A N

# ANSWER to a Popish BOOK,

INTITULED,

*A True and Modest Account of the Chief Points in Controversie, between the* Roman Catholicks *and the* Protestants.

Together with some Considerations upon the

SERMONS of a DIVINE of the *Church* of *England.* By *N. C.*

WHEREIN

The OBJECTIONS *N.C.* has brought against the ARGUMENTS which His Grace

# JOHN,

Late Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury,*

Made use of in

His SERMONS against *Popery,*

Are considered; and answered on these following Heads:

1. *The Church of* Rome *not Catholick.*
2. *The Supremacy.*
3. *The Infallibility of the Church.*
4. *Transubstantiation.*
5. *Communion in one Kind.*
6. *Prayers in an unknown Tongue.*
7. *The Invocation of Saints.*
8. *Images.*
9. *Purgatory.*
10. *Indulgences.*

*Design'd for the Use of such as are in danger of being perverted by the Emissaries of the* Church of Rome.

I am fully convinced, that the Insolent Behaviour of the Papists has made what you advise necessary to be done, for the Safety of my Person and Government, and the Welfare of my People.

Her Majesty's most Gracious Answer to the Lord's Address.

LONDON: Printed for *W. Hawes,* at the *Bible* and *Rose* in *Ludgate-street.* 1706.

*Books printed for* W. Hawes, *at the* Bible *and* Roſe *in* Ludgate-ſtreet.

TEN Sermons, preach'd before her Royal Highneſs the Princeſs *Anne* of *Denmark*.

A Second Volume of Sermons, preach'd at *Whitehall* and St. *James*'s.

Some Letters relating to the Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*. Publiſh'd by *Lewis Atterbury*, LL. D.

A Thankſgiving Sermon for the Victory at the paſſing the Lines, by his Grace *John* Duke of *Marlborough*, *Anno* 1705.

An Anſwer to a Popiſh Book, intituled, *A True and Modeſt Account of the Chief Points in Controverſie, between the* Roman Catholicks *and the* Proteſtants. Together with ſome Conſiderations upon the Sermons of a Divine of the *Church of England*. By *N. C.* Wherein the Objections *N. C.* has brought againſt the Arguments which His Grace *John*, late Lord Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, made uſe of in his Sermons againſt Popery, are conſidered, and anſwer'd.

The Grounds and Principles of the Chriſtian Religion, explain'd in a Catechetical Diſcourſe, for the Inſtruction of Young People.

A Companion for the Afflicted, whether in Mind, Body, or Eſtate. Being a Collection of Texts of Scriptures, and Forms of Prayer, ſuited to the ſeveral Conditions of Perſons in Affliction; to which is added Directions and Prayers, for the Receiving the Holy Sacrament, and a Morning and Evening Prayer for the uſe of Families. By *John*

*John Lewis*, Rector of *Acryse*, in the Diocese of *Canterbury*.

Fourteen Sermons preach'd at St. *James*'s Church in *Westminster*, on several Occasions. By the Right Reverend Father in God, *Charles Hickman*, Lord Bishop of *London-Derry*.

Essays Ecclesiastical and Civil. Containing Learned and Judicious Discourses on several Subjects. By the late Learned Sir *Bulstrode Whitlocke*, Kt. Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, and Ambassadour from *Oliver Cromwell*, and the Commonwealth of *England* to *Christina* Queen of *Sweden*.

A Continuation of *Drummond*'s History of *Scotland*, from the Death of King *James* V. In Four Books. Wherein many secret and memorable Transactions (relating to both Kingdoms) are brought to Light.

A Treatise concerning the Lawfulness of Instrumental Musick in Holy Offices. By *Henry Dodwell*. M. A.

An Essay towards the Theory of the Ideal or Intelligible World. In Two Parts. The First considering it absolutely in it self, and the Second in Relation to Human Understanding. In Two Volumes. By *John Norris*, Rector of *Bemerton* near *Sarum*.

The Church Catechism explain'd by way of Question and Answer; and confirm'd by Scripture Proofs.

*Joshuah*'s *Charge*. Two Assize-Sermons against Hypocrisie and Indifference in Religion: The first preach'd at *Taunton*, March 20. 1704--5. the second at *Wells*, *August* 15. 1705. By *Charles Jones*, L. L. B. late Fellow of *New-College* in *Oxford*; now Rector of *Nettlecomb* and *High-Ham* in *Somerset-shire*; and Chaplain to the Right Honourable *Thomas* Earl of *Pembroke*, Lord President of the Council.

# ANSWER TO THE PREFACE.

THE Design of the Book intituled *A True and Modest Account*, &c. being as the Author tells us in the beginning of his Preface, *To answer the most Material Objections in Dr.* Tillotson's *Sermons*; as also, *To lay down the Grounds on which the* Popish *Religion is founded.* My Business at present shall be, only to make good the Force of those Arguments which his Grace has urg'd against *Popery*; and to shew that they still remain firm and unshaken, notwithstanding all those Objections which have been brought against them; reserving the Consideration of the *Grounds on which the* Popish *Religion* is founded to a Second Part, that this Treatise may not swell to too large a bulk, but be more useful to convince those of their Errors who have been bred up in the Communion of the *Church of* Rome; and to confirm such who are unsettled in their Principles, in the serious Belief of the *Protestant Religion.*

For tho' we have many Excellent Books, in which the Controversies between the *Church of Rome* and the *Protestants* are plainly stated, and

solidly and learnedly discuss'd; yet they are in a great measure render'd ineffectual; because the Generality of those who live in Communion with the *Church of Rome*, either want the Will, or the Ability, or Permission to read them: But the *Archbishop's Sermons*, besides the Plainness and Familiarity of the Expression, and the other Beauties of the Stile, have also this Advantage beyond other Controversial Writings; that his Arguments against *Popery*, being intermixt with more Practical Truths, are read with Pleasure and Delight, by such Persons who would never endure the fatigue of turning over, and considering a Book writ closely, and consisting only of dry Argumentation.

The *Papists* are taught to believe as their Church believes, without weighing or considering why they do so; they must not trust their own Understandings, nor their Senses in Matters of the nearest Importance, which concern their Eternal Salvation; but repose themselves on their infallible Guide, and give themselves up intirely to its Conduct: They are kept as much as 'tis possible in the dark, and diverted from reading any Controversies in Religion, even those which are written by their own Authors; which is the Reason why their great Champion *Bellarmine* is so scarce in *Popish* Countries. And from hence it was, that the Gentlewoman, for whose Satisfaction *N. C.* wrote his Book; who had never *took the pains to inquire into the Reason of her Faith*, nor had consider'd what the *Scriptures* lay of the Articles of her *Creed*, was so surpriz'd when she first read the *Archbishop's Sermons*; where the crafty Wiliness of the *Papists* is so plainly detected, and their Super-

Superstition and Idolatry prov'd, by such evident Arguments and undeniable Facts; that tho' they may find out many specious Pretences, nice Distinctions, and subtle Evasions, to impose upon the Unwary and Ignorant, and to deceive the weak in Faith; yet will they be manifest to every considerate and unprejudic'd Reader. *N. C.* indeed pretends to have remov'd his Lady's *Scruples*, and to refute the Archbishop by Scripture, Reason, and the Authority of the Fathers; but if he made use of no other Arguments than those he is pleas'd to afford us in his Book, I believe the Reader will soon judge on how Sandy a Foundation her *Satisfaction* was built.

For his usual course thro' the whole Work, is rather to obscure, than enlighten his Subject; to render the Controversy more perplex'd, instead of explaining it; to introduce some nice and unintelligible Notion of the Schools, to misapply some plain Text of Scripture, to quote some Half-Sentence out of the Fathers, to furnish out some stale Argument, which neither that poor Lady, who had never been *sufficiently instructed in the Principles of her Religion*, nor any plain and illiterate Reader can understand; and provided he says something with an Appearance of Truth, 'tis no matter how little to the purpose: Whereas he ought to have grounded his Arguments on the *Holy Scripture* and solid Reason; and to have made Proof of the *Popish* Tenents, by such plain, easy, and familiar Arguments, that every Rational Person might understand them, such as the Archbishop's incomparable Sermons every where abound with.

For 'tis not to be imagin'd, that the Stress of our Salvation should depend on Secular Learning, or the reading the Schoolmen or Fathers; no, we have *a more sure Word of Testimony, to which if we give heed we shall do well*; which is so plain and evident in all Points absolutely necessary to Salvation, that *he who runs may read it*. Tis from the Holy Scriptures alone, *those Fountains of Living Water*, from whence we derive all the Fundamental Articles of our Faith, and are instructed in all the necessary Truths of our Religion: And tho' the Fathers of the Church are held by us in great Esteem, especially those who wrote in the first Centuries, whilst the Christian Religion continued pure and uncorrupted; and we lay a great Stress on the Authority of such Ecclesiastical Historians, as were Men of Probity and Vertue: Yet do we look with far greater Veneration on those Divine Books, which were pen'd by the Immediate Inspiration of the Holy Ghost: Not that we have the least Suspicion, that the *Protestant Religion* will not bear a Tryal by the Ancient *Fathers of the Church*, or maintain its Claim to Antiquity and Purity by the dint of Secular Learning: This has been made out long ago, beyond all Contradiction, and several of our Learned Divines have challeng'd the *Papists* to produce one Sentence out of the Ancient Fathers in Favour of *Popery*, which was not foisted into them, or the Text corrupted. The *Papists* do indeed make their Brags of the Unity, Universality, and Antiquity of their *Church*, and hereby too often impose upon the unlearned and unwary Reader: But 'twill be evident to every one who carefully examines, and looks narrowly into the

the Grounds of their Pretences; that *Popery* is a late Invention, introduc'd by degrees into the Christian Church, consisting of Innovations in Faith and Practice, devis'd on purpose to support the Grandeur and Temporal Interest of the *Church* of *Rome*; and that 'tis widely different from that Profession of Faith deliver'd down by Christ and his Apostles, and believ'd and practis'd in the Purest Ages of the Church. This might easily be made good, but at present I shall confine my self only to those Arguments which *his Grace* has urg'd in his Sermons; as being adapted to the meaneſt Capacity, and those of the weaker Sex, who are in most danger of being perverted by the Emissaries of the *Church of Rome*: And if I do not give his Learned Citations a full Animadversion here, I hope it will not be esteem'd a faulty Omission in me; since *N. C.* tells us, the main Design of his Book is, *to instruct the Weak and Ignorant*, and not *to please the Curious*.

In two things, *N. C.* bespeaks the Reader's Favour, and pleads for his Excuse,

First, that he doth not give the Archbishop his due Title, and for this the Reason is obvious, tho' he will not speak out, and tell us plainly, that he doth not own him to be a Bishop: But there can be no Shadow of a Reason given, nor the least Excuse pretended, for those *hard Words*, as he calls them; that Rude and Scurrilous Treatment which he bestows on this most Reverend Prelate, so freely in several parts of his Book; especially, when he gave us hopes of more civil usage, by promising, *That he would shew all the Respect that might be expected, without betraying the Cause*; But 'tis plain, by

that *Liberty of Speech*, which he uses, that even in matters of common Civility, and decency of Expression, *Faith is not to be kept with Heretics.*

Had he transcrib'd that Copy the Good Archbishop set him, he might have learn'd, that Controversies may be managed with Civility, and a due Respect to the Characters of our Adversaries, *without betraying the Cause*; that *soft* Words, and *hard* Arguments, are of greater force than Calumny and Railing; and that the smooth and oily Stile sinks deeper, and makes a more lasting Impression, than the Salt and Vinegar of the more Passionate Controvertists.

It is true, the Archbishop sometimes diverts himself and his Reader with the Foppery and Impertinencies of the *Popish* Authors, their unsound Reasonings and absurd Consequences, but never at the expence of good Manners, or good Breeding; he every where mingles his sharpest Reflections on the Cause, with Charity to the Person, reconciles Controversy with Good Nature, and hath shewn himself to be not only a Skilful Divine, and an Able Disputant; but also a Good Man, and one of the civilest Gentleman-like Persons in the World.

The second Address which *N. C.* makes, is to the Magistrate. He was, it seems, aware that such poysonous Doctrine, such seditious Principles, such insolent Railing, was likely to awaken the Governours of our Church and State, and to whet the Edge of Penal Laws against *Popish* Recusants; who live securely and peaceably, and are protected in their Properties and Liberties,

ties, whilst the *Protestants* in Foreign Parts suffer Persecution, and undergo the severest Penalties for the sake of Religion, and a good Conscience; But his blind and intemperate Zeal made him turn a deaf Ear to those Carnal Motives, and to disregard all prudential Considerations, so he could but advance the End of his Mission, the making Proselytes to the *Popish* Religion; which may give us a seasonable intimation of the dangerous Consequence of harbouring such furious Zealots in *Protestant* Countries.

I do not write this to incense the Magistrates against them, or to promote a prosecution of the Penal Laws; For I could wish that Liberty of Conscience, in Matters purely speculative, which is so agreeable to the Law of Nature, were the Law of Nations too: But 'tis certainly the Duty of the Magistrate, and an Essential Part of his Office to take care, *Ne quid detrimenti Respublica capiat*, that the Community receive no Prejudice from the bitter Zeal and superstitious Capriches of the Emissaries of the Church of *Rome*.

For the *Papists* are not so inconsiderable a Party in *England* as some Men are pleas'd to represent them: Their Revenues here set apart for the propagating the Faith are very great, near Fourscore thousand Pounds *per Ann.* and their Priests very numerous, and by some of their own Religion said to amount to Three thousand; which I have the more reason to give credit to, by comparing this Account with that of the Priests in *Ireland*, where they are much more numerous, as the List of their Names given in to the Government, by the Articles of *Limerick*, will inform us. Add to this, that they are all dependent on a Foreign

Foreign Head, and supported by a powerful Confederacy; and then I think it will appear highly reasonable, that such care ought to be taken, that it may not be in their power to disturb the Government, and to make us and themselves too, Slaves to the Ambition of a Universal Monarch. And that this is no Chimera, or ungrounded Supposition is plain, from that Concern which the *Papists* here in *England* always express for the Interest of *France*, and that in the highest degree; as plainly appear'd by their Refusal, to comply with the Invitation of the *Portugal* Ambassador on the Day for the Publick Thanksgiving for the Victory of *Blenheim*; which will remain a lasting and notorious Instance of their Disaffection to our Government, as well as Religion.

'Tis true, the Sons of the Church of *England* are mild, patient and charitable, ready to give a kind and friendly Reception to all those who differ from them, and live peaceably and quietly under the Government; but 'tis the Interest of these Gentlemen to take care that they do not abuse this *Patience* (as this Author has done) by reviling the Governours of our Church with such opprobrious Language, printing Books in which their baffled Arguments are trump'd up again, and only varnish'd over in order to deceive poor ignorant People, and seduce them from their Religion and Allegiance, for *Læsa Patientia fit Furor.*

I readily acknowledge, that several of our *English Papists* are Men of excellent Tempers, and (even contrary to their Principles) have behav'd themselves Loyally in a time of Trial, and

and are affectionately concern'd for the Good of their native Country; and I am heartily sorry they are not all so: For when the Leaders and Guides of their Consciences are once arriv'd to that boldness, as to tell us to our Faces and the whole World in Print, that we are Schismaticks and Hereticks, and to upbraid us with that Sacrilege which was committed in *Popish* Times, and by zealous *Papists*, which they themselves are most guilty of; by robbing the People of the Cup in the Sacrament, of the Holy Scriptures, and as the Archbishop ingeniously expresses it, *stealing away the Tenth Commandment in the Face of the Eighth*; and when this is done at a time when (as the Author himself acknowledges) *they are over-look'd by the Government*, and *partake largely of the unmerited Goodness and Clemency of the Church of* England; they certainly take the ready way to put our Magistrates upon the Debate, whether they ought to be *over-look'd* still.

---

ANSWER

# ANSWER
## TO THE
# INTRODUCTION.

THERE is nothing whereby a Man's Diſpoſition and Temper of Mind is made more evident, than by his Stile and Manner of Writing; ſo that let a man take what caution he can, or uſe never ſo much Art to conceal his true Sentiments and natural Diſpoſition, yet the Paſſions of his Mind will by ſome means or other diſcover themſelves, and the Spirit and Soul of the Man will be repreſented in this Mirror: And if ſo, then it will certainly be an undeniable Inſtance of the real Worth, the unaffected Piety, the genuine Humanity and Compoſedneſs of Mind, with which the late Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* was endow'd; that even his Controverſial Writings were pen'd with ſuch Smoothneſs of Stile, and Candor of Expreſſion, and a generous Diſdain of thoſe many Calumnies and Reflections which were continually caſt upon him, *not rendering Railing for Railing, but on the contrary Bleſſing*; and like the Sun, neglecting thoſe Clamors which were occaſioned only by his Height and Brightneſs: And in this Claſs the Author of the *True and Modeſt Account, &c.* has plac'd himſelf.

For

For if ever any meer human Author wrote with Strength of Argument and Demonstration, as well as Accurateness of Stile and Politeness of Expression, it was certainly the late Archbishop of *Canterbury*; and yet the Author of the *True and Modest Account, &c.* will allow him only the mean Commendation of an *Ingenious Person*: But, as he insinuates, without any sound Sense or solid Argumentation, by which he betrays his own want of Capacity, Learning and good Sense; of which he has given us another Instance, in the Judgment he passes on the Dispute between his Grace and Mr. *Serjeant*, who (as he tells us) was so *great a Wit, and so indefatigable a Writer, and by much superiour to the Ingenious Dr.* Tillotson: In Answer to which, I shall refer the Reader to the Preface to the First Volume of the Archbishop's Sermons, where he will find a full and satisfactory Account of the Controversie between them, and plainly discover how little *N. C.* is to be depended on for his Character of Men, as well as his Judgment of Controversies in Religion, and how trifling an Author Mr. *Serjeant* is.

But to come nearer to the Point, he tells us that his *Design*, in his Introduction to his Book, is to undermine the *Foundation* upon which the Archbishop built all his Controversial Writings against the Church of *Rome*. This indeed was a great and dangerous *Design*, which if this *Goliah* had been able to accomplish, he might have spar'd himself the labour of planting a formal Battery against the rest of his Arguments, and writing his Book.

He tells us, that the Archbishop laid down this Fundamental Principle: *That whatsoever is plain*

*plain and evident to our Senses and Reason, is to be believ'd, tho' all the Men and Churches in the World should perswade us to the contrary*; as that two and two make four: And thus far he owns him to be in the right, as every Man of Sense and Reason must do; tho' a little after he is pleas'd to deny it in pag. 19. where he prefers the Authority of Tradition even before the Evidence of Sense, and supposes that tho' *God's Goodness will not put it into Man's Heart to tell a Lie*, yet *his Wisdom may have Reasons to impose upon the Senses.*

But he says, that from this *Fundamental Principle*, it doth not follow that this is the Protestant's Case with regard to the *Papists*; no, I grant it doth not follow from thence, nor did the Archbishop make so silly an Inference: But it doth necessarily follow from this Supposition, that if the Tenents of the Church of *Rome* are contrary to Sense and Reason, they must needs be false; if they should teach that two and two do not make four, but five, or that the Substance which I eat, and which my Senses inform me is Bread, is not Bread, but the Body of a Man, *that then they ought not to be believ'd, tho' never so many Men or Churches should combine together to affirm these Propositions to be true.* And this is plain from hence, because Sense and Reason are more certain Judges of Truth than any Human Authority can be. The best Man in the World may be deceiv'd in his Opinions of Things, he may be bias'd by Prejudice and Interest; Bodies of Men have been so, and Councils have err'd; but Sense and Reason are the surest *Criterions* of Truth; and upon their Testimony all the Certainty which we have of Things is founded. To this *N. C.* answers, That if our

Senses,

Senses and Reason are to be credited before Authority, or Antient Tradition, that then the Church of *Rome*, and several other Churches, have been in an Error for many Years, and mistaken in several Points of their Religion, and have introduc'd into their Church several Tenents contrary to the Testimony of Sense and Reason: And all this I readily grant, nay, that the *Roman* Church was, and still continues so much corrupted, that it requires the utmost of our Charity to believe it a true, tho' a very unsound part of the Catholick Church of Christ. For as the Archbishop tells us, (*Vol. 6. p.* 261.) "It is not necessary that "the whole Christian Church, or any part of "it, should be free from all Errors and Cor-"ruptions; even the Churches planted by the "Apostles in the Primitive Times were not so. "St. *Paul* reproves several Doctrines and Pra-"ctices in the Church of *Corinth*, and of *Coloss*, "and of *Galatia*; and the Spirit of God several "things in the seven Churches of *Asia*; and "yet all these were Parts and Members of the "Catholick Church of Christ, because they a-"greed in the main and essential Doctrines of "Christianity; And when more and greater "Corruptions grew in the Church, the greater "need there was of a Reformation. And as "every particular Person has a right to Reform "any thing that he finds amiss in himself, so far "as concerns himself; so much more every "National Church hath a Power within it "self to Reform it self from all Errors and Cor-"ruptions: And whatever Part of the Church, "how Great and Eminent soever, excludes from "her

"her Communion such a National Church for "Reforming her self from plain Errors and Cor- "ruptions, clearly condemn'd by the Word of "God, and by the Doctrine and Practice of "the Primitive Christian Church, it is undoubt- "edly guilty of *Schism*: And this is the Truth "of the Case between Us and the Church of "*Rome*.

And in order to make Proof of this, I shall consider:

First, *What Arguments his Grace has made use of on the several Heads.*

Secondly, *What* N. C. *has advanc'd in abatement to the Force of them.*

Thirdly, *I shall endeavour to give a plain and clear Answer to all his Objections; whereby 'twill become evident to every honest and intelligent Reader, that notwithstanding all those nice Distinctions which have been lately invented to reconcile those Contradictions we charge upon the Church of* Rome; *the Softnings which have been given to their Opinions, and the Misrepresentations which have been made of them, contrary to their known Practice, and the Sense of their most allow'd Authors: Yet* Popery *is a Religion which teaches Doctrines directly contrary to the Revelation of the* Holy Scriptures, *the Dictates of Right Reason, and the Evidence of our Senses; And if so, that then no Person can now continue in the Communion of the Church of* Rome, *without extreme hazard of his Salvation: And that such* Protestants *who* have been once enlightned with the Knowledge of the Truth, *and yet renounce their Holy Faith, and turn* Papists, *are guilty of a Sin of the deepest Die, and of that* Apostacy *which is near akin to the* Sin against the Holy Ghost.



THE

# THE

# *Roman Church not Catholick;*

And of the

# *Supremacy and Infallibility.*

WHEN the Church of *Rome*, which was deſervedly eminent in the Times of the Apoſtles, and ſome ſucceeding Ages, for the Soundneſs of its Faith, and the Exemplary Lives of its Profeſſors, had by degrees in a long Tract of Time ſo far corrupted itſelf, as to become guilty of notorious Superſtition and Idolatry; then it pleaſed God to raiſe up many *Worthies*, Men endowed with an Apoſtolical Spirit, and a Primitive Zeal for the Truth, who, with the hazard of all their Worldly Intereſts, ſet about *that Great and Glorious Work*, The Reforming the Church, and reſtoring it to its Primitive Purity and Holineſs.

But as ſoon as (by the Bleſſing of God) our firſt Reformers had made ſome Progreſs in it, and it became viſible to the

World, that there were many notorious Errors, many Superſtitious and Idolatrous Practices in the Church of *Rome*, ſuch as could not be juſtified either by Reaſon or Scripture; then thoſe whoſe Intereſt inclin'd them to retain theſe Corruptions, made it their Buſineſs either to defend them by ſome plauſible Arguments, or at leaſt to palliate them by ſome frivolous Excuſes; and amongſt thoſe, the Doctrine of the *Infalliblity of the Church*, was eſteem'd the main Prop by which *Popery* was to be upheld and ſupported.

For, if *the Church cannot err in delivering the Doctrine ſhe receiv'd from Jeſus Chriſt, nor miſtake in her Explanation thereof*; then (as they tell us) we have nothing elſe to do, but firſt to inquire which is the True Church? and ſecondly, what this Church Teaches? and (without troubling our ſelves farther about the particular Controverſies of Religion) to take up our Faith on Truſt, and ſit down and believe whatſoever the Spiritual Guides of the Church dictate to us, and we ſhall be ſav'd. Now, the *Papiſts* would have us be ſo good natur'd as to take it for granted:

1. *That the* Holy Catholick Church *doth conſiſt only of ſuch Members as are in Communion with the Church of* Rome; and that all thoſe who are excommunicated by it, (which is the greateſt Part of the Chriſtian

Christian World) are no true Members of the *Catholick Church*, nor have they any Possibility of Obtaining Salvation: And if we can once be brought to believe that the Church of *Rome* is the only true Church, then it will be natural to infer from hence;

2. That the *Pope* is the Supream Head of the Church.

3. That Infallibility is so surely lodg'd in the Church of *Rome*, that whatsoever that Church defines to be necessary to be believ'd, ought to be assented to by every good Christian, on Pain of Eternal Damnation.

This at first sight seems to be a short and easy Way of ending Controversies, and freeing Mens Minds from such Scruples and Doubts, as for the most part perplex the most sober and honest Persons; such as are best disposed, and have the most serious sense of Religion. It seems indeed to be a plain and direct Path at the first entrance, but when we are gone on a little way in it, there will soon appear so many crooked Windings and Turnings, that we shall be more perplex'd to find out the right Way than we were before. For,

1. It cannot be made out, that the Church of *Rome* is the *Catholick Church* Nor,

2. That the *Pope* is the Supream Head of the Church. Nor,

3. That there is any Infallibility lodg'd in it: But the direct contrary is evident, from those Arguments which *His Grace* has urg'd in his Sermons.

1. That the Church of *Rome* is not the *Catholick Church* he proves;

1. Because to affirm this, is to be guilty of the same Absurdity, as to say, That a Part is the Whole; for the Church of *Rome* is only a Particular Part of the Universal Church, and therefore cannot be the *Catholick* or the Whole *Church.*

To this *N.C.* answers, That by the *Roman* Church, the Papists do not mean the Diocese of *Rome*, which in a strict sense may be call'd the Church of *Rome*; but all Christian Churches over the World, in Communion with the Particular Church or See of *Rome*, not as submitting to its Jurisdiction, but only as 'tis *the Centre and Principle of Catholick Unity.*

But 'tis evident, That this not a true Representation of the Matter of Fact; for the *Papists* own no other Members of the Church of *Rome*, but those who own the Supremacy, and submit themselves to the Authority and Jurisdiction of the Pope of *Rome.* It being declared, in their Canon Law, necessary to Salvation, that every Hu-

Humane Creature ſhould be ſubject to the Biſhop of *Rome*, And this is confirm'd by the laſt *Lateran* Council. But ſuppoſing that they do mean no more, becauſe *N. C.* tells us ſo; why then ſhould they be ſo fond of this Appellation, *Roman Catholick Church*? Why ſhould not the *Univerſal Chriſtian Church* do as well? Why ſhould they ſtudy to adorn the *Church of Rome* with ſo many Glorious Titles, which do not belong to her? The *Church of Rome*, we grant, is an eminent Part of the *Chriſtian Church*; but that this Part can comprehend the Whole, that we deny. For it doth no where appear, nor are the Papiſts able to make it out, that the *Church of Rome* was inveſted with any peculiar Privileges beyond other *Chriſtian Churches* planted by the Apoſtles; or that ſhe was to be the Mother and Miſtreſs of all other Churches. For *Jeruſalem* was certainly the Mother-Church; there was the firſt *Chriſtian Church* planted, and from thence all *Chriſtian Churches* in the World derive themſelves. For if *Rome* was the Mother and Miſtreſs of all other Churches, 'twill be difficult to account why St. *Paul*, in a long Epiſtle to that Church, takes no notice of it: So that in all probability he was ignorant of thoſe mighty Prerogatives of the *Church of Rome*, otherwiſe it cannot be imagin'd but he would have written

with more *deference* to the *Mother-Church*, the Centre of Unity, and Seat of Infallibility; where the Vicar of *Christ* was, by his Appointment, to fix his Throne, and eſtabliſh his Reſidence.

But ſays *N. C.* if you allow the *Church of Rome* to be part of the *Catholick Church*, then 'tis certain, even to Demonſtration, that it muſt be the *whole Catholick Church*, *p.* 99. but where to find this Demonſtration, or any probable Argument to prove it, I cannot tell.

He tells us indeed, that one Faith and one Communion are eſſential to the Conſtitution of the *Catholick Church*; therefore thoſe who do not hold the ſame Faith, nor are in Communion with the *Church of Rome*, are not Parts or true Members of the *Catholick Church*.

1. But to this the Anſwer is very eaſie, that the ſame Fundamental Articles of Faith, and the ſame Sacraments and Offices of Religion are eſſentially neceſſary to the Conſtitution of the *Catholick Church*; but it is not neceſſary that all Parts of the *Catholick Church* agree in every Point of Religion, or maintain mutually external Communion one with another. For the Church of Chriſt may fall into many Errors, and will have many Rents and Diviſions, and one particular Church may excommunicate another, and yet both ſtill remain

remain Members of the Universal Church. That Church indeed which retains the greatest Purity of Doctrine, and whose Constitution is most conformable to the Practice of our Saviour and his Apostles, is the most sound Member of the *Catholick Church*: But whatsoever Church *holds the Head*, and professes the fundamental Points of the Christian Religion, and retains the same Sacraments and Ordinances of Christ; that Church is a true and real Member of the *Catholick Church*, tho' there may be many Errors or corrupt Practices (such as put Men in very great hazard of their Salvation) found in it, and tho' it may not hold an external Communion with all other Churches. And if so, then it will follow, *That other Societies of Christian Churches, who have not external Communion with the Church of Rome*, but are excommunicated by it, *are Parts of the Catholick Church*; and therefore the Church of *Rome* comprehends only a part, and not the whole Church, as will more evidently appear, because,

2. The Churches of *Asia*, which were Excommunicated by the Bishops of *Rome*, for not keeping *Easter* as they did; and the Churches of *Asia* and *Africa*, upon the Point of Rebaptizing Hereticks, were hereby turn'd out of the Communion of the *Roman Church*, and yet did still continue

in the Communion of the *Catholick Church*; which could not possibly be, if the *Roman Church* and the *Catholick Church* were the same.

This Argument *N. C.* tells us, is grounded upon a Fallacy, because the Bishop of *Rome* and the *Roman Church* are not the same; and whoever said they were? the Bishop of a Church and the Church over which he is Bishop, are certainly two very different things. But is it not the same thing to be Excommunicated by the Bishop of *Rome*, and to be Excommunicated out of the *Roman Church*? And if so, then the *Catholick Church* and the *Roman Church* are not the same, nor of the like Extent; because those who are Excommunicated out of the *Roman Church*, may still remain Members of the *Catholick* or *Universal Christian Church*.

3. The Papists themselves hold, That the Baptism of Children by Hereticks, is good and valid, and makes them Members of the *Catholick Church*; but Baptism conferr'd by a Heretick doth not make the Person Baptiz'd a Member of the *Roman Church*, therefore the *Catholick* and the *Roman Church* are not the same.

To this Argument *N. C.* answers, That Baptism conferr'd by Hereticks is good and valid, and that such Persons who are baptiz'd by them, are made Members of the *Roman*

*Roman Church*, unleſs they caſt themſelves out of the Church when they come to Age by partaking of the ſame Schiſm or Hereſie, and that even Hereticks receive a true Character of Baptiſm; but that this Character doth not make them either Members of the *Catholick Church*, nor avails any thing to their Salvation.

In which Anſwer, Two Things will be very difficult to be made out. *Firſt*, How a Prieſt, who doth not own the Church of *Rome*, but looks upon it as a Superſtitious and Idolatrous Church, and that 'tis not lawful to Communicate with it, and by being Excommunicated is become like a Heathen or Infidel, can make another a Member of that Church to which he bears no Relation; 'tis an old Axiom, *Nemo dat id quod non habet*, that no Man can give that which he is not poſſeſs'd of; and if a Heretick is not a Member of the Church of *Rome*, how can he make another ſo? Beſides, to the due Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, the *Papiſts* hold the Intention of the Prieſt abſolutely neceſſary; this is declar'd by the Council of *Trent*, with an *Anathema* upon all who ſay otherwiſe, *Seſſ.* 7. *Can.* 11. So that if the Prieſt doth not intend to Baptize, the Perſon doth not receive Baptiſm, nor is made a Member of Chriſt's Church: Now 'tis certain, that thoſe the Papiſts call

call Hereticks do not intend to Baptize into the *Roman Church*, how then can their Baptism make them Members of that Church? *Secondly*, If the Administration of Baptism doth confer even upon Hereticks a true Character of Baptism, why should it not make them Members of the *Catholick Church*? For, what is this true Character which is confer'd by Baptism, but an Actual Admission of them into the Church of Christ.

4. If the *Roman Church* were the same with the *Catholick Church*, then all those Churches who do not yield Subjection to the Bishop of *Rome*, nor acknowledge his Supremacy, are not true Parts of the *Catholick Church*, and by consequence have no possibility of being sav'd; but since this is the Condition of the *Greeks* and *Eastern Churches*, as well as of the Protestants (four of the five *Patriarchal* Churches of the Christian World) we have good reason to believe that God will be more merciful than our Brethren of the Church of *Rome*, and that the *Catholick Church* doth extend farther, and hath larger Bounds than the *Roman*.

