaders who still promote or countenance this unchristian calumny to be utterly destitute of all hopes of salvation, unless they make some public reparation of honor to their church, which both they and their forefathers have slandered in such a notorious manner? I think the matter is beyond all question according to this received maxim of Christian morality — “that the sin of injustice is incapable of pardon, if restitution be not made.”

· **Again.** Either the Church of Rome is an heretical Church or not. If she be, it follows again that she has no lawful ministry, nor a power to transmit it to others. If not, there follows a train of the most destructive consequences to all the reformed churches. For, if she be not an heretical church, then her whole faith is orthodox, and it follows that the pope’s supremacy, the Church’s infallibility, transubstantiation, the sacrifice of mass, the lawfulness of communion in one kind, of invoking the saints, and honoring their relics, images, and pictures, and many more articles denied by the reformed churches, are all articles of revealed faith, because they are all proposed as such by the Church of Rome; and if any of them were not revealed truths, she would be manifestly guilty of heresy; because to add to the revealed word of God is as much heresy as to detract from it; that is to say, in plainer terms, whatever church declares that to be an article of revealed faith, which really is not so, is no less an heretical church than that which denies articles of faith revealed by God.

Well, then; supposing the Church of Rome not to be an heretical church, it follows, 1. That she is the true Church of

Christ; 2. That all the reformed churches have separated themselves from the true Church of Christ; 3. That in so doing they are all schismatical churches; 4. That they are likewise heretical churches in denying the fore-mentioned articles proposed by her as revealed truths; and, 5. That, being heretical churches, they are incapable of having any lawful ministry; because no man, or society of men, ever had a lawful power to preach heresy. This I call a train of consequences destructive to all the reformed churches, if the Church of Rome be not an heretical church; and if she be one, they can have no lawful mission from her; and so they are hemmed in betwixt the two horns of this dilemma, one of which must give them a mortal wound, let them turn themselves what way they please.

But it may, perhaps, be asked whether, if the whole Church of Christ should fall into heresy or idolatry, there would be no possibility, in that case, of a lawful ministry or ordinary mission. I answer, 1st, that the case is impossible; because Christ has positively promised his Church that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against her," (Matt. c. 16, v. 18,) and that "he will be with her unto the end of the world." Matt. c. 28, v. 20.

I answer, 2dly, that, if it were possible for the whole Church to apostatize, the ecclesiastical ministry or mission, as established upon the footing it now is, would cease of course in that case, and an extraordinary vocation would then be absolutely requisite to authorize persons to establish a new ministry, in case it should please God to form a new church; which was the very principle the first reformers went upon when they claimed an extraordinary vocation; and they argued very justly, as I observed before, if it had been true what they pretended, that the whole Church was fallen into heresy and idolatry.

There remains, now, but one popular argument to be answered, viz., that it was not the business of the reformation to preach a new faith, or set up a new church, but only to bring the Christian religion back to its ancient purity, which

surely any minister of the gospel may lawfully do. Thousands of the laity, who know nothing of ecclesiastical history, and swallow down without examination whatever their guides teach them, have been, and are still, seduced by the plausible appearance of this argument. For nothing is more certain than that the most ancient Christian religion is that which was taught by Christ and his apostles, and the religion they taught is most certainly the only true one. When, therefore, the people are confidently told by their ministers, that Protestantism is the ancient religion, and believe it upon their word, there they stick, fully satisfied, without inquiring any further whether it be really so or no; whether their ministers can prove it as easily as say it; or whether their averring it be a safe bottom to hazard their souls upon. Whereas, if they made these inquiries with the sincerity requisite in a concern of this importance, they would soon discover their state to be the same as that of persons under the delusion of a pleasing dream. And, indeed, as long as they continue under this delusive dream of having antiquity and the primitive ages on their side, all endeavors to convince them of this or that particular truth is but labor lost, like speeches made to persons in a profound sleep.

For which reason, I refer the reader to the book entitled the Shortest Way to end Disputes about Religion, 1 part, chap. 4th and 5th, where it is made plain that the doctrine commonly known by the odious name of *Popery* was the doctrine of the Catholic Church in the primitive ages, and, by consequence, of the apostles themselves.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
EDICATION.....	3
TRODUCTION.....	7
SECTION I.—Concerning Man's Free Will.....	11
II.—Concerning Christ's giving Sufficient Grace to all Men	14
III.—Concerning Christ's Dying for all Mankind.....	17
IV.—Concerning the Commandments.....	19
V.—Concerning Faith and Justification.....	25
VI.—Concerning Good Works.....	34
VII.—Concerning Works of Supererogation and Aus- terity of Life.....	42
VIII.—The Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.....	50
IX.—Of the Sacrament of Confirmation.....	67
X.—Of the Sacrament of Penance.....	69
XI.—Of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.....	72
XII.—The Sacrament of Holy Order	73
XIII.—The Sacrament of Matrimony	75
XIV.—Of the Sacrifice of the Mass	76
XV.—Of the Ceremonies of the Church	83
XVI.—Of the Single Life of Priests and such as have vowed Perpetual Chastity	85
XVII.—Of Antichrist	94
XVIII.—Of the Chief Pastors of the Church	98
XIX.—Of Prayer for the Dead, Purgatory, and Indul- gences	101
XX.—Of the Worship and Invocation of Angels and Saints	117
XXI.—Of Images	134
XXII.—Of the Relics of Saints and Pilgrimages to Holy Places	144
XXIII.—Of the Lord's Prayer and the Doxology	151
XXIV.—Of Tradition and the Judge of Controversy ...	153

	PAGE
SECTION XXV. —Of the Perpetuity and Infallibility of the True Church.....	17
XXVI. —The Universality and Visibility of the Church of Christ	18
XXVII. —Of the Invisibility of the Protestant (Episcopal) and Presbyterian Churches before Luther and Calvin's Time.....	19
XXVIII. —The Prophecies of the Old Law concerning the Church of Christ are only verified of the Roman Catholic Church	21
XXIX. —Of the Opinions of the Fathers concerning the Roman Catholic Church	21

APPENDIX.

THE REFORMED CHURCHES PROVED DESTITUTE OF A LAWFUL MINISTRY.....	225
INTRODUCTION.....	227
ARTICLE I. —No lawful Ministry without a lawful Mission ...	233
II. —The Disagreement amongst Protestants concerning their Mission.....	248
III. —The First "Reformers" had no extraordinary Mission.....	256
IV. —No extraordinary Vocation without the Gift of Miracles.....	271
V. —The First "Reformers" had no ordinary Mission.....	280
VI. —Protestants convicted, from their own Writings, that they have no lawful Mission from the Church of Rome.....	286

CX 000 279 638

DATE DUE

000-11			
1/70-81			
6-15-95			

039