This Argument *N. C.* grants is founded on a very great Inconveniency; and so great, that every good Man will be very apt to conclude, both from the Goodness and Mercifulness of God's Nature, that he will

will not damn ſo great a Multitude of Men, only becauſe they are *Anathamatiz'd* by the Biſhop of *Rome*, eſpecially ſince *N. C.* has formerly told us, That they may be Excommunicated by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and yet remain Members of the *Catholick Church*. *N. C.* indeed is very poſitive, that they cannot be ſav'd, and tells us 'tis the Opinion of the *Romiſh Church*; but from this uncharitable Judgment of theirs, we have good reaſon to infer, That the Church of *Rome* is ſo far from being the whole *Catholick Church*, that it is only a very arrogant and uncharitable part of it.

5. If the *Roman Church* was the ſame with the *Catholick Church*, then it would have been thus expreſs'd in the Ancient Creeds, becauſe it is of ſo great importance to the Salvation of Mens Souls, and the Peace and Unity of the Church, that it would not have been omitted. But we do not find any Foot-ſteps of this Expreſſion; nor is this Phraſe *The Holy Catholick Church* thus explain'd in the firſt Ages of the Church. And *Æneas Sylvius* (who was afterwards Pope) tells us, that before the Council of *Nice*, little reſpect was had to the *Roman Church*; 'tis true, *his Grace* remarks, that this was ſaid before *Æneas Sylvius* was Pope, but that 'twas never the leſs true for all that.

To

To this *N. C.* anſwers, That tho' the words *Roman Catholick Church* are not to be found in the Ancient Creeds, yet the thing meant by theſe words is there, becauſe *Roman Catholick Church* and *Holy Catholick Church* do denote the ſame thing, and are Words of the ſame importance: But this is a ſhameful begging of the Queſtion; for the thing in diſpute is, Whether the *Catholick Church* in the Creed is the ſame with the *Roman Church?* and becauſe *N. C.* cannot prove it, he is pleas'd to ſuppoſe it. Such arguing as this he learn'd from his Friend Mr. *Serjeant.* If a Rule is a Rule, then a Rule is a Rule. And the *Roman Church* is the ſame ſame with the *Catholick Church*, therefore the *Roman* is the *Catholick Church.* As to the Authority of *Æneas Sylvius*, *N. C.* tells us, That the words of *Æneas Sylvius* relate only to the Dioceſe of *Rome.* "For (ſays he) I am ſure he never "ſaid or writ, that the *Romiſh Church*, "as it includes all the *Chriſtian Churches* "in Communion with the See of *Rome*, "(in which ſenſe the Doctor could not "be ignorant we always take it) was "not the true *Catholick Church.*

In which words he plainly contradicts himſelf, for he tells us that the Papiſts always take the *Roman Church* for all *Chriſtian Churches* in Communion with the Church

Church of *Rome*, and in no other ſenſe; and yet in the ſame breath he gives us another ſenſe of the words, and tells us that *Æneas Sylvius* meant them only of the Dioceſe of *Rome*. But let us ſuppoſe that *Æneas Sylvius* did ſpeak of the Dioceſe of *Rome*. What then, certainly it muſt from thence follow, that if little Reſpect was had to the Dioceſe of *Rome* before the Council of *Nice*, therefore 'tis not likely that by the *Roman Church* the *Catholick Church* was denoted, the *Roman Church* being only a ſmall, and no remarkable part of it.

As to that Quotation out of *Irenæus*, whereby he endeavours to weaken the Authority of *Æneas Sylvius*, to wit, That every Church muſt have recourſe to this, by reaſon of her more powerful Principality. The words plainly relate to the Civil Government, and prove that the See of *Rome* had no Advantage over thoſe Sees which were plac'd in other Cities, from any Power deriv'd from Chriſt which was purely Spiritual; but only becauſe the Civil Power had plac'd there its Reſidence and Tribunal.

Laſtly, The *Roman Church* is not the *Catholick Church*, becauſe our Saviour never conſtituted St. *Peter* and his Succeſſors ſupream Head and Paſtor of the whole *Chriſtian Church*. Which brings me to

to the ſecond Point in debate, to prove,

2. That the *Pope* is not the *Supream Head of the Church.*

*N. C.* tells us, that *the Pope or Biſhop of* Rome *is the Succeſſor of St.* Peter, *and as ſuch, is the Head of the Church; i.e.* not only *the Centre of Catholick Unity*, as he ſometimes explains it; but alſo by Divine Appointment, *the Supream and Univerſal Paſtor of the Chriſtian Church*; to whoſe Juriſdiction every Humane Creature muſt be ſubject, on Pain of Eternal Damnation.

This is an unſufferable Branch of the *Papal Uſurpation*, over all Chriſtian Churches in the World, without the leaſt Ground or Colour of Ground, either from Scripture or Antiquity; and may and has been extended, to a Temporal Power over all Princes and Magiſtrates, under the ſubtle Pretence of Acting in order to Spiritual Ends.

But that the Biſhop of *Rome*, as Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, cannot be the *Supream and Univerſal Paſtor* of Chriſt's Church, the Archbiſhop proves;

1. Becauſe there is not the leaſt mention of this in Scripture, (*i. e.*) That St. *Peter* was *the Supream and Univerſal Paſtor* of Chriſt's Church.

2. Suppoſing this, yet it doth not thence neceſſarily follow, that this Power ſhould be derived down from St. *Peter* to the Pope of *Rome*.

1. There

1. There is not the leaſt mention in Scripture of St. *Peter's* being *the Supream and Univerſal Paſtor* of Chriſt's Church; there is not the leaſt Intimation of any ſuch thing in the *Goſpel*, or the *Acts* and *Epiſtles* of the Apoſtles; nay, there is clear Evidence to the contrary, that in the Council at *Jeruſalem*, St. *James* was, if not ſuperior, yet at leaſt equal to him; and S. *Paul withſtood him to the Face*, and plainly aſſerts the Equality of his own Authority with his.

To this *N. C.* anſwers, That 'tis true, that the Scriptures make no mention of this Title, *Supream and Univerſal Paſtor*, in expreſs Words, yet the Archbiſhop *has no reaſon to quarrel with them*; becauſe there is nothing more meant by them, but that the *Pope* is *Head of the Church*.

But this is meer trifling; for 'tis not the Words or Title of *Supream* and *Univerſal Paſtor*, which the Archbiſhop diſlikes, but the Thing intended by them; and denies that St. *Peter* was this *Supream* and *Univerſal Paſtor*; or that the Scripture gives any Intimation that he was the *Head of the Church*: So that what he ſays of the word Conſubſtantial in the *Nicene* Council, is nothing at all to the Purpoſe.

But he tells us, that there are Texts of Scripture which prove clearly, that St. *Peter* was conſtituted by Chriſt *Supream*

*pream Head of the Church*; he quotes *Matth.* 16. 18. *I ſay unto thee, thou art Peter* (or as the *Greek* has it, *a Rock*) *and upon this Rock will I build my Church*: As alſo that our Saviour ſaid unto him, 1 *John* 21. 15, 16. *Feed my Lambs, and feed my Sheep*; by the one he will have the People deſign'd, by the other the Paſtors of the Church. And *Luke* 22. 31, 32. *When thou art Converted, ſtrengthen* or confirm *thy Brethren*. Theſe Texts of Scripture (he concludes) muſt needs denote ſome particular Mark or Character impreſs'd upon St. *Peter*, and ſome Authority and Juriſdiction veſted in him above the reſt of the Apoſtles.

This is eaſily ſaid indeed, but not ſo ſoon prov'd; for 'tis evident, that there is nothing here ſaid to St. *Peter*, but what is applicable to all the reſt of the Apoſtles; they are all enjoin'd to *feed God's Lambs and God's Sheep*; both the ſtrong and the weak in Faith; they are all exhorted to confirm and *ſtrengthen one another*; and there is ſo little Umbrage in the Holy Scripture of any Superiority given to one above the reſt, that our Saviour gives the Mother of *Zebedee*'s Children a ſevere Check, for making this Requeſt, *that her Sons might ſit the one on the right Hand, and the other on his left, in his Kingdom*: This certainly had been a fit

a fit opportunity for our Saviour to declare to whom this Right did belong, but he blames their Ambition and Arrogancy, and tells them plainly, that he who would be uppermoſt ſhould be a Servant to the reſt.

But becauſe the Papiſts draw the moſt plauſible Arguments, and rely chiefly for the Proof of St. *Peter's Supremacy* from that Text, *Matth.* 16. 18. *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church:* I will therefore conſider it more particularly.

And, *Firſt*, This Promiſe of our Saviour to St. *Peter*, is generally thought to relate to St. *Peter's* Confeſſion; for when our Saviour asked his Diſciples, *But whom ſay ye that I am?* ver. 15. *Peter* immediately anſwered, *Thou art Chriſt the Son of the Living God. And Jeſus anſwered and ſaid unto him, Bleſſed art thou Simon Barjona, for Fleſh and Blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven: And I ſay unto thee, Thou art Peter,* (*i. e.* thy Name ſignifies a Stone), and upon that great and fundamental Truth which thou haſt made Confeſſion of, (*viz. that I am Chriſt, the Son of the Living God*) *I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it*; *i. e.* againſt that Church, which by the Miniſtry of St. *Pe-*

*ter*, and the rest of the Apostles, was to be built upon this Fundamental Article of Faith; and that this is the true meaning of the Words, will be more clear by comparing them with *Ephes.* 2. 19. where the same Metaphor of a Building is made use of, to which the Church is compar'd, and the Apostles and Prophets to the Foundation, *Jesus Christ* himself to *the chief Corner-stone.*

But suppose these Words were spoke to St. *Peter* himself, all that can be infer'd from it is, That Christ would so build his Church upon that Apostle, that he should have the Honour of laying its Foundation, both amongst the *Jews* and amongst the *Gentiles*; not that he should be the *Supream Head and Governour* of it when built, which can never with any shew of Reason, be imply'd in the Promise of Christ of *building his Church upon this Rock*; for 'tis evident that none of the Apostles nor St. *Peter* himself did understand this Promise of any Primacy of Power or Jurisdiction; because after our Saviour had said these Words, and after they had received the Effusion of the Holy Ghost, which led them into all Truth, and inspir'd them with the full Understanding of Christ's Words; they did not believe there was any such Primacy given to St. *Peter* above the rest of the Apostles,

Apoſtles, but contended who ſhould be greateſt.

*Secondly*, He argues, that the *Evangeliſts* repeating the Names of the Twelve Apoſtles, place St. *Peter* firſt, and particularly mark his Supremacy. *Now the Names of the Twelve Apoſtles are theſe, the firſt Simon, who is called Peter*; and thence *N. C.* concludes, that there could be no other Reaſon why he was nam'd firſt (being he was neither the firſt Diſciple who was call'd, nor the oldeſt Man) but becauſe the *Supremacy* was veſted in him; and adds, that moſt certainly Chriſt did not deſign the πρῶτος Πέτρος, thoſe words, *firſt Peter*, for a Primacy of Ceremony and Civility, but for that of Order and Juriſdiction.

But where the Strength of this Argument lies (which he utters with ſo much confidence) I cannot find; for, how doth it follow, That becauſe St. *Peter* was nam'd firſt, therefore he had the Rule and Juriſdiction over the reſt of the Apoſtles? The utmoſt that can be concluded from the naming St. *Peter* in the firſt place, is; that he had the Precedency of the reſt of the Apoſtles, for ſome Reaſon or other; but what that Reaſon was, is not hereby determin'd. But in truth, we cannot conclude from hence ſo much as this; for tho' St. *Peter* is here nam'd firſt,

yet he is not always ſo, for *Gal.* 2. 9. he is nam'd in the ſecond place.

3. But *N. C.* inſiſts farther, That after Chriſt's Aſcenſion, St. *Peter* actually took upon himſelf the Character of *Supream Head of the Church*; and this he endeavours to prove from the Firſt of the *Acts*, where St. *Peter* ſtood up, and diſcours'd at large of the Fall of *Judas*: 2. When he gave an account of the Gift of Tongues: 3. When he made his Defence before the Rulers: 4. When he paſſed Sentence upon *Ananias* and *Saphira*, but eſpecially by what he did in that famous Council of the Apoſtles, *chap.* 15.

Theſe Inſtances indeed prove St. *Peter* to be an Eminent Apoſtle, but do not give us the leaſt hint of his Superiority or Juriſdiction over the reſt of the Apoſtles; for in the Council at *Jeruſalem*, St. *James* was, if not ſuperior, at leaſt equal to him; and St. *Paul* himſelf tells us, That he withſtood him to the Face, that St. *Peter* gave him the right Hand of Fellowſhip; and we are told, *Acts* 8. 14. That St. *Peter* and St. *John* were ſent by the Apoſtles, who were at *Jeruſalem*, to *Samaria*, which gives no encouragement to the notion of St. *Peter's* Supremacy.

To this *N. C.* replies, "That 'tis true "St. *Paul* was equal to St. *Peter*, and ſo is "every Biſhop to the *Pope*; but that this

"equality

"equality doth consist only in the Power "of Preaching the Word, of Administring "the Sacraments, and of conferring Holy "Orders, but that the supream Govern- "ment of the Church was entirely lodg'd "in St. *Peter*. This he says indeed, but how doth he prove it? Why, after his usual manner, by taking it for granted, without affording us the least shadow of Reason for it.

But since he thinks fit to take it for granted, we will pay so much deference to him for the present, as to do so too, and suppose that St. *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*, and *supream Head of the Church*. But then he will be hard put to it to prove, that he transmitted his *Supremacy* to his Successors, and to his Successors at *Rome*, rather than to those at *Antioch*, where 'tis evident that he was first Bishop, but not that he was ever Bishop of *Rome*. For, if St. *Peter* devolv'd his *Supremacy* upon his immediate Successor, and that it is self-evident by the Law of Nature, that Heirs and Successors inherit the Privileges of their Ancestors, as he tells us, *pag.* 102. then his immediate Successor at *Antioch*, where he was first Bishop, must be the *Supream Head and Pastor of the Church*; and then the *Supremacy* will be lodg'd in the Church of *Antioch*, and not in the See of *Rome*,

To this *N. C.* anſwers, That 'tis true, that the Holy Scripture no where declares, that St. *Peter's Supremacy*, was derived down to his Succeſſor at *Rome*, and that it was not neceſſary it ſhould be ſo declar'd; becauſe the Power and Authority of a Biſhop naturally devolves upon his Succeſſor; and with his uſual Modeſty and Civility tells us, "That this "Queſtion of *His Grace* (*viz.* Where does "it appear in Scripture, that St. *Peter's* "Power was deriv'd to his Succeſſors?) "is one of the ſimpleſt Expreſſions that "ever fell from a Man of his Parts; and "and that he is almoſt unwilling to ho-"nour it with a Confutation. But ſince he acknowledges *His Grace* to be an *Ingenious Perſon*, and a *Man of Parts*, I am apt to think he had ſome good Reaſon for what he ſaid; tho' a Man of *N. C.'s* Parts and Ingenuity cannot preſently apprehend it. Now ſince there are three ſorts of *Supremacy*; a *Supremacy* of Worth, Order, and Juriſdiction; why may not St. *Peter's Supremacy* be the firſt and ſecond of theſe? Which being founded on Perſonal Merit, doth not naturally flow to the immediate Succeſſor? That it was ſo, is more than probable, becauſe there is not the leaſt Footſtep of any *Supremacy* of Juriſdiction lodg'd in St. *Peter*, either in the Holy Writ, or in any of the Antient Monuments of

of the Church for the first five Centuries; and when the Title of *Universal Bishop* was usurp'd by the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, in the end of the sixth Century, it was look'd upon as new and profane Title. But the Archbishop asks another Question; Why, (supposing that S. *Peter's Supremacy* did descend to his immediate Successor) the Supremacy should be fix'd to the See of *Rome*? Because 'tis uncertain whether St. *Peter* was ever Bishop of *Rome*; and if we grant that too, yet 'tis evident that he was first Bishop of *Antioch*: And when the Papists themselves confess, that St. *Peter* rais'd two Episcopal Sees, the first at *Antioch*, the other at *Rome*, why should all Power and Jurisdiction be entail'd upon the See of *Rome*, and none descend to his immediate Successor at *Antioch*? This Objection *N. C.* took notice of, but is not pleas'd to honour it with an Answer.

And now since the Missionaries of the Church of *Rome* make use of this Sovereignty and Supremacy of the *Pope*, to prove the Infallibility of his Person; by shewing how little Reason there is to submit to his *Supremacy*, the way is level'd and prepar'd in order to attack that great *Bulwark* of *Popery*, the *Infallibility*; and to shew, That neither the *Pope*, nor *Church*

*of Rome*, are *Infallible*. And this the Archbishop proves;

1. Because the *Papists* are not agreed amongst themselves, where this *Infallibility* is seated, whether in the *Pope* alone, or a *Council* alone, or in both together, or in the diffusive Body of Christians; and we cannot judge it reasonable that the Christians in all Ages did believe it, and had constant recourse to it, for determining their Differences; and yet that That very Church, which hath enjoy'd and us'd it so long, should now be at a loss where to find it; nothing could have fall'n out more unluckily, than that there should be such Differences amongst them, about that which they pretend to be the only Means of ending all Differences.

To this *N. C.*'s Answer is so singular, that I shall transcribe it for the use of the Reader. "For my own Part, (says he) "I never yet read, or heard of any Ca- "tholick Divine, that ever said, That the "Catholick Church, taken for *the Diffu- "sive Body of Christians*, was not *infalli- "ble* in declaring Matters of Faith; there- "fore, I think, all agree, that the *Infalli- "bility* is seated in *the diffusive Body of "Christians*; And I challenge any *Pro- "testant* in the World to name me one, "who says the contrary. The *Pope* is "one, and the chief Member of that Dif-

"fusive

" fusive Body. The *Pope*, and *Council* to-
" gether, make a great many Members;
" and if you add to these all the rest of
" the Faithful, they make up *the entire*
" *Diffusive Body of Christians.* If the *Pope*
" be *infallible*, surely the concurrence of a
" *Council* will rather confirm than dimi-
" nish his *Infallibility*; if the *Pope* and
" *Council* together be *infallible*, the Con-
" sent of the *Diffusive Body of Christians*
" must surely strengthen and confirm it;
" but if neither the *Pope*, nor the *Council*
" alone be *infallible*, the *Diffusive Body of*
" *Christians* must necessarily be; if any
" such thing as *Infallibility* may be ascrib'd
" to any of the Three, seeing both *Pope*
" and *Council* are included in it. We are
" sure then, the *Infallibility* consists at
" least in *the Diffusive Body of Christians.*
" But to illustrate this a little more, let
" us propose this familiar Example. If I
" should ask where my *Lord Mayor* of
" *London* is, at this time? And that
" some should tell me, he is in his own
" House; others, not in his own House,
" but somewhere in *London*; and others,
" neither in his own House, nor in *Lon-*
" *don*, but in *England*: I would willing-
" ly know, whether these three sorts of
" People do not all agree that my *Lord*
" *Mayor* is in *England*? Certainly they
" do; because the Assent of the two

" for-

" former is neceſſarily implied in the " latter.

" In like manner, tho' ſome ſay the " *Pope* is *infallible*; others, not the *Pope* " alone, but together with a *General Coun-* " *cil*; and others, neither *Pope* nor *Council* " alone, without the Concurrence of the " *Diffuſive Body of Chriſtians*; yet all do " concentre in this, that the *Diffuſive* " *Body of Chriſtians* is *infallible*. The " Doctor is then very much out, when " he ſays; *They do not know where it is, tho'* " *they are ſure they have it.*

" In ſhort, the Article of Faith, clearly " known, and unanimouſly aſſented to by " all *Roman Catholicks*, in regard of *Infal-* " *libility*, is only this: (*viz.*) That the " *Holy Ghoſt*, the Spirit of Truth, by the " Promiſe of *Chriſt*, in all Ages reſides in " the *Catholick Church*; *infallibly* declares " and explains, by the Paſtors of the " Church aſſembled in General *Council*, " and united to their Head, all Chriſtian " Verities. In this great Principle of " Faith, all *Roman* Catholicks with Aſ- " ſurance and univerſal Concord agree; " and herein conſiſts the whole Notion of " what *Roman* Catholicks mean by the " Term *Infallible*.

And I think, whoever reads this Anſwer, muſt conclude from thence, that the *Papiſts* are not agreed amongſt themſelves, where

where this *Infallibility* is ſeated; *Therefore they do not know where it is.* 'Tis a plain Queſtion we demand of the *Papiſts*. If there is appointed by Chriſt an *infallible* Judge, to decide all Controverſies which ſhall ariſe about the Chriſtian Faith, Who is he, and where we may addreſs our ſelves unto him? To this *N. C.* anſwers, "That he never yet read or heard of any "*Catholick Divine*, that ever ſaid, that the "*Catholick Church*, taken for the *Diffuſive* "*Body of Chriſtians* was not *infallible*, in de- "claring Matters of Faith. Well then, all the *Catholick Divines* are agreed, that the *Infallibility* doth reſide in the *Diffuſive Body of Chriſtians*; and we have nothing elſe to do, but to prove, That the *Diffuſive Body of Chriſtians* cannot be *infallible* Judges and Determiners of Controverſies; which I think is no difficult matter to perform, becauſe they never did, nor can meet together, nor did they ever determine any one Controverſie.

But perhaps his meaning may be, that the *Diffuſive Body of Chriſtians* is *infallible*; not as taken perſonally, but as repreſented "in a General *Council*, of which the *Pope* is "the Head; and that the Holy Ghoſt *infal-* "*libly* declares and explains by the Paſtors "of the Church aſſembled in a General "*Council*, and united to their Head, all "Chriſtian Verities. But this doth not agree with

" with what he has told us, That to make " up *the diffusive Body of Christians*, not only " a General *Council* united to their Head, but " all the rest of the Faithful are requir'd. " And that several of the *Popish* Divines are " of Opinion, That a General *Council* with " the *Pope* at their Head is not *infallible*, " without the concurrence of *the diffusive* " *Body of Christians:* And how to reconcile these Inconsistences, I know not; and till they are reconcil'd, I must affirm, that not only the *Papists* in general, but *N. C.* in particular, tho' he may be never so confident that the *Roman Church* is *Infallible*, knows not where to find this *Infallibility*, and then 'twill be of no use to him; and if 'tis of no use, I am very inclinable to think there is no such thing. And as for this Instance of the *Lord Mayor*, it labours with this Fallacy; That first he supposes such a Magistrate in Being; and then he would prove from hence, that he must be somewhere; but the thing in dispute is, whether there is an *Infallible* Judge, or no? and if he is not to be met with any where, 'tis very reasonable to conclude there is no such Person. There are several other Hints in this Paragraph which are very dark and mysterious, and I should be very glad to have them explain'd, and to know how *Infallibility* can be strengthned, and made more

more certain; for if it can be ſo, I am apt to think, that the *Infallibility* the *Papiſts* boaſt ſo much of, will fall ſhort of that *Moral Certainty* we *Proteſtants* are contented withall: Or, what uſe he intended to make of that irrefragable Demonſtration: "That ſuppoſing *Infallibility* "is either in the *Pope*, or *Council*, or *the* "*diffuſive Body of Chriſtians*; that if it is "not in either of the two firſt, it muſt ne- "ceſſarily be in the laſt. But leaving thoſe Trifles, the Archbiſhop argues;

2. That the Church of *Rome* is not *infallible*, becauſe there is not the leaſt intimation in *Scripture* of this Privilege conſer'd upon it. The *Apoſtles* in all their *Epiſtles* do not give the leaſt direction to Chriſtians to appeal to the *Biſhop* of *Rome* for a determination of the many Differences, which even in thoſe Times hapned among them: Nay, on the contrary, there are ſhrewd intimations given, that the Church of *Rome* her ſelf ſhould Apoſtatize from that Faith, and that her Haughtineſs would be her Ruine, *Rom.* 11. 20, 21. where ſpeaking of the *Jews* who were broken off by their Unbelief, he gives this Caution to the Church of *Rome*; *Well, becauſe of Unbelief, they were broken off, and thou ſtandeſt by Faith. Be not high-minded, but fear. For, if God ſpared not the natural Branches, take heed leſt he alſo ſpare not thee.*

*thee. Be not high-minded, but fear.* What need they to *fear*, who had the Privilege of *Infallibility*? Their Faith muſt needs be unſhaken: But St. *Paul* ſeems to think that Church to be in as much danger of falling from the Faith as any other. Neither do the Ancient Fathers in their Diſputes with *Hereticks*, appeal to this Judge, tho' it was ſo ſhort and expedite a way of ending Controverſies. And this very Conſideration to a Wiſe Man, is inſtead of a thouſand Arguments, to ſatisfie him that in thoſe Times no ſuch thing was believed in the World.

To this *N. C.* anſwers, That thoſe "Texts of Scripture which prove the *Roman Church* to be the *Catholick Church*, "prove alſo the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, "but thoſe have been already accounted "for: Then he affirms, That the *Ancient Fathers* did appeal to this Judge, and quotes a Sentence out of St. *Auſtin*, which is nothing to this purpoſe; the Father ſays, That *he ſhould not believe the Goſpel, but that the Authority of the Church moves him to it*; the true meaning of which is, That 'tis by the Authority of the *Church*, that we judge what Books are *Canonical*, and what not; and that the true Books are diſtinguiſh'd from the ſpurious, by the *Church* giving Teſtimony that they were the genuine Books, written in thoſe Times,

Times, by thoſe Perſons whoſe Names they bear; and then he remits the Reader to *Tertullian*, St. *Auſtin*, *Epiphanius*, but quotes nothing out of them, which he would certainly have done (being is very liberal of his Quotations out of the Fathers) if the caſe were ſo plain as he pretends.

3. The Archbiſhop argues farther, that we may as well expect an *Infallible* Judge in Temporal Matters as in Spiritual. The ground of this Argument is this, The *Papiſts* in defence of their *Infallibility* urge, that an *Infallible* Judge is neceſſary, becauſe otherwiſe every particular Man would be left to judge for himſelf; and if every Man ſhould judge for himſelf, there would be nothing but confuſion in Religion, there would be no end of Controverſies; ſo that an Univerſal, *Infallible* Judge is neceſſary; and without this, God had not made ſufficient Proviſion for the aſſurance of Mens Faith, and for the Peace and Unity of his Church, or as 'tis expreſs'd in the *Canon Law*, *Aliter Dominus non videretur fuiſſe diſcretus*, otherwiſe our Lord had not ſeem'd to be diſcreet.

To this *his Grace* anſwers, That 'tis high Preſumption in Men to ſay, God ſhould do thus or thus; but they ought rather to conſider what he has done, *and to lay their Mouths*

*Mouths in the Duſt*, and to admire the Wiſdom of his Doings.

*Secondly*, That if this Argument had any ſenſe in it, it would prove that there ought to be an *Infallible* Judge ſet over us in Temporal Matters as well as Spiritual, becauſe the one is as neceſſary to the Peace of the World, as the other to the Peace of the Church; and that Men are every whit as apt to be perverſe about Matters of Temporal Right, as about Matters of Faith.

To this *N. C.* replies, 'That this Life 'is a State of Trial, and that we muſt *paſs* 'thro' much Tribulation into the Kingdom of 'God; and therefore God permits the 'Cruelty of Tyrants to try the Patience 'of Martyrs, and ſuffers the Oppreſſion of 'the Poor on Earth, to enhance their Re-'ward in Heaven; ſo that the Cruelty or 'Errors of a Temporal Judge do rather 'increaſe, than diminiſh the Happineſs of 'the Juſt: But that the Caſe is far other-'wiſe in Spiritual Matters; if the Judge 'ſhould ſpoil us of our Faith, or err in Judg-'ing for us, it would cauſe our eternal 'Ruin, our Damnation being neceſſarily 'conſequent upon a falſe Belief. And for 'that Reaſon, the Goodneſs of God ſeems 'to be ſo much the more engag'd to ſecure 'the Spiritual, than the Temporal Judge 'from Error.



In

In which Reply, *N. C.* is guilty of several gross Mistakes; for, *First*, he supposes that every Man must rely upon the Judgment of some Spiritual Judge, and that his Salvation depends upon the Certainty of this his Judgment; but this we *Protestants* deny, and think that God has much better provided for us, by giving every one liberty to judge for himself. And, *Secondly*, he mistakes the Archbishop's Argument, which is only levell'd against that idle pretence of the *Papists*, *That 'tis very convenient that there should be such an Infallible Judge of Controversies:* To which *his Grace* replies, That 'tis a high Presumption in Man to think, that God must do whatsoever he fancies convenient. And, *Thirdly*, it seems much more convenient that there should be no *Infallible* Judge, because if we were *infallibly* certain of the Articles of our Faith, our Assent to them would be no Virtue, and we should lose that Blessing which is pronounced on those *who have not seen, and yet believe*, because we should be more certain than if we had seen them. *N. C.* says farther, That Christ threatens eternal Damnation to all those who will not believe his Doctrine, which cannot stand with his infinite Goodness, unless he had provided *infallible* Means of conveying the Truth of this Doctrine to them.

Whereas *his Grace* has often told them, and particularly in his *Preface* to his *First Volume of Sermons*, That there may be such Evidence as no Wise Man may have reason to question, tho' there should be no *Infallibility* at all; and therefore when we have such a *Moral Assurance* of the Truth of these Articles of our Faith which are propos'd to us, we have good reason to be content with this Evidence, and to give our full Assent to it.

*Fourthly*, *His Grace* argues, That an *Infallible* Judge, if there were one, is no certain way to end Controversies, and and to preserve the Unity of the Church; unless it were likewise *infallibly* certain, that there is such a Judge, and who he is. For till Men are sure of both these, there will still be a Controversie, Who the *Infallible* Judge is, and where to find him. And if it be true which they tell us, *That without an Infallible Judge Controversies can never be ended*, then a Controversie concerning an *Infallible* Judge can never be ended.

To this *N. C.* answers, That he has already prov'd both, that there is an *Infallible* Judge, and who this *Infallible* Judge is.

But, *First*, How has he prov'd that there is an *Infallible* Judge? He pretends to prove it from Reason, and Scripture, and

and the Fathers; and herein he appeals to the Senſe and Reaſon of every private Perſon in this great Fundamental Article of the *Popiſh* Faith; but this Appeal is contrary to that Principle of the *Papiſts*, *That an Infallible Judge is neceſſary to decide all Controverſies in Religion.* But ſays *N. C.* we appeal to the *Church*, which is an *Infallible* Judge; and the *Church* tells us, both that there is an *Infallible* Judge, and that the *Church* is that *Infallible* Judge: But this is to ſuppoſe the thing in Controverſie, not to prove it; and beſides, ſince they are not agreed amongſt themſelves what they mean by that *Church*, which is to be the *Infallible* Judge of all Controverſies, 'tis evident, that this Controverſie can never be ended till they find out ſome other *Infallible* Judge to decide it. Let them therefore firſt agree amongſt themſelves what they mean by that *Church*, which is to be the *Infallible* Judge of Controverſies, whether the *Pope*, or the *Pope* in *Council*, or the *Pope* in *Council*, together with *the diffuſive Body of Chriſtians*; before they ſend us to this *Church*, to have our Differences decided by it.

*Fifthly*, The Archbiſhop argues, That if God had thought it neceſſary that there ſhould be an *Infallible Church*, in the Communion whereof every Man may be ſecur'd from the dangers of a wrong Be-

lief, he would have revealed this very thing more plainly than any particular Point of Faith whatſoever. He would have told us expreſly, and in the plaineſt terms, that he had appointed an *Infallible* Guide and Judge in Matters of Faith, and would have likewiſe as plainly told us who he was, and where we might find him, and have recourſe to him on all occaſions.

To this *N. C.* anſwers, That the *Socinians* may retort this Argument upon us, and ſay, 'That if God had thought the 'knowledge of the three Perſons really di-'ſtinct, each of them perfect God, and yet 'but one God, neceſſary to be believ'd by 'the Faithful, he would have revealed this 'very thing more plainly than any par-'ticular Point whatſoever, becauſe it is 'look'd upon to be the chiefeſt *Myſtery* of 'Chriſtianity.

But here *N. C.* is miſtaken in ſeveral Particulars. For all that we are oblig'd to aſſent to in the *Myſtery* of the *Trinity*, which is neceſſary to Salvation, is as plainly reveal'd in the Holy Scriptures as the Matter will bear, and that it is not more plainly reveal'd is only owing to the Weakneſs of our Intellect, which in this Life is not capable of comprehending it; plain Truths are plainly revealed in the Holy Scripture, but *Myſteries* only ſo far

far as they have an Influence upon our Practice, and after all the Explications of them, they will remain *myſterious* ſtill. Thus we are told in the Holy Scripture, that there is One God, and Three diſtinct Perſons in the Godhead; becauſe this is neceſſary to underſtand the Oeconomy of our Salvation, and the different Operations of the Godhead in the Wonderful Work of Man's Redemption: But the Manner of the Subſiſtence of the *Trinity*, is ſtill a *Myſtery*, and will continue ſo, *till Faith ſhall end in Viſion:* Nay 'tis very queſtionable, whether in Heaven itſelf we ſhall be capable of comprehending it. And therefore ſince this is one of the moſt Adorable *Myſteries* in Chriſtianity, there is no Reaſon why we ſhould endeavour to comprehend the Manner of it; but very good Reaſon why we ſhould not. But the Doctrine of the *Infallibility* is of a different nature; for the End of conſtituting an *infallible* Judge muſt be, To determine ſuch Controverſies as ariſe about Religious Matters. Now, this End is wholly evacuated, unleſs it evidently appears not only that there is ſuch a Judge, but who this Judge is; nay unleſs there is ſuch a plain Revelation of it, that even *Schiſmaticks* and *Hereticks* may be *infallibly* convinc'd who this Judge is: For ſince *N. C.* defines the Church to conſiſt only

of ſuch Members who agree in one Faith, there is no need of ſuch a Judge for thoſe who are already agreed, but only for thoſe that differ; and as he tells us before, *when the Faith is violated by Schiſmaticks* and *Hereticks*. 'Tis therefore a ſufficient Ground of our Aſſent to this Article of our Faith; That in the Godhead there is a *Trinity* in *Unity*, to prove from Scripture, that every diſtinct Perſon is God, and that yet there is but one God; and we ought to be content to be ignorant of the Manner how it is ſo; tho' 'tis but reaſonable that many other Truths in the Holy Scriptures ſhould be more fully explain'd to us, becauſe they lie more level to our Capacities and Underſtandings.

As to thoſe Texts of Scriptures which he inſtances in, and tells us, that they plainly prove, that the Church is *infallible*; they are nothing at all to the purpoſe, but prove rather the direct contrary.

The Firſt is, *Tell the Church, and if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen or Publican*, Matth. 18. 16, 17. But this Text plainly relates to ſuch Private Injuries as ariſe between Man and Man, and direct us how to compoſe them, and right our ſelves, without returning or revenging them; as will plainly appear; by conſidering the Scope of the Place,

Place, and the Coherence of the Words, with thoſe which went before.

*John* 1. 13. *When he the Spirit of Truth cometh, he will guide you into all Truth*; this Promiſe is evidently made to the Apoſtles only, who were *infallibly* guided into all Truth: But if we ſhould grant that it was made to the whole Church, it doth not follow, the Church ſhould always be *infallible*; no more than it follows, that we ſhould be defended from all Sin; becauſe we have a Promiſe of being led into all Good.

*Matth.* 28. 20. *Lo I am with you always, to the end of the World*; and 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. *The Pillar and Ground of Truth*; the firſt mentions **nothing** of the Church's *Infallibility*, and doth not prove any ſuch thing; for God may many ways aſſiſt and direct his Church, without making it *infallible*: The other is a Metaphorical Expreſſion, and too weak a Foundation to build any Doctrine upon, eſpecially that weighty Point of the *Infallibility*.

I have been the ſhorter in my Explication of theſe Texts of Scripture, becauſe 'tis contrary to the Principles which the *Papiſts* hold, to found this Doctrine upon the Authority of the Holy Scripture: For as 'His Grace tells us, They hold, 'that the *Infallibility* of the Church muſt 'firſt be known and prov'd, before we can either

'either know the Scriptures, or the Sence 'of them; and yet, till we know the Scri-'ptures and the Sence of them, nothing 'can be prov'd by them. Now to pretend 'to prove the *Infallibility* of their Church 'by Scripture; and at the same time to de-'clare, that to know which are the true 'Books of Scripture, and which is the 'true Sence of them, can only be prov'd 'by the *infallible* Authority of their Church, 'is a plain and shameful *Circle*, out of 'which there is no way of escape; and 'consequently, that God hath appointed an '*infallible* Church, is impossible ever to be 'prov'd from Scripture, according to their 'Principles, and the thing is capable of no 'other Proof. For that God will *infallibly* 'assist any Society of Men, is not to be 'known, but by Divine Revelation; so that 'unless they can prove it by some other 'Revelation, the thing is not to be prov'd 'at all.

*Sixthly*, We have as much need of *infallible* Security against Sin and Vice in Matters of Practice, as against Errors in Matters of Faith. For since a right Belief is only in order to a good Life, a Man would be hard put to it, to give a Wise Reason, why God should take greater Care of Men's Faith, than of their Obedience.

To

'To this *N. C.* anſwers, That every 'good Chriſtian is infallibly ſecur'd againſt 'Sin, by the Aſſiſtance of God's Grace; 'and that the Aſſiſtance of God's Grace, 'together with the Co-operation of our 'Wills, which is always in our Power, is an '*infallible* Security againſt Sin, if put in uſe. But how contrary this is both to the Holy Scripture, and our own Experience, let any one judge. Doth not the Holy Scripture teach us, that *there is none that doth good, no not one*, Rom. 3. 22. that *the moſt juſt Man falleth ſeven times a day*; and that *our Righteouſneſs, our moſt holy and devout Performances, are but as filthy rags?* Iſa. 64. 6. Is not this the Tenor of the Goſpel-Covenant, *That if we repent of our Sins, he is faithful and juſt to forgive us our Sins, and to cleanſe us from all Unrighteouſneſs?* 1 John 1. And therefore as under the Goſpel God doth not exact a Perfect Obedience from us, but has enjoin'd us to ſerve him ſincerely and heartily; and to repent, and be truly ſorry for our involuntary Tranſgreſſions, our Sins of Ignorance and Infirmity: So God has ſo far ſecur'd us from Error, that we ſhall not fall into any Damnable Doctrine, if we read the Holy Scriptures with an attentive Mind, and an honeſt Heart, and uſe our utmoſt Endeavour to underſtand them: But as the Weakneſs and

Frail-

Frailty of our Condition is ſuch, that we have no *infallible* Security againſt Sin and Vice; ſo neither is there any againſt Error. It is ſufficient, that in both reſpects he hath done that which is ſufficient to make us capable of Happineſs, if we are not wanting to our ſelves; The reſt he hath left to the Sincerity of our Endeavours; expecting that we, on our Part ſhould *work out our Salvation with fear and trembling, and give all diligence to make our Calling and Election ſure.*

Laſtly, Since all things neceſſary, either in Faith or Practice, are clearly and plainly revealed in the Holy Scripture; therefore there is no need of an *Infallible* Church. This is ſo plainly prov'd in the four firſt Sermons of the third Volume of the Archbiſhop's Sermons, *(edit. poſt ob.)* that *N. C.* doth not think fit to ſay any thing in Confutation of it; but only tells us, that in eſtabliſhing this Principle, (which as he truly ſays, is the Fundamental Principle of *Proteſtants*, and can never be mov'd by all the *Papiſts* in the World) the Archbiſhop does two things, he would not willingly allow of: That Firſt, He makes any Man of ſenſe, who can read the Scripture, as *infallible* as the whole *Catholick Church* (he means the *Roman*) pretends to be. Secondly, He juſtifies in a great meaſure, all the *Hereticks* that

that ever denied any Points of Faith, on Pretence that they are not plain Scripture. This is indeed a heavy Charge, let us ſee how he maintains it. Firſt, He ſays, the Archbiſhop makes any Man of ſenſe, that can read the Scripture, as *Infallible* as the whole *Catholick Church* (i. e. the *Church of Rome*) pretends to be. For, 'ſays he, the *Catholick Church* pretends 'only to be *Infallible* in neceſſary Articles 'of Faith. Now if all things neceſſary to 'be known in Faith and Practice, be clear 'and plain in Scripture; then there is no 'Man of ſenſe that reads it, but may be 'as *infallible* in what is clear and plain, as 'any Church or Churches in the World; 'For what is clear and plain to a Man, he is 'as ſure and certain of, as if all the Mathe-'maticians in the World had demonſtrated 'it unto him. So that this worthy and grave 'Doctor neceſſarily veſts in every Private 'Man that *Infallibility*, which he endea-'vours with ſo much earneſtneſs to deny 'to the whole *Catholick Church*.

Thus *N. C.* argues, or rather he makes uſe of ſo many wilful Prevarications, that there is hardly one Sentence, that doth not include ſome Falſity in it. For ſays he, the *Catholick Church* only pretends to be *infallible* in the neceſſary Articles of Faith; but is there any ſuch Limitation as this in the Definition of *Infallibility*?

Doth

Doth he not ſay, *That the Church cannot err in Delivering the Doctrines ſhe received from Chriſt, nor miſtake in the Explanation of it?* And will he ſay, that by Doctrines he means only ſuch as are abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation; ſuch as are contain'd in the written Word of God? And doth he not know, that the *Roman Church* lays claim to a Power of declaring what Doctrines are neceſſary, and what not? And ſo can call what Doctrines ſhe pleaſes Neceſſary, tho' of never ſo little Importance, as many of thoſe Twelve Articles are, which the *Pope* has added to the *Apoſtles Creed*; as alſo that he lays claim to a power of Explaining all thoſe Articles; whereby many New Tenents are introduc'd into the Church, and declar'd to be abſolutely neceſſary to be believ'd in order to Eternal Salvation, which have no manner of Foundation in the Holy Writ. 2*dly*, He cannot be ignorant that the Archbiſhop means a *Moral Aſſurance*, and not an *Abſolute Infallibility*; becauſe he has declared it ſo plainly in many of his Sermons, and inculcated it ſo often; and yet *N. C.* is reſolved to miſtake his Meaning, and to affirm, That the Archbiſhop places the ſame *Infallibility* in every Private Perſon, which the *Papiſts* affirm to be veſted in the

the *Church of Rome.* Whereas the *His Grace* only ſays, that every Private Perſon, by the conſtant and diligent Study of the Holy Scripture, may attain to ſo much Knowledge, as may inform him what he ought to believe, and what he ought to do; and ſuffice to lead him unto Life Everlaſting. 3*dly*, He cannot but know that we may have a *Moral Certainty* of many things, for which we have no Demonſtration: All theſe things *N. C.* could not be ignorant of, tho' he was reſolved to ſhut his Eyes, and ſeem not to apprehend them. By which we may ſee, what Shifts thoſe Perſons are put to, who have undertaken to lay falſe Colours upon a bad Cauſe, and to place their counterfeit Wares in a falſe Light, in order to put them off to ſome unwary or unskilful Chapman.

2. He ſays, the Archbiſhop juſtifies all Hereticks that ever deny'd any Points of Faith, on pretence that they are not plain in Scripture; and particularly he inſtances in the *Socinians*, who, he tells us, have got the better of the *Proteſtants*, and beat them at their own Weapons.

But firſt 'tis evident, that *N. C.* is no competent Judge which has got the better, becauſe he doth not pretend to be a Judge of the meaning of thoſe Texts of Scripture which give occaſion to the Diſputes. Nor doth the Abuſe of the *Holy Scriptures*

*Scriptures* put in any Bar againſt the uſe of them; Mens Luſts, and Paſſions, and Prejudices, will blind their Underſtandings, and clap a Biaſs upon their Judgments: And tho' the Truths of Religion are never ſo plain, and clearly revealed to them, yet will not they afford them their Aſſent: Thoſe Men who will not practice thoſe Duties, which are evident even by the Light of Nature, will miſapply the plaineſt Texts of Scripture, when they deliver any thing contrary to their corrupt Inclination. But this is not the fault of the Rule, but of the Men who miſapply it; who would continue the ſame Infidels or Hereticks, tho' they had an *Infallible* Judge to dictate to them? for we find, there were never more *Hereſies* than in the Times of the Apoſtles; and yet 'tis confeſs'd on all hands, that they were endow'd with an *Infallible* Spirit.

I might add a great deal more on this Argument, but I fear I have dwelt too long on it already; and therefore I muſt deſire the Reader, who is not ſatisfied with what is here ſaid, to review the Archbiſhop's Sermons, where he will find many more excellent Arguments to the ſame purpoſe. I ſhall ſum up all with an ingenious Apologue, from the 99th Page of the *Third Volume* of *Sermons*.

I will

I will conclude (ſays *his Grace*) with a a very plain and familiar Caſe, by which it will appear what Credit and Authority is fit to be given to a *Guide*, and what not. Suppoſe I came a Stranger into *England*, and landing at *Dover*, took a *Guide* there to conduct me in my way to *York*, which I know before by the *Map* to lie *North* of *Dover*; having committed my ſelf to him, if he led me for two or three days together out of the plain Road, and many times over Hedge and Ditch, I cannot but think it ſtrange, that in a civil and well-inhabited Country, there ſhould be no High-Ways from one part of it to another: Yet thus far I ſubmit to him, tho' not without ſome regret and impatience. But then if after this, for two or three days more he led me directly *South*, and with my Face full upon the Sun at Noon-day, and at laſt bring me back again to *Dover* Peer, and ſtill bid me follow him; then certainly no Modeſty doth oblige a Man not to diſpute with his *Guide*, and to tell him, ſurely that can be no Way, becauſe it is Sea. Now tho' he ſet never ſo bold a Face upon the Matter, and tell me with all the Gravity and Authority in the World, That it is not the Sea, but dry Land, under the *Species* and *Appearance* of Water; and that whatever my Eyes tell me, having once committed my ſelf to his

his Guidance, I muſt not truſt my own Senſes in the caſe; it being one of the moſt dangerous ſorts of Infidelity for a Man to believe his own Eyes, rather than his faithful and *infallible Guide*: All this moves me not; but I begin to expoſtulate roundly with him, and to let him underſtand, that if I muſt not believe what I ſee, he is like to be of no farther uſe to me, becauſe I ſhall not be able at this rate to know whether I have a Guide, and whether I follow him or not. In ſhort, I tell him plainly, that when I took him for my Guide, I did not take him to tell me the difference between *North* and *South*, between a *Hedge* and a *High-Way*, between *Sea* and *dry Land*; all this I knew before, as well as he or any Man elſe could tell me; but I took him to conduct me the directeſt way to *York*: And therefore, after all his impertinent Talk, after all his Motives of Credibility to perſuade me to believe him, and all his confident Sayings, which he gravely calls Demonſtrations, I ſtand ſtifly upon the Shoar, and leave my Learned and Reverend *Guide* to take his own courſe, and to diſpoſe of himſelf as he pleaſeth, but firmly reſolv'd not to follow him: And is any Man to be blam'd who treats with his *Guide* on theſe Terms?

And

And this is truly the caſe, when a Man commits himſelf to the *Guidance* of any Perſon or Church; if by virtue of this Authority, they will needs perſuade me out of my Senſes, and not to believe what I ſee, but what they ſay, *that Virtue is Vice, and Vice Virtue, if they declare them to be ſo:* And that becauſe they ſay they are *Infallible*, I am to receive all their Dictates for *Oracles*, tho' never ſo evidently falſe and abſurd in the Judgment of all Mankind. In this caſe there is no way to be rid of theſe unreaſonable People, but to deſire of them, ſince one Kindneſs deſerves another, and all Contradictions are alike eaſie to be believ'd, that they would be pleaſed to believe, that Infidelity is Faith; and that when I abſolutely renounce their Authority, I do yield a moſt perfect Submiſſion and Obedience to it.

# *Of Transubstantiation.*

WHAT the *Papists* hold to be of Faith concerning this Point, *N. C.* tell us, is this, "That the whole "Substance of the Bread and Wine, is after "Consecration, chang'd into the Body "and Blood of Christ, without any al-"teration of the Accidents or outward "Forms.

Against this impious and absurd Tenent, *his Grace* has very frequently, all along his Sermons, taken care to fence his Hearers, and has writ a just Treatise, and inserted it in his *Third Volume* of *Sermons*, to prove that this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is directly contrary to Sense and Reason, and the common Notions of Mankind; and that it has no Revelation to uphold it, nor was it ever thought on in the first and purest Ages of the Church, and that 'tis chiefly upheld by the interest of the *Roman Clergy*, and the uncommon assurance of those who assert it; and this he has perform'd with that Strength of Argument, and Plainness and Clearness of Stile, which was natural to him; and which has in a great measure exhausted the Subject.

 To

To the Archbiſhop's Arguments, *N. C.* pretends to return an Anſwer, and with ſome ſhew of Reaſon and Philoſophy, and Quotations out of the Fathers and the Holy Scripture; and (as uſually) is very poſitive in his Aſſertions; tho' in truth, he doth but nibble an Argument, and ſays little to the purpoſe; ſo that *thoſe ſtrong Reaſons which his Grace has brought forth*, (like an Arch'd Building) ſtand more firm and ſecure for the weak Efforts he has made againſt them. And therefore, tho' the bare reading over the Archbiſhop's Treatiſe, by any intelligent and well diſpos'd Perſon, would be a ſufficient Anſwer to *N. C's* Cavils; yet ſince he has made uſe of ſome *untemper'd Mortar*, to repair the Ruins, and fill up the Chinks of this myſterious Edifice (as he calls it) and labours to prop up the rotten Materials and viſible Decays of this tottering Fabrick; I ſhall therefore take the pains to conſider what he has to ſay on this Subject.

And, Firſt, *N. C.* begins with a heavy Complaint againſt the Archbiſhop, for treating the *Papiſts* with ſcurrilous and abuſive Language, but does it in ſuch terms, that no one would ever have thought that *N. C.* and the Author *of the True and Modeſt Account*, were the ſame Perſon; for tho' *His Grace* doth

ſometimes expoſe the Follies of the *Church of Rome*, and is pleaſant at ſuch times, when the Matter doth not require a ſerious Anſwer. But as *Horace* adviſes,

——— *Ridiculum acri*
*Fortius & melius magnas plerunque ſecat res.*

Yet he never departs from that becoming and good-natur'd Gravity, which was in a peculiar manner his Character and Ornament. And therefore *N. C.* has only expos'd himſelf, when he begins his Diſcourſe with this inſipid Harangue, which I ſhall tranſcribe, to give the Reader a taſte of his Sincerity and Temper.

" Never, ſays he, *Roman* Conqueror " ſung more *Pæans* after Victory, nor in- " ſulted over his Enemy with more " Oſtentation, than Dr. *Tillotſon* has, on " this Subject, over the *Roman Catholicks* " and the *Church of Rome*; and (to com- " pleat the Parallel) if his railing Elo- " quence and unchriſtian Contumelies " (I am ſorry he extorts ſuch Words from " me) were of equal force to bind, with " that of *Roman* Chains, no barbarous " Captives were ever worſe us'd by their " inſulting Conquerors, than the Sons of " that Mother, whoſe Piety and Zeal, " brought forth in Chriſt, his Anceſtors, " have

" have the fortune to be treated by the " unchriſtian Slanders and Calumnies of " his bitter Tongue and Pen. Beſides " that invincible Argument (if we believe " him) that *Achilles*, *the Evidence of* " *Senſe*, which he pretends to be againſt " this Myſtery, and which he repeats " over and over, in more places of his " Sermons than I can at preſent reckon; " he has oblig'd us with a Treatiſe writ- " ten on purpoſe upon this Subject, " which he calls *a Diſcourſe againſt Tran-* " *ſubſtantiation*: In this Piece I meet " with as copious a Collection of ſcurri- " lous, injurious Language, of notorious " and manifold Impoſitions, and ſo much " Diſingenuity in citing of Authors, and " managing their Authorities, as I be- " lieve, was ever poſſible for any Man, " who had never ſo little eſteem for his " Credit, to bring within ſo narrow a " compaſs,

This is ſo heavy a Charge, and of ſo venemous a Nature, conſidering the Crimes objected, and the Dignity and Worth of the Perſon, againſt whom it is levell'd, that if *N. C.* cannot make plain proof of it, he muſt paſs amongſt all Men of common Honeſty and Senſe, for a bare-fac'd and infamous Calumniator. I ſhould be glad he had any thing to ſay to excuſe himſelf, and ſhould have had the charity

to believe, that Zeal for the great *Diana* of the *Popiſh* Religion, or Paſſion which is *brevis Furor*, might have tranſported him into theſe Indecencies, and occaſion'd the caſting up ſo much Dirt and Filth upon his Superiours; but that he takes care to inform his Reader, that he was calm and ſerene when he wrote it, and *in no Paſſion:* And therefore he has the more to anſwer for, and ought himſelf to conſider what he ſo frequently admoniſhes the Archbiſhop of, *That he muſt ſhortly give an Account at God's Tribunal.*

Well then, if he is ſo much his own Man, we may expect, that he will make his Charge good, and produce theſe *weighty Reaſons*, and juſtifie the Demonſtrations he ſo frequently glories in. But ſo far is he from this, or making any Proof of that which he has ſo confidently aſſerted, that he doth not go about it; but contents himſelf, to gull the Reader with that idle Excuſe, That at preſent he has other buſineſs: Well, however he takes care to inform us, that tho' he has now other Employment upon his hands of greater importance, yet he will find a time to call the Archbiſhop to account, and anſwer his Book, Paragraph by Paragraph; and to give us a Sample of his intended Work, he will ſingle out his main Objection, and confute that.

Now

Now *N.C.* tells us, that the main Objection against *Transubstantiation* is, That 'tis contrary to Common Sense, and the Reason of Mankind; he might have added, to the Revelation of the Holy Scripture, and the Practice of the Primitive Church; for all this *His Grace* has made out, and sufficiently prov'd in that Excellent Treatise.

And first the *His Grace* says, the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is contrary to the Evidence of our Senses: "But, says "*N. C.* this he only says, and repeats, "but never makes the least offer to prove "it; he would have us, it seems, take "it for granted: For without this, I "believe, nay I am sure, he did not well "know how to go about to prove it. To prove what? Why, that That which I see, and feel, and smell to be Bread in the Sacrament is certainly Bread, and not Flesh, or the Body of a Man. And then he goes on: "And 'tis a thing I often ad- "mir'd, with how much Confidence this "Good Man and others, would press "this Argument (of Believing our Sen- "ses) upon us, without offering the "least Proof of it. And this seems the "more strange; because that the more "evident any thing is, as they pretend "this to be, the easier 'tis to find Me- "diums to prove it. But neither he, nor "all the Philosophers that ever were,

" or are to come, ſhall ever be able to " make one good Argument, to prove " that *Tranſubſtantiation* is contradicted " by Senſe. To which I ſhall only reply, That as there are ſome things ſo clear, that 'tis a very difficult matter to prove them; ſo there are ſome Objections ſo impertinent, that 'tis a very hard matter to anſwer them.

For what thinks he of Self-evident Principles, are they not ſo clear and plain, that they neither want, nor can have any Medium to prove them by? Doth not every one believe *a Rule is a Rule*, and *Faith is Faith*, without proving it? If not, let him go about it; but I fear he will meet with the ſame Succeſs his Friend Mr. *Serjeant* had. For did he never hear of a certain Philoſopher, who when his Opponent denied there was any ſuch thing as Motion, took no other way to confute him, but only Walking about? And truly 'tis my Opinion, that That Man who denys the Evidence of Senſe, and would have it prov'd, that he ſees, or feels, deſerves only the *Argumentum Baculinum*.

But as he goes on: " What is *Tran-* " *ſubſtantiation*? Why the Change of one " Subſtance into another. Of what ſenſe " then is Subſtance, the Object, that " ſuch a Change may be diſcover'd by it? " 'Tis of no Senſe ſure, but of the Under-

ſtanding,

" ſtanding, as all the World knows. How " can that then contradict ſenſe, which " is not the object of any ſenſe; ſince no " Faculty can be employ'd, but about its " proper Object? They might as well " tell us, that Colours contradict the " ſenſe of Hearing, or Sounds the ſenſe of " Seeing. Good God! what trifling is here? I am tired with tranſcribing it.

I ſhall not therefore enter into the detail of all his Miſtakes and Miſrepreſentations, nor will I give him the trouble of telling me what he means by Colours contradicting the Senſe of Hearing, or Sound the Senſe of Seeing, for then I ſhould never have done; but I ſhall only take notice of ſuch as are material. And,

*Firſt*, *Tranſubſtantiation* is not the Change of one Subſtance into another, for this we allow to be poſſible; but 'tis ſuch a Change, in which the Subſtance is altered, and yet the Accidents remain, which we hold to be altogether impoſſible: For where-ever the proper Accidents of any numerical Subſtance is, there that numerical Subſtance muſt be; Accidents are only the different Shapes and Modes of Material Beings, and have no manner of Exiſtence diſtinct from the Bodies in which they inhere. The Underſtanding indeed can abſtract the one from the other

other, but 'tis impoſſible they ſhould have any diſtinct actual exiſtence; 'tis as impoſſible to ſeparate the roundneſs, and hardneſs, and blackneſs of one Numerical Body, and apply it to another; as that the ſame Body ſhould be hard and ſoft, white and black, at the ſame time, and in the ſame reſpect.

*Secondly*, 'Tis evident, that Subſtance is the remote, tho' not the immediate Object of Senſe; (*i. e.*) our *Senſes* do judge of the *Subſtances* of things, by the perception of thoſe proper Accidents which belong to them; and there is no other way of knowing the change of a Subſtance, but by the evidence of Senſe, diſcovering the change of thoſe *Accidents* which do belong to that Numerical Subſtance. And therefore our Knowledge concerning any particular Subſtance, muſt be deriv'd from the Report of the Senſes: For by what Means can we tell, that this is a Book, and that a Stone, that this is a Loaf, and that a piece of Fleſh, but by the Judgment of the Senſes? For ſhould any Man give me a Stone, and affirm, nay ſwear to me 'twas Bread; yet I ſhould never believe him, but confide rather in the Teſtimony of my own Senſes; becauſe where ever there is an Alteration of the Subſtance, there muſt needs be an Alteration of the Accidents

or

or outward Forms. A piece of Bread may be turn'd into Flesh, but then 'tis impossible it should retain the outward Form, and the same Symetry of Parts; for then it would not be Flesh, but Bread still; the change of the Substance necessarily implying the change of the Accidents also. For Extension is by the *Papists* allowed to be an Accident of the Bread; but if after the Bread is transubstantiated, all the Accidents of the Bread remain, then the Body and Blood of Christ must be extended in the Sacrament, but this the *Papists* will not allow; because they hold that the Body of Christ is present in the Sacrament, not corporally, but spiritually. But farther, 'tis evident, that there is no other way to distinguish between Flesh and Bread, but by their different Appearances to the external Sense; whereby 'tis evident, that they have a different Disposition of Parts: For if things might be substantially chang'd, and yet the same Accidents, Appearances and Objects of Sense remain; there could be no such thing as Certainty in the World, there could be no way to distinguish one thing from another; to know an Egg from an Elephant, or a Musquet-Bullet from a Pike: And if so, what would become of the main Proof of the *Christian Religion*, from *Miracles*? How could the *Apostles* be

be Witneſſes of the Reſurrection of our Bleſſed *Saviour*, when they knew not with what Body he roſe, or whether he had any real Body or no? In ſhort, there is nothing more big of monſtrous Abſurdities, than the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*; and tho' the *Papiſts* may endeavour to diſguiſe it, and coin new and ſubtil Diſtinctions, with never ſo much Art, to keep the Learned in Play, and to impoſe upon the Unlearned and Ignorant; and that they may ſay ſomething when preſs'd, tho' in truth they have nothing at all to ſay to the Purpoſe; Yet the World begins to diſcover the Impoſture, and to be ſenſible of the Weakneſs of theſe frivolous Evaſions, and this Doctrine will be the Mill-Stone, hung about the Neck of *Popery*, which will ſink it at the laſt.

But ſays *N. C.* "Granting all you have "have ſaid to be true, yet it proves no "more, than that ordinarily and for the "moſt part, the matter is ſo: But why "may not God notwithſtanding this, do "otherwiſe upon Extraordinary Occa- "ſions, eſpecially in Myſteries of Faith, "which are not ſubject to the Ordinary "Rules of Nature? And why may not "we believe, that the Accidents of "Bread exhibit another Subſtance to us; "eſpecially ſince we have the Word of "the Son of God for it, as well as the

"Ac-

" Accidents of a Dove, and the Appear-
" ance of Men could repreſent the Holy
" Ghoſt, and the Angels to St. *John* the
" Baptiſt; and to *Lot*. *John* the Baptiſt
" ſaw in appearance a Dove deſcend, and
" remain upon Chriſt; yet he believed it
" was not a real Dove; becauſe he was
" told by him who ſent him (God) that
" it was the Holy Ghoſt, that was to
" deſcend, and remain upon him. And
" why may we not believe the ſame God,
" when he tells us, that that which ap-
" pears to us to be Bread, is his Body, &c.

And here our Author confeſſes ingenuouſly, that we ought always to give credit to our Senſes, except in ſuch caſes where God tells us, that we muſt not give credit to them; and ſo the determination of this Controverſie will devolve upon this Point; Whether God has ever told us, that we muſt not believe our Senſes; which I have good reaſon to deny, becauſe I cannot be certain that any ſuch Revelation is from God, but by the Teſtimony and Evidence of my Senſes. Let us conſider the Revelation of the Chriſtian Religion; doth not the Proof of the Truth of this Revelation depend upon the Belief of the Reſurrection of our Bleſſed Saviour? And this Belief depends upon the Teſtimony of the Apoſtles, and their Teſtimony upon the Evidence of Senſe.

For

For ſince there is an infinitely wiſe and good Being, who firſt made, and ſtill governs and preſerves the World, he will not ſuffer his poor Creatures to wander in the Dark, but will give them ſufficient means to come to the Knowledge of the Truth, and purſue the End of their Beings; he directs all Ranks of Creatures according to the nature of their Beings, Stones by the Laws of Motion, ſenſitive Beings by Inſtinct, rational by Reaſon, which depends on thoſe Notices taken in by the Senſe. So that the laſt Appeal both of Reaſon and Revelation is to Senſe; we are aſſur'd that there is ſuch a Book as the *Bible*, by our Senſes, and 'tis by the reading or hearing of it that we come to the Knowledge of what is written in it; And therefore, if there ſhould be any Text in Scripture which ſeems to contradict the plain Evidence of Senſe, I ſhould be very diligent in enquiring into the meaning of it, and wary in receiving any other Interpretation, but what is agreeable to the verdict of my Senſe; For I have the ſame reaſon to believe that Interpretation to be falſe, which I have to believe the *Bible* I read, to be the Word of God. So that the Queſtion is not, Whether I ſhould be-

believe the Holy Scripture, or no; but when there ariſes a Difference about the meaning of the Holy Scripture, which Interpretation I ought to prefer, that which is agreeable to Senſe and Reaſon, or that which is plainly contradictory to both theſe.

But may not God ſometimes interpoſe and alter the uſual courſe of Things? May not he make Things appear otherwiſe than they really are? And, is it not a ſufficient Security againſt our being impos'd upon thereby, that God tells us this is ſuch or ſuch a Being? this is *Bread*, and this *my Body*?

But, *Firſt*, we muſt be very well aſſur'd, that God doth tell us ſo, before we aſſent to it; for here lies the great danger of our being impos'd upon, that we ſhould believe that to be reveal'd to us which really is not, and miſtake the meaning of thoſe words which have a Divine Authority ſtamp'd upon them; and, how can we come at the meaning of them without the Aſſiſtance of our Senſes? And if my Senſes may impoſe upon me, 'tis impoſſible that I ſhould ever know what God has reveal'd unto me.

*Secondly*, We may be aſſur'd, that God never told us any thing which contradicts the Evidence of our Senſes. For God has placed our Senſes in us for this very

very End, to discover the difference of one Object from another; the Frame and Constitution of our Nature requires it, that we should come to the knowledge of Things by the mediation of Sense; and therefore if I may, upon any occasion, disbelieve my natural Senses speaking to me, (which is as much the Voice of God as any Revelation can be) why may I not with equal reason disbelieve those pretended Revelations which are contrary to the Evidence of my Sense? So that 'tis impossible that any Revelation should command me to renounce my Senses, because the Truth of all Revelation must be prov'd by the Evidence of Sense, which supposes that the Evidence of Sense is always certain, and ever to be depended on. And therefore what *His Grace* says, *Volume 2. p. 67. That God can impose upon the Senses of Men, and represent things to them otherwise than they are*; is to be understood only of God's Power; for tho' he is able to do it, yet his Truth, and Goodness, and Justice, do restrain him from putting this Power into Act. And therefore no *occasions* can be so *extraordinary* as to oblige God to do an unjust thing, or to violate the Truth of his Word, or so far to impose upon us, as to make our Senses represent Objects different from what they truly are, which would be in effect

effect to unravel our whole Nature, and to make our Senſes of no uſe to us.

" But, ſays *N. C.* why may we not be-
" lieve, that the Accidents of Bread
" may exhibit another Subſtance to us,
" eſpecially ſince we have the Word of
" the Son of God for it, as well as the
" Accidents of a Dove and the Appea-
" rance of Men could repreſent the Ho-
" ly Ghoſt, and the Angels to St. *John*
" the *Baptiſt*, and to *Lot* ?

And in truth, if either the Son of God had told us ſo, or there had been Matter of Fact, that this thing had actually been done, it would be to no purpoſe to diſpute againſt the doing of it. But upon a little conſideration it will appear, that tho' *N. C.* according to his uſual Cuſtom, doth confidently aſſert both of theſe, yet has he no manner of Ground, or any tolerable Reaſon for ſo doing.

And therefore I ſhall prove,

1. That the Matter of Fact is not true, and that the Holy Ghoſt was not repreſented by the Accidents of a Dove.

2. That our Saviour Chriſt never told us, that the Accidents of one Subſtance may exhibit another Subſtance to us.

1. That the Matter of Fact is not true; The Holy Ghoſt was never repreſented by the Accidents of a Dove. 'Tis true, S. *John* ſays, *I ſaw the Spirit deſcending*

*from Heaven, like a Dove, and it abode upon him; and I knew him not. But he that ſent me to baptize with water, the ſame ſaid unto me, upon whom thou ſhalt ſee the Spirit deſcending, and remaining on him, the ſame is he that baptizeth with the Holy Ghoſt. Joh.* 1. 32.

But what would *N. C.* infer from hence? Would he ſay, that this appearance of a *Dove* was the *Holy Ghoſt* cloathed with the Accidents of a Dove? He may ſay ſo indeed, but how doth he prove it? Why may not the Subſtance of a Dove, as well as the Accidents, be there? Why might it not be a real Dove? This was the Opinion of ſeveral of the Fathers, as St. *Auſtin*, *Tertullian*, as alſo of *Thomas Aquinas*; and they give this remarkale Reaſon for it; *Alioquin Spiritus Sanctus Homines falleret*; that if it was not a real Dove, the Holy Spirit would have impos'd upon the Senſes of thoſe who beheld it. It ſeems, they thought that it was incompatible with the Divine Attributes, to impoſe upon the Senſes of his Creatures, tho' they receiv'd no damage thereby. Others were of Opinion, that as Fiery Tongues ſat upon the Heads of the Apoſtles, when the Holy Spirit was infus'd into them; ſo this Dove, was Fire in the ſhape of a Dove. But whatever this Dove was, 'tis certain 'twas the viſible Symbol of

of the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, as the Rainbow was of the Covenant which God made with Mankind, and the Fiery Tongues which ſat upon the Heads of the Apoſtles; and that there is not the leaſt Shadow of a Reaſon to incline us to believe, that there were only the Accidents of a Dove, ſeparated from all manner of Subſtance. And as little to his purpoſe, is the other Inſtance of the Appearance of Angels, under the Form of Men. That Spirits may aſſume a Body, is evident; but that this Bodily Shape conſiſted only of Accidents, lyes upon *N. C.* to prove; which he will never be able to do, nor indeed doth he make any offer at it.

2. It is as evident, that our Saviour Chriſt never told us, that the Accidents of one Subſtance, may exhibit another Subſtance to us; if he did, let him quote the Text.

But I ſuppoſe *N. C.* means, That tho' our Saviour Chriſt never ſaid ſo in expreſs Terms, yet this may reaſonably be infer'd from what he ſays in the Holy Goſpel; for when he tells us, That the Bread and Wine in the Holy Communion, was his Body and Blood; and that ſince 'tis evident, that the Accidents of Bread and Wine remain after the Conſecration, therefore from thence it will follow, that the

Substance of Bread must be chang'd into the Substance of Christ's Body.

But this Argument is of no force. For, *First*, Tho' our Saviour Christ has told us, That the Bread in the Sacrament is his Body; yet he has not told us, that this Bread is converted into his Real Body, even the Literal Sence of the Words will not bear the Interpretation.

*Secondly*, We have better Evidence, That the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament is not changed into the Real Body and Blood of Christ, than that our Saviour ever said these Words; the one is evidenc'd by Three of the Senses, the other only by two. But,

*Lastly*, 'Tis evident, that these Words signifie no such matter, both from the Natural Signification of the Expression, and its Coherence with that Context: And because this is the last Refuge, which the *Papists* are forc'd to fly to when they have nothing else to say; I shall (in as few Words as I can) consider what our *Saviour* meant by these words, *This is my Body.*

In order to understand these Words, it will be necessary to consider, That the *Jews* were required to celebrate the Passover once a Year at *Jerusalem*, (*i. e.*) to eat a Lamb with bitter Herbs, and unleavened Bread; in Commemoration of the Deliverance of their Forefathers out of *Egypt*:

*Egypt*: And this Lamb was called, the *Lord's Paſſover*, in Remembrance of that Paſchal Lamb which was ſlain in *Egypt*, as a Sacrifice of Atonement, whereby the Lord was prevail'd with to paſs over the Houſes of the *Iſraelites*, when he ſlew the Firſt-born of every Houſe in *Egypt*. This Tranſaction being only the Type of Chriſt, who was, *the Lamb ſlain to take away the Sins of the World*; our Saviour took that time of the Year when the *Jews* kept the Paſſover, to lay down his Life, and to offer himſelf up for the Sins of the whole World, and inſtituted this Sacrament of his Body and Blood, to be kept for ever, in Remembrance of his Death and Paſſion.

And therefore the right underſtanding of the Paſſover, is the Key which will let us into the true meaning of this Holy Rite. For if we conſider it well, it will plainly appear, that not only every Part and Circumſtance of the Lord's Supper, is adjuſted to the Manner of holding the Paſſover; but even the very Words and Phraſes were the very ſame, the *Jews* made uſe of at that Holy Solemnity; and that the Words, *This is my Body*, bear a plain Relation to theſe in the Paſſover, *This is the Lord's Paſſover*: And therefore ſince theſe Words in the Paſſover ſignifie only, that this Lamb

which is ſlain, is for a perpetual Memorial of the Lamb ſlain in *Egypt*, and the Deliverance which the Children of *Iſrael* obtain'd by virtue of that Sacrifice: So theſe Words in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, *This is my Body*, only denote to us, that this Bread repreſents my Body, which is to be offer'd up for you upon the Croſs. And this Interpretation receives great Strength from hence, becauſe this Form of Speech became very cuſtomary amongſt the *Jews*, ſo that there was nothing more uſual than for them to ſay, this is ſuch a thing, when they deſign'd to intimate, that this ſignify'd or repreſented that very thing; I might give you many inſtances, but one ſhall ſerve inſtead of all, *Gen.* 41. 26. *Joſeph* expounding *Pharaoh*'s Dream to him, ſays, *The ſeven good Kine are ſeven Years, and the ſeven good Ears of Corn are ſeven Years.* And (as *His Grace* tells us) it was not only ſo amongſt the *Jews*, but it is common in all Languages to give the Name of the Thing ſignified to the Sign. As the Delivery of a Deed or Writing under Hand and Seal is call'd a Conveyance, or making over of ſuch an Eſtate; and it is really ſo, not the Delivery of meer Wax and Parchment, but the Conveyance of a real Eſtate, as truly and really

ly to all effects and purposes of Law, as if the very material Houses and Lands themselves could be, and were actually delivered into our Hands. And that this is the true meaning of the Words, will be evident from what immediately follows them, That he calls it *his Body broken*, and *his Blood shed*, even before his Passion; and after the Consecration, he calls it *the Fruit of the Vine* still. And that the *Apostles* understood it in a Figurative Sense, is evident, because they were not startled at this Expression, as they would certainly have been, if they had thought the meaning of it was, that they must eat his very Flesh, and drink his Blood. And afterwards, when the *Jews* mistook him, and took his Words in a literal sense, he tells them, That *the words which he spake unto them, were Spirit and Life*, *i. e.* ought to be taken in a Spiritual and Figurative Sense. This is only a taste of what is and might be said on this Subject; but I shall look back and consider how *N. C.* represents it, and what Colours he puts upon it.

And, *First*, *N. C.* tells us, That these Words must be taken in such a literal Sense, as denotes the change of the Substance of the Bread into the Substance of Christ's Body. He argues from Christ's Promise, *John* 6. 51. *I am the living Bread*

*which came down from Heaven; if any Man eat of this Bread, he ſhall live for ever: And the Bread that I will give is my Fleſh, which I will give for the Life of the World.*

To which I anſwer, That theſe Words are plainly ſpoke of the Doctrine of our Saviour Chriſt, which St. *John* compares with the Law of *Moſes*, and alludes plainly to the *Manna* which *Moſes* gave to the Children of *Iſrael* in the Wilderneſs, which thoſe who eat of dy'd; but our Saviour gives his Followers ſuch Food, and will keep them alive for ever. The Children of *Iſrael* were fed with temporal Promiſes, the Diſciples of our Saviour with the hopes and aſſurance of a bleſſed Eternity; and therefore in the 47th Verſe he ſays, *He that believeth in me hath everlaſting Life*, whereby he explains what he means by *eating his Fleſh*, *i. e.* believing his Doctrine, and hereby being made Partaker of his Death and Paſſion.

*Secondly*, He quotes 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The Cup of Bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Chriſt? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Chriſt?* Now ſays he, to communicate or partake of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, is certainly to eat and drink of his Body and Blood.

But

But 'tis evident, that by Communicating of the Body and Blood of Christ, nothing else is meant, but being made Partakers of the real Benefits of his Death and Passion, as by *Baptism* Christians are said to be made Partakers of the Holy Ghost, *Heb.* 6. 4. because presently afterward he several times calls it *Bread*, v. 17. *for we being many, are one Bread and one Body; for we are Partakers of that one Bread.* And therefore *N. C.* might, if he pleas'd, as well argue from hence, That all Christians are substantially changed, first into Bread, and then into the natural Body of Christ, by their participation of the Sacrament, because they are said thereby *to be one Bread and one Body.*

*Thirdly*, *N. C.* quotes 1 *Cor.* 11. 27, 28, 29. *Wherefore whosoever shall eat this Bread or drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord. But let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh Damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body.* 'Certainly, says he, *Damnation* is too great a Punishment for the 'violation of the Types and Representations only of Christ's Body; therefore 'the Bread and the Cup are the true and 'real Body and Blood of Christ.

But

But this Objection is of no force, because St. *Paul* tells us plainly, That 'tis Bread that is eaten, and the Cup or Wine that is drank; and whosoever eats and drinks these unworthily (as the *Corinthians* did) is guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ, *i. e.* by prophaning this Holy Ordinance, *they crucifie Christ afresh, and put him to an open shame*; and therefore he is accounted in the sight of God, as truly guilty of the Death of Christ, as if with his Hands he had nail'd him to the Cross, because he obstinately and wilfully continues in those Sins which were the occasions of his Death and Passion. And now I think it will appear very evident from these Hints I have given, That *Transubstantion* has no Foundation in the Holy Scripture, and in truth this is so evident, that many of their most learned Writers are forc'd to confess it. And if so, then the People are not so grossly abus'd as *N. C.* wou'd have us believe, when they are told how monstrously absurd this Doctrine is; and that 'tis as evident, that *Transubstantiation* is contrary to the common sense of Mankind, as that twice two make four. Such Doctrine certainly better becomes the Pulpit than that Credulity the *Papists* preach up, whereby the People are led blindfold by an implicit Faith, into the belief of Nonsense and Contradiction; and are not only

ly rook'd of their Money, but perſuaded out of their Senſes. For, as *his Grace* tells us, Credulity is certainly a Fault as well as Infidelity; and he who ſaid, *Bleſſed are they that have not ſeen, and yet have believed*, hath no where ſaid, *Bleſſed are they that have ſeen, and yet have not believed*; much leſs, *Bleſſed are they that believe* directly contrary to their Senſes.

I had like to have forgot the Challenge which this Champion of the *Roman Cauſe* makes to all his Adverſaries; *That if any one will bring but one ſingle Argument in Mood and Figure, to prove that* Tranſubſtantiation *doth either contradict Senſe or Reaſon, he doth ſincerely promiſe, he will be of his Opinion the very next moment.* This is ſo Light and Boyiſh, that I ſhall only make this Reply to it; That when he has return'd a ſerious and ſolid Anſwer to any one *Paragraph* in the Archbiſhop's Treatiſe, or made good one Leaf he has written, his Challenge ſhall be accepted. And for his *ſincere Promiſes of Converſion*, I ſhall pray to God that by the aſſiſtance of his Grace, he may be *in this* as good as his word.

As to the Quotation he brings from the *Socinian*, I have already prov'd that the *Socinian* is miſtaken, and that his Lordſhip is certainly in the right in affirming, That *Tranſubſtantiation* may be diſprov'd by the Senſes of Mankind, and that for this plain Reaſon,

Reaſon, becauſe there can be no change in the Subſtance which doth not affect the Accidents; but his Lordſhip has explain'd this Matter ſo well himſelf, that I ſhall have no need to take up the Cudgels, and and therefore I ſhall only remark, that it is at the Forge of theſe *Philiſtines*, that the *Papiſts* ſharpen their Weapons, who are for ſailing with every Wind which flatters them with the leaſt hopes of Advantage.

I ſhould now take my leave of this Subject, but that I find he has reſerv'd his moſt doughty Objection for a parting Blow, and tells us that the Archbiſhop ſays; That *Tranſubſtantiation* was firſt introduc'd into the Catholick Religion, about the latter end of the Eighth Century in the ſecond Council of *Nice*, and that it was almoſt 300 Years before this miſ-ſhapen Monſter was lick'd into that Form in which it is now ſettled and eſtabliſh'd in the Church of *Rome*. But that he is miſtaken near 200 Years; well then, he grants that it was not introduc'd till the latter end of the ſixth Century. But, how doth he prove that the Archbiſhop was miſtaken? Why, Dr. *Humphry* ſays, that St. *Auſtin* brought this Doctrine into *England*; I have not the Book by me, and therefore cannot contradict him; but however, from thoſe Words he has

has quoted, no ſuch Inference can be made, becauſe the firſt Notion of *Tranſubſtantiation* was far different from that which obtained in After-times, this miſ-ſhapen Monſter growing ſtill more deform'd, till it obtain'd that frightful Aſpect we now find it in; of which the Popiſh Doctors are ſo ſenſible, that they are continually employ'd in taking off the Excreſſences, paring the Claws, licking it into Shape, and yet they do but render it more ugly by that awkward Reſemblance it bears to a Rational Form.

And now, I hope, it will eaſily be determin'd, whether *His Grace* or *N. C.* has the moſt right to thoſe *hard words* (as he calls them) with which *N. C.* concludes this Chapter.

---

*Of*

# *Of Communion in one kind.*

IN ſtating the Subject of Diſpute on this Head, our *Author* tells us, that the main Streſs lies here:

*Whether or no it be in the Power of the Church, to alter her Diſcipline, in a Matter of this Importance; ſo as to reſtrain the Faithful, to the Receiving the Sacrament in one kind only.*

But this is a falſe Repreſentation. For *Firſt*, This is no Matter of Diſcipline, but of Right, and Poſitive Inſtitution. *2dly.* 'Tis eſſential to the Nature of this Sacrament, that it ſhould be adminiſtred in both kinds; and therefore 'tis not in the Power of the Church to alter it. Nor *3dly.* Is there any Reaſonable Cauſe, ſo to do.

*Firſt*, Our Saviour inſtituted this Sacrament in both kinds. *Matth.* 26. 26. *And as they were eating, Jeſus took bread, and bleſſed it, and brake it, and gave it to the diſciples, and ſaid, take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, ſaying, drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the New Teſtament, which is ſhed for many, for the remiſſion of ſins. But I ſay unto you, I will*

*will not henceforth drink of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.* In which Inſtitution 'tis very remarkable, that our Saviour lays a particular Streſs upon the Adminiſtration of the Cup; foreſeeing that there would ariſe a Set of Men, who would ſacrilegiouſly deprive the People of it. And therefore whereas he ſays only of the Bread, *take, eat*; he ſays of the Cup, *drink ye all of this*; and gives the Reaſon why they ſhould *all* drink of it; becauſe this denoted to them his Blood which was ſhed for the Remiſſion of their Sins: And therefore as many as expected Remiſſion of Sins by the *ſhedding of his Blood*, ought to partake of this Fœderal Rite, and be frequently put in mind of his Death and Paſſion: And agreeably hereunto, in 1 *Cor.* 11. 23, 24, &c. the Apoſtle St. *Paul* writing to the *Corinthians*, tells them: *For I have received of the Lord, that which alſo I delivered unto you; that the Lord Jeſus, the ſame night in which he was betray'd, took bread; and when he had given thanks he brake it, and ſaid, take eat, this is my body which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the ſame manner alſo he took the cup, when he had ſupped, ſaying, This cup is the New Teſtament in my blood, this do, as oft as you drink it in remembrance of me: For as often*

*as*

*as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do ſhew the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore, whoſoever ſhall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, ſhall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup: For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himſelf, not diſcerning the Lord's body.* Which evidently demonſtrates to us, that not only the *Apoſtles*, but alſo the whole Congregation, did receive the *Cup* as well as the *Bread*. And as 'tis evident that our Saviour thus inſtituted the Sacrament *in both kinds*, and that it was thus adminiſter'd in the times of the *Apoſtles*; ſo it will plainly appear, both from Reaſon and the Practice of the Primitive Church, that thus it ought ſtill to be adminiſtred; and that the receiving the *Cup* as well as the *Bread*, is abſolutely neceſſary to a due Participation of this Sacrament. For ſince all Sacraments receive their Efficacy not from any inherent Virtue of the Outward Signs to produce ſuch Effects, but from God's Inſtitution of them to ſuch Bleſſed Ends and Purpoſes; therefore it follows, that we ought to keep up, as near as poſſibly we can, to our Saviour's Inſtitution, and follow his Example. Now one chief End of celebrating this Sacrament, is

to

to put us in mind of the Death of Christ, the breaking of his Body, and pouring out of his Blood; but this cannot be fully represented to us, but by the pouring out of the Wine, as well as the breaking of the Bread.

And that this was thus perform'd in the Primitive Times, is evident; the *Papists* not being able to give us any one Instance of any Publick Celebration of this Sacrament, where 'twas administred in one kind only. And to do them justice, they do confess this, and yet directly contrary to the plain Command and Institution of our Blessed Saviour, they enjoin the People, on Pain of Eternal Damnation, to receive this Sacrament in one kind only; and the Council of *Constance* decrees, that tho' our Saviour instituted the Sacrament thus, and tho' it was administred thus in the Primitive Times; yet since such a Custom of receiving it in one kind only, had crept into the Church, they think fit it should be continu'd, and that the Bread only should be given to the People. This is the substance of what *His Grace* has said in several of his Sermons.

To this *N.C.* replies, 'That tho' our Savi-'our did institute the Sacrament in both 'kinds, yet in several places of the *Scripture* 'he mentions but one; and quotes three Places in the sixth *Chapter* of St. *John*'s

*Gospel*, where he speaks of the Bread only; as *vers.* 50. *This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not dye:* vers. 51. *I am the living bread, which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give, is my flesh.* And *vers.* 58. *This is that bread which came down from heaven, he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.* He also tells us, that there are three other Passages in the same *Chapter*, which speak of giving the *Cup* as well as the *Bread:* As *vers.* 53 *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you:* vers. 54. *Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life:* vers. 56. *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.* Now says *N. C.* "If it be true, that *the Man who* "*eateth of this bread, shall live for ever*; "How can it be at the same time true, "that he cannot live, except he eat the "*Bread*, and drink the *Cup*? Must we "then hold these three Passages, and "reject the rest? As to the *Protestants*, I "do not see how it can stand with their "Principles to do otherwise.

To which I answer: *First*, That it doth not appear that this *Chapter* doth relate to the *Lord's Supper*; but that the Bread he speaks of, is the Doctrine of the *Holy*

*Holy Gospel*, and that we eat it by Faith: And therefore he says, *vers.* 47. *Verily, verily I say unto you, that he that believeth on me hath everlasting life:* And this is the Opinion of some Learned Men amongst the *Papists*, and particularly of Cardinal *Cajetan*. But taking it for granted, that these Words do relate to the *Lord's Supper*, yet 'tis evident that the Words are not to be taken literally, but in a spiritual Sense: This *N. C.* is forc'd to confess, and says, "That they cannot "be understood in the proper and strict "Meaning of the Words; but that Eat-"ing and Drinking, do denote only the "Partaking of the Body and Blood of the "Lord: But certainly they do denote the different manner of receiving the Parts of this Holy Sacrament, Eating and Drinking being two distinct Acts. And since our Saviour says so often in the same *Chapter*, that, *unless we eat and drink his Body and Blood, we cannot have Everlasting Life:* Therefore where Eating only is mention'd, Drinking must be included in it; and that it is so, the Practice of the *Apostles*, and the *Primitive Church* for a Thousand Years, is an undeniable Proof.

The next Text which *N. C.* quotes, is taken from the 24*th* of St. *Luke*; where the Evangelist tell us, that Christ, after his

Resurrection, appear'd to two of his Disciples, as they went to *Emmaus*, who constrained him to abide with them; and when he sat at Meat, *He took Bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave it to them; and their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight.* 'Now 'says *N.C.* 'tis certain, that if this Bread, 'which Christ bless'd and brake, was the '*Eucharist*, we have at least one Instance, 'in which Christ himself gave the Commu-'nion in one kind. To which I might return; That if the *Papists* have no other Instance but this, and this Bread was not the *Eucharist*, then they have no Instance that our Saviour gave the Communion in one kind; and that this Bread was not the *Eucharist*, is more than probable, because our Saviour did not discover himself to them till after they had broke Bread; and it is not probable, that they would receive the Sacrament from one they did not know. *Breaking of Bread* was usual at their ordinary Meals, and is frequently spoke of in the Holy Scripture, when there was no Sacrament. And there is a good Reason why our Saviour should *Bless*, and *Break Bread* at *Emmaus*, that thereby he might convince his *Disciples* of the truth of his Resurrection; and that by conversing thus familiarly with them, they might be assur'd that he was that *Jesus* who

who was crucify'd. And yet granting that this was the Sacrament, yet since there is no other Account given of the Manner of its Celebration, nor any other Circumstance mention'd, but only the *Breaking of Bread*; it cannot from hence be infer'd, that our Saviour did not consecrate the Wine as well as the Bread, or that the Communion was given *in one Kind only*. But so ready are the *Papists* to snatch at the Shadow of an Argument that they will let nothing pass, which they think they can wind and turn to their purpose, tho' they lose the Substance thereby.

But *N. C.* confidently affirms, that by *breaking Bread* in the *Acts of the Apostles*, is always meant the *Communion*; and therefore I desire him to consult *Acts* 27. 35. where *St. Paul took Bread, and gave Thanks to God in presence of them all; and when he had broken it, he began to eat.* Which I believe *N C.* himself will not say, was meant of the Sacrament; and because he adds, that four Great Men were of Opinion, that the *breaking of Bread* at *Emmaus* was the Celebration of the Sacrament, I shall only oppose the Authority of one, no very great Man, against them all, (*i. e.* himself) who confesses, that this is not so interpreted by the universal consent of the Church.

And now having examin'd these Texts of Scripture which *N. C.* has brought, to prove his *Half Communion*; I cannot imagine what reason he has to break out into the following Remonstrance, with such foul Language, and so many indecencies of Expression.

" And now, who would believe, says " he, that the *Roman Catholicks* had such " grounds in Scripture for the *Communion* " *in one Kind*, considering the loud and " clamorous Accusations, yea, and the " horrible Sacrileges they are charg'd " with upon this Subject? Well, and " who are these who charge us? Why, " they are great and eminent Men; great " indeed, not only for the Rank and Sta- " tion wherein *the Powers of this World* " have plac'd them, but also great for their " Learning, and other excellent Endow- " ments. But then, 'tis that they must " so do; the *Protestant Religion*, as all " the World knows, was planted in these " Kingdoms by open Force and Violence. " These Gentlemens Predecessors pos- " sess'd themselves of the rich Benefices of " the Church; and when Mens Interest " and Honour are once engag'd, 'tis hard " if they do not stand by them. Now " there is no way left to justifie these Pro- " ceedings, but by railing at the Church " of *Rome*, &c. In which few Lines, there

is

is ſo much Scandal cram'd in, and pack'd ſo cloſe together, that it would require more Time and Paper than I have here to take it off, and retort it; nor indeed do I care to foul my Fingers with that Filth, which without Senſe or Reaſon, he ſo liberally caſts about him.

" But, ſays *N. C.* ſuppoſing that our " Saviour did inſtitute the Sacrament *in* " *in both Kinds*, yet to Adminiſter the Sa- " crament *in one Kind only*, is not contra- " ry to our Saviour's Inſtitution, becauſe " the Adminiſtration of the Communion, " whether in one or both Kinds, is quite " another thing from the Inſtitution of " it.

To which I anſwer, That our Saviour did both inſtitute and adminiſter the Sacrament at the ſame time; but with reſpect to us, the Adminiſtration and the Inſtitution of the Sacrament is quite different; and therefore *His Grace* argues thus; Chriſt inſtituted the Sacrament in both Kinds, and therefore thus it ought to be adminiſtred, becauſe every Adminiſtration ought to come as near as poſſibly it can to the firſt Inſtitution; and tho' ſome Circumſtances may be alter'd, yet no eſſential Part ought to be omitted, eſpecially when our Saviour has made his Inſtitution the Copy by which we ought to act, and commanded us to do the ſame

that he did. And that the giving the Cup is not a Circumſtance, but an eſſential part of this Sacrament, is plain; by conſidering the End for which this Sacrament was inſtituted, which was to repreſent to us the Death and Sufferings of our Bleſſed Saviour, to ſeal to us the Pardon of our Sins, and to convey down to us thoſe Benefits which he has purchas'd for us by his Death and Paſſion. Now this cannot be ſo effectually and ſignificantly perform'd by receiving the Bread only, which repreſents to us only the Body of Chriſt, as by the receiving the Cup, whereby the pouring out of his Blood and his Death upon the Croſs is ſignified to us. This *N. C.* confeſſes; "But, ſays he, the "Queſtion is not, Whether Chriſt gave "it in both Kinds, but whether we ought "neceſſarily to give it in both Kinds, be-"cauſe he did ſo? This the Doctor af-"firms, and we deny. But is it not plain, that Chriſt commanded his Diſciples to do what he did? And if ſo, then if our Saviour Chriſt gave the Sacrament *in both Kinds*, we ought ſo to do. "But, ſays "*N. C.* the giving it in *one Kind*, or "*both*, is only a Circumſtance, and not "eſſential to the Sacrament: But, why ſhould not the giving the Bread be a Circumſtance as well as giving the Cup? and then

then both may be omitted; and if so, what will become of the Sacrament?

" But, says *N. C.* we are not oblig'd " to do every thing that Christ did, nor " imitate what he did both before and af- " ter the Sacrament, and therefore we are " not oblig'd to give the Cup in the Sa- " crament. But this doth in no wise fol- low; because we are strictly charg'd to ob- serve all the Essential Parts of this Ordi- nance; nor can any Power upon Earth dispense with our non-observance of them. And therefore we may justly wonder at the Council of *Constance*, which decreed the giving the Sacrament *in one Kind* on- ly, with a *non obstante* to the Institution of Christ, and the Practice of Christians in the first Ages of the Church.

But that the Council of *Constance* did thus decree it, *N. C.* roundly denies, and delivers himself after this following man- ner: " Good God! What may not Men " undertake, who have the confidence to " give out such Calumnies for Truth? " 'Tis a vulgar Observation, but a true " one, that when Mountebanks pretend " most to infallible Cures, they are then " farthest from them; just so 'tis with " those Gentlemen, when they pretend " most to Evidence and Demonstration " in Matters of Religion, then they have " the least colour, or reasonable pretence

" to

" to it. But the beſt way to refute this " Calumny, is to cite the very words of " the Council, and then let the Reader " judge what Faith is to be given to Men " who were ſuch Impoſtors for Truth.

Well, ſince he has appeal'd to the Council, To the Council we will go. And the Words of the Council are theſe; " In the " Name of the Holy and undivided Tri- " nity, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. " *Amen.* Since there are certain Perſons " in divers Parts of the World who pre- " ſume to aſſert, That all Chriſtian Peo- " ple ought to receive the Holy Sacra- " ment of the Euchariſt in both Kinds, " under the Species of Bread and Wine. " And that the Laity communicated not " only under the Species of Bread, but " alſo under the Species of Wine, even " after Supper, and when they are not " faſting; and that they obſtinately " maintain, that they ought thus to re- " receive it, contrary to the laudable cu- " ſtom of the Church, grounded upon " Reaſon, which they endeavour to con- " demn as Sacrilegious. For this reaſon, " this preſent holy and general Council " held at *Conſtance*, aſſiſted by the holy " holy Spirit of God, and being met in " order to provide for the Safety of the " Faithful againſt this Error, after a long " conſultation of many Doctors, both of " Divinity

" Divinity and Law, doth declare, de-
" cree, and define, That tho' Chriſt af-
" ter Supper, did inſtitute and adminiſter
" to his Diſciples in both Kinds, both of
" the Bread and Wine, this venerable Sa
" crament, yet this, notwithſtanding the
" laudable Authority of the holy Canons
" and the approved Cuſtom of the Church,
" hath, and doth oblige us to hold, that
" this Sacrament ought not to be celebra-
" ted after Supper, nor at ſuch times
" when the Faithful are not Faſting, un-
" leſs in caſe of Sickneſs, or of abſolute
" Neceſſity, allow'd by the Law or the
" Church. And ſince this Cuſtom is
" reaſonably introduc'd, to avoid ſome
" Inconveniences and Dangers, that tho'
" in the Primitive Church the Faithful
" did receive the Sacrament in both
" Kinds, and afterwards the Prieſt that
" Adminiſtred in both Kinds, and the
" Laity under the Species of Bread, yet
" it is moſt firmly to be believed, and in
" no wiſe to be doubted of, that the
" whole Body and Blood of Chriſt is tru-
" ly contain'd under the Species either of
" Bread or Wine; a cuſtom of recei-
" ving it only in one Kind only, has
" been introduc'd, and long obſerv'd,
" the ſame is to be held as a Law, that
" may neither be rejected nor chang'd,
" otherwiſe than by the Church's Autho-
" rity. And

And presently afterwards; "And this "holy Synod doth decree, — That those "who Administer the Sacrament to the "People under both Kinds, and teach, "that it ought so to be administred, shall "be effectually punished.

*In Nomine Sanctæ & Individuæ Trinitatis, Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti, Amen. Cum in nonnullis mundi partibus quidam temerariè asserere præsumant, Populum Christianum debere Sacrum Eucharistiæ Sacramentum sub utraque Panis & Vini specie suscipere, & non solùm specie Panis, sed etiam sub specie Vini Populum Laicum passim etiam post cœnam, vel aliàs non jejunum, & communicandum esse pertinaciter asserant; contra laudabilem Ecclesiæ consuetudinem rationabiliter approbatam, quam tanquam sacrilegam damnabiliter reprobare conantur: Hinc est, quòd hoc præsens Concilium sacrum generale Constantiense, in Spiritu Sancto legitimè congregatum, adversus hunc errorem saluti fidelium providere salageus, matura plurium Doctorum, tam divini quam humani juris, deliberatione præhabita; declarat, decernit, & definit; quòd licèt Christus post cœnam instituerit, & suis Discipulis administraverit sub utraque specie Panis & Vini hoc venerabile Sacramentum; tamen hoc non obstante, sacrorum Canonum Authoritas laudabilis, & approbata Consuetudo Ecclesiæ servavit, & servat; quòd hujusmodi Sacramentum*

*mentum non debet confici poſt cœnam, neque à fidelibus recipi non jejunis; niſi in caſu infirmitatis, aut alterius neceſſitatis, à Jure vel Eccleſia conceſſo, vel admiſſo. Et ſicut Conſuetudo hæc ad evitandum aliqua pericula & ſcandala, eſt rationabiliter introducta; quòd licèt in Primitiva Eccleſia hujuſmodi Sacramentum reciperetur à fidelibus ſub utraque ſpecie; poſtea à conficientibus ſub utraque, & à Laicis tantummodo ſub ſpecie Panis ſuſcipiatur; cum certiſſime credendum ſit, & nullatenus dubitandum, integram Chriſti Corpus & Sanguinem, tam ſub ſpecie Panis, quam ſub ſpecie Vini, veraciter contineri.*

*Item ipſa Sancta Synoda decernit & declarat ſuper iſta materia, Reverendiſſimis in Chriſto Patribus & Dominis, Patriarchis, &c. ut effectualiter puniant eos contra hoc Decretum excedentes; qui communicando Populi ſub utraque ſpecie Panis & Vini exhortati fuerint, & ſic faciendum eſſe docuerint, &c.*

And now, let any one who reads this judge to whom Credit is to be given, and whether *N. C.* or *His Grace*, is moſt likely to *vend Impoſtures for Truth*. For, doth not the *Council* ſay, That our Saviour inſtituted the Sacrament of the Lord's Sup- Supper *in both Kinds*? Doth it not confeſs, That that it was received by the Faithful in the Primitive Times of the Church? And yet notwithſtanding all this,

this, doth it not decree, That thoſe Prieſts ſhall be puniſh'd that Adminiſter to the to the People in both Kinds, or teach that thus it ought to be Adminiſtred? What ſhall we ſay to thoſe Men who know theſe things, and yet have the Forehead to deny them? But this is very agreeable to that Rule which *N. C.* lays down in the foregoing Chapter; "That in this ſort "of Writing, *i. e.* in diſputing with He-"reticks, 'tis natural for any Man to take "all kind of juſt Advantage of his Ad-"verſary in order to confute him, even "to the ſilencing of ſome part of the "Truth, when it is not to his purpoſe.

And now tho' it ſeems ſufficiently evident, even by their own confeſſion, that this Practice of giving the Sacrament was but of late date, and a novel Invention; and introduc'd into the Church without any good Reaſon: Yet I ſhall conſider what *N. C.* has farther to ſay for himſelf. Now amongſt thoſe other Shifts and Evaſions *Papiſts* have invented, the chief is the Doctrine of *Concomitancy*; the meaning of which is this; They ſay there is no need of receiving the Cup, becauſe the Body of Chriſt doth contain the Blood; ſo that whoſoever receives the Body of Chriſt, receives the Blood alſo: And indeed this ſeems to be the natural Conſequence of that abſurd Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*:

*tion:* For when they once came to be ſo hardy as to believe, that the whole Body and Blood of Chriſt is in the Sacrament, and that in every crumb of the Bread, there is a whole Chriſt; Body, Soul, and Divinity; and that our Saviour took himſelf in his own Hand, and gave himſelf to his Diſciples, and put himſelf into his own Mouth: Then from theſe notorious Abſurdities, 'twas natural to infer many more. To conclude; That the Receiving a whole Chriſt ought to be but one entire Act, and that after they had received a whole Chriſt in the Wafer, it would conſtitute a new Sacrament, to receive him over again in the Cup; and therefore they brought in the Cuſtom of Receiving is *one kind only.* Thus fruitful of Abſurdities in Error.

Againſt this Doctrine of *Concomitancy* *His Grace* argues, That in the Sacrament the Bread repreſents Chriſt's Body without the Blood, the Cup his Blood poured out; and both together, the Death and Crucifixion of our Bleſſed Saviour: But *His Grace* doth not ſay, (as *N. C.* would have him,) That the Body of our Saviour Chriſt was drain'd of every drop of Blood; but that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper being a Repreſentation of the Death and Paſſion of our Bleſſed Saviour: His Body is repreſented by the Bread, and his Blood

Blood is repreſented as poured out, by the Wine; and that both theſe make up the Type or Repreſentation of his Paſſion; and that therefore both theſe are eſſential to the due Adminiſtration of this Sacrament.

*N. C.* acknowledges, That the Primitive Chriſtians did receive it thus, and agrees with *His Grace*, in giving the very ſame Reaſon for it: *Becauſe the Repreſentation of the Death of our Lord is more fully expreſs'd in both kinds, than in one.* But then he tells us, that he muſt conſider, "That this Repreſentation is not of that "Importance, as to balance all the "weighty Conſiderations, that mov'd "the Church to command the uſe only "of one kind; or to make amends for "the horrid Prophanation and Abuſes, "which muſt inevitably attend the Com-"munion in both kinds, in a degenerate "Age, in which all Piety and Goodneſs "are almoſt extinguiſh'd.

But what weighty Conſiderations, and what ſcandalous Abuſes he means, I do not know; for moſt of thoſe he inſtances in, are not ſo. *Bellarmine* indeed tells us, That the Cup is taken away, becauſe one Prieſt could not adminiſter to a great Number of Communicants; that in ſome Places they have no Wine, and ſome Perſons have a natural averſneſs for it: But

 cer-

certainly these could not be the *weighty* Reasons: For he must needs be sensible, that none of these could be a Reason of denying the Cup to the People, but in some extraordinary Cases, which ought not to be a Rule for the constant Administration of it. Nor can I imagine what Abuses the Cup is more liable to than the Bread; unless that in some Countries it should hang upon the prophane Whiskers of the Laity; and then in such a Case, most People would judge it more expedient, that those Persons should be anathematized, who would not cut off their Whiskers, rather than that the good People should be defrauded of one half of the Sacrament, and be deprived of the precious Blood of their Blessed Saviour.

I have never heard of any other Abuses objected against those who receive this Sacrament in both kinds; only *N. C.* (whose Talent lyes peculiarly in Scandal) tells us of some "*Libertine Protestants*, "who being drunk over-night, come in "the Morning to receive the Sacrament, "and drink up whole Communion-Cups "of Consecrated Wine. But such Scandalous Reports as these are so commonly forg'd amongst the *Papists*, that no Reader who has but the least Taste of their Writings, can be shock'd at them;

and therefore I ſhall eſteem this ſilly Story of equal Authority with the *Nags-head* Fable. And truly I am ſo much his Friend, that I cannot forbear giving him a little Advice: That he would either give over his Endeavours to Impoſe upon the World by ſuch idle Reports; or quit the Title to, *The Author of the True and Modeſt Account.*

For let me (who know this Matter better than he can do,) aſſure him, that this Sacrament is Adminiſtred in all our Churches, with the greateſt Decency and Solemnity imaginable; and that we are as free from all theſe Prophanations and Abuſes, as the Church of *Rome* can be.

But ſuppoſe a drop or two of the Wine ſhould chance to be ſpilt, this is no greater Prophanation of the Sacrament, than the dropping ſome crumbs of the Bread; which in the Primitive Church muſt frequently happen, when they ſent ſome portions of the Conſecrated Bread to their abſent Friends; and ſometimes ſent the Holy Scrament by Boys to the Sick, and gave the Wine to Sucking-Children: And if this is a ſufficient Cauſe of depriving the People of the Cup, for the ſame Reaſon they might take away the Bread alſo.

*N. C.'s*

*N. C.*'s laſt Excuſe (to take off the Guilt of Sacrilege from his Church) is, That the *Papiſts* may as well vary from Chriſt's Inſtitution in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as we *Proteſtants* do in the Sacrament of Baptiſm, by ſubſtituting Sprinkling, inſtead of Dipping: But 'tis evident that there is an abſolute Neceſſity for this in cold Countries: And we may be aſſur'd, both from the Holy Scripture, and the Contemplation of the Divine Attributes; that God is better pleas'd with an Act of *Mercy*, than *Sacrifice*.

# *Of Prayers in an unknown Tongue.*

IN the beginning of this Chapter, our Author endeavours to impoſe upon the ignorant and unwary Reader, by denying the Matter of Fact, and affirming, that the *Papiſts* do not pray in an *unknown Tongue*, but in the *Latin Tongue*, which is the moſt *known Tongue* in the World; taking it for granted, That the Publick Prayers of the Church ought to be offer'd up in the ſame Tongue all the World over.

By ſaying that they pray in the moſt *known Tongue*, *N. C.* ſeems to grant, that 'tis moſt ſuitable to the nature of Prayer to be offer'd up in that *Tongue*, which is beſt underſtood by the People. But then the Queſtion will be,

Whether the daily Offices of the Church ought to be offer'd up in all Countries and Places in one Language, or elſe in every Country in that Language, which is beſt underſtood by thoſe Perſons who are requir'd to join in theſe Publick Offices of Religion? And methinks there ſhould not be much contention about this matter, when the Diſpute may be ſo eaſily decided, by the common Senſe of Man-

Mankind, and the expreſs Words of the Holy Scripture. But let us hear what the Archbiſhop ſays on this Subject;

And, *Firſt*, *His Grace* ſays, That the celebrating the Divine Service in an *unknown Tongue*, is contrary to the Practice of the Primitive Church. And for the Proof of this he quotes *Origen*: And *Bellarmin* himſelf confeſſes, that the *Armenians*, *Egyptians*, *Ethiopians*, *Ruſſians*, and others did, and do ſtill uſe their own Language in their *Liturgies* even at this Day.

To which *N. C.* anſwers, 'That by an 'unknown *Tongue* is meant, either ſuch a 'Tongue as no body underſtands, or elſe 'ſuch a *Tongue* as is *unknown* to moſt of the 'common People. But this is the moſt ſenſleſs Diſtinction that can be imagined; for, how can there be ſuch a *Tongue* which no body underſtands? Or, in other words, ſuch a *Tongue* which no body in the World can ſpeak; for no body can ſpeak a *Tongue* which he doth not underſtand Well, but *N. C.* tells us, 'The Primitive Church, 'and all ſucceeding Generations, (he 'means the *Latin Church*) did celebrate 'Divine Service in the *Latin Tongue*; and then he tells us, 'That the common Peo-'ple (except the *Italians*) were always 'ignorant of the *Latin Tongue*. What, in the *Latin Church*, and in the *Primitive Times*? And if ſo, how came Divine Ser-

vice to be ſaid at firſt in the *Latin Tongue?* Was it for this Reaſon, becauſe the common People did not underſtand it? or, becauſe this was the Language which was moſt univerſally underſtood in the *Roman Empire?* And if ſo, then what *His Grace* affirms is evidently true, That the celebrating the Divine Service in an *unknown Tongue*, is contrary to the Practice of the Primitive Church.

'Tis true, that in After-times, by the inundation of the barbarous Nations upon the *Roman Empire*, the *Romans* loſt their Language by degrees, and yet the Governours of the Church ſtill kept up Divine Service in the *Latin Tongue*; which at laſt was wholly *unknown* to the common People. And that about the ninth and tenth Centuries, when a groſs Ignorance cover'd this part of the World, the *Pope* and the *Prieſts* took away the Key of Knowledge, and put it under the Door for ſeveral Ages, till the Reformation fetch'd it out again, and rub'd off the ruſt of it.

*Secondly*, *His Grace* argues from the Nature and End of Religious Worſhip which ought to be a *reaſonable Service*; and this it cannot be, if it be not directed by our Underſtandings, and accompanied with our Hearts and Affections. But if 'tis perform'd in an *unknown Tongue*, our Underſtanding can have no part in it; and

and if we do not understand it, it cannot move our Affections.

*N. C.* replies, 'That all this he readily grants, and that he hopes they 'are as careful in the *Romish Church* to 'teach the common People their Prayers 'in their own *Tongue*, and to exhort them 'to say them in the same *Tongue* as their 'Neighbours. But the direct contrary is too evident; and (tho' in this particular too, he thinks it convenient *to silence some part of the Truth, because it is not to his purpose to have it discovered*) yet it is notorious, that even the common People are taught to say their Prayers in *Latin*, a Language which they do not understand. But supposing they do teach, or at least allow the common Peoples saying their Prayers in a Language they do understand; yet what is this to the *Publick Prayers* of the *Church*, of which we are now discoursing? Certainly, if our *Private Prayers* ought to be offer'd up with Understanding, our *Publick Prayers* ought to be much more so; for, how can they be said to be *Publick Prayers* when the People do not join in them? And, how can they join in that they do not understand? And, what reason can be given why the People should not understand their *Publick* as well as their *Private Prayers*? Is God less honour'd by them? or, are we

not as capable of being edified, and of having our Hearts and Affections mov'd and excited by them? Where lies the difference?

*N.C.* confeſſes all this; but comes in with a *notwithſtanding*, *the Church doth not think fit to alter it:* But what Church doth not think fit? Why the *Romiſh* Church: And therefore I think it a very good Reaſon why that Church ſhould receive conſiderable Alterations, and a thorough Reformation: Becauſe 'tis plain, that it is ſo much corrupted, that it cannot be prevail'd on to reform the moſt notorious and ſcandalous Abuſes: Nay, that it is ſo far from reforming them, that it endeavours to keep People in Ignorance of the moſt neceſſary part of their Duty, and has double-lock'd the Door of Knowledge: For as if their ſaying their Prayers in an *unknown tongue* was not ſufficient, and leſt there ſhould be ſome of the Congregation who ſhould underſtand the *Latin Tongue*, and by conſequence join in their Publick Worſhip, *N.C.* tells us, *That the greateſt part of the* Maſs *is pronounc'd ſo low, that ſcarce any who is preſent hears what is ſaid.* So that if there is any ſuch thing in the World, as a *Tongue which no Man can underſtand*, it is that Tongue in which they celebrate the Publick Prayers of their Church; which com-

common Reaſon tells us, ought to be the Tongue which is beſt underſtood.

3. But if the *Papiſts* will not be perſuaded to follow the Primitive Practice of the Church, (to which they pretend to pay great Deference) nor receive any conviction from the Reaſon of the thing, or the End of Divine Worſhip; yet methinks they ſhould hearken to the Voice of God, in the Revelation of his Holy Word: Since there is no leſs than a whole *Chapter*, the Fourteenth of the Firſt *Epiſtle* of St. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, which treats purpoſely on this Matter, and plainly condemns this Practice. And this the *Apoſtle* doth in ſuch plain and expreſs Terms, that I cannot but wonder that any one who has read that *Chapter*, ſhould juſtifie that unreaſonable Practice: But ſomething they muſt ſay, when they are reſolv'd to uphold it.

Now *N.C.* tells us, that there is no ſuch thing as *unknown*, in all that *Chapter*; but the Word is added by the Tranſlators of the *Engliſh* Bible, how truly we ſhall ſoon ſee: And this *Firſt*, From the uſual Signification of the Word in the *Original*; and *Secondly*, From the Scope and Deſign of the whole *Chapter*. And *Firſt*, From the uſual Signification of the Word in the *Holy Scripture*. Now the Word in the *Original* which is tranſlated

* *un-*

* *unknown Tongue*, has ſeveral Significations; ſometimes 'tis taken for the Faculty of Speaking, ſometimes for the Peculiar Language of every Nation, but generally for *unknown Tongues*. And ſince this Word has divers Significations, we muſt be determin'd, as to its Meaning here, by conſidering the Deſign of the *Text*, and of the whole *Chapter*.

And here I agree with my Author, that by *Tongues* in this *Chapter* are meant, that extraordinary and ſurprizing Gift of Tongues, wherewith the firſt Believers were inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt; who infus'd into them the Ability of Speaking in different Tongues, ſuch as they who ſpoke them never learnt, but were underſtood by thoſe who heard them. For the Apoſtles being ſent by our Bleſſed Saviour, to propagate the Goſpel thro' the whole World; and it being neceſſary that they ſhould Preach the Goſpel to every People in a Tongue which they underſtood; and impoſſible that they ſhould learn all thoſe Languages in a Natural Way, in ſo

---

* Πᾶσαν γλῶτταν βασάνιζε, omnem dicendi facultatem excute. *Ariſtoph.*

Γλώσσης χαρακτὴρ, forma ſermonis unicuique genti peculiaris. *Herod.*

Ἀγνωστόταλοι τινὶ γλώσσαν, ignoto ſermone utentes. *Thucyd.*

Γλωσσῶν ἐξήγησις, interpretatio vocum obſcuriorum. *Galenus.*

ſmall

ſmall a time; God was pleaſed to ſupply this Natural Defect, by the Extraordinary Aſſiſtance and Inſpiration of his Holy Spirit: So that in whatſoever Country or Nation they came, they were enabled to ſpeak readily in the Language of that Country, and were plainly underſtood by the Hearers; which was neceſſary to their reaping Benefit by their Prayers and Preaching. Again, the Apoſtles being oftentimes call'd to ſpeak to a mixt Multitude, conſiſting of many People and Nations, who did not underſtand the Language which the Apoſtles naturally ſpake, nor one another, nor had any one common Language between them: It pleaſed God to inſpire the Apoſtles after ſo miraculous a manner, that tho' they ſpake but one Tongue, yet it was as effectual as if they had ſpoken many; and every particular Hearer heard the Word Preach'd in his own Tongue, which he naturally underſtood. And this I take to be the meaning of the Gift of Tongues: And if ſo, then what *N. C.* affirms cannot be true; *That this extraordinary Gift of Tongues, was given rather as a Sign to the Unbelievers, than for the Inſtruction of the Faithful.* That this is a groſs Miſtake, is evident from the Deſign of this *Chapter*; which is to ſhow, That tho' the ſpeaking in *unknown* and *ſtrange Tongues*, was uſeful for

for the ſpeedy Converſion of Unbelievers, yet when us'd for the Inſtruction of the Faithful, (call'd Propheſying) 'twas much more beneficial to the Church. And therefore the Apoſtle adviſes them rather to covet Propheſying, (*i. e.*) Interpreting the Holy Scriptures to their Hearers, than Speaking with Tongues; becauſe tho' the firſt might raiſe the greater Admiration and Veneration to their Perſons, yet the other was of more general Uſe, and tended more to the Edification of the Church. This being the true Notion of Speaking with Tongues, 'tis plain, that Praying in a Tongue which the Generality of the People do not underſtand, is expreſly contrary to the Deſign of the Apoſtle in this *Chapter:* For ſince there was but two Ends for which this Miraculous Gift was beſtowed upon the Church; the Converſion of Infidels, and the Strengthning the Faithful in their Holy Belief; neither of theſe can be obtain'd, in our Times, by Preaching and Praying in ſuch a Tongue, as the Generality of the People are ignorant of: And the Apoſtle tells us, That the End of all Publick Prayer and Preaching, ought to be the Edification of the Hearers; and that 'tis as abſurd to Pray or Preach in an unknown Tongue, as for a Trumpet to give ſuch an indiſtinct Sound in the time of Battel,

that

that no body can tell the meaning of it, whether it betokens a Charge or a Retreat, *ver.* 8. In like manner, if we ſpeak or pray in Publick, in a Language the People do not underſtand, they can neither join together in Prayer, nor ſay *Amen* to it; nor are they edified by the Preaching: This is ſo evidently the deſign and tendency of this Chapter, that one would think it needed no Comment. And if ſo, then *N. C.*'s Objection is of no force, That the Word in the Original is ſometimes tranſlated *Tongues* abſolutely, and ſometimes *unknown Tongues*; for ſince this Word is taken both ways in other Authors, there is reaſon that it ſhould be ſo tranſlated, and the Senſe of the Place, and the Coherence with what goes before and what follows, muſt determine when 'tis to be taken in one ſignification and when in the other; and that 'tis thus duly and properly tranſlated, any one of competent Knowledge and Learning may eaſily judge. Thus I think it is as clear as Noon-day, from Antiquity, Reaſon, and the Holy Scripture, That the Publick Service of the Church ought to be offer'd up in a Tongue which the People underſtood. But to leave them no manner of excuſe, I will conſider what they ſay for themſelves, and with what Fig-leaves they cover this unſound Part.

And

And, *First*, *N. C.* tells us, 'That the 'performance of the Publick Offices of 'the Church in one common Tongues 'contributes very much to *foment* the 'Union of the Church": To *foment a Union* is a very odd expreſſion; (and indeed *N. C.* is very unhappy in his Expreſſions thro' the whole Book, tho' I have not thought it worth my while to take notice of them). Well, but (paſſing over the abſurdity of the Expreſſion) how doth it contribute to the Union of the Church to have the Publick Offices of Religion perform'd in the ſame Tongue in all the Nations of the World? Methinks, if they were perform'd in never ſo many Languages, if there were but care taken, that they were ſuch as no body underſtood, they would have the very ſame Effect.

'But, ſays *N. C.* all the Members of 'the *Catholick Church* ought to have Com-'munion and Fellowſhip one with ano-'ther; they ſhould all be united in one 'Faith, and one uniform Worſhip of one 'God; they ought all to be qualified for 'the Participation of the ſame Sacrament, 'and to aſſiſt together at the Publick Di-'vine Service where ever they meet; elſe, 'how can the Unity of their Faith and 'Communion ſubſiſt?" In which words *N. C.* ſeems to affirm, That all Unity, whether of Worſhip or Faith, depends on the having

having one common Language in our Publick Devotions; as for the Unity of Faith, 'tis evident, Men may believe the ſame Creed, tho' they make uſe of a different way of Worſhip, much more when they uſe the ſame Form of Worſhip, tho' in a different Tongue; and as for the Unity of Worſhip, that doth not depend on the ſerving God with the ſame Tone of the Voice, or making the ſame Sound, but in offering up to God the ſame devout Affections, in joining together in the ſame Prayers and Praiſes, and in addreſſing our ſelves to God after the ſame manner, with one Heart and with one Voice. Now, how can this be perform'd when the generality of the People do not underſtand the Tongue, in which the Publick Offices of Religion are perform'd? And when they are ſaid in ſo *low a Voice*, that very few, even of thoſe who are preſent, can hear them. And, to uſe *N. C.*'s own words, which immediately follow this Objection, and are a ſufficient anſwer to it; 'For how, ſays he, can I join in 'Prayer, or in God's Publick Worſhip, 'with any Society of People, when I can'not diſcern by any thing they do or ſay, 'whether they are *Catholicks* or *Here'ticks?* or, how ſhall I receive the Sacra'ment in the Society of thoſe, who for 'any thing I can ſee or underſtand, may 'be

'be *Jews*, or Blaſphemers of my Holy Re-
'ligion"? Thus *N. C.* has given a ſuffi-
cient Anſwer to himſelf, like one of thoſe
little waſpiſh Animals, who carry in their
Tails an Antidote for their own Sting.
Had he as good a knack in proving as in
anſwering what he ſays, he would be a
much more formidable Adverſary; but
how he will make out what immediately
follows, I cannot imagine: That the per-
forming the Service in *Latin*, is the Bond
that unites and cements all the Members
of Chriſt's Myſtical Body; and that the
whole Frame of the *Catholick Church*
would diſſolve and fall to pieces, if this
were taken away. I ſuppoſe he muſt
mean, that it unites the Members of the
*Romiſh Church* in Ignorance, which, as
they tell us, is the Mother of Religion
and Devotion. But farther, *N. C.* tells
us, 'That the difficulty of tranſlating the
'Liturgy into Vulgar Languages, and
'preſerving it in its Purity, is enough to
'diſſuade us from the Undertaking; and
'that the Uniformity of the *Liturgy* is the
'beſt ſtanding Monument we have of the
'Faith and Practice of our Anceſtors; 'tis
'it that ſhews us, how they us'd to Ad-
'miniſter the Sacraments, and what ſorts
'of Ceremonies they judged moſt proper
'to excite and ſtir up Devotion, and to
'perform God's Service with that Gravi-
'ty

'ty and Decency ſuitable to his Holy Re-
'ligion; and that if it were tranſlated
'into Vulgar Languages, it would require
'frequent Alterations and Changes, and
'be the cauſe of endleſs Diſturbances.

To which I anſwer, That it plainly appears from the *Liturgy* of the *Church of England*, which was compiled One hundred and forty Years ago, and yet retains its Primitive Purity, without any conſiderable uncouthneſs of the Phraſe; that the Publick Prayers may be tranſlated into ſuch Sterling Language, and ſuch Simplicity of Expreſſion, as may continue a long while without any need of Alteration; and that if once in a Century a few words were chang'd, it would not cauſe any Commotions or Diſturbances, nor any alteration in the Senſe.

And that 'tis very true, that the Uniformity of our *Liturgy* is of excellent uſe, and cannot be ſufficiently commended. But when *N. C.* ſays, 'tis the beſt ſtanding 'Monument we have of the Faith and Pra-'ctice of our Anceſtors, he ſhould have made an Exception of the Holy Scriptures. But can he be ſo ſtupid as to think, that this Uniformity doth conſiſt only in the Uniformity of Language? Doth he not know, that 'tis a Uniformity of Doctrine, a Uniformity of Heart, of Voice, of Rites and Ceremonies, which is ſo pro-

per to excite and ſtir up Devotion; which we may have, nay, which is much better obtain'd, when the Publick Prayers of every Nation are tranſlated into that Language, which is moſt commonly and familiarly us'd by the People who inhabit it; whereas Prayer in a Foreign Tongue is of no uſe, 'tis a *mocking of God*, and giving the People a Stone inſtead of Bread.

This, I think, is all that is material to be ſaid on this Subject; I paſs on to another notorious Abuſe, which has obtain'd in the *Church of Rome*, and very near akin to it, and is treated of in the ſame Chapter.

The *Papiſts* are charg'd by *His Grace, that they lock up the Holy Scriptures in an* unknown Tongue, *and forbid the common People the uſe of them.*

To this Charge *N. C.* replies, 'That 'tis wholly groundleſs and notoriouſly 'falſe, and unworthy the Character and 'Reputation of Dr. *Tillotſon*; that 'tis as 'clear as the Sun at Noon-day, that the '*Papiſts* have the Scriptures in all the 'Vulgar Languages ſpoken in thoſe Parts 'of the World where they live; that the '*Doway Bible* and *Rhemiſh Teſtament* are 'common, and in the hands of the Peo'ple, as alſo the *French Bible*; and that 'in *Spain*, *Germany*, and *Italy*, the People 'have the Scriptures in the Vulgar Lan'guages. To

To this I answer, *First*, That those Translations which have been made of the *Bible* into the *Vulgar Tongue*, were forc'd from them; for when they found that the People could not be with-held from reading the *Bible*, and looking into those Translations which the *Protestants* had publish'd, they thought it would be better to let them have one of their own dressing up; and they have provided such Translations as run directly contrary to the Original, and have foisted into them so many Popish Tenents, and have inserted so much of their own Superstition, that they have turned this wholsome Food into deadly Poison; an instance of which we have in that *Bible* printed at *Bourdeaux*, *A. D.* 1686.

*Secondly*, The common People are not permitted to read any * Translation but their own, nor these Translations without License; and to obtain a License, a Man must *first*, have the Consent of his Parish-Priest; *secondly*, the Leave of the Bishop and the Inquisitor must be asked; and,

* *Cum experimento manifestum sit, si Sacra Biblia Vulgari Lingua passim sine discrimine permittantur, plus inde detrimenti quam utilitatis oriri ob hominum temeritatem; hac in parte Judicio Episcopi aut Inquisitoris stetur: ut cum consilio Parochi vel Confessarii Bibliorum à Catholicis Authoribus versorum lectionem in Vulgari Lingua eis concedere possint, quos intellexerint ex hujusmodi lectione non damnum, sed fidei atque pietatis argumentum capere posse: quam facultatem in scriptis habeant.* De Lib. Prohib. Reg. 4.

and this must be under his Hand in Writing; and this is never granted, but only to such Persons as they are very secure of, such as do not design an Increase of Knowledge, but only of Faith and Piety. So that a Licence, with all these Limitations, is no Licence at all. And then, let any one judge, whether the Council of *Trent* (to which he appeals) *doth not in the least favour* the locking up the *Holy Scripture* from the People. 'Tis certain, that our Saviour made no such *Limitations*, in whose time, *the Poor had the Gospel Preached unto them.*

*Thirdly*, They allow of no Interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, but what is put upon it by that Church, *i. e.* the Church of *Rome.* So that for a Private Person to be too prying and Inquisitive into the Meaning of the Holy Scripture, especially into any Point of Controversy, is the way to have his Licence (which is revocable) taken from him; and 'tis well if he escapes the Inquisition, if he be an

---

That is, since 'tis evident from Experience, that if the *Sacred Bible* were permitted indifferently, and without distinction, to be read in the *Vulgar Tongue*, such a Liberty (by reason of Mens Rashness) would produce more hurt than good; be it therefore left to the Bishop's or Inquisitor's Judgment, by and with the Advice of the Parish Priest, or Confessor, to give leave to read the *Versions* of the *Bible*, translated by *Catholick Authors* into the *Vulgar Language*, to such Persons, who, as they shall determine, will not receive Prejudice, but an increase of Faith and Piety thereby.

an Inhabitant of the *Popiſh* Countries; tho' to thoſe in *England* they may be more favourable, becauſe they cannot help it.

*Laſtly*, To make all ſure, (for tis 'ten to one but Truth will out, and 'tis a very difficult matter to conceal it in ſuch Prying Times) they prefer Unwritten Traditions before the Word of GOD; and *N. C.* tells us ſo, and gives us this Reaſon for it: "That Chriſt our Lord commanded his Diſciples to go and Preach "the *Goſpel*; but we do not find, that he "gave any Injunction about giving his "Word in Writing to the People, in "order to learn their Faith. As if committing the *Goſpel* to Writing, was not as much Preaching of it, as declaring the Contents of it to the People with their Voice.

And now having (as I think, made good this Aſſertion, That the *Papiſts* lock up the Holy Scriptures in an *unknown Tongue*) I hope there needs not much to be ſaid to prove, That they are guilty of a heinous Sin, and a ſacrilegious Theft in ſo doing; and therefore I ſhall only quote a Paſſage out of one of *His Grace*'s *Sermons*, *Vol.* I. *poſt obit. pag.*160. 'The like may 'be ſaid of Locking up the Scriptures, 'from the People in an *unknown Tongue* 'contrary to the Command of the Scri'ptures themſelves, and to the great End

'and Deſign of Almighty God in the 'Writing and Publiſhing of them; and 'contrary to the perpetual Exhortations 'and Counſels of all the Antient Fathers 'of the Chriſtian Church for a great 'many Ages, not one excepted. They are 'hardly more frequent, and copious, and 'earneſt in any Argument, than in per-'ſuading People of all Ranks and Con-'ditions, to the conſtant and careful 'Reading of the Holy Scriptures. And 'contrary to the Common Reaſon and 'and Senſe of Mankind. For what ſhould 'Men be perſuaded to be acquainted 'withal, if not with that which is the 'great Inſtrument of our Salvation? That 'Book which was written on purpoſe to 'reveal and convey to Men the Knowledge 'of God, and of his Will, and their Duty? 'What ſhould Men be allowed to know, 'if not that which is the beſt and moſt 'effectual Means to direct and bring them 'to Heaven; or turn them from Sin, and 'to preſerve them from Eternal Miſery? 'When our Saviour would repreſent the 'beſt and moſt effectual Means of bring-'ing Men to Happineſs, and ſaving them 'from Eternal Torments of Hell: In the 'Parable of the Rich Man and *Lazarus*, 'he brings in *Abraham*, giving the beſt 'Advice he could to the Rich Man, who 'was in Hell, concerning his Brethren



'who

'who were upon Earth, how they might 'prevent their coming into that Place of 'Torment; and he directs them to the 'Scriptures, as the beſt, and moſt effectual 'Means to that Purpoſe: *They have*, ſays he, '*Moſes and the Prophets, let them hear them*; '*for if they hear not Moſes and the Prophets*, '*neither would they be perſuaded, tho' one roſe* '*from the dead*. And now one would think, 'that the declared Judgment of our Saviour 'ſhould go a great way, even with the 'moſt Infallible Church in the World. 'However, this we muſt ſay, that 'tis a 'very hard Caſe to which the Church of '*Rome* hath reduced Men; that it will 'neither allow them Salvation out of their 'Church, nor the beſt and moſt effectual 'Means of Salvation when they are in it. In which words, *His Grace* has excellently diſplay'd, not only the great Uſe and Benefit of Publiſhing the Bible in a Tongue that the People underſtand; but alſo the Reaſonableneſs and Neceſſity of ſo doing. Let us ſee now what Pleas *N. C.* and others make in Defence of the contrary Practice in the Church of *Rome*.

And *Firſt*, He tells us, 'That Dr. *Tillot-* '*ſon*, and his Party, are of all others the 'unfitteſt to reproach the *Papiſts* with this 'Conduct; conſidering, that moſt of the 'Learned Men of his Church do inge- 'nuouſly own, That the Promiſcuous Uſe

'of the Scripture allowed to all ſorts of 'Perſons, and their Private Interpretations 'thereof, was in a great Meaſure the Cauſe 'of all the different Sects, that ſprang up, 'and divided themſelves from their Com-'munion; which is an Aſſertion abſolutely falſe; and would become any one better, than one who pretends to write, *A True and Modeſt Account*, &c.

I deſire him to read theſe Words of the Archbiſhop, which will make him bluſh, if he has any *Modeſty* left. *Vol.* III. *pag.* 492. "They, (*i. e.*) the *Papiſts* ſay, that Peo-"ple are apt to wreſt the Scriptures to "their own Deſtruction; and that the "Promiſcuous Uſe of them, hath been the "great Occaſion of Hereſies. It cannot "be deny'd, but be the condition of the "beſt things in the World, that they are "liable to be abuſed; Health, and Light, "and Liberty, as well as Knowledge. "But muſt all theſe therefore be taken "away? This very Inconvenience of "People's Wreſting Scripture to their "own Ruine, St. *Peter* takes notice of in "his days; but he doth not therefore "forbid Men the Reading of them, as his "more Prudent Succeſſors have done "ſince. Suppoſe the Reading of the "Scriptures hath been the Occaſion of "Hereſies: When were there ever more, "than in the Firſt Ages of Chriſtianity? "and

" and yet neither the Apoſtles, nor their " Succeſſors ever preſcrib'd this Remedy. " But are they in earneſt? Muſt not Men " know the Truth, for fear of falling in- " to Error? Becauſe Men may poſſibly " miſs their Way at Noon-day, muſt they " never travel but in the Night, when " they are ſure to loſe it?

" And when all is done, *THIS IS* " *NOT TRUE*, that Hereſies have " ſprung from this Cauſe; they have ge- " nerally been broach'd by the Learned, " from whom the Scriptures never were, " nor could be concealed. And for this, " I appeal to the Hiſtory and Experience " of all Ages. And then he quotes St. *Chryſoſtome*, and St. *Hierome*. This Paragraph *N. C.* could not but take notice of; but I ſuppoſe he thought fit, *to ſilence the Truth* here too; becauſe *it was not to his Purpoſe*, of traducing *His Grace*, and the reſt of the Learned and Reverend Divines of the *Church of England:* Which tho' it could not eſcape the knowledg of any ingenuous and conſiderate Reader, yet this, and a great deal more may be ſwallowed down by ſuch weak and credulous People, who too often become a Prey to the Miſſionaries of the *Church of Rome.*

I could quote a great deal more to the ſame Purpoſe, but then I muſt tranſcribe the greateſt part of ſome of his Sermons; and

and therefore I ſhall refer the Reader to *Serm.* 12. *Vol.* IV. and *Vol.* III. *Serm.* 12. where he will find this Subject (as indeed all the reſt are) excellently treated on; I ſhall only make one Quotation more; becauſe it will ſhew us the true Cauſe why the *Papiſts* are ſuch irreconcilable Enemies to the Holy Scriptures. *Vol.* III. *Pag.* 483.

" Doth not our Bleſſed Saviour exhort " the *Jews* to ſearch the Scriptures? and " St. *Paul* charges the Chriſtians, that *the* " *Word of God ſhould dwell richly in them*; " and the ancient Fathers of the Church " frequently and earneſtly recommend to " the People the Reading and Study of " the Scriptures: How comes the Caſe " to be ſo altered? Sure the Word of " God is not chang'd, *that certainly abides* " *and continues the ſame for ever.* Was " not the Old Teſtament publiſh'd in a " Language underſtood by the People; " and the *Epiſtles* of the *Apoſtles* by the " Churches to whom they were written; " and the *Goſpels* both by *Jews* and " *Greeks*? Were there no Difficulties " and Obſcurities then in the Scripture, " capable of being *wreſted by the unſtable* " *and unlearned*? Were not the People " then liable to Error, and was there no " Danger of Hereſie in thoſe Times? " And yet theſe are the great Objections



" againſt

" againſt putting the Scriptures into the " hands of the People? Which is juſt " like their arguing againſt giving the " Cup to the Laity, from the Inconve- " niency of their Beards, leſt ſome of the " Conſecrated Wine ſhould be ſpilt upon " them: As if Errors and Beards were " Inconveniencies lately ſprung up in the " World, and which Mankind were not " liable to in the Firſt Ages of Chriſtia- " nity.

" But, ſays *His Grace*, in truth all their " Objections are level'd againſt the Holy " Scripture itſelf; and that which the " Church of *Rome* would find fault with, " if they durſt, is, That there ſhould be " any ſuch Book in the World, in the " hands either of *learned* or *unlearned*; " for if it be dangerous to any, none are " more capable of doing Miſchief with " it, than Men of Wit and Learning. " And this is evident, by the Advice " given to Pope *Julius* III. by the Biſhops " met at *Bononia*: *That as little of the Goſpel as might be, eſpecially in the Vulgar Tongue, ſhould be read to the People; for ſay they, This is that Book, which above all others, hath raiſed thoſe Tempeſts and Whirl-winds which we were almoſt carried away with. And in truth, if any one diligently conſiders it, and compares it with that which is done in our Church, he will find them very con-*

*contrary to each other; and our Doctrine to be not only very different from it, but repugnant to it.* " If this be the Caſe, (as the Arch-" biſhop goes on) they do like the reſt of " Children of this World, prudently " enough in their Generation: Can we " we blame them for being againſt the " Scriptures, when the Scriptures are " acknowledged to be ſo clearly a-" gainſt them? But ſurely no body who " conſiders theſe things, would be of " that Church; which is brought by the " undeniable Evidence of the Things " themſelves, to this ſhameful Confeſſion; " That ſeveral of their Doctrines and " Practices are directly contrary to the " Word of God.

*Secondly*, *N. C.* ſays, That the *Popiſh* Religion is under Perſecution, in moſt *Proteſtant* Countries; that all the Marks of Infamy and Diſhonour are put upon them, being not permitted to bear any Civil and Military Office; nay ſcarce allow'd in ſome Countries, to exerciſe ſuch honeſt Profeſſions or Callings, as may enable them to get their Bread: That they are] rail'd at in the Pulpits by *Proteſtant* Miniſters; and ſuch falſe and ridiculous Tenents aſcrib'd to them, as inflame the People's Hatred, and give them a perpetual Averſion to them and their Religion. And that if the *Teſt* and

*Penal*

*Penal Laws* were taken away; which (as he ſays) are the *Fences* and *Bulwarks* of the *Proteſtant Religion*, it would ſoon fall to Pieces, and theſe Prodigal Children return to their Mother, the Church of *Rome*.

But certainly *N. C.* cannot be ignorant, nor forget, what Uſage the *Proteſtants* have met with in *Popiſh* Countries, and what they ſtill undergo; how many Thouſands of them have been Murder'd, and ſent to Heaven in a Fiery Chariot; and what Cruelties have been practis'd upon their Bodies, Eſtates, and innocent Children; that they have been harraſs'd with Dragoons, condemn'd to Impriſonment, and the Gallies; whereby their Lives have been render'd ſo miſerable, that a ſpeedy Death was much more deſirable: Theſe poor miſerable Wretches, who were guilty of no Crime but their Religion, would have look'd upon it as a peculiar Favour, to have underwent the worſt Sufferings the *Papiſts* are liable to amongſt the *Proteſtants*. Cruelty and Perſecution, meerly for Conſcience ſake, is contrary to the Spirit and Genius of the Goſpel of Love and Peace: But ſeditious Practices againſt the State, endeavours of ſubverting the Fundamental Laws of the Government, ſeducing Subjects from their Religion and Allegiance,

giance, are Crimes of so black and dangerous a nature, that they ought to be repressed by the Civil Magistrate, and if persevered in, severely punished. And such Crimes as these have been prov'd against those *Papists* who have suffer'd in *England*. And as for the *Test* and *Penal* Laws, 'tis but just and reasonable, that those who depend upon a Foreign Head, and have made over their Allegiance to another Government, should be excluded from having any share in ours.

And so little reason has *N. C.* to affirm, that the Protestant Religion is supported by Persecution of its Enemies, and by the Preferments in our Church; that it may with more Truth, be retorted upon the *Papists*, whose Religion permits them to accommodate themselves to all Humours and Capacities, to make use of pious Frauds, and notorious Impostures, *to silence such Truths as are not for their purpose*, and (if 'tis for the good of the Church) to conceal even the Profession of Christianity it self; So that from these, and many more such instances, 'tis very reasonable to conclude, That did the *Papists* but understand the Principles and Practices of their own Church, and was their Religion but set in a true Light before them, and they left at liberty to determine for themselves; that those who have Honesty and Judg-

ment

ment ſufficient to weigh and conſider things, would rather chuſe to be *Turks* and *Heathens*, than ſuch ſort of Chriſtians as the Church of *Rome* teaches Men to be.

---

## *Of the Invocation of Saints.*

THE *Invocation of Saints* is one of thoſe Idolatrous Practices which we charge upon the Church of *Rome*, whereby they fall in with the ſuperſtitious Uſages of Heathen *Rome*, who deify'd their deceas'd Princes and Benefactors; and therefore when the Archbiſhop treats of this Subject, 'tis no wonder that *he lays about him*, (as our Author tells us) *i. e.* takes a great deal of pains to convince his Hearers of the ſinfulneſs of this Practice, and how much they diſpleaſe God thereby, and hazard their eternal Salvation.

Of this *N. C.* ſeems to be ſenſible, and therefore he is wonderful cautious and wary in ſtating this Article of the *Popiſh* Faith. He tells us indeed from the Council of *Trent*, *That that which they hold to be of Faith, is, That the Saints, who reign with Jeſus Chriſt, offer up their Prayers for Men;*

*Men; that it is good and profitable to invocate them after an humble manner, and to have recourſe to their Prayers, Aid and Aſſiſtance, to obtain of God his Benefits, thro' our Lord Jeſus Chriſt his Son, our only Saviour and Redeemer.*

But *N. C.* adds, 'That tho' the Coun-'cil declares this to be the Faith of the 'Church concerning this Point, yet it 'does not command or oblige any of the '*Laity* to pray to the Saints, or invocate 'them; that 'tis not abſolutely neceſſary, 'and that the Church leaves every one at 'liberty to make uſe of it, or not: Nay, *p.* 230. he abſolutely denies the Matter of Fact, and would bear us down; That the *Papiſts* only commemorate the holy Apoſtles, the bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, and the Saints, in the publick Service of the Church; *but*, ſays he, *we do not put up any formal Prayers to them.* Certainly *N. C.*'s Book was deſign'd for the uſe of very *weak and ignorant* Perſons, or of ſuch *Romaniſts* as have an implicite Faith for all that the Guides of their Conſciences ſay; otherwiſe he could never imagine, that ſuch notorious Falſhoods, and evident Prevarications could paſs upon any intelligent Reader; for tho' the *Papiſts* give up themſelves to be led blindfold by their ſagacious and infallible Guides, yet we *Proteſtants* take the liberty to make uſe of our Senſes,

Senſes, and to weigh things in the Balance of unprejudic'd Reaſon, and are not willing to pin our Faith, and the Hopes of our Eternal Salvation, on the Sleeves of any Guide, tho' he pretends to never ſo much Infallibility. And therefore I ſhall take the Liberty to compare *N.* with *C.* and to conſider, whether 'tis poſſible to reconcile thoſe Inconſiſtencies he is guilty of; for certainly never any Man had a better Title to that Character of *Martial*,

*Nemo eſt tam prope, tam procúlque ſibi.*

Well then, *N. C.* tells us, that the Church of *Rome* doth not command or oblige any of the Laity to Pray to Saints; but doth not their Church command the Laity to join in their Publick Worſhip, and are not the Prayers of the Saints a Part of their Publick Worſhip? This he confeſſes, but tells us, 'That in the Pub-'lick and Solemn Service of the Church, '(excepting the Litanies of the Saints, 'which are read or ſung ſolemnly four 'times a Year; the General Confeſſion of 'Sins in the beginning of the Maſs, a few 'Hymns, Anthems, and Verſicles, read 'only once a Year) they put up no 'Prayers to Saints or Angels. What trifling is here? Would it not be more ingenuous and becoming an honeſt Man, to

tell the plain Truth, without *silencing any part of it?* Let me therefore ask him this Plain Question, Do not the *Papists* Pray to Saints? Yes, this he tells us in the beginning of this *Chapter*, tho' he denies it in the latter part of it. Doth not the Church oblige the Laity to be present at the Publick Worship? This he cannot deny. Are not these Prayers part of their Daily Service, and particularly the General Confession? this is evident. Nay is not this one of the Articles of their Creed, without the Belief whereof *none can be sav'd*, that the Saints ought to be invocated and worship'd? This is clear, beyond all Question. And if so, why should they endeavour to cover, what they cannot possibly conceal? Would it not be much better to confess the Truth, and reform their Liturgy, rather than to persist in such Practices as they themselves are asham'd of, especially if it shall appear, that this Practice is downright Idolatry? And this will be very evident, from those Discourses *His Grace* has made upon this Subject; and then *N. C.* must acknowledge, that he had good reason *to lay about him.*

Now to make Proof of this, I shall consider what *His Grace* has said on this Subject. And first, he quotes *Coloss.* 2. 18, 19. where the *Apostle* says, *Let no Man*

*Man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility and worſhipping of Angels, not holding the head.* Which Text is the more remarkable, becauſe the *Apoſtle* ſeems to have ſaid theſe Words, that he might meet with that plauſible, but irrational Excuſe of the *Papiſts*, of *Praying to Saints*; That they think it more decent to pray to Saints to offer up their *Prayers* to God, than to go to God directly: For as 'tis uſual to be introduc'd into the *Preſence* of Great *Princes* by ſome Favourite-Courtier, and inferior Subjects never approach the Throne, but by the Mediation of ſome Officer or Attendant; ſo they think it would be Inſolence, to offer up our *Prayers* and *Praiſes* directly to the Glorious Majeſty of GOD, without the intermediate Interceſſion of ſome Angel or Saint. This is an old, tho' plauſible Excuſe, and therefore the *Apoſtle* exhorts the *Coloſſians* not to be beguil'd thereby; and tells them that thoſe who under this Pretence of a Voluntary Humility, addreſs'd themſelves to Angels, ſhould loſe the Reward of their *Prayers*, (*i e.*) God would not hear them; and that they did not hold the Head, (*i.e.*) they acted contrary to one of the *Fundamental Principles* of the *Chriſtian Religion*; which teaches us to *Pray* to God alone, in the Name, and for the Sake of our Bleſſed Lord and Saviour, Jeſus Chriſt.

To this *N. C.* answers, 'That the Word '*Worship* is us'd in Scripture and in com-'mon Discourse, not only to signify the 'Supream Worship and Honour, we pay to 'Almighty God, but also all sort of Respect 'and Reverence done to Kings, Princes, and 'Persons of Condition. That of this we 'have many Examples in the Holy Scri-'pture; and not only so, but the very 'Word, which we use to signify the Su-'pream Worship due to God alone, is 'sometimes apply'd to Humane Affairs; 'the same Expression being us'd in *Latin* 'to *God* and our *Parents*, 'tis *colere Deum*, 'and *colere Parentes*; but translated dif-'ferently, to worship God, and to honour 'our Parents. So that the Scripture will 'afford us sufficient Grounds for Worship-'ping and Invocating not only God, 'Angels and Saints, but even common 'and ordinary Men.

This is true indeed, but nothing at all to the purpose; for 'tis certainly that Supream Honour and Worship which is due to God, which we *Protestants* say, and prove too, that the *Papists* give to Saints and Angels; or else 'tis a Worship so very like Divine Worship, that we know not how to distinguish between them. For 'tis evident, that they offer up to them the Sacrifice of Prayer and Thanksgiving; and that for this very Reason, because they look

look upon them to be Interceſſors between God and Man; a Worſhip which is only due to that ſole Mediator of the Second Covenant, our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt. And that the Words bear this Senſe, *Theodoret* tells us in his Comment upon them, who affirms, That we muſt ſend up our Thankſgivings to God and the Father, by Chriſt, and not by Angels. In which Words, the Worſhip of Angels by offering up our Thankſgivings and Prayers to them, is evidently decry'd, without any kind of truſting to their Merits, as *N.C.* would bear us in hand. For tho' the Church of *Rome* tells us of a Treaſury of the Merits of the Saints, which indeed is properly ſo call'd, becauſe it has brought an inexhauſtible Fund of Wealth into the *Pope*'s Coffers; yet I never heard of any Treaſury of the Merits of Angels, till *N. C.* diſcover'd it; or, if there was any ſuch, that it was deſign'd for any part of St. *Peter*'s Patrimony.

This is alſo evident from that Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, which enjoins, *That Chriſtians ought not to forſake the Church of God, and go away from it, and to Invocate Angels, and to make Conventicles, all which are forbidden. If therefore any be found giving himſelf to this ſecret Idolatry, let him be* Anathema *; becauſe he hath forſaken the Lord Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God, and is gone over to*

*Idolatry*. And that by this *ſecret Idolatry* in the Canon, is meant Prayer or Invocation of Angels, is plain from the Words of *Theodoret*, when he quotes this Canon, in his Comment on the Third of the *Coloſſians*, verſ. 17. where he tells them, *That becauſe ſeveral Hereticks did command Men to Worſhip Angels, he enjoins the contrary; that they ſhould adorn both their Words and Actions with the Memory of the Name of* Chriſt *their Lord; and ſend ye up* (ſaith he) *thankſgiving to God and the Father by him, and not by Angels.* And then ſpeaking of the Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, he adds; *Which in purſuance of this Rule, and being deſirous to Cure that Old Diſeaſe, made it a Law, that none ſhould Pray unto Angels, or forſake our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Which lets us into the true Meaning of that other Sentence which *N. C.* quotes from *Theodoret*; viz. *We do not addreſs our ſelves to the Saints as Gods, but we pray unto them as Divine Men, that they would pleaſe to be Interceſſors for us: i. e.* We deſire the Saints or holy Men, to intercede with God for us in this World; but we do not make Gods of them, by Praying to them after they are departed this Life. Theſe things being conſider'd, I think *His Grace* had Reaſon to *be warm*, (as *N. C.* expreſſes himſelf) when he diſcourſes on theſe Matters of ſo near Importance; and has made

made use of so much Argument, as well as Rhetorick, that *N.C.* will never be able to gainsay it; tho' he may go on to Prevaricate; for which, I pray God he may obtain Pardon in this World, lest it should be too late to ask it in the next.

*Secondly*, *His Grace* reasons thus: That 'tis evident from the nature and reason of the thing it self, that there can be but one *Mediator* and *Intercessor* in Heaven, who offers up our Prayers to God; because under the Gospel there being but one High-Priest, and but one Sacrifice once offer'd for Sin, and *Intercession* for Sinners being founded in the Merit and Virtue of the Sacrifice, by which expiation for Sin is made, there can be no other *Mediator of Intercession*, but he who hath made expiation of Sin by a Sacrifice offer'd to God for that purpose, and this *Jesus Christ* only hath done; he is both our High-Priest and our Sacrifice; and therefore he only, in the Merit and Virtue of that Sacrifice which he offer'd upon Earth, can intercede in Heaven for us, and offer up our Prayers to God, and procure the Acceptance of them; for that can only be done in virtue of a Sacrifice first offered, and by him that offered it, this being the peculiar Office and Qualification of a *Mediator* and *Intercessor*, properly so called. And this *His Grace* proves at large from the

Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, which ſeems chiefly deſign'd to make good this Truth.

To this *N. C.* replies, and acknowledges, 'That 'tis true, that *Chriſt* only has a right 'and title to *mediate* and *intercede* for us, 'becauſe he alone paid the Ranſom and 'full value of our Sins, and therefore 'may in Juſtice ask of his Father to for-'give us; but tells us, that we ought to 'diſtinguiſh between an *Interceſſion* found-'ed in Juſtice and Equity, and an *Inter-'ceſſion* founded only in Favour and Good-'will, (*i. e.* if I underſtand him right,) that tho' *Jeſus Chriſt* alone has received Power and Authority to obtain of God the Remiſſion of our Sins by virtue of his Merits, yet the Saints and Angels, out of their great Love to Mankind, may entreat and beſeech him to do the ſame, and are permitted by God ſo to do.

But ſince this *Interceſſion* is founded neither in Juſtice nor Equity, but in meer Favour, therefore 'tis but reaſonable that there ſhould be ſome plain Revelation to confirm us in the belief, and engage us to apply our ſelves to the Practice of it: For till God has told us ſo, we have no reaſon to conclude, that God will confer this Favour upon Saints and Angels, eſpecially ſince he is not oblig'd either in Juſtice or Equity ſo to do. God has confer'd this Honour upon his only be-

begotten Son, and made him the only *Mediator* between Mankind and Himſelf; he ſent him into the World for this very purpoſe; and our Saviour was pleaſed to take upon himſelf our Nature, that he might be capable of this Mediatorial Office; and, why ſhould we think that God will make Saints and Angels Partners with him, or give this Honour to any other? Has he given us any intimation of this in the Holy Scriptures? or, Has he any where enjoined us to addreſs our ſelves to thoſe inferior Deities? or, Have we the leaſt hint of any ſuch Practice in the Firſt Ages of the Church? or, Is not our Bleſſed Saviour ſufficient to hear all our Prayers, to retain the Senſe of all our Wants, and to offer up to his Father all our Petitions and Thankſgivings? This *N. C.* was ſenſible of, and therefore he owns, that the Saints and Angels cannot be term'd *Mediators* and *Interceſſors* in the ſame Senſe in which *Chriſt* is our *Mediator*; but they are call'd ſo in a lower and improper ſenſe, becauſe they pray to God for us.

But this Anſwer is very much beſides the purpoſe; for *His Grace* doth not blame the *Papiſts* for making the Saints *Interceſſors* in this improper Senſe, *i. e.* by praying for us, but becauſe they would have them to be ſo in a true

true and proper Sense, and hereby intrench upon Christ's Mediatorial Office, who alone has undertaken to offer up our Prayers and Praises unto God, and by virtue of his own Merits, to render them acceptable unto him. And therefore we have no reason to take *N. C.*'s word, when he tells us, 'That whether the Archbishop calls them *Intercessors* in a proper 'or improper Sense, 'tis all one to him, 'since *His Grace* acknowledges, they do 'pray for us, and *intercede* with God in 'our behalf, he is satisfied, for he is sure 'the *Papists* desire no more of us. What, no more than our Brethren upon Earth can do? They can pray to God for us, and *intercede* on our behalf, but they cannot offer up our Prayers to God, and procure the Acceptance of them: But this, and more, the *Papists* require of the Saints. And therefore,

*Thirdly*, The Archbishop had good reason to find fault with the Bishop of *Meaux*'s Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Romish* Church, when he tells us, *That they pray to the Saints in Heaven, in the same order of Brotherly Society with which we entreat our Brethren upon Earth to pray for us.* For this is not a true Representation of their Doctrine, as will appear from these following Considerations.

1. Be-

1. Becauſe they pray to the Angels and Saints in Heaven, with the ſame ſolemn Circumſtances of Religious Worſhip, that they pray to God himſelf.

2. That in their Prayers and Thankſgivings, they join the Angels, and the Bleſſed *Virgin*, and the Saints, together, with God and Chriſt.

3. That in the Creed of Pope *Pius* IV. it is expreſly ſaid, *That the Saints which reign with Chriſt, are to be worſhipp'd and Invocated.*

4. That in the Publick Offices of the *Romiſh* Church, they do not only pray to the Saints to pray for them, but they direct their Prayers and Thankſgivings immediately unto them, for all thoſe Bleſſings and Benefits which they ask of God, and thank him for.

To which *N. C.* replies, 'That there ne-'ver was a Book more univerſally com-'mended and approved in the *Latin* 'Church, than the Biſhop of *Meaux*'s Ex-'poſition of the Doctrine of the Catholick 'Church, that the *Pope*, and *Cardinals*, 'and *Conſiſtory*, approved of it, *&c.* So 'that to ſay, this Expoſition is not a true 'Repreſentation of the Doctrine and Pra-'ctice of the *Roman Catholick Church* in this 'matter, is as unreaſonable in it ſelf, as it is 'injurious to that Great and Learned Pre-'late, and to the whole *Catholick Church*, 'which hath approved it. This

This is so high an Encomium of the Bishop of *Meaux* (who is certainly a very deserving Person) that Infallibility it self could not lay claim to a greater; and 'tis a thousand pities this Learned Prelate was not chosen *Pope*, that the *Papists* themselves at least might have had an Infallible Judge to determine all those Controversies, which abound amongst them, and to mollifie their hard Tenents to a sense as near as possible to the *Protestant Faith*. We should be very willing to take him at his word, and the *Popish Faith* upon his credit, if we had good reason to believe it would pass current; but 'tis very suspicious, that those who are very good *Catholicks* in *Protestant Countries*, according to the Bishop of *Meaux*'s Exposition, would in some *Popish Countries* be burn'd for Hereticks.

But whatever Opinion *N. C.* may have of the Bishop of *Meaux*, yet there are others who think, that at least in this particular, *Bellarmine* understood the Doctrine of the *Romish Church* as well as he: And from this Great Champion of the *Romish Cause*, we may learn, That the Saints which reign with *Christ* in Heaven, are Gods by Participation, (*i. e.* a sort of inferior Deities, such as the Heathens suppos'd their Mediators to be,) and that therefore we may flee to their Aid and

and Help, as well as to their *Interceſſion* and *Prayers*. Upon which, *His Grace* makes this Reflection, 'That certainly, 'either *Bellarmine* hath raiſed the Saints 'in Heaven too high, when he makes 'them Gods by Participation; or the 'Biſhop of *Meaux* hath ſunk them too 'low, when he thinks they are to be 'treated and addreſs'd to, *in the ſame or-'der of Brotherly Society* with mortal Men 'here upon Earth. But to come to the matter in hand:

*Firſt*, The Archbiſhop proves, that the Biſhop of *Meaux* miſrepreſents the Doctrine of the *Romiſh Church*; becauſe the *Papiſts* pray to Saints and Angels in Heaven, with the ſame ſolemn Circumſtances of Religious Worſhip, that they pray to God himſelf, in the ſame Place, and the ſame humble Poſture, and in the ſame religious Offices and Services, in which they pray to God, which is never done by any to their Brethren upon Earth.

To which *N. C.* replies, 'That the '*Papiſts* addreſs no Prayers to Saints or 'Angels in the Publick Service of the 'Church, but that all their Prayers are 'directed to God only; and as to their 'Poſture in the Church, or at their pri-'vate Devotions, whether kneeling, or 'ſtanding, or bowing, they declare their 'intention is to adore God alone, and

'none

'none else. Which is so grosly and so evidently false, that I shall not mistrust my Reader's Judgment so far, as to imagine he can be in any danger of being impos'd upon thereby: For 'tis evident, that they do not only address themselves to Saints and Angels in their Religious Worship; but also that

2. They join the Angels, and the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints together, with God and Christ in their Prayers and Thanksgivings, as if (to use their own Phrase) *it were in the same order of Brotherly Society*, and as if they were all equally the Objects of our Invocation and Praise; nay, they do not only in their Publick Offices join the Blessed *Virgin*, with God and our Saviour, but sometimes put her before her Son, and say, *Let Mary and her Son bless us*; and nothing is more frequent in their eminent Writers, than to join them together in their Doxologies and Thanksgivings, *Glory be to God, and the Blessed Virgin, and Jesus Christ*, says *Gregory de Valentia*. And *Bellarmine* himself concludes his Disputations concerning the Worship of Saints, in these very words, *Praise be to God, and to the Blessed Virgin Mother* Mary, *likewise to Jesus Christ, the eternal Son of the eternal Father, be Praise and Glory*. And in the very *Roman Missal* it self, they make

 Con-

Confeſſion of their Sins, to God Almighty; and the Bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, to St. *Michael* the Archangel, and to all the Saints. And in their Abſolution, they join together the Paſſion of our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*, and the Merits of the Bleſſed *Virgin*, and of all the Saints, for the Remiſſion of Sins.

To which *N. C.* replies, 'That 'tis true 'the *Papiſts* do join God and the Saints 'together in the ſame breath, and that 'they are taught by the Holy Scriptures 'ſo to do; of which he gives us ſeveral Inſtances, as 1 *Kings*, 12. 18. *The people greatly feared the Lord, and Samuel.* Acts, 15. 18. *It ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt, and to us.* 1 Tim. 5. 21. *I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the elect Angels.* Rev. 1. St. *John* writes to the Seven Churches in *Aſia*; *Grace be unto you, and peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the ſeven Spirits, which are before his throne; and from Jeſus Chriſt.* 1 Chron. 29. 20. *The congregation bleſſed the Lord God of their fathers; and bowing their heads, worſhip'd the Lord and the King.*

But none of theſe Inſtances come up to the Point; for the Archbiſhop doth not blame them only for joining God and the Saints together in the ſame Breath, for there is no harm in this; but becauſe they

make

make God and the Saints Joint-Objects of Divine Worſhip: They do not only mention their Names, and bow down to them at the ſame time, but they pray unto them for the ſame things, and addreſs themſelves to them in the very ſame manner. So that there is no means to diſtinguiſh the Worſhip of one from the other. And as for the laſt Inſtance, 'tis not evident from the Text, that they *bowed down to God and the King* at the ſame time; for in the *verſe* before, the King commanded the People to bow down to God, which they did; and then made their Obeiſance to the King: And from thence can only be concluded, that the ſame Word is applied to both Acts, tho' with different Degrees of Honour. And now let me put *N.C.* in mind, that the *Romiſh* Church in general, and himſelf in particular, has very great need to take back again the good Counſel he gives to the Archbiſhop; and to weigh and conſider well, what ſort of Worſhip they offer up to God; 'and not to exhi-'bit ſuch Ridiculous Scenes, (to uſe his 'own Words) as make the Religion of '*Jeſus Chriſt*, a Theatre of Laughter and 'Sport: For, *God will not be mocked.*

3. In the *Creed* of Pope *Pius* IV. 'tis expreſly ſaid, *That the Saints which reign together with Chriſt, are to be worſhip'd and invo-*

*invocated*; but this they will not allow to be done to our Brethren upon Earth.

But *N. C.* is positive, That *this is only to be understoood in the same Order of Brotherly Society, in which we worship and reverence our holy Brethren on Earth, upon account of their Piety and Virtue, and in which we intreat them to Pray for us.* But if so, why doth he not give us the Reason why the Council of *Trent* grounds the Invocation of Saints, upon their Reigning with Christ in Heaven? For this shews, that this *Worship* and *Invocation* of *Saints* must necessarily be something more; for otherwise this Reason would be frivolous, if the same thing may be done to our Brethren upon Earth. Nay this Council admonishes us, *ad eorum Orationes, Opem, Auxiliumque confugere*; to fly to their Prayers, Aid, and Help: And in the *Catechism* which was made by Order of that Council, we are taught, That 'tis lawful to ask of the Saints, that they would have Mercy upon us; and the Reason is given, because they are very Merciful. And if so, where lies the difference between their Prayers to God, and to the Saints? If 'tis neither in the Matter of them, nor in the Form, nor in the Reason of them: If we Pray to them for the same Thing, and in the same Form, *Have mercy upon us*; and our

Prayers to the Saints be grounded on the ſame Reaſon, that our Prayers to God are, namely, becauſe they are Merciful. Where then is the Difference between them?

Let us conſult the Publick Offices of the Church of *Rome*, and we ſhall find, that they do not only *Pray to the Saints, to Pray for them*; but they direct their Prayers and Thankſgivings immediately to them, for all thoſe Bleſſings and Benefits which they ask of God, and thank him for.

To which *N. C.* anſwers, by denying the Matter of Fact; and fixes it as an indelible Mark of Inſincerity on the Archbiſhop; that he affirms it, and endeavours by Foul Play (as he calls it) to uphold a ſinking Cauſe: Nay he challenges any Man to find ſo much as one ſingle Prayer, either in the *Miſſal* or *Breviary*, which is directed to Angel or Saint, for all thoſe Benefits and Bleſſings which we ask of of God, and thank him for: And ſays, That that Prayer to the Angels which *His Grace* inſtances in; *viz. Deliver us, we beſeech you, by your Command, from all our Sins*, is not to be found in the Publick Office of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, annex'd to the *Breviary*.

But all this is but quibling and banter. For doth not he himſelf confeſs in two or three places of this very *Chapter*, that in the

the Litany of the Saints, and in the General Confeſſion they do pray to Saints? Do they not pray to St. *Michael*, *Holy Michael, defend us in Battel, that we periſh not in the dreadful Judgment?* And as for that particular Paſſage the Archbiſhop quotes, he cannot deny that 'tis in the Office of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, tho' he doth not find it in that Office annex'd to the *Breviary*. And here I cannot but ſtand amazed at the Inſincerity of the *Popiſh Prieſts*; Inſincerity ſhall I call it; 'tis a *hard Word* indeed, but not hard enough for thoſe who would bear us in hand, that they do not Pray to Saints and Angels; and that only (as they would have it) they deſire them to pray for them; when not only their Private Forms of Devotion are ſtuff'd with ſuch Blaſphemous Expreſſions, as would make one's Ears tingle to hear them, (and yet they do not uſe any Means to ſuppreſs them:) but alſo their Publick and approv'd Forms of Prayer abound with many Inſtances, of direct Invocation both of Saints and Angels. For is there not in the very *Breviary* itſelf, reſtor'd according to the Council of *Trent*, and authoriz'd by three ſeveral *Popes*, in the Feaſt of the *Aſſumption* of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, theſe Words: *Vouchſafe to let me praiſe thee*, O Holy Virgin, *and give me Strength againſt my Enemies?* Is

ſhe not intreated, *To looſe the Bands of the Guilty, to give Light to the Blind, to drive away our Evils, and to ſhew herſelf to be a Mother?* Or, as it is in the *Maſs-Book*, Printed at *Paris*, 1634. *By the Authority of a Mother, command the Redeemer:*

O fœlix Puerpera,
Noſtra pians Scelera,
Jure Matris impera
Redemptori.

Which I find thus rendred into *Engliſh:*

*Sweet Lady, Mother of the Son,*
*Who hath all our Sins foredone;*
*Out of thy Mother's power, we pray thee,*
*Command thy Son for to obey thee.*

This certainly is not *to pray to her, to pray to God for us*; but to pray her to order and command him what he ſhall do for us. In a word, they pray to her for *Purity of Life, and a ſafe Conduct to Heaven.* And in the Feaſt of St. *Maria de Nives*; *To help the Miſerable, to ſtrengthen the Weak, to comfort thoſe that Mourn, and that all who celebrate her holy Feſtivity, may feel her Aſſiſtance.* Thus in the *Hymn* to the *Holy Apoſtles*, they beſeech them, *To command the Guilty to be looſed from their Guilt, to heal unſound Minds, and to increaſe their*

*their Virtues; that when* Christ *shall come, they may be Partakers of Eternal Glory.* Nay they make the Virgin *Mary* to be much more merciful than our Redemer himself; for thus prays Pope *Innocent* III. in the *Hymn* of *Christ* and the *Virgin:*

*Precor te, Regina Cœli,*
*Me habeto excusatum,*
*Apud Christum tuum gnatum;*
*Cujus iram pertimesco,*
*Et furorem expavesco.*

These Instances may suffice, for the present, only for a Taste of the *Sincerity* of these Guides; who would bear us down, and think it a strange thing, that we will not believe them, and take their bare Words for it; That the Church of *Rome* doth not require of any one, nor practise any more, than *to Pray to the Saints, to Pray for them.* But suppose this was so, yet,

4. The Archbishop urges, That thus to Pray to the Saints at all Times, in all Places, and for all sorts of Blessings; doth suppose them to have the Incommunicable Perfections of the Divine Nature inherent in them, or imparted to them; *viz* Omnipotence, Omniscience, and Omnipresence.

In this Argument, *N. C.* confeſſes there is great Difficulty, and that he muſt be at ſome Pains to anſwer it; and I think ſo too, and that he muſt take a great deal more Pains than he has done in the former Part of his Book, to effect it.

Well then, in order to do this, he lays down theſe Grounds.

*Firſt*, That Saints and Angels can underſtand our Thoughts and Prayers at the greateſt diſtance, as well as if they were preſent with us; and that being Pure Minds, there is requir'd no proximity of Place, to converſe with us.

*Secondly*, That God Almighty is able to reveal in an inſtant all the Deſires of our Hearts, and Prayers to them.

And be but ſo good natur'd, as to give him theſe Conceſſions to ſet his Foot upon, and then he will ſoon move this Weighty Argument, which otherwiſe I fear will be too hard for him.

For how doth it appear, that Saints and Angels underſtand the Thoughts of our Hearts, and the Deſires of our Souls? I am ſure the Holy Scripture tells us, that God alone is the Searcher of the Heart; and if ſo, how can they know them at a diſtance? But much more difficult will it be to explain, how they can diſcern the Thoughts of a thouſand Perſons, in different Places, at the ſame Time, without

out partaking of that Omniſcience, which is an Incommunicable Attribute of the Divine Nature.

But being beat from this Hold, I ſuppoſe he will ſay; 'That tho' the Saints cannot hear all our Prayers, yet God can reveal them to whom he pleaſes; and then there will be no neceſſity, that we ſhould attribute the Divine Perfections to them.

But not to diſpute what God can do, where doth *N. C.* give us ſo much as the ſhadow of a Reaſon to prove that he will do ſo? Nay 'tis highly probable that he never deſign'd it; becauſe he has conſtituted a Mediator on purpoſe, to receive our Prayers, and to make them an acceptable Sacrifice unto him, thro' his Merits and Mediation. And as *His Grace* reaſons, 'If 'the Saints muſt have a Revelation from 'God of our Prayers, before they know 'what we pray to them for; then the 'ſhorteſt and ſureſt way is to pray to God, 'and not to them: Or however, (as '*Bellarmine* confeſſes) it were very fit to 'pray to God, before every Prayer we 'make to the Saints, that he would be 'pleas'd to reveal that Prayer to them; 'that upon this Signal and Notice 'given them by God, they may betake 'themſelves to pray to *God* for us. But unleſs 'it were very clear from Scripture, that 'God had appointed this Method; it is in

'Reaſon ſuch a way about, as no Man 'would take that could help it: And it 'ſeems to me, to little purpoſe: For 'why ſhould not a Man think God as 'ready to grant him all his other Requeſts, 'without the *Mediation* and *Interceſſion* 'of Saints, as this one Requeſt of reveal-'ing our Prayers and Wants to them? 'And, if this way be not thought ſo con-'venient, I know but one more, and that 'is, to pray to the Saints to go to God, 'and beg of him that he would be pleas'd 'to reveal to them our Supplications and 'Wants, that they may know what to pray 'to him for in our behalf, which is juſt 'ſuch a wiſe courſe, as if a Man ſhould 'write a Letter to his Friend that cannot 'read, and in a Poſtſcript deſire him, that 'as ſoon as he had receiv'd it, he would 'carry it to one who could read, and in-'treat him to read it to him.

*Laſtly*, To addreſs our ſelves to Saints and Angels, is to be guilty of the ſame *Idolatry* the *Heathens* were, who worſhip'd God by innumerable Mediators, by Angels, and the Souls of their departed Princes and Heroes.

To this *N. C.* anſwers, 'That in order 'to remove this Difficulty, we ought to 'take a view both of the Character and 'Worſhip which the *Heathens* gave to their '*Pagan* Saints, and ſee whether upon the

'Com-

'Compariſon, the *Chriſtian* Saints be in 'any thing by us treated like them.

*Firſt*, As to their Character, *N. C.* tells us, 'That the *Heathens* gave theſe Saints 'the Attributes of the Supream Being, 'that they were guilty of all manner of 'Lewdneſs, Intemperance, and Debauche-'ry: But the *Chriſtian* Saints are of ano-'ther Complexion; The *Papiſts* (he ſays) 'give them none of the Attributes of the 'true God, that they were the Inſtruments 'of God in working Miracles, and that 'all their Sufficiency is from God; and 'that as to their Lives, they were holy 'and pure, which makes their Character 'as different from the *Pagan* Saints, as 'white is from black.

*Secondly*, As to their Worſhip; 'The '*Heathens* worſhip'd their Gods, or *Pa-'gan* Saints upon a falſe pretence of their 'Power and Greatneſs in Heaven; where-'as there were no ſuch Saints. But we ho-'nour and reſpect the *Chriſtian* Saints, be-'cauſe we are warranted by the Word of 'God, that they are ſuch as we repreſent 'them. The *Heathens* erected Altars to 'their Gods; but we make Altars for 'none, but one God only. They offer'd 'Sacrifice to all their Gods and Saints, 'which is the chief Mark of Supream 'Worſhip; but we offer Sacrifice only to 'the true and living God, as Malice it

'ſelf

'ſelf cannot deny. They made Idols, 'and believ'd that their Gods came and 'dwelt in them; but we only put up in 'our Churches the Images and Pictures of '*Jeſus Chriſt* the living God, and of ſuch 'as we are ſure are truly Saints, but do not 'worſhip them for their own ſakes, or be-'lieve there is any Divinity in them, but 'that the Reſpect which we ſhew them is 'to be referr'd to the Originals, namely, '*Chriſt* and his Saints. So that upon the 'whole, the Doctor might as well reſem-'ble Sea to dry Land, as the Worſhip we 'give to *Chriſtian* Saints, to that which 'the *Heathen* paid to their Heroes or 'Saints, as the Doctor calls them.

This is what *N. C.* ſays in defence, or rather to palliate that Idolatrous Worſhip which the *Church* of *Rome* gives to Angels and Saints; and yet, after all he has ſaid to this purpoſe, if we will take the pains to conſider it, we ſhall find, that one Egg is not more like another, than the *Popiſh* Saints are to the *Heathen*, as has been made out beyond Contradiction, by ſeveral of our Learned *Proteſtant* Writers. 'Twould be too long and tedious a task to draw an exact Parallel between them; and therefore I ſhall only make a few plain Remarks on what *N. C.* has ſaid, which may be of uſe to the leſs curious Reader; referring the Inquiſitive, for farther

ther ſatisfaction, to thoſe juſt Treatiſes which have been publiſh'd on this Subject.

And, *Firſt*, *N. C.* tells us, 'That the 'Heathen gave their Saints the Attributes 'of the Supream Being; but the *Papiſts* 'do not impute to their Saints any of the 'Attributes of the true God.

What he means by the *Heathens* giving their Saints the Attributes of the Supream Being, I cannot well tell; and indeed, there is ſuch an impropriety of Expreſſion runs thro' the whole Diſcourſe, that (unleſs *N. C.* is a Foreigner) 'tis unpardonable in one who pretends to ſo much Reading and Learning, which I the rather remark, becauſe I have been frequently oblig'd to tranſcribe his very words. But I ſuppoſe, by the *Heathens* giving their Saints the Attributes of the Supream Being, he muſt mean, That tho' the *Heathens* did generally believe that there was one Supream Being, yet they attributed to their inferiour Deities, or *Pagan* Saints, thoſe Divine Perfections (ſuch as Omnipotency, Omniſcience and Omnipreſence) which were the incommunicable Attributes of God: But the *Papiſts* do not think their Saints have any of thoſe inherent Perfections, but derive all their Power and Sufficiency from God.

But,

But, *First*, 'tis evident, That tho' the *Heathens* did worship the Sun, Moon, and Stars, their Heroe's and Benefactors, and departed Princes, as an inferior sort of Deities, yet do we not find that they attributed to them those Divine Perfections which were originally inherent in the Supream Being. They worship'd the Host of Heaven, supposing the Stars to be animated with Divine Understandings; and they look'd upon the Planets as Mediators between God and Men; and that they were all inhabited by such spiritual Intelligences, as were of a middle nature between the uncreated and created Beings: And as for their Heroes and deceas'd Princes, they acknowledged them to have been mortal Men, who for the Benefits they did Mankind, and for their Wisdom, were made immortal Deities, who had the Government of this lower World committed to them. And as they were inferior in their Nature to the Supream Being, so those Perfections, they were possess'd of, were of a lower Kind, and only Streams deriv'd from this Fountain.

And just such sort of Beings do the *Papists* hold their Saints to be; an inferior sort of Deities to whom the Supream Being communicates the Transactions of this lower World, and gives them Power and Efficacy

Efficacy to help those who pray unto them, and devoutly worship them.

*Secondly*, *N. C.* says, 'That the *Hea-* 'then Saints were guilty of all kinds of 'Licentiousness and Debauchery, but the 'Christian Saints are pure and holy Beings, 'Men who laid down their Lives for the 'Truth of the Christian Religion.

But this is nothing to the purpose; for the Charge of Idolatry will lie upon every one who pays Divine Worship to a created Being, tho' never so good, tho' the most perfect Saint, or the most glorious Archangel; for the Question is not concerning the Quality of the Object of our Worship, but whether our Worship is suitable to its Object?

And as for the *Romish* Saints, 'tis certain, that they were not all endow'd with those good Qualities *N. C.* so much glories in; some of those whom the *Pope* has thought fit to make Saints, were not the best of Men, as *Thomas Becket*, and *James Clement*, and *Ignatius Loyola* himself. Several of their Saints are very probably thought to have been only the Product of some Poet, or Painter's luxuriant Fancy; as *Time* is painted like an Old Man wing'd with a Scythe, and *Justice* with a pair of Scales: So St. *Christopher* and St. *Margaret* were only Hieroglyphical Representations of the different State

of

of *Chriſtians* in this World; the one being only the Repreſentation of a *Chriſtian* paſſing over a Land-flood, carrying *Jeſus Chriſt* on his Back, who did burthen him, but yet conducted him; the other of a Woman attack'd by the Devil, but gaining the Victory, and trampling him under her Feet. And generally of all their Saints, there are ſuch fulſome Stories told, ſo inconſiſtent with any ſhew of Truth, as are ſufficient to diſparage thoſe which are beſt atteſted; and tho' the bare rehearſing them would ſeem too light and ludicrous in a ſerious Diſcourſe amongſt *Proteſtants*, yet are they firmly believ'd in *Popiſh* Countries.

But, *Thirdly*, *N. C.* tells us, 'That there 'is a great Difference as to the Worſhip of 'them; the *Heathen* Saints were worſhip'd 'upon account of their Power in Heaven 'who never were there. And may not this be ſaid of ſeveral of the *Popiſh* Saints too? The *Heathens* erected Altars, and offered Sacrifice to their Saints; and do not the *Papiſts* do ſo too? Do they not offer up unto them the Sacrifices of Prayer and Thankſgiving, which certainly are more acceptable to the Supream Being than any other Sacrifices can be? The Devotion of our Hearts muſt needs be a more precious Offering than any outward Sacri-'; and therefore St. *Auſtin* ſpeaking of

 the

the Sacrifice due to God, makes our Hearts the Altar, and Chriſt our Prieſt, and our Prayers and Praiſes offer'd up to God by a fervent Charity, to be a true Sacrifice. So that (to uſe the Words of a Learned Prelate,) 'tis evident, That on the ſame account that the *Heathens* did give Divine Honour to their inferior Deities, thoſe in the Church of *Rome* do ſo to Angels and Saints: For the *Heathens* made a difference between their Sacrifices to the Supream God, and to their inferior Deities and Heroes; ſo that if the putting any difference in the way of Religious Worſhip doth excuſe the one, it muſt do the other alſo. Did the *Heathen* uſe ſolemn Ceremonies of making any capable of Divine Worſhip? So does the Church of *Rome*. Did they ſet up their Images in Publick Places of Worſhip, and kneel before them, and invocate thoſe repreſented by them? So does the *Roman* Church. Did they conſecrate Temples, and erect Altars to them, and keep Feſtivals, and burn Incenſe before them? So does the *Roman* Church. *Laſtly*, Did they offer up Sacrifices in in thoſe Temples, to the Honour of their leſſer Deities and Heroes? So does the *Roman* Church. For *Bellarmine* reckoning up the Honours belonging to canonized Saints, beſides thoſe before-mentioned,

tioned, reckons up this as one, That the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, and of Lauds and Prayers are publickly offer'd to God, *for their Honour.*

*Lastly*, *N.C.* says, they do not call the Saints Gods; but this is nothing to the purpose; for if they worship them as such, if they offer up to them their Sacrifices, Prayers, and Praises, they do much more. For the Name of God is attributed in Scripture, to those who were no Gods; but the Worship of God cannot be given to any Created Being, without being guilty of the same Idolatry the Heathens formerly were; and I think this is very evident, from what has been already said.

I shall close up this *Chapter* with that Remark, which *His Grace* makes at the end of the Third *Sermon* of the Second *Volume*, Publish'd *post Ob.* That this Practice of Praying to Saints was first Establish'd about the Eighth Century; at the same time with the Worship of Images, and when the first Foundation of Transubstantiation was laid: And as they began at the same time, so it is very fit, and 'twould conduce very much to the good of the Church, if they were taken away together.

*Of*

# *Of IMAGES.*

THERE were two ſorts of *Idolatry* the *Heathens* were guilty of, both of which we charge upon the Church of *Rome*. *Firſt*, That they give that Divine Worſhip to Saints and Angels, which ought to be given to God alone. *Secondly*, That they worſhip the true God by viſible Symbols and Repreſentations, ſuch as *Images* are. The firſt I have treated of in the former *Chapter*, the other I ſhall make the Subject of my preſent Enquiry.

Now *N. C.* tells us, that the Council of *Trent* declares, *That the Images of* Chriſt, *of the* Virgin-Mother *of God*, *and of all other* Saints *are to be had, and kept, eſpecially in Churches, and that due Honour and Reſpect is to be given them: Not that we believe any Virtue or Divinity to be in them, for which they ought to be worſhip'd; or that we ſhould ask any thing of them; or put any truſt or confidence in them, as was formerly done by the Gentiles, who put truſt in Idols; but becauſe the Honour due them, is refer'd to the Originals, which they repreſent. So that by thoſe Images which we kiſs, and before which we uncover our Heads, and bow down,*

*we adore* Christ, *and reverence the* Saints, *whose likeneß they bear.*

This is that State of the Case the Council of *Trent* has given us, tho' a very confus'd and partial one: For it only declares, that we must give *due Honour* to the Images of Christ and the Saints, but what that *due Honour* is, it doth not determine; nor doth it distinguish between that Honour which is to be given to the Image of God, and that which is to be given to the Image of the Saints; or whether both alike: These were some parts of the Truth, which the Council thought fit to *silence*; and are Difficulties so abstruse, that they could not be determin'd by Infallibility itself; and yet 'till they are determin'd, the Decree of the Council about the Worship of Images, is insignificant, and to no purpose.

However taking this Doctrine in the gross, we have one Plain and General Argument against Worshipping of Images; because (as *His Grace* tells us) this Doctrine is as point-blank against the second Commandment, as a deliberate and malicious killing of a Man, is against the sixth.

To which *N. C.* replies; 'That if 'he means by Worship, to give the 'Supream Worship and Adoration to Ima'ges, which is due only to God, he is

very

'very much in the right, and I hope he ſhall 'never be contradicted by me. But if he un- 'derſtands by *Worſhip*, to give *Images* that 'Honour and *Reſpect* which is due to things, 'that repreſent *Jeſus Chriſt* and his Saints, 'he is contradicted by Scripture, by all An- 'tiquity, and even by his own Church. So that he would have us believe, that the *Papiſts* do not give any Divine Worſhip at all to Images, but only that Honour and Reſpect which is due to things which repreſent *Jeſus Chriſt* and his Saints.

But that this is a falſe Repreſentation of the Practice of the *Papiſts*, will become very plain, by conſidering,

*Firſt*, That the *Papiſts* do not only make Images of the Saints, and *Jeſus Chriſt*, as Man, but of God himſelf; and this *N. C.* tells us in plain terms: *We*, ſays he, *make only the Images and Pictures of the true God, and the Saints*, Pag. 265. and this is ſo commonly practis'd, that they do not only place them at the beginning of their Bibles, but they hang them up for Signs, at their Doors and Inns; ſo that I have heard of ſome who travel'd in *Italy*, that they have lodg'd at the *Trinity*, and ſet their Horſes at *God's Head*: This is a Practice ſo ridiculouſly prophane, that one would not mention it, were it not to ſhame them out of their Impieties.

*2ly*, They give the ſame Worſhip to the Images, as they do to thoſe things which

thoſe Images repreſent, and therefore to the Image of God they muſt give Supream Worſhip and Adoration. For ſince (as they tell us) the Worſhip they give to Images, doth not terminate in the Image, but in that thing of which the Image is only the Repreſentation; and as the Council of *Trent* ſays, *The Honour done to them, refers to the Original they repreſent; and that by bowing down and worſhipping them, they adore Chriſt and God.* Therefore they muſt give to the Images of *God* and *Jeſus Chriſt*, Supream Worſhip and Adoration.

But, ſay the *Papiſts*, 'We do not give 'this Divine Worſhip to theſe Images, '(which are only Stocks and Stones, the 'Work of Men's Hands) as the Heathen 'did; but we give Divine Worſhip unto 'God, by and in theſe Images; we pre-'ſtrate our ſelves indeed before them, 'but God alone is the ultimate Object of 'our Worſhip.

But pray let me ask *N. C.* one Queſtion or two: Do they give any Worſhip or Honour to the Image itſelf, by which God is repreſented? And if ſo, Is it that Worſhip which is due to God, or an Inferior ſort of Worſhip? An Inferior ſort of Worſhip it cannot be; becauſe the Council of *Trent* tells us, That all Honour done to Images, is refer'd to the Original which they

they repreſent; and therefore ſince theſe Images repreſent God, the Supream Worſhip due to God, is by them given to theſe Stocks and Stones, as they tell us the *Heathens* formerly did, which is the groſſeſt Idolatry in the World.

This, I think, doth naturally follow from thoſe Principles which the *Papiſts* make Profeſſion of. But however, ſince they generally diſclaim the Paying of any Divine Worſhip to the Images themſelves, we will in Charity grant them ſo much, and admit their Plea: That they only Worſhip God in, by, or thro' thoſe Images and Repreſentations which they make of his Divine Being. But yet this being admitted, it will do them very little Service. For 'tis evident, That this Worſhipping of God in, by, or thro' any Viſible Repreſentation, is directly contrary to the Second Commandment.

Now the Commandment itſelf is very plain in this Matter; and ſo plain, that we can hardly imagine how it could be ſet down in more intelligible and expreſs Terms. Yet to put it out of all Queſtion, *Moſes* himſelf gives this Explanation of it; Levit. 26. 1. *For*, ſays he, *you ſhall not make you any Idol or graven Image, neither rear up a ſtanding Image; neither ſhall ye ſet up any Image of Stone in your Land, to bow down to it; for I am the Lord your God.*

To which the *Papists* reply, 'That the 'Word translated * *Image*, ought to be ren-'der'd *Idol*; and that 'tis translated by the '*Seventy*, by a † Word of the same Signifi-'cation; and that then this Command-'ment will be levell'd against the idola-'trous Practices of the *Heathens*, who 'worship'd the Images themselves, and 'not against those *Christians* who only 'worship God by and thro' them.

But this Shift will be of no use to them, because 'tis plain, that the Word which in this Commandment is translated *Image*, in the proper signification of it, doth de-note any * Image which is carv'd, or cut out of Wood or Stone; and thus 'tis generally render'd by the LXX, at least forty times; and but thrice otherwise. And as for this particular place, 'tis evi-dent it ought to be render'd *Image* here, because 'tis explain'd by a † Word that follows, which signifies any likeness or similitude whatsoever. We are forbid not only the making *graven Images*, but also *the likeness of any thing*, &c.

But farther, That this is the true Sense of the Commandment, will appear from the Reason which is given of this Law, which the Scripture informs us was de-riv'd from God's spiritual and incom-

* Pesel. † Eἰδωλον. * Γλυπτὸν. † Themuna.

pre-

prehenſible Nature; for as *His Grace* argues, 'Becauſe God is a Spirit, therefore 'we are not to liken him to any thing 'which is corporeal; we are not to re'preſent him *by the likeneſs of any thing 'that is in Heaven above*, *i. e.* of any 'Birds; *or in the Earth beneath*, *i. e.* of 'any Beaſts; *or in the Waters under the 'Earth*, *i. e.* of any Fiſh. For as the Pro'phet tells us, there is nothing that we 'can liken God to, *Iſa.* 40. 18. *To whom 'will ye liken God?* or, *What likeneſs will 'ye compare unto him?* We debaſe his ſpi'ritual and incorruptible Nature, when 'we compare him to corruptible Crea'tures, *Rom.* 1. 22, 23. St. *Paul* ſpeaking 'of the *Heathen* Idolatry, *who profeſſing 'themſelves wiſe, became fools; and changed 'the glory of the incorruptible God, into an 'Image made like to corruptible Man, and 'to Birds, and to four footed Beaſts, and 'creeping Things*, ſays, *They became Fools*; '*i. e.* This is the Folly of Idolatry, to 'liken a Spirit, which hath no bodily 'Shape, to things that are corporeal and 'corruptible. So that however ſome are 'pleas'd to mince the matter, I cannot 'ſee how the Church of *Rome*, which wor'ſhips God by or towards ſome Image or 'ſenſible Repreſentation, can be excus'd 'from Idolatry; and the Church of *Eng'land* doth not, without juſt cauſe, chal-

'lenge the *Romiſh* Church with it, and 'make it a ground of Separation from 'her. And ſince we *Chriſtians* under the Goſpel, have clearer Diſcoveries of God's ſpiritual Nature than the *Jews* ever had, we ſhall be far more unexcuſable, if we do not offer up to him a more ſpiritual Worſhip. And if Perfection of our Chriſtian Worſhip doth conſiſt in the ſpirituality of it, that it is the Worſhip of our Souls and of our moſt devout and fervent Affections, how can it be imagin'd, that an Image ſhould contribute any thing to the raiſing the Affections? Will not ſuch a Worſhip by viſible Repreſentations, rather incline us to entertain low and mean Thoughts of God, and bring down our *Idea's* of him to the Figure and Lineaments of a Man? And if the beſt *Idea's* or Notions we can frame of God, are unworthy of him, and infinitely below the Excellency of his Nature, how careful ought we to be, that we do not imagine him to be ſuch an one, nay, worſe than our ſelves? And to this purpoſe, when this Commandment was enforc'd on the People of *Iſrael* by a particular caution, *Deut.* 4. 15, 16. *Take ye therefore heed to your ſelves, leſt ye corrupt your ſelves, and make you a graven Image, the ſimilitude of any Figure, &c.* the ground of that Caution is expreſs'd in

in these Words, *For ye saw no manner of similitude on the Day that the Lord spake unto you:* Which evidently shews, that God will not be worship'd by any manner of similitude; for otherwise, he would have appear'd in that shape or likeness to them, if he had thought it agreeable to the Excellency and Dignity of his Nature.

But that the worshipping God by an Image, is not lawful; nay, that 'tis downright Idolatry, is evident from several Instances recorded in the Holy Scripture. I shall instance in that Calf which *Aaron* made in the absence of *Moses*, and those which *Jeroboam* set up in *Dan* and *Bethel*; the worshipping of which, is generally agreed to be Idolatry: That the Worship of the Calf which *Aaron* made was Idolatry, is evident from 1 *Cor.* 10. 7. where the Apostle exhorts the *Corinthians*, *Neither be ye Idolaters, as were some of them, as it is written; the People sat down to eat, and to drink, and rose up to play*; that is, that their celebrating a Feast in honour of this Calf, was Idolatry: And this Text is the more remarkable, because the Apostle here exhorts *Christians* to take care that they were not guilty of the same Crime, lest they should incur the same, or more grievous Punishments. And that this Idolatry did consist in worshipping the

the true God by this visible Representation, is as evident, because in either of these Cases, 'tis incredible that the *Israelites* should so soon have forgot the true God, and that when the Golden Calf was set up, *Exod.* 32. 4. they cried out, *This is thy God, O Israel, who brought thee out of the Land of Egypt; and Aaron built an Altar before it, and made Proclamation, and said, To morrow is a Feast to the Jehovah, or the Lord:* Now the Name *Jehovah* is never attributed in the Holy Scripture to any but the true God. And to close up all, the Burnt-offerings, and Peace-offerings, were the same which God in the Law commanded to be offered up, a Bullock and seven Rams; the offering of which, was the greatest Affront imaginable to the Religion of the *Egyptians*, as is evident from *Exod.* 8. 16. From this and a great deal more, which might be said on this Subject, it plainly appears, That the worshipping God by an Image, or visible Representation, is that Idolatry which the Children of *Israel* were charg'd with, and guilty of.

And therefore I shall only strengthen and confirm what I have said by one Observation more; That even that Idolatry which the *Heathens* were guilty of, was the same with the *Jews*, and that which is the crying Sin of the Church of *Rome*

at

at this Day. For there were few of them ſo fooliſh and ſtupid as to believe, that thoſe Stocks and Stones which they worſhipp'd, were the Gods who created the World, or that the Leeks or Onions which they planted, were the ſupream Deities; no, this extravagant Idolatry is peculiar to the Church of *Rome*; firſt, to adore their God, and then to eat him: But the Heathens treated the meaneſt of their Deities after another manner.

*Porrum & Cæpe nefas violare, & frangere morſu.*

Tho' they declar'd as the *Papiſts* do, That their Images were Symbols or Repreſentations of that Being to which they gave Divine Worſhip; and that none but a Fool could think otherwiſe of them, as * *Celſus* declares. That they never thought their Images to be Gods, or to have any Divinity in them, but what only comes from their Conſecration to ſuch a uſe; and, as † *St. Auſtin* tells us, that thro' theſe Images they worſhip'd the Deity. Moreover, ſays * *Maimonides*, as to what concerns Idolaters, you know that none of them worſhip the Idol with this Opinion, as if they thought there were no other

* Apud Origen, *l.* 7. *p.* 373. † St. Auſtin. Tom. 8. in Pſal. 113. * More Nevochim. ch. 36.

God

God but that: Nay, there never was any Man, nor will there ever be, who can fancy to himſelf, that the Figure which he hath made of Metals, Wood or Stones, created the Heavens and Earth, and governs them: But they worſhip them, inaſmuch as they look upon them as Things intermediate between them and God. And to name no more, *Julian* tells us, We do not think them Gods, but that thro them we may worſhip the Deity; for we being in the Body, ought to perform our Service in a way agreeable to it.

But may ſome ſay, If the *Heathens* did not make their Images the ultimate Objects of their Worſhip, why then do the Scriptures ſo often accuſe them for adoring Stocks and Stones, and for paying Divine Worſhip to Devils?

To which I anſwer, That they are juſtly accus'd for worſhipping all theſe, becauſe they made them either the Mediators between them and the Supream Being, or the Mediums by which they offered up their Worſhip, and hereby tranſferr'd the Worſhip, due to God alone, to theſe Idols, as the *Papiſts* at this Day do.

Well, but *N. C.* tells us, That even *Proteſtant* Writers, and ſome Learned Men in our Church, do allow, ſome Honour and Reſpect is due to the Images of Chriſt and the Saints; and he inſtances in the ingenuous

genuous Author, as he frequently calls him, of the *Answer to the Bishop of Meaux*, who says, 'We will honour the Relicts of the 'Saints, as the Primitive Church did; we 'will respect the Images of our Saviour, 'and the Blessed Virgin; and as some of 'us now bow towards the Altar, and all 'of us are enjoined to do so at the Name 'of *Jesus*, so will we not fail to testifie 'all due Respect to this Representation.

To which I answer, That Images are either such as represent God, and these are utterly unlawful to be made, or sold, or expos'd to publick View; or else, such as represent some visible Being; and these we may make, and are useful, as Ornaments to such Places, where they are not abus'd to Superstition or Idolatry: But even these cannot lawfully be worship'd with any sort of Divine Worship, nor any that comes near it, or gives any reasonable cause of suspicion of it, (nor doth that Learned Author allow of it.) because, as God himself gives the Reason in this Commandment, *God is a jealous God*; for, as he forbad *the having any other Gods besides himself* in the First Commandment, because *he is the Lord our God*; so in the Second, he forbids *the Worshipping of Images*, because *he is a jealous God*; so that tho' the *Papists* do not pay Divine Worship to their Images, yet if *their Eyes are after their Idols*, if they kiss them, and



bow

bow down unto them; a jealous God will never ſuffer ſuch Teſtimonies of Kindneſs. God will not be mov'd by their Diſtinctions of Relative, Inferior, and Improper Worſhip, by which they may prove either Side of the Queſtion; and anſwer this, as ſome of the Church of *Rome* in *Scotland* did the Queſtion, *Whether the the Lord's Prayer might be uſed to the Saints? That ultimately, principally, primarily, and ſtrictly, they might not; but ſecondarily, leſs principally and largely, and relatively they might*; as Biſhop *Andrews* tells us. *Anſw.* to *Peron*, pag. 59. But to return into the Way from whence we have diverted; *His Grace* tells us, That the moſt Learned Men in the Church of *Rome* do acknowledge, that they ly under the juſt ſuſpicion, and probable Charge of *Idolatry*; becauſe they give this Reaſon, why the Worſhip of *Images*, and the Invocation of *Saints* departed, were not practis'd in the Primitive Church, for the Firſt Three Hundred Years. 'That the Primitive Chriſtians did 'then forbear thoſe Practices, becauſe they 'ſeem'd to come too near to the *Heathen* 'Idolatry, and leſt the *Heathen* ſhould 'have taken occaſion to juſtify themſelves, 'if thoſe things had been practiſed among 'the *Chriſtians*: And they cannot now 'be ignorant, what Scandal they give by

'these Practices both to *Jews* and *Turks*, 'and how much they alienate them from '*Christianity* by this Scandal: Nor can 'they chuse but be sensible, upon how 'great Disadvantage they are, in defend-'ing these Practices from the Charge of '*Idolatry*: And that by all their blind 'Distinctions, with which they raise such 'a Cloud and Dust, they can hardly make 'any plausible and tolerable Defence for 'themselves, against this Charge: In 'so much, that to secure their own Peo-'ple from discerning their Guilt in this 'Matter, they have been put upon that 'shameful Shift of leaving out the Second 'Commandment in their common Cate-'chisms and Manuals; lest the People, 'seeing so plain a Law of God against so 'common a Practice of their Church, 'should upon that Discovery have broken 'off from them.

Now to this last Charge of leaving out the Second Commandment, *N. C.* answers, *First*, By denying the Matter of Fact; and says, 'That 'tis to be found in hundreds 'of Manuals and Catechisms, *in* England '*itself*; and that he has by him a Ma-'nual and Catechism, which has this Com-'mandment in it, in the same Form as it 'is in ours; and then breaks out into this intemperate and unbecoming Exclamation: *Now a Man* (he means the Arch-

Archbiſhop) *who can diſpence with his Honour and Conſcience, ſo far as to Publiſh from the Preſs and Pulpit, Untruths ſo eaſily diſcover'd, what Paradox may not he undertake to maintain?* Theſe are *hard Words* indeed, and one would think, that before he had given a Perſon of the Archbiſhop's Figure, ſuch Rude and Scurrilous Language, and the *downright Lye*; he ſhould have been well aſſur'd that he was on the right ſide of the Hedge, and that what he affirm'd was true; leſt the Bolt which he ſhot up ſhould *fall upon his own Pate.* For what was it that the Archbiſhop Publiſh'd from the Preſs and Pulpit? Was it, that the *Papiſts* had no Catechiſms and Manuals in which the Second Commandment was inſerted, *eſpecially in* England? This he dares not affirm. Or is it not true, that *Papiſts* do frequently leave it out? This is evident, and that in ſome of their Manuals they mangle them ſo, that one cannot tell what to make of them, nor can the People reap any Benefit by them: Of this kind, the Reverend Mr. *Spinckes* in his Learned *Anſwer* to the *Propoſals* for *Catholick Communion*, gives us an Inſtance of one which he has by him; where after the Firſt Commandment, the reſt are inſerted thus: 2. *Thou ſhalt not make.* 3. *Thou ſhalt not take.* 4. *Remember that thou keep*, &c.

But

But *Secondly*, he ſays, *That what we call the Second Commandment, is in truth part of the Firſt, and prohibits nothing but what the Firſt prohibits, the having or worſhiping more than one God.* But is not the having, and the worſhiping more Gods than one, two different things? Beſides, there is no Shew of Reaſon for dividing the Tenth into Two diſtinct Commandments, and making the Ninth to be, *Thou ſhalt not covet thy Neighbour's Wife*; and the Tenth, *Thou ſhalt not covet the other Poſſeſſions of thy Neighbour, as his Houſe, his Servant.* For *Firſt*, Our Saviour refer'd the Looking upon a Woman to Luſt after her, to the Seventh Commandment: And *Secondly*, *Moſes*, in the Twentieth *Chapter* of *Exodus*, reckons the Coveting of the Houſe firſt, and then of our Neighbour's Wife. So that if this Diſtinction had been genuine, the Ninth Commandment muſt have been included in the Tenth, which is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe.

I think there is but one thing more, which *N. C.* ſays upon this Head, which deſerves to be taken Notice of: He cannot gainſay, but that there are notorious and ſcandalous Abuſes in the Worſhip of Images in the *Church* of *Rome*; but he doth not think it reaſonable, that the Abuſe of a thing ſhould be urg'd as an *Argument* againſt the Uſe of it. Neither indeed ought it,

unleſs where the Abuſe of it is ſo flagrant, and univerſal, and of more pernicious Conſequence than the taking away of the Uſe of it can be; This was the true Cauſe of *Hezekiah*'s deſtroying the *Brazen Serpent*; not that the People Sacrificed to it, and made it a God, as *N. C.* tells us, which no one can reaſonably imagine of the *Jews*, who had been ſo long train'd up in the Knowledge and Worſhip of the true God; but that they made this the Viſible Symbol of Worſhiping the Inviſible God; and paid that Divine Worſhip to it, and by it, which is due to God alone.

And thus the *Papiſts* are juſtly charg'd with worſhiping a Crucifix, as is evident to any one who will give himſelf the trouble to look into their Miſſal; where there are ſo many Paſſages to this Purpoſe, that I cannot imagin with what Face *N. C.* could contradict what that Learned Author of the *Anſwer* to the Biſhop of *Meaux*, affirms concerning it. I ſhall only tranſcribe a Paſſage or two. In the Order for Bleſſing a *New Croſs*, after a ſolemn Conſecration of it, by Incenſe, Holy Water, and Prayer; the Rubrick directs, That the Biſhop kneeling before the *Croſs*, ſhould devoutly adore and kiſs it. And in the Order for the *Solemn Reception* of an *Emperor*, that the Croſs ſhall be carried on the

the right ſide of the *Emperor's* Sword; becauſe *Latria*, (*i. e.*) that ſort of Worſhip which is particularly due to Almighty God, is to be given to it. 'Tis eaſie to give an Hundred more ſuch Inſtances as theſe; and particularly, that in that very Place, 'tis *Adoramus eam*, (*i. e.*) *Crucem*; Let us worſhip the Croſs. Which *N. C.* muſt needs know, and be very well appriz'd of: And therefore by that ſevere Sentence, which he ſo rudely and unjuſtly paſſes upon the Right Reverend Author of the *Anſwer* to the Biſhop of *Meaux*, he muſt be condemn'd; it being very evident, *That tho'* N. C. *profeſſes himſelf to be ſo great a Friend to Sincerity and Truth, yet he manifeſtly ſwerves from both in this Point.*

# *Of* PURGATORY.

IN ſtating this Article of the *Popiſh* Faith concerning *Purgatory*, *N. C.* is very cautious, becauſe he is ſenſible that 'tis burthen'd with ſuch Difficulties, that no fair Account can be given of it; either from Scripture, or Reaſon, or the Practice of the Firſt Ages of the Church. And herein he follows the Steps of the Council of *Trent*; which declares only, *That the Souls there detain'd, are help'd by the Prayers of the Faithful, but eſpecially by the acceptable Sacrifice of the Maſs:* But doth not determine what ſort of Place *Purgatory* is, or what manner of Pain Souls endure in it; or whether they are purg'd by Material Fire, or by other Terrors and Anguiſhes of Mind: Theſe were Difficulties too knotty to be loos'd, and therefore both the Council and *N. C.* wiſely paſs them by; but tells us, 'That this Do-'ctrine in General is founded in Scripture, 'and in the Antient Practice of the Church; 'And that *Praying* for the *Dead*, which 'was Practis'd in the Primitive Church, is 'an *unanſwerable Argument* to prove, that 'they believed *Purgatory* too.

This

This he affirms indeed, with an Air of Aſſurance peculiar to himſelf; but however we have no Reaſon to take his Word for it, becauſe he has ſo often broke it already. And therefore I ſhall conſider what *His Grace* has ſaid on this Subject; and in doing ſo, I ſhall return a ſufficient Anſwer to *N. C.*'s *unanſwerable* Argument.

And, *Firſt*, *His Grace* affirms, That the Doctrine of Purgatory is not founded in Scripture, nor can be prov'd from it; and that ſome of their own eminent Men do acknowledge that it cannot.

To which *N. C.* anſwers, That he has produc'd two Paſſages from the Holy Scripture, and can produce many more which plainly prove it; and therefore he thinks he may ſafely tell the Doctor, *he is miſtaken*. And becauſe the Archbiſhop has not quoted any of their Learned Men, who ſay, That Purgatory cannot be prov'd from Scripture, therefore he takes it for granted, that he knew of none who do ſay ſo.

The two Texts of Scripture which he quotes, are, firſt, *Matth.* 5. 25, 26. *Agree with thy Adverſary quickly, whilſt thou art in the way with him: leſt at any time the Adverſary deliver thee to the Judge, and the Judge deliver thee to the Officer, and thou be caſt into Priſon. Verily, I ſay unto thee,*

*Thou ſhalt not come out thence till thou haſt paid the uttermoſt farthing.*

Theſe Words are ſpoke by our Saviour, to ſhew of what ill Conſequence 'tis to harbour and indulge a malicious and an uncharitable Temper; as will appear to any one who reads the former part of the Chapter; and therefore he exhorts his Hearers *to agree with their Adverſary quickly, whilſt they are in the way with him, i. e.* to be reconcil'd to thoſe with whom they have any difference; eſpecially thoſe they have wrong'd, whilſt they are travelling on in this World, leſt the Adverſary commence his Suit againſt them, and they be caſt, and then the Judge will deliver them to the Officer, *i. e.* the Devil, who is the Executioner of God's Vengeance, and they be caſt into Hell, from whence there is no Redemption, *they ſhall never depart till they have paid the uttermoſt farthing.* And that by *the uttermoſt farthing* is meant Hell, and not Purgatory, is plain; becauſe the *Papiſts* themſelves grant, that thoſe who are guilty of damnable and mortal Sins, do not go to Purgatory, but to Hell: Now this uncharitable Temper, againſt which our Saviour forewarns his Diſciples, is confeſs'd on all hands to to be a damnable Sin without Repentance; and the Parable ſuppoſes, that the Man did not repent of it, becauſe he did not agree;

agree with his Adverſary whilſt he was in the way, *i. e.* in this Life. Nor do theſe words, *That he ſhall not come out till he has paid the uttermoſt farthing*, denote, that he may pay the Debt which he owes, or that there will be a time when he ſhall be releas'd from his Torments, as is evident from a parallel Place, *Matth.* 18. 34. where our Saviour ſays, That the Lord of that Man who had not compaſſion for his fellow Servant, *delivered him to the Tormentors, till he ſhould pay all that was due unto him*; now that he could never pay this Debt is plain, becauſe we are told, *ver.* 25. *that he had not to pay.*

The other Text which *N. C.* quotes, is 1 *Cor.* 3. 10, 11, &c. *According to the Grace of God which is given me, as a wiſe Maſter-builder, I have laid the Foundation, and another buildeth thereon; but let every Man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other Foundation can no Man lay, than that which is laid, Jeſus Chriſt. Now if any Man build upon this Foundation, Gold, Silver, precious Stones, Wood, Hay, Stubble, every Man's Work ſhall be made manifeſt; for the Day ſhall declare it, becauſe it ſhall be reveal'd by Fire, and the Fire ſhall try every Man's Work of what ſort it is. If any Man's Work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he ſhall receive a Reward. If any Man's Work ſhall be burnt, he ſhall*

*ſuffer loſs, yet he himſelf ſhall be ſav'd, yet ſo as by Fire.*

The meaning of which place, *His Grace* gives us in theſe words; The Apoſtle here ſpeaks of a ſort of Perſons, who held indeed the Foundation of *Chriſtianity*, but built upon it ſuch Doctrines or Practices as would not bear the trial; which he expreſſes to us by *Wood, Hay, and Stubble*, which are not Proof againſt the Fire. Such a Perſon, the Apoſtle tells us, hath brought himſelf into a very dangerous State, tho' he would not abſolutely deny the poſſibility of his Salvation; *He himſelf ſhall be ſav'd, yet ſo as by Fire.*

'Tis evident, That by *Fire* here, is not meant the Fire of Purgatory, as ſome pretend, becauſe the Particle of Similitude, (ὡς) plainly ſhews, that the Apoſtle did not intend an Eſcape out of the Fire literally, but ſuch an Eſcape as Men make out of an Houſe, or Town, that is on fire; eſpecially, ſince very Learned Perſons of the Church of *Rome* do acknowledge, that Purgatory cannot be concluded from this Text; nay, all that *Eſtius* contends for from this place, is, that it cannot be concluded from hence that there is no Purgatory; which we never pretended, but only that this Text doth not prove it.

It is very well known that this is a Proverbial Phraſe, uſed not only in Scripture, but

but in prophane Authors, to signifie a narrow Escape out of a great Danger; *He shall be sav'd, yet so as by Fire,* διὰ πυρὸς out of the Fire; just as δι' ὕδατος is used, 1 *Pet.* 3. 20. where the Apostle speaking of the eight Persons of *Noah*'s Family, who escaped the Flood, διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος, *they escaped out of the Water.* So here this Phrase is to be render'd, *He himself shall escape, yet so as by Fire.* The like Expression you have, *Amos* 4. 11. *I have pluck'd them as a Fire-brand out of the Fire.* And, *Jude* 23. *Others save with fear, plucking them out of the Fire.* All which Expressions, signifie the greatness of the Danger, and the difficulty of escaping it; as one, who when his House at midnight is set on fire, and being suddenly wak'd, leaps out of his Bed, and runs naked out of the doors, taking nothing that is within along with him, but employing his whole care to save his Body from the Flames, as St. *Chrysostom* upon another occasion expresses it. And so the *Roman** Orator (who it is likely, did not think of Purgatory) useth this Phrase, *Quo ex Judicio, velut ex incendio, nudus effugit;* from which Judgment or Sentence, he escaped naked, as it were out of a burning: And one of the *Greek* † Orators tells us, *That to save a Man out of the Fire,* was a common Proverbial Speech.

* Tully. † Aristides.

To

To which I shall add, That these words, *so as by Fire*, cannot possibly denote a Purgatory Fire, because, *First*, this Fire is design'd for the Tryal of Mens Works, but Purgatory for the Torment of Mens Souls; *Secondly*, This Fire is to try every Man's Work, even those who build *Gold*, as well as those who build *Hay* and *Stubble*; whereas the Fire of Purgatory only tries those who are guilty of venial Sins; and, as the *Papists* tell us, many there are who never are try'd by it.

And now since *Bellarmine* tells us, That this is one of the most difficult, tho' profitable Texts, (which is true, if by profitable he means gainful, for generally the plainest Texts are most useful,) I hope 'tis by this time manifest, that Purgatory cannot be so plainly prov'd from it, as *N. C.* would have us believe; and therefore till he can bring some other Texts of Scripture which are more to the purpose, and prove this Doctrine of Purgatory more plainly, I am apt to believe the Reader will think that *N. C.* and not the Archbishop, was *mistaken*.

But, *Secondly*, *N. C.* tells us, That he reasonably presumes that *His Grace* could not produce the Testimonies of any Learned Men of the Church of *Rome*, who tell us, That Purgatory cannot be prov'd from Scripture, because he only quotes *Estius*, who,

*who, by the Doctor's own Confession, only says, that in his Opinion, the Passage of St.* Paul *above-cited, does not evince Purgatory; but does not say, that other Passages of Scripture do not.*

The Archbishop's Words are these, *All that* Estius *contends for in this place, is, that it cannot be concluded from hence, there is no Purgatory*; which is somewhat different from those *N. C.* cites. But, have they no other Authors who say the same thing? And, has the Archbishop cited none? What doth he think of * *Fisher*, Bishop of *Rochester*, cited in another place? *Vol.* 2. *Post Obit. p.* 314. who is of the same mind, and which *N. C.* must needs know, because he refers to the very Page in the next Objection. But more than this, does not † St. *Austin* himself say the same thing, that Purgatory cannot be prov'd from the Holy Scripture? Tho' 'tis confess'd, that he was wavering as to his Opinion, whether there was any Purgatory or not.

*Secondly, His Grace* objects against the Belief of Purgatory, that Text, *Rev.* 14.13. *I heard a Voice from Heaven saying unto me,*

* *De Purgatorio apud priscos, nulla vel rarissima fiebat mentio.* Act. 18. contra Lutherum.

† *Nec ullus ulli medius locus ut possit esse nisi cum diabolo, qui non est cum Christo; tertium penitus ignoramus, imo nec esse in Scripturis Sanctis invenimus.* St. Augustinus de peccatorum meritis & remissione. cap. 28.

*write,*

*write, Bleſſed are the Dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth: Yea, ſaith the Spirit, that they may reſt from their Labours; and their Works do follow them.*

From whence *His Grace* infers, That if *thoſe who die in the Lord are at reſt from all their Labours* and Pains, then this Text concludes directly againſt the feigned Purgatory of the Church of *Rome*, which ſuppoſeth a great Number, yea, the far greateſt part of thoſe *that die in the Lord*, to have obtain'd eternal Redemption by him from Hell; not to paſs immediately into Happineſs, but to be detain'd ſomewhere, (they are not certain where, but moſt probably in the Suburbs of Hell) in great Pain and Torment, equal in degree to that of Hell, and differing only in Duration; I ſay, to be detained there till their Souls are purg'd from the Defilements they have contracted in this World, and the Debt of temporal Puniſhments to which they are liable, be ſome way or other paid off, and diſcharged.

They ſuppoſe indeed, ſome very few Holy Men to be ſo perfect at their departure out of this Life, that they do immediately, and without any ſtop, paſs into Heaven, becauſe they need no Purgation; and thoſe likewiſe who ſuffer Martyrdom, becauſe they diſcharge their Debts of temporary Puniſhments here; but the generality

lity of *Chriſtians* who *die in the Lord*, they ſuppoſe ſo imperfect, as to ſtand in need of being *purg'd by Fire*, and accordingly that they are detain'd a longer or ſhorter time, as their Debt of temporary Puniſhments is greater or leſs.

But how is it then, that St. *John* ſays, that thoſe that *dye in the Lord* are happy, becauſe *they reſt from their Labours*: If it be ſo, the far greateſt part of thoſe *who dye in the Lord*, are ſo far from reſting from their Labours, that they enter into far greater Pains and Torments, than ever they endur'd in this World. And therefore *Bellarmine*, (that their Doctrine of Purgatory may receive no Prejudice from this Text) would have *from hence forth* in the Text, to be dated from the Day of Judgment, when he ſuppoſes the Pains of Purgatory will be at an end. But why, *from hence forth* ſhould take Date from the Day of Judgment, he can give no Reaſon, but only to ſave Purgatory, from being condemn'd by this Text. For St. *John* plainly ſpeaks of the Happineſs of thoſe that ſhould dye after that time, (whatever it be) that he there deſcribes. But that time cannot be the Day of Judgment, becauſe none ſhall die after that time.

To which *N. C.* replies: *Firſt*, That this ſeems to be an obſcure and difficult Text of Scripture, becauſe *His Grace*

ſpends

ſpends ſo much Time and Paper in explaining of it: And 2*dly*, That he allows, *that* by thoſe who *dye in the Lord*, are meant, thoſe who ſuffer Martyrdom for Chriſt's ſake. And then he goes on, Railing after his uſual manner, without any Fear, Reaſon, or Wit. 'Wherefore, in my Opi-'nion, (ſays *N.C.*) he ſhould have given us 'another Interpretation of this Text, or 'have let Purgatory alone. But 'tis no 'new thing to find the Doctor pull down 'in one Place, what he built in ano-'ther: And therefore I am not ſurpriz'd 'to ſee Purgatory brought in by Head 'and Shoulders, and ſpoken againſt, 'in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon. 'Tis Purga-'tory that reproaches the Sacrileges and 'Depredations of the Doctor's Anceſtors 'of worthy Memory, and bears hard up-'on their Poſterity; and upon that ac-'count it muſt be cry'd down; leſt the 'Guilt of the Sacrilege of the *Fathers* 'ſhould fly in the Face of the *Children*, and 'give them that Purgatory in this Life, 'which, he would perſuade them, they 'ſhall not meet with in the next.

As to the Difficulty of the Text, *His Grace* tells us, that tho' there is ſome Difficulty about the Interpretation of ſome particular Expreſſions in them; yet the general Senſe and Intendment of them is very plain, and ſo it appears to be, to any con-

conſiderate Reader. *Secondly*, That tho' he allows that the Martyrs are certainly included, and perhaps primarily intended, by thoſe *that dye in the Lord*; yet there is no reaſon to reſtrain this general Expreſſion to them only. And as for thoſe Railing Accuſations, which he brings againſt both the Church of *England* and the Government, I have ſaid enough already on this Subject; and ſince 'tis foreign to the Matter in hand, I ſhall not anſwer him according to his Folly.

But before I proceed, I ſhall inſert a Paragraph of the Archbiſhop's, becauſe it contains ſome proper Arguments againſt *Purgatory*, and immediately follows the former; and yet *N. C.* does not take the leaſt notice of it.

The Scripture is perpetually ſilent about this Doctrine of *Purgatory*, tho' there are ſo many fair Occaſions of ſpeaking of it; as in the Parallel of the Rich Man and *Lazarus*, where the Future State is ſo particularly deſcrib'd, yet there is no mention made, nor the leaſt intimation given of this *Third* State. But beſides the Silence of the Scripture about it, there are ſeveral Paſſages utterly inconſiſtent with it; as, namely, St. *Paul's* Diſcourſe in the beginning of the Fifth Chapter of the Second Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, where he plainly declares, the aſſurance he had that

all

all ſincere *Chriſtians*, ſo ſoon as they quit the Body, do paſs into Happineſs; *For we know, that if our earthly Houſe of this Tabernacle were diſſolved, we have a Building of God, a Houſe not made with Hands, eternal in the Heavens.* The plain meaning of which is, That ſo ſoon as we quit the one, we ſhall paſs into the other. And this Conſideration, he tells us, made *Chriſtians* weary of this World, and willing to die, *ver.* 2. *For in this we groan earneſtly, deſiring to be cloath'd upon with our Houſe, which is from Heaven*; and, *ver.* 4. *For we that are in this Tabernacle do groan, being burthen'd.* But had *Chriſtians* believ'd, that the greateſt part of them, when they left the Body, were to go into Purgatory, to be terribly tormented there, they would not have been in ſuch haſte to die, but would have protracted the time as long as they could, and have contentedly born the Burthen of this earthly Tabernacle, rather than to quit it for a Condition a thouſand times more intolerable. But St. *Paul* expreſly ſays, That *Chriſtians* know the contrary; and that as ſoon as ever they went out of the Body, they ſhould be happy, and with the Lord; and that this gave them courage againſt the Fears of Death, *ver.* 6. *Therefore we are always confident*, θαῤῥοῦντες δὲ πάντοτε, *bono igitur animo ſumus*; therefore we are always

of

of good courage, *knowing that whilst we are at home in the Body, we are absent from the Lord*; and, ver. 8. *We are of good courage, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the Body, and present with the Lord.* The plain sense of which is, That *Christians* were willing rather to die than to live, because they knew, that so soon as they *left the Body*, and departed this Life, they should be present with the Lord. But now if the Doctrine of Purgatory be true, this whole Reasoning of St. *Paul* proceeds upon a gross mistake; and therefore I am certain it is not true.

But, as *N. C.* says, the Third Objection the Doctor brings is, That we have a very considerable substantial Reason to exempt, as few as possibly we can, from going to Purgatory; because (says he) the more we put in fear of going thither, the Market of Indulgences (as he calls it) riseth the higher, and the profit thence accruing to the Pope's Coffers; and the more and greater Legacies will be left to the Priests, to hire their saying of Masses for the delivery of Souls out of that Place of Torments.

This I find is *Argumentum ad hominem*, and touches the sensible part of the Popish Emissaries; their great *Diana* Interest lies at stake in the maintenance of

this Article of their Creed, and therefore 'tis no wonder if *N. C.* grows impatient, and *lays about him*, without regarding Friend or Foe. But not to give my Reader the trouble of an Answer to these *ridiculous* Expressions of his Passion, let me ask him calmly, Are not these things which the Archbishop objects Matters of Fact? Nay, is not this Doctrine attended with far greater Abuses than any of those which are here instanc'd in? And if so, what Reason had he to cry out? *For shame Doctor! away with such unchristian Scandals, and do not put us upon exposing your Credit and Character any farther, &c.* Certainly, nothing can more expose him and his Party, than such rude Insults as these, upon the Governours of our Church, and even at such a time when they are *over-look'd*, and partake liberally of the unmerited Clemency and Indulgence of the Government.

But *N. C.* has an Argument to prove a Purgatory, which he thinks *unanswerable*, *viz.* that if it doth appear that the Primitive Church did pray for the Dead, that their Sins might be forgiven them; then it will necessarily follow, that they believ'd those Souls they thus pray'd for to be in a place where they might be help'd and benefited by their Prayers.

But, *First*, praying for the Dead doth not suppose a Purgatory, because the *Ancients*

*cients* pray'd for many of those, whom the *Papists* will acknowledge never were in Purgatory; as for Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles, of whose happy Estate it were Impiety to make any question. *Secondly*, Because we have many instances of those who did believe and practice Prayer for the Dead, and yet never believ'd a Purgatory, as particularly the *Greek Church*.

To this *N. C.* answers; *First*, By denying that Prayers were made for the Apostles, Martyrs, or the Virgin *Mary*.

*Secondly*, That 'tis a shameful Evasion to conclude, that the Primitive Church did not believe Purgatory, because they pray'd for the Virgin *Mary*, and the Apostles, and Martyrs.

That Prayers were made for Patriarchs, Prophets, &c. is evident from the Constitutions of *Clement*, *lib.* 8. *cap.* 18. *Offerimus pro iis qui tibi placuerunt à Seculo pro Sanctis Patriarchis, Prophetis, &c.* Nay, as *N. C.* confesses, The *Roman Missal* doth the same now; it offers up Prayers for, and in honour of the Apostles, Martyrs, and the blessed Virgin *Mary*. But then (says he) these Prayers are not intended for the delivery of their Souls from any Pains, &c. And who ever said they were? But we say that from hence it is evident, That Prayer for the Dead is not such an *unanswerable* Argument to prove a Purgatory,

becauſe many of thoſe they pray for; by their own Confeſſion, never were in Purgatory; And the Church in the firſt Ages did not believe a Purgatory, tho' they us'd ſome ſort of Prayer for the Dead.

The truth is, 'twas an early cuſtom in the Primitive Church, to make ſome kind of Memorial for the Dead, which quickly came to be us'd in form of a Prayer: they thought the Souls were not in perfect Reſt and Happineſs till the Reſurrection; this Opinion they might probably imbibe from the Philoſophy of *Plato*, which had too great an Influence on the Opinions of the firſt *Chriſtians*, and was one Reaſon why that Caveat of the Apoſtle was given to them, *to beware of vain Philoſophy*. From hence *Origen* took his Notion, that after ſome time the damn'd in Hell, and even the Devils, ſhould be ſav'd. And theſe Philoſophical Opinions, by degrees, were form'd into a belief of Purgatory; which has ſince been ſo fruitful of Errors and ſuperſtitious Practices, ſuch as Indulgences, Maſſes for the Dead, Viſions, Apparitions, *&c.* as have tended very much to the diſcredit of the Chriſtian Religion, and to propagate Irreligion and Atheiſm in the World; and then 'tis no wonder that this Handle was took hold of, to deprive the Church of thoſe Revenues which were obtain'd by ſuch ill Arts, and apply'd to ſuch ſuperſtitious and unwarrantable Uſes.

Of

# *Of* INDULGENCES.

CONcerning Indulgences; there is ſo much difference amongſt the Popiſh Writers themſelves, that 'tis a very difficult matter to form any juſt Notion of the Doctrine of the *Church* of *Rome* about them.

The Council of *Trent* only tells us, *That the Power of Indulgences was left in the Church by Chriſt, and that the uſe of them is very helpful to Chriſtian People*; but doth not determine how and in what manner it is helpful, whether by freeing us from the Guilt or from the Puniſhment of our Sins; if from the Puniſhment, from what ſort of Puniſhment; whether the Eternal, or Temporal, or the Cenſures and Diſcipline of the Church.

'Tis true, *N. C.* tells us, That 'tis only from the laſt; and that Indulgence is nothing elſe but a Relaxation, or Remiſſion of ſome part of (or all) thoſe penitential Works to which a Sinner is liable by the Canons of the Church; which Remiſſion is granted by the Paſtors, but eſpecially by the chief Paſtor of the Church, upon ſome weighty Conſiderations, for the greater benefit and advantage of the Faithful in general. And that the *Roman Church*

'neither means by Indulgences, nor pre-
'tends to any more than the same Power,
'which the Primitive Fathers both had and
'practis'd, *i. e.* of dispensing with or re-
'mitting the Penances prescrib'd by the
'Canons; nor do they ever pretend to dispense
'with any Man from Repentance for Sin, or
'Obedience to the Law of God. And
'that there is not one Divine or Casuist in
'that Church who doth not hold, that it is
'sinful and diabolical, even the Sin of *Si-*
'*mon Magus*, to give or receive any Money
'for Indulgences. 'Tis confessed indeed,
'that there have been many Abuses in this
'matter in the *Church* of *Rome*, but that
'they are so far from countenancing or
'abetting them, that it is their earnest
'Wishes and the *desire of their Hearts*, that
'all such should be entirely abolish'd and
'taken away.

This is a very smooth and plausible Apology for one of the vilest and most scandalous Practices which we charge upon the *Church* of *Rome*, and a Representation of Matter of Fact as far remov'd from Truth, as Light is from Darkness. But because *His Grace* has said very little upon this Subject, I shall only make two or three Remarks on his Account which *N. C.* has given us, and so, for this time, take leave of my Author.

And, *First*, will *N. C.* affirm, That Indulgence

dulgence is; nothing else but a Remission of those Penitential Works, to which a Sinner is liable by the Canons of the Church? But if this was true, what need they talk so much of the Treasure of the Church? Why do their Indulgences run for the Dead, and those who are in Purgatory, as well as the Living? What need is there of the distinctions of Plenary, more Plenary, and most Plenary Indulgences, and such like? And, can there be any thing more evident, than that the Bulls of their Popes, promise a full pardon of all Sins, a freedom from the Guilt as well as the Punishment of Sin? And can we imagine, that if the People did not thus understand them, they would part with so much Money for the purchase of them?

*Secondly*, He tells us, That the *Roman Church* means nothing else by Indulgences, but the same Power which the Primitive Fathers both had and practis'd. But this is evidently false; neither can he bring any Instance of this Practice in the first Ten Centuries, 'twas a Doctrine that crept into the *Romish Church* after the belief of Purgatory was settled, and upheld solely by the temporal Interest of the *Popes*, and the gainful Markets which they made by it. But this N. C. denies, and tells us, That 'tis sinful and diabolical to give or receive any Money for Indulgences, nay,

the Sin of *Simon Magus*; and that none of their Divines or Caſuiſts allow of it.

'Tis very ſtrange that any Man ſhould ſo confidently deny what can be ſo eaſily prov'd; what is evident from Hiſtory, from the very Bulls of their *Popes*, from their own Writings, and from their conſtant and daily Practice: This is ſo notorious, that I ſhall only give an inſtance or two of it, and leave the Reader to judge for himſelf.

And *Firſt*, Did not the Publiſhing Indulgences, and ſetting them to Sale, give Occaſion to *Luther*, to Preach againſt the Church of *Rome*? What was it that he found ſo much Fault with, but that *Leo* the Tenth ſending Indulgences throughout all Chriſtendom, ſet them at high Prices, and collected vaſt Sums of Money; part of which he diſtributed to ſeveral Perſons, and particularly to his Siſter * *Magdalen*? Did not *Boniface* the Ninth inſert this Clauſe in his

* *Seguendo queſti eſſempii Leone, coſi conſegliato dal Cardinal Santi quattro mando una Indulgenza, & remiſſione de peccati, per tutte le Regioni di Chriſtiani concedendola a chi contribuiſſe danari & eſtendendola anco a morti: per i quali quando foſſe fatta l'eſborſatione, voleva che foſſero liberati dalle pene del Purgatorio.*

Im-

his Bulls; *parrigentibus Manus adjutrices*; which in plain *English* is, to those who would give Money for them. Nay is there not a Book extant, entitled, *Taxæ Cancellariæ Apostolicæ*, which gives an Account of the different Rates, which Indulgences for several sorts of Sins are set at; and, as an Author of their own complains, not only teaches Men unheard-of Crimes, but gives a Licence for most of them, and Absolution for all, at a very easy Rate? Is it not easy to give a Thousand Evidences of this Matter? And yet this Man will bear us down, that there is no such thing as Buying or Selling Indulgences in the Church of *Rome*: They do so indeed in *Protestant Countries*, where the Practice is not so common; but in *Popish Countries* they turn the Tables; and there you shall hear nothing, but of the Treasury of the Church, and of the Plenitude of Power conferr'd upon St. *Peter* and his Suc-

*Imperoche havendo egli del* 1517, *publicata la universale concessione delle Indulgenze distribuì una parte delle rendite, prima che fossero raccolte, ne ben seminate; donando a diversi le revenute di diverse Provincie & riserbando anco alcune per la sua camera. In particolare dono il tratto delle Indulgenze della Sassonia, & di quel braccio di Germania, che di la camina fino al mare, a Madalena sua Sorella.* Hist. del Concil. Trid. p. 4.

Successors, to forgive Sins; and there the the poor People implicitly believe all that is told them, and practise more than a *Protestant* can well believe.

But perhaps *N. C.* will say, These there are the Abuses he complains of, which Papists, *with all their Heart*, desire should be redress'd. But were not these Abuses complain'd of, and acknowledg'd long ago at the Council of *Trent*? And yet no Redress could be obtain'd for them. Are not these Abuses practis'd by their Popes, and Bishops, and Governors of their *Church*, and continued at this day; and how heinous a Sin must it needs be, by these *Pious Frauds* (as some of their own Authors term them) not only to cheat the People of their Goods, but to lull them into a deep and fatal Security, and ruine their Souls, under pretence of pardoning their Sins. Nay is not the Assent to this Doctrine made an Article of Faith, absolutely necessary to be believ'd, in order to Salvation, by every Member of the Christian Church?

Well, but says *N. C.* 'Where is the harm 'of Believing this and the other Points of 'the *Popish* Faith; tho' we have not so 'much Assurance of their being Divine 'Truths, as we have of other things, how 'can this hurt any body? But there is 'infinite Harm in not believing, because



the

the Church of *Rome* has commanded me to believe, and dare not to hear and believe, it should be my Sin, or being reputed Heretick and Publican: Suppose it should happen, that the Points in Dispute were not commanded by Christ and his Apostles; where is the Harm in believing them, since we are commanded so to do by the Church? To which I answer, That true Faith is an Assent founded upon Rational Motives, and that to assent to anything without knowing why or wherefore, is not Faith, but Credulity; which is so far from being commendable, that it generally betrays Men into the most foolish Errors, and the most superstitious and unreasonable Practices. God has given us the Holy Scripture to be the Rule of our Faith, and the Guide of our Actions; he has given us a Rational Soul to consider them, and make use of them to our Comfort and Advantage; he expects that we should offer him up the Service of a Man, a Rational Service, proceeding from Choice and Knowledge, and directed by those Rules which he has given us; and whoever worships him with Inventions of his own Brain, and gives himself up to the Conduct of those Blind Guides, whose Design is to make Merchandize of their Proselytes, and whose whole Religion is

only

only an Art to support the Temporal Greatness of the Church of *Rome*, instead of a *Well done, good and faithful Servant*, will be ask'd; *Who required these things from him?* But this is not all: For there are several of the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, which necessarily engage Men in the Practice of the most heinous Sins; such as Superstition, Uncharitableness, *Idolatry*; and expose the best meaning Men of their Communion to apparent Danger of Eternal Damnation: But for those who have been bred *Protestants*, and knowingly and willingly run into these Sins, I will leave them to God's Mercy; but can give them no Hopes of Salvation at all, according to the Tenor of the Gospel.

And because they glory so much in the Number of their Proselytes; and how many they bring over to the *Popish Religion*; whereas, as *N. C.* tells us, the *Protestant Faith* doth not make any Progress. I shall conclude with a Passage or two from the Archbishop's Sermons, *Edit. post Obit.* shewing us in some measure the Reason of it. 'And here, says *His Grace*, I might take notice likewise, what worldly and indirect Means they commonly make use of, to make Disciples and gain Proselytes, by Flattery and Falshood, by concealing and misrepresenting their Doctrines and Practices, by defaming their

their Adversaries with known Fictions Calumnies; tempting Men from their Religion by Promises of Temporal Advantages; which when they have gain'd them, they do not always make good. Can any thing be more opposite to the Genius of the Christian Religion, than to promote it by Means so plainly contrary to the very Nature and Design of it? It must be confess'd, that nothing can be more serviceable to the Religion of the Church of *Rome*; for such a Religion as is calculated for the promoting Secular Interest, is to be carried on by Secular Arts. And of this (says *His Grace*) we have a Famous Instance in that Worldly and Secular Church; which now for several Hundred Years hath more pursued the End of Secular Greatness and Dominion, than any other Church hath done the Ends of True Religion, the Glory of God, and the Salvation of Men's Souls. So that there is hardly any Doctrine or Practice peculiar to that Church, and differing from our common Christianity, but it hath a direct and visible tendency to the promoting of some Worldly Interest or other. For Instance, Why do they deny the People the Holy Scriptures, and the Service of God in such a Language which they can understand? But that by keeping

ing them in Ignorance, they may have them in more perfect Slavery and Subjection to them? Why do they forbid their Priests to Marry? But that they may have no Interest distinct from that of their Church; and leave all to it when they dye? To what End is Auricular Confession? But to keep People in Awe, by the knowledge of their Secrets? Why must the Laity only receive the Sacrament in One Kind, but to draw a greater Reverence to the Priest, whose Privilege it shall be to receive in Both? And why is the Intention of the Priest necessary to the Efficacy of the Sacraments? But to perswade the People, that notwithstanding the Gracious Intention of God towards Mankind, they cannot be sav'd without the Goodness of the Priest? The Doctrines of Purgatory and Indulgences, are a plain Device to make their Markets of the Sins and Souls of Men, &c. I might instance in a Hundred Things more in that Church, which are of the same tendency. But that which is most remarkable is, that St. *John* foretold, that it should be the Character of Antichrist, that he should be of a Worldly Spirit, and the Doctrines such as should serve a Secular Interest and Design; 1 *Joh.* 4, 5. *They are of the World, and they speak from the World, and the World hears them.*

And tho' I do not from hence infer, that

the *Pope* is Antichrist, as some have done; yet I think I have reason to say with my Lord *Bacon*; That if a Hue and Cry should come after *Antichrist*, which should describe him by those *Characters*, by which he is decypher'd in the *Bible*, the *Pope* would certainly be apprehended for him.

And now having given a short, but I hope a distinct and satisfactory Answer to to all those Objections *N. C.* has brought against the *Archbishop's* Sermons; I shall conclude with the Profession of a Sincere *Love* and Hearty *Good Will* to the Persons of our Adversaries; and my Prayers, That what I have Writ may be useful to open their Eyes, and convince their Judgments; *That they may see in this their Day, the things which belong to their Peace, and Eternal Welfare.* And to this End:

O *Lord, we beseech thee to keep thy Church and Household continually in thy true Religion; that they who do lean only upon the Hope of thy Heavenly Grace, may evermore be defended by thy mighty Power, through Jesus Christ our our Lord.*

O *Lord, who hast taught us, that all our doings without Charity are nothing worth, send thy Holy Ghost, and pour into our Hearts that most excellent Gift*

*Gift of Charity, the very Band of Peace, and of all Virtues; without which whosoever liveth, is counted dead before thee. Grant this for thy only Son Jesus Christ his sake. Amen. Amen.*

FINIS.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

*I have here inserted the chief of the* Errata, *which either pervert or obscure the Sense. Many more there are, (especially when I quote* N. C.*'s own Words, which I have taken care punctually to transcribe) which are not to be imputed to the Press.*

## *ERRATA.*

PAg. 10. l. 14. r. day appointed for. p. 11. l. 14. r. second. p. 26. l. 19. r. *Greek*. p. 34. l. 23. r. no, not St. *Peter*. p. 39. l. 5. r. as a new. p. 44. l. 20. r. his. p. 45. l. 12. r. these. p. 67. r. nibble at. p. 70. l. *penult*. r. intended. p. 88. l. 13. r. as. p. 81. l. 15. r. and this. p. 84. l. 21. r. the. p. 106. l. 6. r. vend such. p. 109. l. 15. r. *integrum*. p. 109. l. 31. r. thus. p. 113. l. 4. r. for. p. 122. *penult*. r. γλωσσῶν. p. 131. r. *permittatur*. p. 138. l. 5. r. of. p. 132. l. 5. *dele* as. 135. l. 23. *dele* that. p. 156. l. 3. r. was.